



WHITESTONE SOLAR FARM

Volume 5: Reports and Statements

5.1 Consultation Report Appendix E Statutory Consultation Feedback Part One

Application Document ref. EN0110020/APP/5.1
Revision 01
June 2026

Planning Act 2008
Infrastructure Planning
(Applications: Prescribed Forms and
Procedure) Regulations 2009
Regulation 5(2)(q)

Contents

APPENDIX E1 FEEDBACK FROM S42 CONSULTEES 2

 Appendix E1.1 Feedback from s42(1)(a) consultees and Applicant
 Responses 2

 Appendix E1.2 Feedback from s42(1)(b) consultees and Applicant
 Responses 236

 Appendix E1.3 Feedback from s42(1)(d) consultees and Applicant
 Responses 453

APPENDIX E1 FEEDBACK FROM S42 CONSULTEES

This appendix includes all statutory consultation feedback from s42 stakeholders. The Applicant has split the feedback into the different consultees (s42(1)(a), s42(1)(b) and s42(1)(d) to ensure the feedback is clear. Within the s42(1)(a) responses, the Applicant has divided the feedback into two sections: s42(1)(a) consultees other than parish councils and s42(1)(a) relevant parish councils. This is to aid the finding of feedback within this document. The parish council feedback and the s42(1)(d) land interest feedback strongly reflect the community feedback presented in **Appendix E2 [EN0110020/APP/5.1]**. For this reason, the parish council feedback and land interest feedback has been analysed and grouped thematically in the same way as the community feedback, with an Applicant Response provided for each subtopic. The other feedback presented in this section has been copied out verbatim and listed by consultee, with the Applicant Response provided for each point made.

Appendix E1.1 Feedback from s42(1)(a) consultees and Applicant Responses

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
s42(1)(a) Consultees other than Parish Councils			
Cadent Gas	In respect of existing Cadent infrastructure, Cadent will require appropriate protection for retained apparatus including compliance with relevant standards for works proposed within close proximity of its apparatus, Cadent Infrastructure within or in close proximity to the development. Cadent has identified the following apparatus within the vicinity of the proposed works: ▪ w 2 bar) gas pipes and associated equipment. (As a result it is highly likely that there are also gas services and associated apparatus in the vicinity, these are not shown on plans but their presence should be anticipated) Note: No liability of any kind whatsoever is accepted by Cadent Gas Limited or their agents, servants or contractors for any error or omission.	Cadent Gas assets within close proximity of the Proposed Development have been identified and avoided via the relevant asset records. The Applicant has contacted Cadent's asset protection team to discuss the required safety clearances and buffer zones for installing/constructing near the assets. Interaction plans are being developed by the Applicant and have been shared with Cadent Gas for review as part of ongoing engagement.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Cadent Gas	Diversions: Where diversions of apparatus are required to facilitate the scheme, Cadent will require adequate notice and discussions should be started at the earliest opportunity. Please be aware that diversions for high pressure apparatus can take in excess of two years to plan and procure materials. Cadent will require the party requesting the diversion works to obtain any necessary land rights, planning permissions and other consents to enable the diversion works to be carried out. Details of these consents should be agreed in writing with Cadent before any application is made. Cadent requires a minimum of C4/ Design study to have been carried out to establish an appropriate diversion route, temporary and permanent land take ahead of any application being made. Where diversions sit outside the highway boundary the party requesting the diversion will be responsible for obtaining at their cost and granting to Cadent the necessary land rights, on Cadent's standard terms, to allow the construction, maintenance and access of the diverted apparatus. As such adequate land rights must be granted to Cadent (e.g. following the exercise of compulsory powers to acquire such rights included within the DCO) to enable works to proceed, to Cadent's satisfaction. Cadent's approval to the land rights powers included in the DCO prior to submission is strongly recommended to avoid later substantive objection to the DCO. Land rights will be required to be obtained prior to construction and	As part of the design, a PAS128 Type D survey was undertaken, and any known assets have been avoided with an appropriate offset between infrastructure and Cadent assets. There will be requirements to cross Cadent assets with access roads and cabling, the exact locations to be agreed at the detailed design stage. The draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] contains protective provisions for the benefit of Cadent Gas.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	commissioning of any diverted apparatus, in order to avoid any delays to the project's timescales. A diversion agreement may be required addressing responsibility for works, timescales, expenses and indemnity.		
Cadent Gas	Protection/Protective Provisions: Where the Promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with any of Cadent's apparatus, Cadent will require appropriate protection for retained apparatus and further discussion on the impact to its apparatus and rights including adequate Protective Provisions. Operations within Cadent's existing easement strips are not permitted without approval and will necessitate a Deed of Consent or Crossing Agreement being put in place. Any proposals for work in the vicinity for Cadent's existing apparatus will require approval by Plant Protection under the Protective Provisions/Asset Protection Agreement and early discussions are advised.	The Applicant is currently engaging with Cadent's asset protection team to ensure any works that may be required in close proximity to Cadent's assets are carried out in line with the relevant guidance. The Applicant's legal team is also engaging with Cadent's legal team to ensure that the appropriate Protective Provisions are in place.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Cadent Gas	Key Considerations: • Cadent has a Deed of Grant of Easement for each pipeline, which prevents the erection of permanent / temporary buildings/structures, change to existing ground levels or storage of materials etc within the easement strip. • Please be aware that written permission is required before any works commence within the Cadent easement strip and a Crossing Agreement may be required if any apparatus needs to cross the Cadent easement strip • The below guidance is not exhaustive and all works in the vicinity of Cadent's asset shall be subject to review and approval from Cadent's plant protection team in advance of commencement of works on site. General Notes on Pipeline Safety: • You should be aware of the Health and Safety Executives guidance document HS(G) 47 "Avoiding Danger from Underground Services", and Cadent's specification for Safe Working in the Vicinity of Cadent High Pressure gas pipelines and associated installations - requirements for third parties GD/SP/SSW22. Digsafe leaflet Excavating Safely - Avoiding injury when working near gas pipes. There will be additional requirements dictated by Cadent's plant protection team. • Cadent will also need to ensure that our pipelines remain accessible throughout and after completion of the works . • The actual depth and position must be confirmed on site by trial hole investigation under the supervision of a Cadent representative. Ground	All points noted. The Applicant is currently engaging with Cadent's asset protection team to ensure any works that may be required in close proximity to Cadent's assets are carried out in line with the relevant guidance. The Applicant's legal team is also engaging with Cadent's legal team to ensure that the appropriate Protective Provisions are in place. Appropriate surveys will be carried out on site to identify the exact location and depths of Cadent Gas assets prior to construction works commencing. Where it is identified and agreed that Cadent Gas supervision is required during construction due to close proximity, works will only be carried out with a suitable Cadent Gas representative present to monitor.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	cover above our pipelines should not be reduced or increased. • If any excavations are planned within 3 metres of Cadent High Pressure Pipeline or, within 10 metres of an AGI (Above Ground Installation), or if any embankment or dredging works are proposed then the actual position and depth of the pipeline must be established on site in the presence of a Cadent representative. A safe working method agreed prior to any work taking place in order to minimise the risk of damage and ensure the final depth of cover does not affect the integrity of the pipeline. • Below are some examples of work types that have specific restrictions when being undertaken in the vicinity of gas assets therefore consultation with Cadent's Plant Protection team is essential: ▪ Demolition ▪ Blasting ▪ Piling and boring ▪ Deep mining ▪ Surface mineral extraction ▪ Landfilling ▪ Trenchless Techniques (e.g. HDD, pipe splitting, tunnelling etc.) ▪ Wind turbine installation ▪ Solar farm installation ▪ Tree planting schemes • Pipeline Crossings: • Where existing roads cannot be used, construction traffic should ONLY cross the pipeline at agreed locations. • The pipeline shall be protected, at the crossing		

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	points, by temporary rafts constructed at ground level. The third party shall review ground conditions, vehicle types and crossing frequencies to determine the type and construction of the raft required. • The type of raft shall be agreed with Cadent prior to installation. • No protective measures including the installation of concrete slab protection shall be installed over or near to the Cadent pipeline without the prior permission of Cadent. • Cadent will need to agree the material, the dimensions and method of installation of the proposed protective measure. • The method of installation shall be confirmed through the submission of a formal written method statement from the contractor to Cadent. • A Cadent representative shall monitor any works within close proximity to the pipeline. New Service Crossing: • New services may cross the pipeline at perpendicular angle to the pipeline i.e. 90 degrees. • Where a new service is to cross over the pipeline a clearance distance of 0.6 metres between the crown of the pipeline and underside of the service should be maintained. If this cannot be achieved the service shall		

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	cross below the pipeline with a clearance distance of 0.6 metres. • A new service should not be laid parallel within an easement strip • A Cadent representative shall approve and supervise any new service crossing of a pipeline. • An exposed pipeline should be suitable supported and removed prior to backfilling • An exposed pipeline should be protected by matting and suitable timber cladding • For pipe construction involving deep excavation (<1.5m) in the vicinity of grey iron mains, the model consultative procedure will apply therefore an integrity assessment must be conducted to confirm if diversion is required		
Canal and River Trust	Impact on Harthill Reservoir Impact on the Spillway	The Applicant has refined the Order Limits after the statutory consultation to exclude the area where	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	The solar farm proposed to the south of the Project area would be to the West of Harthill Reservoir. This includes an element directly to the North of the reservoir dam structure. Whilst revisions to the site plan for this area have been made following the initial submission, we are unsure as to the location of the red line boundary relative to the spillway channel from the reservoir. The supplied plans show a red line boundary that extends across the front of the reservoir dam slightly. The position of the spillway is not marked. We therefore have concern that the solar farm could encroach onto the position of the spillway (or block access for maintenance). It is therefore vital for updated plans to be provided to ensure that the Trust can maintain access to the spillway for maintenance. The inability of the Trust to access this space could have significant health and safety implications for communities downstream, as the Spillway is vital infrastructure required to manage flood risk downstream, and to avoid the risk of any catastrophic dam breach from the reservoir itself. We therefore request that any future submission should ensure that the red line boundary does not extend onto land used by the spillway or used to provide access for maintenance to the spillway. Updated plans are necessary to provide details of the spillway location relative to the red line boundary, so that the Trust can assess whether the proposals could impact the spillway operation. We wish to highlight that the draft Environmental Statement appears to include information showing	the new spillway has been constructed, and therefore no impacts on the spillway itself or access to the spillway are anticipated. A plan of the updated Order Limits was provided to the Canal and Rivers Trust via email on 22 April 2026 to show the Order Limits around the reservoir in more detail. Design changes are detailed in the Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]; ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4] and ES Volume 3, Appendix 4.1: Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. It is noted that the figures accompanying the ES show water flow in the location of the previous spillway. The new spillway is not yet reflected in OS mapping and OS opensource datasets, resulting in it not being possible to accurately update the figure at the time of writing. Instead, an inset map has been added to ES Volume 3, Figure 10.3: Surface Watercourses and Waterbodies [EN0110020/APP/6.19] with aerial imagery which does show the new spillway location.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	the position of the spillway prior to the works (e.g. figure 10.2.3 shows the presence of water flows from the north east of the reservoir, in the location of the previous spillway, which has not been blocked up and replaced by the new spillway. The drawing does not show the existing spillway.		
Canal and River Trust	Impact of Construction Works on the Reservoir Structure Construction works and loading from new structures associated with the solar farm have the potential to damage the reservoir structure. Most pertinent would be the risk of works undermining the dam structure to the north of the site. The reservoir is supported by a reinforced earthwork dam, and works at the base have the potential to undermine and/or destabilise this structure. We request that, in the event of a future submission, appropriate stand offs should be provided to limit the potential for damage to the structure. The illustrative masterplan for Whitestone 3 shows the red line boundary in close proximity to the footpath that surrounds the reservoir. We are unsure if the final red line boundary to be submitted to the examination will include the path. We request that the red line boundary for the project should be sited so that it does not include the footpath. This would be necessary to ensure that access along the footpath for maintenance and inspection activities can be retained, and will not be subject to any restriction that could be incorporated into any future Development Consent Order requirements.	The Applicant has refined the Order Limits after the statutory consultation to exclude the area where the new spillway has been constructed, and therefore no impacts on the spillway itself or access to the spillway are anticipated. A plan of the updated Order Limits was provided to the Canal and Rivers Trust via email on 22nd April 2026 to show the Order Limits around the reservoir in more detail. The footpath that surrounds the reservoir is not included in the Order Limits, and access on this route will not be impacted by the Proposed Development. Design changes are detailed in the Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]; ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4] and ES Volume 3, Appendix 4.1: Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.20].	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Canal and River Trust	Impact on Broadbridge Dyke Feeder Broadbridge Dyke Feeder runs through land identified to be used as one of the Solar Farms. This provides water between Harthill Reservoir and the Chesterfield Canal. It is important for the Trust to maintain access to the Dyke in order to allow us to carry out maintenance activities. The construction schedule for the Solar Farm and the final layout of development should be designed to enable such access. Failure to safeguard this access could otherwise increase the risk of flooding from the Dyke Feeder should it become blocked, and could have an impact on the water management of Harthill Reservoir, which could have significant health and safety implications. The Trust has previously had to access the farmland with machinery for tree work and silt removal relatively recently, and any future access would need to allow for machinery access to the Feeder channel. To avoid any loading on the Dyke Feeder, the development should incorporate an appropriate stand off to prevent any vibrations during construction works or any permanent loading post development, which could otherwise increase the risks of land slips into the watercourse (which could result in the same risks discussed above).	The Proposed Development has been designed to maintain a 10 m buffer from all watercourses, including rivers, streams and canals and thus from the Broadbridge Dyke Feeder. Consultation is ongoing with the Canal and River Trust to agree setbacks and ensure access to assets will be maintained. Furthermore, protection for statutory undertakers' assets is included within the protective provisions in the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Canal and River Trust	Harthill Reservoir Candidate Local Wildlife Site The Trust's understanding is that Harthill Reservoir is a candidate Local Wildlife Site. This is not referenced within the Local Designated Sites in table 6.8, nor are the impacts of the Development upon this considered within the report. Harthill Reservoir is adjacent to the proposed Whitestone 3 Site. We therefore request that this designation should be double checked by the applicant. If it is a designated site or likely to become a designated site, impacts upon it should be incorporated into this part of the Environment Report.	Harthill Reservoir Candidate Local Wildlife Site (LWS) and potential impacts on the LWS have been considered within ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]. No significant effects are anticipated for the Important Ecological Features within the candidate LWS due to the pollution prevention measures detailed in the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.9] which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	No
Canal and River Trust	Other Local Wildlife Sites Several LWS appear to have been missed on Figure 6.1 Local Designated Sites and from Table 6.8 - Local Designated Sites within 2km of the Proposed Order Limits. This includes part of the Chesterfield Canal LWS (which is directly crossed by the proposed cable route) and is approximately 0.26 km north-east of W3 Site. Further the W3 site is hydrologically linked to the Chesterfield Canal and LWS via Broad Bridge Dyke which is situated within the W3 Site and feeds the Chesterfield Canal. Within the final Environmental Report, details should be updated to include these along with assessments of potential impacts of the Development from them. The proposal, hydrologically linked to the Chesterfield Canal (along with the potential cable crossing), has the potential to impact the site through lighting, dust, pollution, noise, vibration and transmission of	The LWS baseline has been updated since the Draft ES, and an assessment of all relevant sites has been included in ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]. This includes the consideration of Chesterfield Canal LWS, and no significant effects are anticipated for the Important Ecological Features within the LWS due to the pollution prevention measures detailed in the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1], and the requirement to a use trenchless methodology when installing the PV cable across the canal.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	Invasive Species. We therefore advise that these impacts on the Chesterfield Canal LWS should be further assessed.		
Canal and River Trust	Impact of Horizontal Directional Drilling on the Chesterfield Canal Paragraphs 6.5.22 to 6.5.24 discuss the impact of cable corridors on biodiversity and nature. No direct reference is given to the impact of vibrations (from Horizontal Directional Drilling below) on waterborne species in the watercourses that will be crossed within these paragraphs. We do note, however, that paragraph 6.7.14 refers to methodology to help ensure impacts of vibrations on the water habitat is avoided. Chapter 14 Noise and Vibration states includes an assessment as to the potential impacts on structural elements associated with these areas. Reference to BS 5228-2 and BS 7385-2 is made that states that construction vibration is considered Significant in the context of potential cosmetic damage where construction vibration would exceed 15 mm/s PPV. Whilst we understand that vibrations will be kept within this limit, we do request that clarification is provided that this limit will also not adversely impact waterborne species within the Chesterfield Canal. Whilst the proposals seek to limit vibrational impacts through locating HDD activities at least 5m below the bed of watercourses (including the Chesterfield Canal), we request that details of any vibration monitoring and settlement should be	The impact of vibration on waterborne species in watercourses is assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]. No significant effects due to vibration are anticipated for Chesterfield Canal, and control measures to reduce and mitigate vibration impacts are provided in the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]. The potential impact of vibration from the Proposed Development on other receptors is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14], including details of mitigation measures to avoid significant impacts from vibration. The mitigation measures are detailed within the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] and will be included in the CEMP, secured in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	included to help ensure that impacts are fully monitored and controlled.		
Canal and River Trust	Species Surveys Table 6.5 includes proposals for otter and water vole surveys on watercourses. The Chesterfield Canal and Harthill Reservoir form watercourses crossed or in close proximity to the project, and we request that these surveys should include these assets. With regards to reptiles, we ask that clarification be provided with regard to paragraph 6.6.53, which states that only one species of reptile has been recorded. This appears to be contradicted by the reptile survey report, which states that surveyors believe they likely found an adder which is illustrated by 'Triangle 8' on Figure 6.9.2c.	Otter and water vole surveys have been completed where access permits in the Order Limits and have been reported in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.11: Otter and Water Vole Survey Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. For those sections of the Cable Corridor where field surveys were not undertaken, the assessment was informed by publicly available sources, including aerial imagery, satellite data, and existing habitat and landcover datasets. This has enabled sufficient information to be available to determine an assessment based on reasonable worst-case parameters. The baseline reptile survey report advised that this record was of an unidentified snake species and that the species could not be confirmed. Following further clarification, the report has been updated to remove contradictory information on adder presence (see ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.9: Reptile Survey Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]). Interpretation of baseline survey findings is provided in Section 6.5.59 and 6.5.6 (reptiles) of ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6], with	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		survey results found in ES Volume 3, Appendices 6.1 to 6.13 [EN0110020/APP/6.20] .	
Canal and River Trust	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Draft ES Chapter 7) Our previous comments requested that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) should include the Chesterfield Canal and Harthill Reservoir as recreational receptors. Table 7.1 on pages 16-17 indicate that the viewpoint (viewpoint 49) on the reservoir has been amended to address our previous comments and will offer summer and winter views from the viewpoint towards the proposed solar farm. Whilst viewpoints from the Chesterfield Canal are not included, we are aware that this lies in a cutting, and is less likely to be impacted by the proposals visually. Paragraphs 7.6.18 to 7.6.26 list the recreational users likely to be affected by the scheme. Harthill Reservoir is listed, as are the paths around the local area. Whilst the path along part of the Chesterfield Canal is highlighted on figure 7.5.6, we request that consideration should be given for including the towpath in drawing so that impacts from any temporary works associated with HDD activities are included in the assessment. VP 49 as a baseline is a reasonable representative	Since the Draft ES and statutory consultation, the Applicant has removed solar panels near Harthill Reservoir. The reservoir is included as a viewpoint within the landscape and visual assessment in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Representative Viewpoint Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20] and considers the effect on recreational users at this location. Impacts from construction activities, including Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD), in this area are assessed in Section 7.7 in ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]. VP49 is assessed in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Representative Viewpoint Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20], where changes in views are expected to be limited to a small portion of the view along the PRow, where only a partial loss of openness would be anticipated.	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	view for reservoir recreational users. Looking at the view from the baseline, there will be a significant visual impact as the proposed parcel for the solar farm will be located on the ascending open arable land directly in front of the pathway; this will also impact any recreational watercraft that may experience views here. There is significant tall existing vegetation on the left side of the photograph, to the south of the view map; however, this does not provide sufficient shielding within VP49, as the line of vegetation ends, and there are clear views towards the site where the land accents above the tree line, which will accentuate visual impact (as opposed to a flat landscape to eyeline). Open, arable and undulating rural landscapes do contribute to the amenity value of the reservoir. The adaptation of arable field into a significant land mass of solar panels has the potential to have a significant negative impact on this view's amenity within the setting. As a result, we do have issue with the conclusions in section 7.8 that the proposals will result in a minor to moderate impact that is not significant (page 63). We request that consideration is given towards the use of careful mitigation, either through layout or planting buffering strategies, or a combination of both, to help mitigate the visual impact of the scheme from the reservoir.	The Chesterfield Canal Towpath, which is part of the Cuckoo Long Distance Walking Path (LDWP), is also assessed within ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Representative Viewpoint Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20] as VP47. During construction, and the early part of the operation phase, moderate / major adverse impacts on recreational receptors are anticipated, although as planted mitigation becomes established this is anticipated to reduce to a moderate adverse (not significant) effect on recreational receptors within the operation phase. Details of green infrastructure and landscaping in proximity to the reservoir is provided in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.13] and ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1: Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/6.19]. An assessment of effects on the character of the landscape and views and visual amenity is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7] and associated appendices. Visualisations are provided in ES Volume 3, Figures 7.6.1 to 7.6.58: Representative Viewpoints.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Canal and River Trust	Ground Conditions and Land Quality (Draft ES Chapter 9) We understand that Phase I assessments identify the potential from ground instability associated with the proposed cable corridor. We advise that any risks associated with works in proximity to Trust assets, notably the Chesterfield Canal as well as Broadbridge Dyke Feeder would need to be fully addressed. We note that Coal Mining Risk Assessments will be undertaken to inform any potential risk and that these will then be addressed via Construction Environment Management Plans (as well as an Excavated Materials Management Plan). We request that these documents, when available, should be of an appropriate standard to ensure that full mitigation is provided to address any risk. Risks posed by potential ground contamination (the cable corridors having been identified to be within limits) would also need to be addressed, as the water environment (notably Broadbridge Dyke Feeder as well as the Chesterfield Canal) are potential receptors. We request that any future CEMP document should seek to identify and fully address the risk to these receptors.	The Phase 1 Contaminated Land Reports: ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.7 – 9.9: Phase 1 Contaminated Land Reports [EN0110020/APP/6.20] detail all potential sources of on-Site and off-Site contamination within the Study Area (250 m from the Order Limits) where there is potential for the migration of contaminants to occur. These have informed the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] which is submitted with the Application and includes the outline Soil Management Plan (oSMP) and outline Excavated Materials Management Plan (oEMMP); the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] is secured via a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Canal and River Trust	Water Resources and Flood Risk (Draft ES Chapter 10) The Trust made previous comments on this topic, which are not referred to in table 10.1. These concern the description of the flow of Broad Bridge Dyke Feeder, and the impact on water flows to the Feeder. On the first matter, we wish to confirm that the feeder flows south to north, not east-west as described in table 10.7. To avoid confusion, we recommend that this is amended for future documentation. We also note that 10.8.33 implies that the feeder feeds the reservoir, which is incorrect. The feeder provides water from the reservoir to the Chesterfield Canal. On the second matter, paragraph 10.8.41 and the outline surface water drainage strategy suggests that no additional discharge to the feeder is sought, which the Trust has no issue with. As highlighted in our comments above, it is essential that the proposals do not interfere with access for the Trust to the Feeder nor to the spillway from the Reservoir. This is essential to manage water flows safely from the reservoir. As highlighted above, the draft Environmental Statement appears to include information showing the incorrect position of the spillway to the reservoir (e.g. figure 10.2.3 shows the presence of water flows from the north east of the reservoir, in the location of a previous spillway, which has not been blocked up and replaced by the new spillway. The drawing does not show the existing spillway).	Noted. The description of the flow direction of the Broadbridge Dyke Feeder has been revised within the ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]. It remains the case that no additional discharge to the feeder is sought. The new spillway is not yet reflected in OS mapping and OS opensource datasets, resulting in it not being possible to accurately update the figure at the time of writing. Instead, a call out box has been added to ES Volume 3, Figure 10.3: Surface Watercourses and Waterbodies [EN0110020/APP/6.19] with aerial imagery which does show the new spillway location. Design amendments following statutory consultation have moved the Order Limits to outside the area where the new spillway has been constructed, and therefore no impacts on access to the spillway are anticipated. Access arrangements for the Canal and River Trust's assets are under discussion. Protection for statutory undertakers' assets are included within the protective provisions in the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Canal and River Trust	Noise and Vibration (Draft ES Chapter 14) Our previous comments requested that vibration impacts to the canal structure from Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) should be considered in this chapter. This is important as vibrations can impact both biodiversity and could also result in damage to the canal structure (increasing the risk of leakage or localised land slips into the water). We note the response that the mitigation of construction impacts will mainly be done via a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) (highlighted within paragraphs 6.7.6 and 6.7.14 within the biodiversity chapter. We request that the CEMP should include methodology to limit the impact of vibrations as well as associated monitoring, in addition to any information on settlement of the land. Impacts on the structure of the canal should be considered in addition to impacts on biodiversity.	A construction vibration impact assessment has been carried out in relation to Chesterfield Canal and Harthill Reservoir, which refers to potential impacts on structural elements associated with these areas. The trenchless crossing below Chesterfield Canal would be installed at least 1.5m below the bed of the watercourse. The Applicant will develop a management approach with the appointed construction contractor to ensure that construction vibration levels do not exceed 15 mm/s at Chesterfield Canal. This is detailed in the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] which is secured in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. Levels of vibration at Harthill reservoir would be below 15 mm/s on the basis that piling activities for the installation of the solar infrastructure would not be within 20 m. The embedded mitigation measure to ensure that piling in relation to the installation of the solar infrastructure will not occur within 20 m of Harthill is detailed in the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] which is secured in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. The assessment of potential impacts of vibration from the Proposed Development on receptors is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14], including details of mitigation measures to avoid significant impacts from vibration.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Canal and River Trust	Landowner Comments Our consent as Navigation Authority and Landowner may be required for the installation of new cables across/below our waterways, including the Chesterfield Canal and Broadbridge Dyke Feeder. Please note that the Canal & River Trust is a statutory undertaker which has specific duties to protect the waterways. Accordingly, it is likely that we will resist the use of compulsory powers which may affect our undertakings. Accordingly, we require that the acquisition of any rights over the canal should be secured by agreement. Landowner consent would be required from the Trust for the installation of a new cable below our assets. The applicant is advised to contact the Trust's Utilities section for further advice. In our capacity as landowner, we wish to advise that the applicant/landowner would likely be required to comply with the Trust's 'Code of Practice for Works affecting the Canal & River Trust' for the works shown. The promotor is advised to contact the Canal & River Trust's Works Engineering Team should they have any questions or require further information upon the Code.	The Applicant has issued detailed Heads of Terms to voluntarily secure the rights required to construct, operate, maintain and decommission the Proposed Development and is engaging with the Canal and River Trust with a view to reaching agreement before the end of Examination. The Applicant is also engaged with the Canal and River Trust to ensure that the appropriate Protective Provisions are included in the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Canal and River Trust	Protective Provisions The Trust have a range of standard Protective Provisions that we would likely request are incorporated into any Future Development Consent Order. These would be consistent with other solar schemes with cable corridors affecting our network. These are designed to ensure for the protection of our waterways, and also can provide more certainty for the promotor during the creation of the Development Consent Order. The Trust would be happy to share our standard provisions with the promotor. Should this be of interest to the promotor, they would be welcome to contact me on the details below.	The Applicant is engaged with the Canal and River Trust to ensure that the appropriate Protective Provisions are included in the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	No
The Coal Authority	Our records indicate that within the area identified for the project there are recorded coal mining features present at surface and shallow depth including; mine entries, coal workings and reported surface hazards. These features may pose a potential risk to surface stability and public safety. This current consultation appears to be seeking comments on the draft ES. Having reviewed this document we are pleased to see that at section 9.5.9 the report authors acknowledge the coal mining features recorded to be present. It is noted that the ES confirms that a Phase 1 Coal Mining Risk Assessment (CMRA) will be undertaken and provided as technical appendices in the ES. As we have previously noted, solar panels themselves fall on our published Exemptions List, we do however request that if mine entries are present consideration is given to retaining these areas	Mine entries are described in the Phase 1 Contaminated Land Reports and Phase 1 Coal Mining Risks Assessments (see ES Volume 3, Appendices 9.7 – 9.12) [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. The Coal Mining Risk Assessments (CMRA) include a preliminary risk assessment in relation to land instability, on the Proposed Development and on other receptors as a result of the Proposed Development. This principally relates to risk from land affected by historic coal mining from the surface or shallow underground and from mine entries. No permanent buildings are to be constructed on such land, although solar arrays and cables would be installed except within 20m of mine entries. The 20m Zone of Influence (ZoI) around known mine entries has been used to avoid ground stability	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	devoid of solar panels and fenced, in the interests of public safety. The Coal Authority is of the opinion that building over the top of, or in close proximity to, mine entries should be avoided wherever possible, even after they have been capped, in line with our adopted policy: Where infrastructure is proposed to support the solar farm we would again seek to ensure that this is not built over, or within influencing distance of, the recorded mine entries. Where this cannot be avoided justification for this should be provided along with a robust engineering solution for addressing the risks posed. It would be helpful for any future report to include a plan which clearly demonstrates the relationship between the solar farm layout, including ancillary equipment/buildings, and the coal mining features present, specifically mine entries and their zones of influence.	issues and, if construction within the zone is required, targeted ground investigations under the oversight of the MRA will be undertaken. Coal mining and other land stability risks will be further addressed as part of the ongoing detailed design development by targeted ground investigation undertaken prior to construction in areas where risk of unstable ground has been identified to inform design. Additional Mitigation is included in Section 9.8 of ES Volume 2 Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9].	
The Coal Authority	It should also be noted that a Permit from the Mining Remediation Authority (trading name of the Coal Authority) will be required for any investigatory, and/or treatment, works. Under the Coal Industry Act 1994 any intrusive activities, including initial site investigation boreholes, and/or any subsequent treatment of coal mine workings/coal mine entries for ground stability purposes require the prior written permission of The Mining Remediation Authority, since such activities can have serious public health and safety implications. Failure to obtain permission to enter or disturb our property may result in the potential for court action.	Noted – the appropriate required permits will be obtained prior to any works if required.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Environment Agency	Groundwater: the Environmental Statement (ES) needs further work to fully reflect the risks posed to groundwater from the development, with inconsistencies and data omissions throughout. Further points where the ES should be revised to inform the proposals are identified in Appendix 1. A phase 1 Contaminated Land Desk Study should have addressed these gaps however it is not yet available and intended to be submitted in support of the ES.	Risks to groundwater as a receptor to land contamination have been assessed in more detail in ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9] , and extensively in the Phase 1 Contaminated Land Reports and Phase 1 Coal Mining Risks Assessments (see ES Volume 3, Appendices 9.7 – 9.12) that include preliminary risk assessments. All residual effects relating to groundwater quality and contamination have been assessed as minor / negligible, and Phase 2 ground investigations will be completed where necessary prior to construction of the Proposed Development as secured within the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] . Risks to groundwater as a water environment receptor in its own right as well as updated hydrogeological regime description, WFD status, groundwater bodies, abstractions, springs, Source Protection Zones (SPZs) and hydraulic connectivity, and assessing quantitative and qualitative effects on groundwater resources and dependent receptors are covered in ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10] . No significant effects on water resources have been identified.	No
Environment Agency	Water resources: it is currently unclear what the water needs for the operational development are, and where this is able to be sourced from. It is proposed that the oCEMP will provide an assessment of water demands and options for	A Water Consumption Plan will be developed prior to construction to identify construction-phase water demand, sources of supply and any relevant abstraction or discharge licensing requirements. The Plan will set out measures to minimise water	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	water supply, however that is not yet available. We have provided advice on what such an assessment should include in order to help you undertake this assessment.	use, prioritise the use of non-potable water where practicable, and ensure no adverse effects on EA-licensed abstractions or private water supplies. The Water Consumption Plan will be secured through the CEMP and subject to consultation with the EA, where required. The need for a Water Consumption Plan is set out in ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10] .	
Environment Agency	Watercourse crossings: methods for watercourse crossings for access purposes will be assessed on a case-by-case basis, and existing crossings will be used for access where possible. For cable routing, main watercourses will be crossed via HDD or other trenchless technique, with depth determined on a case-by-case basis. The details of these have not been submitted however therefore further work will be required to ensure we are in agreement on the specifics.	An assessment of the potential impacts caused by watercourse crossings (for infrastructure and cable laying) is provided in ES, Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10] . No significant effects are anticipated for surface water quality, quantity and watercourse geomorphology as a result of watercourse crossing construction for access tracks or cables, with consideration of the mitigation measures detailed in the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] .	No
Environment Agency	Ecology: only partial information has been provided within the draft ES on the ecology baseline. We understand further work is currently underway and full reports will be provided as part of the final ES. We recommend we have sight of this as early as possible to help advise on any implications for your design and mitigation options which appear to be largely implemented through the proposed oLEMP and oCEMP. We note it is intended the proposal to be submitted to PINS prior to the implementation of statutory requirement for	Updated baseline survey information is included in ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6] . Access was obtained for baseline surveys for the majority of the Order Limits; however, some sections of the Cable Corridor Study Area were not subject to field survey due to access constraints. Field surveys were therefore focused on key sections of the Cable Corridor where more sensitive habitats were considered most likely to	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	Biodiversity Net Gain, however you are intending to achieve 10% enhancement. Consideration should be given as to your resiliency to this policy requirement should your anticipated submission be delayed.	occur, with the remaining sections assessed through desk-based methods. For those sections of the Cable Corridor where field surveys were not undertaken, the assessment was informed by publicly available sources, including aerial imagery, satellite data, and existing habitat and landcover datasets. This has enabled sufficient information to be available to determine an assessment based on reasonable worst-case parameters and assuming presence of protected species or other sensitive biodiversity features where we have gaps in survey data could not be obtained. Based on the extensive survey work undertaken, it is considered that sufficient baseline has been recorded to base the assessment on and inform the design. Nonetheless, and in order to ensure readiness for implementation should development consent be granted, further survey work is ongoing to validate the findings of this assessment. A commitment to complete surveys is provided in embedded mitigation and the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] with the results expected to inform post consent activities and details to be included in the CEMP secured in the Schedule 2 requirements of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	
Environment Agency	Planning Permitting Overlap: Clarification on what permits are required in addition to the DCO	A Consents and Agreements Position Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.3] is submitted as part of the Application and sets out which	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	should be provided as part of a Consenting Strategy document.	additional permits, consents and agreements are required.	
Environment Agency	In light of the above, further information is required for the Environment Agency to provide a definitive response on relevant environmental impacts. This is important so we can provide the best possible advice to the Planning Inspectorate. We strongly recommend that you consult us, well in advance of DCO submission, on draft documents which include, but are not limited to, the following: • Flood risk assessment • Crossings schedule • Biodiversity net gain strategy • Ecological assessments (inc morph surveys, eDNA results, fish survey results) • Outline (EMPs) for all phases (including construction, operational and decommissioning) including sub-documents: - o Outline Water Consumption Plan - o Outline Site Waste Management Plan - o Outline Landscape Management Plan • Phase 1 Contaminated land assessment • Water Framework Directive (WFD) Assessment • Waste management strategy • Consenting strategy • Statement of Common Ground • Draft Development Consent Order	Draft versions of some of the documents requested have been provided to the Environment Agency for review (including the Crossings Schedule, oCEMP, and Phase 1 Contaminated Land Assessments). The Crossings Schedule can now be found in ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]. Comments have been picked up to prepare the documents for the DCO Application. Other documents were unavailable for sharing with the Environment Agency, and therefore review and consultation on these documents will continue into examination.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Environment Agency	Depending on the outcome this will have implications for the content of the DCO. Sufficient time is required to ensure we can appropriately respond to discharge of requirements and protective provision consultations. Please ensure in your DCO a minimum of 21 days is stipulated as a response time for the discharge of requirements and a minimum of 61 days for protective provisions.	The Applicant notes the Environment Agency's requested timescales. Part 2 of Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] stipulates a minimum 21 business days to be provided in relation to the discharge of requirements. The Environment Agency informed the Applicant in a letter sent via email on 8 May 2026, that it did not consider there a need to include any protective provisions for the benefit of the Environment Agency, therefore the draft DCO does not include any such protective provisions.	No
Environment Agency	Issue: Baseline conditions presented in Section 9.6 are based on very limited information. In 9.6.1 it states: "Additional baseline environment data will be provided in the Phase 1 CLRs in the ES." As such, we know the discussion presented as 9.6 is not intended to meet this purpose. Impact: The subsequent assessment is limited by the level of information available. Important details may be currently unknown and therefore missed. Solution: Ensure the baseline conditions assessment is fully reviewed and updated after additional data have been collected and fully considered.	Baseline conditions have been fully defined in this chapter of the ES with updates included from the Phase 1 Contaminated Land Reports (ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.7-9.9: Phase 1 Contaminated Land Reports [EN0110020/APP/6.20]). Section 9.5 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9] reflects a fully updated baseline from the baseline initially presented in the Draft ES.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Environment Agency	Issue: There are discrepancies in the anticipated foundation depths, especially for BESS and PCS, between chapters 5, 9 and 10. See additional narrative. Impact: Foundation design and impacts on different receptors cannot be adequately assessed if information is inconsistent between chapters. Solution: Ensure the ES includes consistent likely foundation depths for all components between all chapters.	Noted – consistency has been checked across the Environmental Statement. The foundation depths are set out in the Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3] which are secured through the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] .	No
Environment Agency	Issue: Discusses “shallow groundwater underlying the area (superficial aquifers being ‘Medium’ sensitivity).” Some of the site is immediately underlain by bedrock principal aquifer. The superficial designation only applies where it is present. Therefore, shallow groundwater underlying some areas of site, if encountered, will be High sensitivity. Impact: Misinterpretation of site characterisation may result in significance of effect being assessed too low. Solution: As BMV is assessed as High sensitivity, we are satisfied that the appropriate level of assessment is being reflected, however the applicant must be careful of this in future.	Risks to groundwater have been assessed in more detail in ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9], and extensively in the Phase 1 Contaminated Land Reports (ES Volume 3, Appendices 9.7, 9.8 and 9.9: Phase 1 Contaminated Land Reports [EN0110020/APP/6.20]) that include preliminary risk assessments. The Cadeby formation, which is characterised as a Principal Aquifer and intersects with Cable Route L, connecting W3 to W2, is considered in this assessment as having high sensitivity. Section 9.6 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9] reflects a fully updated baseline from the Draft ES, and section 9.7 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9] an updated assessment of effects.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Environment Agency	Issue: Assessment has been carried out before all supporting information is available. Several effects considered need further information (Phase 1 CLR or Phase 1 CMRA). Inconsistent use of sensitivity and magnitude of effect classifications. Impact: Assessments cannot be relied upon as information and screening may change. Summary table does not accurately reflect the main text. Important information may be missed. Solution: Until site investigations have been carried out, including in and around landfills, the potential magnitude of impact cannot be determined, even when embedded mitigation is considered. The assessment must be revisited when additional data have been collected and supporting desk studies are complete.	Further information has been collected since the release of the Draft ES, and the Phase 1 Contaminated Land Reports and Phase 1 Coal Mining Risk Assessments have been completed since the release of the Draft ES (see ES Volume 3, Appendices 9.7 – 9.12 [EN0110020/APP/6.20]). The information included in these documents has been used to inform updated assessments which are provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9] and have concluded that no significant effects from contamination due to the Proposed Development are anticipated. Future site investigations have been discussed with the Environment Agency, and would take place following consent being granted, where required. These investigations are secured in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	No
Environment Agency	Issue: An indicative lifespan for buried cables is not given. Some components are shown as “replacement not anticipated”, and above ground cables have a lifespan of 25-30 years. It is unclear therefore why buried cables are not listed at all. Impact: Requirements and associated impacts of replacing buried cables is unknown. This includes degradation of cables in the subsurface, waste quantities (of old cables), effects of excavation to remove and replace cables. Solution: Confirm indicative lifespan for buried cables, and any associated impacts. This could be included in the ES.	It is not proposed that cables will be replaced during the operational period of the Proposed Development, and the cables would remain in situ following operation. This is set out in the outline Decommissioning Environment Management Plan (oDEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.11] which is secured in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Environment Agency	Issue: Fires and firewater are not mentioned as a potential effect to ground conditions during operation. Impact: We cannot agree if embedded mitigation is sufficient until we have seen the oBSMP or BESS drainage design. Not enough information has been supplied to satisfy us risks are mitigated. Risks to controlled waters might remain. Solution: Ensure fires and firewater are considered in relation to ground conditions and land quality in subsequent reports.	Fires at Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) facilities can cause significant generation of firewater that can be polluted and risk negative effects on soil and controlled waters without appropriate mitigation. An outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.15] has been submitted with the application and is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. Firewater contamination and pollution prevention, including prevention of pollution to soils and underlying groundwater, is considered in ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]. No significant impacts from fires and firewater on water resources are anticipated. Unforeseen and accidental effects are considered in ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16].	No
Environment Agency	Issue: EA comment relating to groundwater springs: the applicant states that none have been identified at the time of writing. It is unclear what searches the applicant has made to date, as this information is available in data submitted with this report. OS Maps are listed as a source of information in 10.5.5. Springs are shown on several current and historical map excerpts included with the Envirocheck data searches supplied by the applicant (see Appendix 9.3 for area W2). Impact: The applicant has missed important local	Springs within the Study Area have been identified using Envirocheck® data searches and OS 1:25k mapping and are detailed in paragraph 10.5.55 within ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]. The springs are shown in ES Volume 3, Figure 10.12: Hydrogeology [EN0110020/APP/6.19]. Springs within the Study Area (1 km from the Order Limits) are listed, and potential impacts on springs	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	information and not fully considered previous advice. Solution: Review all available data. Update this assessment in the final ES.	and hydrogeology are assessed, in ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10] .	
Environment Agency	Issue: Aquifer designations given in figures 10.11.1 to 10.11.3 are not consistent with the terms used in Chapter 10 Section 10.6.31 and elsewhere, or BGS or EA terminology. The source of these terms is unclear. Secondary B aquifer shown in Figure 10.11.1 is defined as “Rocks with essentially no groundwater”. This is incorrect and may result in the sensitivity of this aquifer being considered as lower than is appropriate. Impact: Aquifer descriptions in figures are confusing and not representative of the site. Solution: Review designations and ensure the correct terminology and definitions are used.	Noted. British Geological Survey (BGS) and EA aquifer designations have been reviewed and all terminology has been updated in both ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10] and associated Figures to ensure full consistency with standard EA / BGS classifications. Aquifers are shown on ES Volume 3, Figure 10.12: Hydrogeology [EN0110020/APP/6.19] .	No
Environment Agency	Issue: Assessment of effects is based on an unsound geological model. See additional narrative. Deeper piles discussed in other chapters are not considered here. We cannot agree with the assessed magnitude of impact (“negligible”) based on the current model. Impact: Potential risk to controlled waters due to inadequate geological model.	Noted. The geological baseline has been updated following completion of a geological desk study, including a review of BGS borehole data. Revisions have been made to reflect the derived stratigraphic and hydrogeological conditions. Potential hydrogeological effects are covered in ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9] .	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	Solution: Review available data, carry out additional studies if required, and resubmit the assessment when complete.	The hydrogeological baseline is discussed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]. Impacts to groundwater are discussed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]. ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10] only considers impacts to water resources (private water supplies (PWS), licenced abstractions, and springs) in relation to groundwater.	
Environment Agency	Issue: No mention private water supply boreholes not licensed by the EA. Impact: Impacts on some private water supplies could be overlooked. Solution: Obtain information on private water supply boreholes not licensed by the EA from the relevant local authorities.	Information on PWS (including private water supply boreholes) not licensed by the EA has been obtained from the relevant local authorities and from questionnaires issued to residents within the Study Area (1 km from the Order Limits). Details on PWS are included in ES, Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10] alongside the baseline PWS conditions and the assessment of effects.	No
Environment Agency	Issue: Figure title is “SPZ and Groundwater Abstractions” but we cannot see any groundwater abstractions shown. We have records of abstractions within the 250m search buffer and these are noted in Chapter 9, with a reference to this figure. Anyone relying on this figure will be unaware of these. Impact: Groundwater abstractions might be missed.	The relevant figure (Figure 9.5 - ES Volume 3, Figures [EN0110020/APP/6.19]) has been updated for the ES to show the groundwater abstraction records within 250 m of the Order Limits.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	Solution: Update the figure to include all groundwater abstractions		
Environment Agency	Issue Procedure for identifying and managing previously unexpected contamination encountered during construction is not specifically included in these lists. Impact Potential that insufficient controls will be in place if unexpected contamination is encountered during works. Solution Ensure it is included in the [o]CEMP and [o]DEMP.	The oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] and oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11] submitted with the Application and secured via a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1], contain explicit procedures for encountering unexpected contamination. The Phase 1 Contaminated Land Reports ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.7 – 9.9: Phase 1 Contaminated Land Reports [EN0110020/APP/6.20] detail all potential sources of onsite and offsite contamination within the Study Area (250 m from the Order Limits) where there is potential for the migration of contaminants to occur. Certain areas have higher potential of contaminated land, for example, Cable Corridors intersect narrow historical and registered landfills in four locations and Phase 2 intrusive investigations will be required in these areas prior to final engineering design. Future site investigations have been discussed with the EA, and are secured via a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		The ES Volume 3, Appendix 2.3 – Commitments Register [EN0110020/APP/6.20] includes the unexpected contamination procedure. The requirement for Phase 2 intrusive works prior to construction in certain areas is secured via a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] .	
Environment Agency	Additional points for consideration Chapter 9 Section 9.5.7 - The applicant references withdrawn EA guidance, Groundwater Pollution Prevention Principles (GP3). Following the link given in the reference (ref. 29), the GOV.UK webpage includes a link to the guidance this has been replaced by. We recommend the applicant uses the current guidance. Chapter 9 Section 9.8.22 - Any dewatering must be done in line with EA guidance, including obtaining necessary permits beforehand or works done under the relevant exemptions. Chapter 9 sections 9.8.28 to 9.8.31 - Currently, the potential for ground stability issues due to historical coal mining is not fully known. If any land stabilisation is required, especially where that includes grouting of mine workings and shafts, the risks to controlled waters must be fully assessed in the design phase. Chapter 9 Table 9.6 & Chapter 10 Table 10.6 - These tables both define the framework for Significance of Effect, but they are not the same. For consistency throughout the ES, it would be beneficial if significance of effect was defined in the	Guidance and assessment has been updated in ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9] and it is noted that any dewatering would require the appropriate permits, as set out in the Consents and Agreements Position Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.3]. Potential impacts to ground stability have been assessed within ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9] and it has been concluded that no significant effects on ground stability would occur with the Proposed Development. Future site investigations may be needed in areas with potential ground instability, and these have been discussed with the EA, and are secured within the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. The framework to determine the Significance of Effect is set out in ES Volume 2, Chapter 2: EIA Methodology [EN0110020/APP/6.2], although each technical topic outlines the criteria and	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	same way in each chapter. We have not checked equivalent tables in other chapters.	rationales for measuring various types of effects (which is detailed in each ES technical chapter).	
Environment Agency	Issue: It is understood methods for watercourse crossings for access purposes will be assessed on a case-by-case basis, and existing crossings will be used for access where possible. For cable routing, main watercourses will be crossed via HDD or other trenchless technique, with depth determined on a case-by-case basis. Impact: The principles are broadly acceptable, but the details have not been submitted and cable routes not yet defined so we are unable to advise on the detail. Solution: Further work is required and should be initiated with the submission of a crossings schedule and aquatic survey results.	An assessment of the potential impacts caused by watercourse crossings (for infrastructure and cable laying) has been completed in ES, Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]. No significant effects on surface water quality, quantity and watercourse geomorphology are anticipated due to watercourse crossings for access tracks or cable routes. Engagement with the EA and the Lead Local Flood Authorities (LLFA) regarding watercourse crossings has been undertaken and will continue through examination and prior to construction. All watercourses to be crossed are Ordinary watercourses, as such the permitting needs fall under the relevant LLFA. The need to obtain the appropriate permits for watercourse crossings have been set out in section 10.6.27 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10] and in the Consents and Agreements Position Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.3].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Environment Agency	Issue: There has been no submission of a WFD Assessment for the watercourses impacted. It is understood this is to be submitted in support of the final ES. Impact: The associated risks with this project have not assessed the impact these may have on the classification elements of the waterbodies impacted. Solution: A WFD Assessment is required to measure the scale of the impacts towards the watercourses, ensuring these do not cause deterioration of any classification elements or prevent the achievement of Good status. We recommend a draft version of this assessment is submitted as early as possible prior to the submission of the DCO and final ES.	The Water Framework Directive (WFD) Assessment is provided as ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.4: Water Framework Directive Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. The assessment considers the five WFD watercourses and two groundwater bodies interacted with by the Proposed Development, and concludes that the components / activities associated with the Proposed Development will not result in deterioration of any WFD quality elements (ecological or chemical) for these water bodies. Due to project timescales the Applicant has been unable to share the WFD Assessment with the EA prior to submission of the DCO Application, but the Applicant will consult with the EA following submission to discuss this topic.	No
Environment Agency	Issue: The ecology chapter is supported only by appendices with surveys undertaken to date. We understand surveys are currently ongoing. Impact :Without this baseline data an assessment of the impacts of the proposals are unable to be undertaken and design elements such as the cable routing options are unable to be fully considered. Solution: Survey data should be provided at the earliest opportunity, including eDNA results, fish surveys and morph surveys	Updated baseline survey information is included in ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6] and the accompanying appendices. Access was obtained for baseline surveys of the Site and part of the Cable Corridor in the Order Limits; however, some sections of the Cable Corridor Study Area were not subject to field survey due to access constraints. Field surveys were therefore focused on key sections of the Cable Corridor where more sensitive habitats were considered most likely to occur, with the remaining sections assessed through desk-based methods. For those sections of the Cable Corridor where	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		field surveys were not undertaken, the assessment was informed by publicly available sources, including aerial imagery, satellite data, and existing habitat and landcover datasets. This has enabled sufficient information to be available to determine an assessment based on worst case parameters and assuming presence of protected species or other sensitive biodiversity features where survey data could not be obtained. Based on the extensive survey work undertaken, it is considered that sufficient baseline has been recorded to base the assessment on and inform the design. Nonetheless, and in order to ensure readiness for implementation should development consent be granted, further survey work is ongoing to validate the findings of this assessment. A commitment to complete surveys is provided in embedded mitigation and the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] with the results expected to inform post consent activities and details to be included in the CEMP secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO EN0110020/APP/3.1].	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Environment Agency	Issue: This section outlines the sorts of measures which will be considered to manage the spread of INNS but does not include any specific proposals. Mitigations will be detailed within the oCEMP as part of the final ES. Impact: Where mitigation measures are not included we are not able to advise on their adequacy. Solution: The draft oCEMP and supporting oLEMP should be provided prior to the finalisation of the ES for comment.	Specific measures to avoid the spread of Invasive Non-Native Species (INNS) during construction, with details provided within the ES Volume 2, Chapter 6 Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6] and the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]. These will be secured in the CEMP, and will include cleaning and inspection of plant, machinery and vehicles, contractor training and toolbox talks, and Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) oversight of INNS management and compliance. The draft oCEMP was provided to the EA for review prior to submission, and amendments have been made following receipt of their comments.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Environment Agency	Issue: NPS EN-1 requires that the ES should assess the impact of the scheme on water resources, and how water consumption will be minimised. There has been no assessment of the water required for the construction and operation of the scheme, or where this can be sourced from. Impact: Lack of consideration for the impacts of water availability upon the scheme can result in significant problems and delays to construction. Solution A Water Supply Strategy should be undertaken to provide reassurance that water supply options are sustainable and also achievable. applications. A basic water supply strategy should: • Provide a plan B to water company supply in the case that it is not available for non-domestic purposes; •Evaluates the scope of available alternative sources; •Manage expectations of water availability and the implications for likely licence conditions such as hands off flows for the scheme; •Allow time for the development of solutions such as storage or for a mix of sources to be considered in advance of detailed design; •Provide clarity on permits likely to be required; •Reduce the risk of problem solving and process lead times causing delays pre commencement	A Water Consumption Plan will be developed for the Proposed Development in the post consent phase (prior to construction starting) which will identify the appropriate sources and volumes of water needed for construction and operation. This will be secured through the CEMP, which is secured via a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. Wastewater will be disposed of via a licensed carrier and foul water removals. This will be secured through the CEMP, which is secured via a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. The need for a Water Consumption Plan is set out in ES, Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Environment Agency	Issue: No Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted as an appendix to Chapter 10. Impact: As the FRA has not been submitted, it is not possible to provide detailed comments, however we offer the following recommendations: Solution: A draft FRA should be submitted for comment at the earliest opportunity, see guidance below	A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2 [EN0110020/APP/6.20]) has been submitted as a supporting appendix to ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]. Most of the Site is located in Flood Zone 1. However, there are small areas along the Ulley Brook, Anston Brook, and Broad Bridge Dyke are within Flood Zone 2 and 3. No infrastructure is proposed in areas of Flood Zone 3b. Discussion of the sequential test is provided in the FRA (ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2 [EN0110020/APP/6.20]) and Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]. The FRA (ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2 [EN0110020/APP/6.20]) has considered the appropriate climate change uplifts in line with the proposed lifetime (60 years) of the Proposed Development. As the Proposed Development is considered 'Essential Infrastructure' the higher climate change allowance for the 2080s epoch has been used.	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Environment Agency	Issue: It is acknowledged that fire suppression water could impact surface watercourses and that there are proposed gravelled areas. Impact: Contaminants from a fire event may accumulate in the gravel even if firewater runoff is identified as being suitable for release. These contaminants would then be released into the natural environment over longer periods of time. Solution: We ask that where gravel is proposed to be used within an impermeable drainage basin, the operator must demonstrate how they will manage accumulation of silt and pollutants within the base of the gravel.	Consideration of potential impacts on water quality is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]. No significant effects on watercourses are anticipated from fire suppression water. Where gravel is proposed to be used, measures will be taken to inspect the gravel areas and removal and cleaning of the gravel will take place if required following a fire event, as detailed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10] and the oBSMP [EN0110020/APP/5.15] submitted with the Application.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Environment Agency	Issue: The sections on waste are generally well covered however there are areas where additional detail would be useful. We note an Outline CEMP and Site Waste Management Plan will be submitted in support of the ES. Impact: It is common for waste operators to misunderstand requirements around the description and sampling side of waste management, resulting in complications around permitting at the post-permission stage. Solution: Further detail and clarification should be provided around the following points and reflected within the CEMP and SWMP. It appears no environmental permits around waste are required. This should be clarified and reflected within your Consenting Strategy. If no Environmental Permits are required, the Environment Agency would have no remit in relation to noise and vibration, and this should be considered by the Local Authority. If there was to be activity under an environmental permit then the Environment Agency's approach is to include conditions which place an obligation on operators to use appropriate measures, to prevent pollution this applies to all the terms used in the various noise conditions in permits. Additional noise guidance for EA permits below. Noise and vibration management: environmental permits - GOV.UK Environmental permits/exemptions may be required should waste material need to be imported to the site for any construction purposes. If a permit or exemption is required, this will need to be in place prior to the acceptance of any waste materials.	Assessment of the potential effects of the Proposed Development on waste, including details of embedded mitigation measures to be used to manage waste, is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16]. No significant effects related to the generation of waste are anticipated for the Proposed Development. Mitigation measures to reduce and manage waste are detailed in oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]. The outline Site Waste Management Plan is provided in Section 7 of the oCEMP, which is secured via a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. The information provided regarding permits is noted, and appropriate permits would be acquired before the commencement of any works if required.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	All waste movements will require the correct documentation to comply with Waste (England and Wales) Regulations. This will include waste from: surplus construction materials, wastewater from site lavatories, packaging materials, other site generated wastes as well as excavated soils. Waste is required to be assessed in accordance with "Waste Classification, Guidance on the classification and assessment of waste (1st Edition v1.2.GB) Technical Guidance WM3. Many wastes particularly soils fall into a "mirror entry" EWC code for waste classification (often 170503 hazardous or 170504 non-hazardous) in accordance with the above guidance document. This means the material may be hazardous or non-hazardous depending on certain concentrations of substances with hazardous properties. This will inform when the hazardous/non-hazardous code should be used on the accompanying documentation. If using the non-hazardous code, then the waste must undergo sampling to show that no hazardous thresholds are exceeded. This evidence will be required for the waste carrier/waste management facility who will be managing the waste.		

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Environment Agency	Appendix 3- Permitting Requirements In order to meet the applicant's objectives for the waste hierarchy and obligations under the duty of care, it is important that waste is properly classified. Proper classification of the waste both ensures compliance and enables the correct onward handling and treatment to be applied. A number of permits and licenses may be required to facilitate this scheme. Should you wish to disapply any element of these proposals and bring within the scope of the Development Consent Order (DCO) details of this should be provided to the Environment Agency a minimum of 6 months prior to DCO submission. We will require a consenting strategy document to be submitted in support of the proposals which outlines a programme of managing the various consents and permits, and confirmation of whether this will be subsumed within the DCO process or as standalone permits. We recommend early engagement with our National Permitting Service (NPS) and full use of their enhanced pre-application advice service to ensure the permitting requirements and implications are fully understood and addressed in good time to inform the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) decision making process. Twin tracking is recommended for those applications considered fundamental to the DCO.	Based on the current design, no permits in relation to waste are anticipated to be required. However, if in the future any materials likely to be classified as 'waste' under the Waste Framework Directive 2008 are proposed to be re-used waste permits and/or exemptions will be sought. Further details can be found in the Consents and Agreements Position Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.3] ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16] provides details of the Proposed Development's approach to minimising and managing waste. The Outline Site Waste Management Plan can be found in Section 7 of oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9], which is secured via a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Environment Agency	Flood risk activity permits The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 require a permit to be obtained for any activities which will take place: • On or within 8 metres of a main river (16 metres if tidal) • On or within 8 metres of a flood defence structure or culvert (16 metres if tidal) • On or within 16 metres of a sea defence • Involving quarrying or excavation within 16 metres of any main river, flood defence (including a remote defence) or culvert • In a floodplain more than 8 metres from the river bank, culvert or flood defence structure (16 metres if it's a tidal main river) and you don't already have planning permission	Engagement with the EA is ongoing and consultation regarding the approach for watercourse crossings has been undertaken with the EA and LLFA, and will continue following submission of the Application. All watercourses to be crossed are Ordinary watercourses, as such the permitting needs fall under the LLFA. The need to obtain the appropriate permits for watercourse crossings have been set out in ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]. The need for the appropriate permits to be obtained for any crossing construction is set out in section 10.6.27 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10].	No
Environment Agency	Dewatering If dewatering is required, the applicant may require an abstraction licence if it doesn't meet the exemption in The Water Abstraction and Impounding (Exemptions) Regulations 2017 Section 5: Small scale dewatering in the course of building or engineering works. If the applicant does not meet the exemption and requires a full abstraction licence, they should be aware that some aquifer units may be closed for new consumptive abstractions in this area.	Noted – appropriate permits would be acquired before the commencement of any works if required, as noted in the Consents and Agreements Position Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.3].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Environment Agency	Discharge of water Where it is not possible to connect foul drainage to the main sewer, under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010 any discharge of sewage or trade effluent made to either surface water or groundwater will need to be registered as an exempt discharge activity or hold a permit issued by the Environment Agency, addition to planning permission. This applies to any discharge to inland freshwaters, coastal waters or relevant territorial waters. The applicant may also need to consider discharge of groundwater, especially if it is contaminated. If the developer identifies the need to discharge to surface water during construction, then a permit may also be required. More information can be found here: A permit does not mean they can deteriorate the watercourse and may not be granted. Only clean, uncontaminated water should be discharged to surface water or groundwater and any permits need to be planned for well in advance of construction. Discharging run-off to watercourses has the potential to transport pollutants such as herbicides/ pesticides/ nitrates/ phosphates and silt and should be a last resort with mitigation in place to reduce the impact. The use of drilling muds for the directional drilling may require a groundwater activity permit unless the 'de minimis' exemption applies. Early discussion about this is also recommended.	Noted – appropriate permits would be acquired before the commencement of any works if required, as noted in the Consents and Agreements Position Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.3].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Environment Agency	Land Remediation Any remediation of land contamination may require site permits and mobile treatment licence Waste on site Excavated materials that are recovered via a treatment operation can be re-used onsite under the CL:AIRE Definition of Waste: Development Industry Code of Practice. This voluntary Code of Practice provides a framework for determining whether excavated material arising from site during remediation or land development works are waste. Developers should ensure that all contaminated materials are adequately characterised both chemically and physically, and that the permitting status of any proposed on-site operations are clear. If in doubt, the Environment Agency should be contacted for advice at an early stage to avoid any delays. The Environment Agency recommends that developers should refer to: • Position statement on the Definition of Waste: Development Industry Code of Practice • our website	Noted – appropriate permits and licenses would be acquired before the commencement of any works if required, as noted in the Consents and Agreements Position Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.3].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Environment Agency	Waste to be taken off site Contaminated soil that is, or must be disposed of, is waste. Therefore, its handling, transport, treatment and disposal is subject to waste management legislation, which includes: • Duty of Care Regulations 1991 • Hazardous Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2005 • Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010 • The Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 Developers should ensure that all contaminated materials are adequately characterised both chemically and physically in line with British Standards BS EN 14899:2005 'Characterisation of Waste - Sampling of Waste Materials - Framework for the Preparation and Application of a Sampling Plan' and that the permitting status of any proposed treatment or disposal activity is clear. If in doubt, the Environment Agency should be contacted for advice at an early stage to avoid any delays. If the total quantity of waste material to be produced at or taken off site is hazardous waste and is 500kg or greater in any 12-month period, the developer will need to register with us as a hazardous waste producer.	Noted – the Applicant will ensure waste is managed and disposed of safely and as per required regulations and legislation, and as agreed with the Environment Agency. Appropriate permits would be acquired before the commencement of any works if required, as noted in the Consents and Agreements Position Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.3].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Environment Agency	Waste management The recycling, storing, treating or disposing and use of waste is an activity that will require an Environmental Permit under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016, unless a waste exemption applies or compliance with a Quality Protocol or Code of Practice can be demonstrated, for example Definition of Waste: Development Industry Code of Practice ('DoWCoP') published by CL:AIRE. Where the applicant intends to use the Definition of Waste: Development Industry Code of Practice ('DoWCoP') for the re-use of excavated materials on site, this should be followed in full. Materials not used in accordance with the DoWCoP process in full may be deemed waste and will require a relevant permit for deposit. A formal Declaration must be submitted by a QP before any use of materials on site or transfer is permitted. Declarations deal with the re-use of materials. The receipt of a declaration does not remove the need for an environmental permit where treatment is required prior to re-use. The applicant should note that granting of planning permission is independent of a permit determination, and a permit application considers factors such as operator competence and operating techniques which have not been considered here. The Environmental Protection (Duty of Care) Regulations 1991 for dealing with waste materials are applicable to any off-site movements of wastes. The code of practice applies to you if you produce,	Noted – the Applicant will ensure waste is managed and disposed of safely and as per required regulations and legislation, and as agreed with the Environment Agency. Appropriate permits would be acquired before the commencement of any works if required, as noted in the Consents and Agreements Position Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.3].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	carry, keep, dispose of, treat, import or have control of waste in England or Wales. The law requires anyone dealing with waste to keep it safe and make sure it's dealt with responsibly and only given to businesses authorised to take it. In order to meet the applicant's objectives for the waste hierarchy and obligations under the duty of care, it is important that waste is properly classified. Proper classification of the waste both ensures compliance and enables the correct onward handling and treatment to be applied.		

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Forestry Commission	The Standing Advice states that proposals should have a buffer zone of at least 15m from the boundary of ancient woodlands to avoid loss or deterioration of the woodland. Where assessment shows impacts are likely to extend beyond this distance, you're likely to need a larger buffer zone. For example, the effect of air pollution from development that can result from a significant increase in traffic or dust from construction. ... It is our opinion that a 30m buffer would provide a suitable mitigation for any potential effects to the ancient woodlands, assuming that all other protection measures including the use of construction exclusion zones, dust minimization, directional lighting to avoid illuminating the woodlands and pollution control measures are utilized.	The Proposed Development will implement the buffer zones set out in the current government guidance for ancient woodlands and veteran trees. The Applicant notes the typo regarding the buffer zone for ancient woodland in the draft ES and it has been corrected in this ES to 15m in line with government guidance. We note the opinion of the Forestry Commission for providing a 30m buffer to be incorporated into the Proposed Development, however, for the Proposed Development, a buffer distance of 25m for woodland is proposed within the Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3] that already goes beyond stated government guidance. An arboriculture survey, and Tree Constraints Plan (TCP) has been provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.14: Arboriculture Survey and Tree Constraints Plan [EN0110020/APP/6.20] the scope of which covered access points to the Proposed Development. Further arboricultural surveys will be undertaken prior to construction and mitigation measures within the CEMP (secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]) will be provided to ensure trees and woodland are protected during construction, operation and decommissioning in compliance with BS5837:2012.	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Forestry Commission	The Joint NE/FC Standing Advice states that for or ancient or veteran trees the buffer zone should be at least 15 times larger than the diameter of the tree. The buffer zone should be 5 metres from the edge of the tree's canopy if that area is larger than 15 times the tree's diameter. This will create a minimum root protection area.	The Proposed Development includes a buffer distance of 25m for woodland and 15m for trees within the Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3], which is more than the stated government guidance. The Outline Design Parameters also states that no works will be undertaken within the Root Protection Zones of Veteran Trees. An arboriculture survey, and Tree Constraints Plan (TCP) has been provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.14: Arboriculture Survey and Tree Constraints Plan [EN0110020/APP/6.20] the scope of which covered access points to the Proposed Development. Further arboricultural surveys will be undertaken prior to construction and mitigation measures within the CEMP (secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]) will be provided to ensure trees and woodland are protected during construction, operation and decommissioning in compliance with BS5837:2012.	No
Forestry Commission	Whilst the application states tree planting will occur on site, this does not appear to reflect an increase in canopy cover, particularly in the short to medium term. It is important that woodland creation is not just used as screening at strategic locations and ensures habitat connectivity throughout the landscape. Habitat connectivity could be improved across the site with further woodland creation, between existing woodland blocks to link and buffer them,	Tree and woodland planting is proposed within the Site, as shown on ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1: Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/6.19]. Management of the Site will be through deer fencing to protect newly created habitats, including woodland, as detailed in section 6.6 in ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	ensuring maximum gains to increase habitat connectivity across the site to avoid habitat fragmentation.	Management of woodlands during construction and operation will be proportionate, and mitigation measures are set out in the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] which is secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. Habitat management is also detailed within the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] which is secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	
Forestry Commission	The species and provenance of all new trees and woodland also needs to be considered to ensure a resilient treescape which can cope with the full implications of a changing climate. This also applies to all woodland areas, including any retained woodlands to be enhanced. With a changing climate, a wide species selection will be beneficial, mixed woodland is usually of maximum benefit for habitat provision. Use of the Forestry Commission Ecological Site Classification Tool (ESC) can assist with selection of tree species that are ecologically suited to particular sites and includes climate change predictions to allow for future suitability and woodland resilience. The biosecurity of all planting stock also needs to be considered to avoid the introduction of pests and diseases, particularly in areas where there are ancient woodlands. We would recommend trees are sourced from plant healthy certified nurseries. Plans should also be in place to ensure the long	Tree and woodland planting is proposed within the Site, as shown on ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1: Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/6.19]. Management of the Site will be through deer fencing to protect newly created habitats, including woodland, as detailed in section 6.6 in ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]. Management of woodlands during construction and operation will be proportionate, and mitigation measures are set out in the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] which is secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. Habitat management is also detailed within the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] which is secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	term management and maintenance of new and existing woodland.		
Forestry Commission	As a large-scale project that will require large areas of deer or similar fencing, it has the scope to exclude a large amount of farmland from the deer range in the area. This is likely to increase herbivore browsing and grazing to other areas in close proximity to the site. Impacts are likely to increase in surrounding woodlands, especially ancient woodlands and the wider landscape, where hedgerows and stewardship schemes may be impacted upon. Large scale fencing will change how deer move through the landscape, which may also increase the numbers of deer crossing local roads and therefore may increase the numbers of deer vehicle collisions in the area. If culls occur prior to development, the risks should reduce.	Management of the Site will be through deer fencing to protect newly created habitats, including woodland, as detailed in Section 6.6 in ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]. Management of woodlands during construction and operation will be proportionate, and mitigation measures are set out in the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] which is secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. Management of the Site in relation to mammal fencing and movement is noted, however in addition to mammal gates, habitat corridors and rides are proposed between fenced areas within the Proposed Development to ensure wildlife corridors are maintained for mammals. This is detailed further within the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] which is secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Forestry Commission	To meet planning policy and Government guidance, we would recommend: • Robust adherence to the Standing Advice, especially regarding buffer zones, to rule out loss or deterioration to the ancient woodlands or ancient and veteran trees. • Detailed plans for protection measures for the woodlands during the construction. • Maintain and where possible improve woodland condition, especially ancient woodland. • Utilise biodiversity gains as part of avoiding woodland and tree impacts (especially ancient/veteran) which can also maximise biodiversity benefits by embracing irreplaceable and high priority habitats – for example focussing on ecological enhancements/creation of woodland edges • Woodland creation and improvements to ecological connectivity. For example, there are potential opportunities to link fragmented woodland habitats across the site, which will increase habitat connectivity, making woodlands more resilient and benefitting biodiversity across the project area. • Overall increase in the tree canopy cover to contribute to the Government's target to increase tree and canopy cover to 16.5% of land area in England by 2050.	The Proposed Development includes a buffer distance of 25m for woodland and 15m for trees within the Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]. The Outline Design Parameters also states that no works will also be undertaken within the Root Protection Zones of Veteran Trees. An arboriculture survey, and Tree Constraints Plan (TCP) has been provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.14: Arboriculture Survey and Tree Constraints Plan [EN0110020/APP/6.20] the scope of which covered access points to the Proposed Development. Further arboricultural surveys will be undertaken prior to construction and mitigation measures within the CEMP (secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]) will be provided to ensure trees and woodland are protected during construction, operation and decommissioning in compliance with BS5837:2012. The Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment completed for the Proposed Development, including enhancement proposals is presented in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. A requirement within Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] secures two thirds of the BNG set out within Appendix 6.4.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	A UK Forestry Standard compliant woodland management plan, including deer and squirrel control, is created to ensure the long term maintenance of all new and existing woodland within the site.	Tree and woodland planting is proposed within the Site, as shown on ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1: Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/6.19]. Management of the Site will be through deer fencing to protect newly created habitats, including woodland, as detailed in Section 6.6 in ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]. Habitat management is also detailed within the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] which is secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. In addition to mammal gates, habitat corridors and rides are proposed between fenced areas within the Proposed Development to ensure wildlife corridors are maintained for mammals, and this is detailed in the oLEMP.	
GTC Pipelines	I have overlaid into our system and can confirm the shapefile you have provided does not encroach any GTC network.	Noted.	No
Health Security Agency	We note your intention to develop and submit an outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP) in support of your DCO Application. We would recommend that this oBSMP includes an adequate site(s)-specific risk assessment of potential failure scenarios around the Battery Energy Storage Systems and any resulting emissions to air. This should also consider the likely constituents of any plume and a justification for the accident scenarios identified in the risk assessment.	An oBSMP [EN0110020/APP/5.15] has been submitted for the Application and is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] . The oBSMP details the potential failure scenarios that could occur with the BESS, and details the mitigation measures in place to reduce the risk of these scenarios occurring. Details are also provided regarding the combustion products of these failure scenarios, including gases and smoke, which have also been assessed in the	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		BESS Plume Assessment [EN0110020/APP/7.2] submitted with the Application.	
Health and Safety Executive	The Applicant should make contact with the operators of MAH sites (see Appendix 1a), to inform an assessment of whether or not the proposed development is vulnerable to a possible major accident.	The Applicant can confirm that it has contacted the identified operators of Major Accident Hazard (MAH) sites but did not receive any response.	No
Health and Safety Executive	Since the works will entail underground cabling and access routes, HSE strongly recommends that at the earliest opportunity, the applicant liaises with the pipeline operators (see Appendix 1 b).	The Applicant can confirm that it has contacted the identified pipeline operators but did not receive any response.	No
Health and Safety Executive	Would Hazardous Substances Consent be needed? The presence of hazardous substances on, over or under land at or above set threshold quantities (Controlled Quantities) will probably require Hazardous Substances Consent (HSC) under the Planning (Hazardous Substances) Act 1990 as amended. The substances, alone or when aggregated with others for which HSC is required, and the associated Controlled Quantities, are set out in The Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 2015 as amended. HSC would be required to store or use any of the Named Hazardous Substances or Categories of Substances at or above the controlled quantities set out in Schedule 1 of these Regulations. Further information on HSC should be sought from the relevant Hazardous Substances Authority	The potential effects of the Proposed Development in relation to waste, including potentially hazardous waste is detailed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16]. The measures to be put in place to minimise and manage waste, are detailed in outline Site Waste Management Plan within the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] which is secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Historic England	Criteria for Assigning Value We are concerned that the proposed approach to criteria for assigning value to heritage assets, as laid out in Table 8.3 Criteria for Assigning Value, is not appropriately robust. Its language and approach are not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework nor Historic England's guidance. We consider that the currently proposed approach to assigning value is unhelpful in developing these proposals. We do not share your view, for example, that designated assets such as Grade II listed buildings or Registered Parks and Gardens can be moved or replaced without affecting their significance.	<u>Criteria for assigning value:</u> The proposed methodology has been revised to align with the National Planning Policy Framework and Historic England Guidance. This has changed the value criteria from 'low', 'medium', and 'high', to 'the highest', 'less than the highest', and 'lower' as per NPS EN-1 based on an asset's archaeological, historical, architectural, and artistic interest. The point that Historic England has highlighted that they disagree regarding the movement or replacement of assets without affecting their significance has been removed from the criteria. Criteria for assigning value is addressed in section 8.4 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8].	No
Historic England	3 km Study Area In May 2025 we provided our initial response that given the extent of the proposed solar array and the topography of the application site, this development is likely to be visible across a very large area. As a result, it could affect the significance of heritage assets at some distance from the site itself. We expected the assessment to clearly demonstrate that the extent of the proposed study area is of the appropriate size to ensure that all heritage assets likely to be affected by this development have been included and can be properly assessed. While we appreciate that the 3 km Study Area has not been "employed as a hard boundary" (paragraph 8.5.6), it is difficult to understand what robust process has been used to	A 3km Study Area has been used to inform the baseline of designated and non-designated heritage assets. A sieving exercise (see ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.3: Sieving Exercise [EN0110020/APP/6.20]) was produced following a review of all assets within a provisional 3km Setting Study Area. High value assets (Scheduled Monuments and Grade I Listed Buildings) beyond 3km were included within the sieving exercise and included for detailed assessment of Indirect Effects relating to Setting, where they fall within the bare earth ZTV and long-distance views towards the Proposed Development contribute towards their Setting and Cultural Significance.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	ensure that heritage assets beyond 3 km have been properly assessed. Paragraph 8.6.299 seems to suggest that only Scheduled Monuments and Grade I listed buildings were considered, whereas Figure 8.12 shows Registered Parks and Gardens and Grade II* listed buildings within the 5 km Study Area.	The 3km Study Area is addressed in section 8.5 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]	
Historic England	Settings to Conisbrough Castle The setting of any heritage asset is the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. This is more than what can be seen from the asset, although views contribute to setting. Understanding how setting contributes to the significance of these heritage assets and allow that significance to be appreciated is an incredibly important part of an assessment process. We would urge that the setting assessment for Conisbrough Castle fully utilises Historic England guidance as set out in The Setting of Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition). With regard to Conisbrough Castle, the proposal site is the only remaining area in which the castle	A dynamic assessment was undertaken for the setting of Conisbrough Castle, which included travelling on foot and car through the main throughfare of Doncaster to Sheffield road, as well as the public footpaths which cross through Conisbrough Parks to the south of the castle (ES Volume 3, Figure 8.3 – 8.4: Cultural Heritage Viewpoints [EN0110020/APP/6.19]). This assessment used the guidance, the Setting of Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition), as referred to in Historic England's comment. The results of this dynamic assessment has been incorporated into the Setting assessment for	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	can be experienced in combination with the historical main route into Conisbrough through to the verdant and agrarian landscape setting, rather than latter urban and suburban sprawl. This rural - medieval town – castle transition through the landscape makes an important experiential contribution to the significance of the castle. The contribution the application site makes to the setting of the castle has been undervalued in the draft ES.	Conisbrough Castle in ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20] . This concluded that a small magnitude of impact is predicted to this high value asset, resulting in a moderate adverse effect which is considered not significant.	
Historic England	Archaeological investigation We note that a geoarchaeological Desk-based Assessment (DBA) has now been undertaken, as previously requested. It has demonstrated that there is limited potential for deeply buried early prehistoric remains and that alluvium, and therefore palaeoenvironmental potential, is largely confined to the river valleys. However, the geoarchaeological DBA also notes that our current understanding of the Quaternary deposits across the proposed development area is somewhat limited and is highly localised, so some potential remains (so archaeological monitoring of geotechnical works will be required, as recommended by the geoarchaeological DBA). Based on the geoarchaeological DBA, magnetometry will have been the most suitable geophysical survey technique for the majority of the proposed development area, which was Historic England's primary concern given the geomorphological history of the area. We also understand from the South Yorkshire Archaeology Service (SYAS) that an alternative geophysical	A first phase of trial trenching (Phase I) has already been undertaken; this targeted those areas for which permanent infrastructure is proposed. Results from these investigations are provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.9: Phase I Trial Trenching Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. The outline Written Scheme of Investigation [EN0110020/APP/5.16] presents the scope and methodology for a programme of further archaeological fieldwork (Phase II), to be undertaken post-consent, in liaison with the South Yorkshire Archaeology Service (SYAS). The Archaeological Preservation Strategy (APS) (within Volume 3, Appendix 8.7: Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]) presents a strategy by which archaeological remains of a level of significance warranting preservation in situ would be protected during construction, operation, and decommissioning.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	survey technique, electromagnetic induction (EMI), will be employed in areas of Whitestone 1 affected by green waste that obscured any archaeological anomalies present. A further programme of archaeological evaluation will also be required to groundtruth the geophysical survey results and assumptions made in the geoarchaeological DBA. This should be devised following advice from SYAS with input from the Historic England Science Advisor, as appropriate	During the preparation of these documents, the use of Electromagnetic (EM) Survey, and a wide variety of other methods, has been discussed with SYAS.	
Indigo	Please see attached plant in area (series of maps of apparatus).	Noted, the Applicant will consider Indigo's assets through detailed design.	No
National Highways	National Highways will expect the traffic impact of the construction HGV traffic, staff movements and AIL deliveries to be controlled through the production of a CTMP (refer para 4.7).	An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.12] is submitted with the Application. Cumulative assessment of traffic and transport effects is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13] .	No
National Highways	The information presented in the Draft ES is not sufficient to confirm at this stage whether the impact of the development at the SRN during the peak traffic periods can be controlled through a CTMP and DTMP or whether further capacity and/or safety assessments will be required (refer para 4.7).	Further information on the impact of the Proposed Development on traffic flows has been provided since the Draft ES, and is detailed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13] and the accompanying appendices (EN0110020/APP/6.20). An oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12] has also been submitted with the Application to manage traffic flows during construction, and is secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] .	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		A DEMP will be prepared at the cessation of operations at the Proposed Development substantially in accordance with the oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11] , which has been submitted as part of the Application and is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] . A Decommissioning Traffic Management Plan will be included in the DEMP.	
National Highways	Subsequent iterations of the ES and Outline CTMP (when produced) should clearly identify the cumulative construction impact at the SRN junctions during the SRN network peak periods. (refer para 4.7).	An oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12] is submitted with the Application. Cumulative assessment of traffic and transport effects is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13] and ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN0110020/APP/6.17] .	No
National Highways	Constraints to vehicle arrivals and departures during the periods 08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00 (as per the TS) may not be sufficient to minimise movements through the SRN junctions, during the SRN network peak hours. (refer para 4.9).	Details on trip generation, including construction worker transport, are provided in both ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20] and oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]. The assessment of the potential impact of the Proposed Development on traffic is presented in ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13] and uses the trip generation detail provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20] and the mitigation measures outlined in the oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]. This assessment concludes that no significant effects on traffic and transport are anticipated.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
National Highways	An updated Glint & Glare Assessment should be undertaken to identify how the areas of 'high impact' on the M1 and M18 can be mitigated (refer paras 5.2 and 5.3).	The Applicant has submitted ES Appendix 16.2: Glint and Glare Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20] as part of the application. This Appendix confirms that engagement with national Highways has been ongoing in relation to the proposed screening along a small number of roads. Through the inclusion of the proposed screening, to reduce glare impacts on road receptors that are considered 'high' or 'medium' impacts, it can now be confirmed that all road receptors assessed have been reduced to 'Low' or 'None' in relation to glare impacts. Engagement with National Highways will continue post consent during detailed design.	No
National Highways	A DTMP should be produced (refer para 6.1).	A Decommissioning Traffic Management Plan will be included in the DEMP. A DEMP will be prepared at the cessation of operations at the Proposed Development, substantially in accordance with the oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11] , which has been submitted as part of the Application and is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] .	No
National Highways	National Highways will expect the traffic impact of the construction HGV traffic, staff movements and AIL deliveries to be controlled through the production of a Construction Traffic Management Plan [CTMP] and Construction Staff Travel Plan (the production of which are committed to within the Draft ES). Nevertheless, the information presented in the Draft ES is not sufficient to confirm at this stage whether the impact of the development at the SRN during the peak traffic periods can be	An oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12] is submitted with the Application. The ES provides further information regarding the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on traffic and transport than provided in the Draft ES, within ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13] . This chapter also includes a cumulative assessment of traffic and transport effects in section 13.8.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	controlled through a CTMP and Decommissioning Traffic Management Plan [DTMP], or whether further capacity and/or safety assessments will be required. Subsequent iterations of the ES and Outline CTMP (when produced) should clearly identify the cumulative construction impact at the SRN junctions during the SRN network peak periods.	A Decommissioning Traffic Management Plan will be included in the DEMP. A DEMP will be prepared at the cessation of operations at the Proposed Development, substantially in accordance with the oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11] , which has been submitted as part of the Application and is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] .	
National Highways	National Highways will need to understand the number of development trips generated by the construction phase in the SRN peak hours, in line with guidance set out in Circular 01/22. It should therefore be noted that the constraints to vehicle arrivals and departures (outlined above) may not be sufficient to minimise movements through the SRN junctions, during the SRN network peak hours. The SRN peak hours should be identified for each of the junctions listed in paragraph 4.5 above.	Details on trip generation, including construction worker transport, are provided in both ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20] and the oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]. Details on how consultation specific to trip generation, routing and calculations are provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. The assessment presented in ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13] uses the trip generation detail provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20] and the mitigation measures outlined in the oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12].	No
National Highways	JSJV has reviewed the Cable Corridor Options shown within the Draft ES submissions and note that there are several locations which identify routing across the SRN. Some of these crossing points appear to be at locations where there are no	This is noted, and the Applicant is currently engaged in the CD622 process with National Highways. The applicant has submitted a Statement of Intent, and is developing a Preliminary Sources Study Report (PSSR) for	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	existing structures passing over or under the SRN. It is advised by JSJV that any works carried out in, on, over, or under National Highways' land will need to be agreed in writing between the undertaker and National Highways, in order to ensure that National Highways can exercise all the statutory functions. Furthermore, JSJV notes that for any form of Horizontal Directional Drilling [HDD] cable route under the SRN, a condition survey and regime of monitoring of any National Highways as sets or structures that National Highways considers will be affected by the specified works, will need to be reviewed and agreed in writing by National Highways, and a form of security put in place to protect National Highways against any financial loss. Additionally, JSJV states that for any proposed works to the SRN, all drawings, specifications, and calculations would be required for review by National Highways and must meet current standards with the correct certification. The undertaker must comply with National Highways' road space booking procedures, prior to and during the carrying out of the specified works. JSJV would note that the routing of power cables through or attached to existing overbridges is not likely to be acceptable to National Highways. The required submissions of information relating to any such routing requests should be confirmed by National Highways.	review by National Highways. The applicant understands this is the appropriate process to manage tunnelling for any cable crossings under the SRN.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
National Highways	The Draft ES identifies the need for perimeter fencing around Solar PV arrays and security fencing around power conversion stations and substations. National Highways will require further information with regards to the specifics of the physical site boundaries and how these will be implemented in relation to the existing land under National Highways' ownership. Further information is also required in relation to how access to this boundary will be obtained throughout development construction and maintenance, whilst noting that highway land cannot be used for these purposes. Moreover, confirmation should be provided as to the extent of the land under the ownership of the applicant, up to the point where this land meets the National Highways boundary.	Details of the proposed fencing around the Solar PV arrays, Power Conversion Station (PCS) and substations are provided in the Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]. They are also described in ES Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]. The physical boundaries of The Proposed Development are shown in ES Figure 3.1: Order Limits [EN0110020/APP/6.19]. Engagement with National Highways is ongoing to ensure access points and routes are designed in a manner that meets the relevant requirements. Details of proposed access points and routes are presented in the oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12].	No
National Highways	National Highways will require confirmation from the applicant that any existing embankments to the boundaries of the site, adjacent to the SRN, can safely accommodate the development proposals. In addition, it is noted that there is potential for cables to be routed under the M1 and/or M18, and information needs to be provided by the applicant on this matter.	National Highways has been consulted regarding access routes to Site. Furthermore, protection for statutory undertakers' assets is included within the protective provisions in the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	No
National Highways	National Highways will require further information with regards to the specific construction safeguards that will be implemented by the applicant to ensure that the construction of the development at the site's boundaries does not impact the SRN in any way. It is noted that the Draft ES commits to an oCEMP being produced as part of the application	Mitigation measures in relation to management of construction traffic are provided in the oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]. While mitigation measures in relation to construction as a whole phase are included in the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]. Some of the mitigation measures proposed include:	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	submission and National Highways will need to review the contents of this document once provided.	• A Delivery Management System (DMS) to control HGV arrival times; • Defined delivery windows; • Traffic marshals to be deployed where required to manage vehicle movements safely at access points; • A Worker Travel Plan to manage construction worker movements; and • Wheel washing and road sweeping where required.	
National Highways	Glint and Glare A Glint and Glare Assessment Report is provided as Appendix 16.2 to the Draft ES. The assessment identifies that (with screening considered) roadside vegetation, topography and proposed mitigation planting will significantly reduce visibility of panels from most stretches of the motorway; nevertheless, short sections of the M1 and M18 will still have potential visibility of panels causing glare and thus have a 'high impact' rating. Paragraph 16.2.322 of the Glint and Glare Assessment Report states that updates will be made to the proposed landscape mitigation in order to "reduce the potential impact of glint and glare to as low practicably possible. Therefore, the magnitude of impact on receptors is expected to be reduced, and this updated mitigation and assessment will be presented in the ES". JSJV welcomes the commitment to further assessment and mitigation and notes that National Highways will need to review the updated assessments when provided with the final ES.	Further screening has been proposed to reduce glare impacts on road receptors that are considered 'high' or 'medium' impacts. As a result, all road receptors assessed have been reduced to 'Low' or 'None' in relation to glare impacts. Further details can be found within the Impact Assessment section of ES Appendix 16.2: Glint and Glare Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. National Highways have been engaged in relation to glint and glare screening required along a small number of roads and their feedback has been considered in the assessment. Engagement with National Highways will continue post consent during detailed design.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
National Highways	Drainage The Draft ES identifies that an outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy [SWDS] will be submitted as part of the application. It is stated that the design aims to maintain pre-development runoff rates using sustainable drainage methods. National Highways will need to review the content of the SWDS (once provided) and require confirmation from the applicant that the development drainage will have no relationship with the SRN drainage system associated with the M18 or M1 motorways.	The drainage strategy for the Proposed Development has been developed considering the local topography, flood characteristics and land use. Attenuation is proposed where relevant alongside an appropriate maintenance regime to ensure robustness for a 1 in 200-year rainfall event, with a 45 % climate change allowance. Further details can be found in the Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy [EN0110020/APP/5.17]. Where appropriate, drainage design has been considered of the SRN.	No
National Highways	Energy Storage Units The relative location and proximity of any energy storage units (located within the site), to the SRN, should be clearly identified within any forthcoming statutory consultation submissions. The Draft ES states that two potential locations for the Battery Energy Storage Systems [BESS] have been identified within W2, but only one location will be developed. JSJV note that one of the potential BESS sites would be located on land adjacent to the M1, north of Morthen Lane. The applicant should continue to liaise with National Highways regarding the likely assessments required for a proposed BESS site at this location, noting that discussions to date have already identified the need for a Road Restraint Risk Assessment Process [RRRAP] to determine the specific site need for VRS and its performance requirements, and that National Highways will need sight of any 'Emergency Plans' with the emergency	The proposed location of the Energy storage units is shown in the Works Plans [EN0110020/APP/2.3] under Work No. 3: BESS. The BESS is proposed to be located adjacent to the M1. Engagement with National Highways is ongoing regarding the BESS, including the location but during this engagement it was agreed that the Road Restraint Risk Assessment Process is no longer required. An oBSMP [EN0110020/APP/5.15] has been produced, shared and discussed with the South Yorkshire Fire Service. Further details can be found in the oBSMP [EN0110020/APP/5.15] and BESS Plume Assessment [EN0110020/APP/7.2].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	services, in the event of an incident for the prevention of the impact of thermal runaway. The Draft ES commits to a Battery Safety Management Plan [BSMP] being submitted with the DCO application, which will need to be reviewed by National Highways.		
National Highways	Decommissioning will involve the removal of solar arrays and ancillary infrastructure. The site would then revert back to its prior usage, such as for agricultural purposes. Given that the typical lifespan of a solar farm exceeds 25 years, it is accepted that it would be most appropriate to assess the impact of the Decommissioning Phase upon the SRN at that time, through a DTMP. National Highways have previously identified that a DTMP can be secured via a suitably worded planning requirement, should planning permission for the development proposals be granted.	The impact of the construction of the Proposed Development on the SRN has been assessed through the oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]. The impact of the decommissioning works will mirror that of the construction. Hence, the oCTMP is deemed to provide a suitable assessment for the decommissioning scope. Further details can be found in the oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/7.5]. A Decommissioning Traffic Management Plan will be included in the DEMP. A DEMP will be prepared at the cessation of operations at the Proposed Development, substantially in accordance with the oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11], which has been submitted as part of the Application and is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	No
Natural England	As referenced in our EIA scoping response, the SSSI's requiring further assessment are: Crabtree Wood SSSI, Lindrick Golf Course SSSI, Anston Stones Wood SSSI and Sprotbrough Gorge SSSI. We have also provided comments on Roche Abbey Woodlands SSSI. Given that Lindrick Golf Course SSSI was initially scoped in for assessment in Chapter 12 'Air Quality' based on its proximity to relevant traffic routes, and no clear justification has	The SSSIs highlighted by NE, including Lindrick Golf Course, are subject to an ecological assessment within the ES detailed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6] , with the assessment consistent with air quality assessment in ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12] .	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	been provided for its subsequent exclusion, we would welcome clarification on the rationale for scoping this site out of further assessment in Chapter 6. In addition, we advise that Chapter 6 provides clearer clarification on which SSSIs are being assessed further for potential water quality impacts. It is currently unclear whether only Sprotbrough Gorge SSSI is being taken forward for further assessment in this regard. We recommend that the assessment clearly identifies all SSSIs with a hydrological connectivity to the proposed development and provides justification where any sites will be scoped out. Please refer to the water quality section below for more information.	In terms of biodiversity (as detailed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]), Crabtree Woods, Anston Stones Wood, Lindrick Golf Course, Roches Abbey Woodlands, and Sprotbrough Gorge SSSIs have a hydrological link to the Site; however, (with the exception of Sprotbrough Gorge which does have aquatic designation features) the features for which each of the SSSIs have been designated are terrestrial and not aquatic. With the pollution prevention measures detailed in the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] in place, there is not a pathway to affect these designation features (whether terrestrial or aquatic), with the duration of effect being short term, of negligible magnitude and not significant to Important Ecological Features of the SSSIs. In terms of water quality (as detailed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]), Lindrick Golf Course SSSI is located more than 2km from the Proposed Development and not within the Study Area (1km from the Order Limits). While a wider hydrological connection is recognised via the River Don catchment, the distance from the Site, the scale of the receiving watercourse and the potential for dilution mean that any potential effects from the Proposed Development would be negligible at the SSSI. On this basis, although the hydrological linkage has been acknowledged, there is no reasonable source - pathway - receptor mechanism	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		by which likely significant effects on the SSSI could arise and further detailed assessment is not required. The SSSI is therefore scoped out of further consideration. Sprotbrough Gorge is located more than 2 km from the Proposed Development and not within the Study Area (1km from the Order Limits). It is also not within the same hydrological catchment as the Proposed Development. As such it remains scoped out. Anston Stones Woods SSSI is located within the Study Area (1km from the Order Limits) and potential for impacts to water quality is therefore considered in the assessment within ES volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10].	
Natural England	Air quality standard advice will be provided for NSIP applications with the potential for air pollution impacts. This standard advice is Natural England's formal statutory advice. It provides decision makers with the information needed to fulfil their statutory duties when making decisions on NSIPs with potential air pollution impacts. Please see the advice attached in annex B.	The standardised advice has been taken into account in the assessment where applicable.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Natural England	We note that an outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) will be produced alongside the ES to address potential water quality impacts during construction. We welcome this and advise that all SSSIs with relevant hydrological links to the site should be considered for further assessment and identified as ecological receptors in the oCEMP where mitigation is required. In addition, when we provided our EIA scoping advice on the SSSIs likely to be impacted by water pollution due to hydrological connectivity, we based this on the information available on the panel locations. We were not aware of the locations proposed for connecting cable routes. However, we note that one of the cable corridor options crosses a watercourse which is hydrologically connected to Roche Abbey Woodlands SSSI. Methodology of crossing and the potential pollutant risks associated with this should be considered. Where trenchless crossing via Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) is proposed to avoid direct damage to habitat, a bentonite break out plan should be produced to prevent other pollutant risk.	With regards to water resources, Anston Woods SSSI is hydrologically connected to the Site and within the Study Area (1km from the Order Limits), and is therefore assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]. No other SSSIs are within the Study Area (1km from the Order Limits) and are therefore scoped out of further assessment. In terms of biodiversity (as detailed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]), Crabtree Woods, Anston Stones Wood, Lindrick Golf Course, Roches Abbey Woodlands, and Sprotborough Gorge SSSIs have a hydrological link to the Site; however, (with the exception of Sprotborough Gorge which does have aquatic designation features) the features for which each of the SSSIs have been designated are terrestrial and not aquatic. With the pollution prevention measures detailed in the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] in place, there is not a pathway to affect these designation features (whether terrestrial or aquatic), with the duration of effect being short term, of negligible magnitude and not significant to Important Ecological Features of the SSSIs. Mitigation in relation to the SSSI are set out in ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10] and the	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9], which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. Impacts associated with cable crossings over watercourses have been assessed within ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10].	
Natural England	With regards to the BESS locations, we note that in section 6.8.86 of Chapter 6 states that “the design layout of the masterplan in Volume 3, Appendix 5.1: Indicative Operation Masterplan shows that the indicative location options for siting the BESS are not hydrologically linked to designated sites, so there is no pathway for fire control products that would be used in an emergency to control BESS fires to be able to cause an impact on hydrologically linked designated sites during operation”. However, it is our understanding that there are multiple designated sites which are, in fact, hydrologically connected to the proposed BESS locations. On this basis, we advise that <i>Anston Stones Wood</i> SSSI, <i>Lindrick Golf Course</i> SSSI and <i>Sprotbrough Gorge</i> SSSI are scoped in for assessment of potential water quality impacts during operation, and identified as ecological receptors in any management plan.	Water quality effects and hydrological connectivity are addressed within the ES for all SSSIs with connectivity, with clarification on which SSSIs are included within the assessment added within ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]. The SSSIs highlighted by Natural England, including <i>Lindrick Golf Course</i>, are also subject to ecological assessment within the ES in ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation, with the assessment consistent with ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.10].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Natural England	However, in principle we welcome the inclusion of the Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP) and consider the proposed firewater and pollution prevention measures to be appropriate. We would advise that this plan is secured through a requirement in the DCO.	An oBSMP [EN0110020/APP/5.15] has been submitted within the Application and is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] .	No
Natural England	Ancient woodland Natural England welcome the approach to ancient woodland and acknowledge that areas of ancient woodland adjacent to the proposed order limits have been scoped in for further assessment. We agree with the conclusion that “with a proposed buffer distance and the implementation of mitigation measures identified within Section 6.7 and detailed in the oCEMP, potential effects from disturbance or harm to ancient woodland are reduced”. We have no further comments to make as long as the approach remains in line with the current guidance.	Noted – appropriate buffers of 25m have been maintained around Ancient Woodland, and are secured within the Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3] . The assessment of any potential effects on Ancient Woodland is detailed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6] .	No
Natural England	Whitestone 1, 2 and 3 (Panel Locations) All land which may experience temporary or permanent disturbance should be subject to a detailed ALC survey, to inform suitable handling and restoration criteria. ALC surveys should be undertaken in line with the MAFF 1988 ‘Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales: Revised criteria for grading the quality of agricultural land’. The results in the submitted in Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report demonstrate that reconnaissance level surveys have been undertaken at this stage for the areas named as Whitestone 1, Whitestone 2 and Whitestone 3, as they have been carried out at a	Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) surveys have been undertaken across the entirety of W1, W2 and W3, in line with the MAFF (1988) guidance and with auger borings taken at 200 m intervals. Post-1988 ADAS ALC data in the W1 area was also included in the assessment. The ALC survey of W1, W2, and W3 (not including the Cable Corridors) provided the following results: • 0.94% of Grade 1 Agricultural Land; • 7.06% of Grade 2 Agricultural Land; • 11.16% of Subgrade 3a Agricultural Land;	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	sampling density of 1 per 2 ha. Reconnaissance surveys can help guide decision making, however detailed surveys will still be required to inform appropriate soil handling techniques within a Soil Management Plan (SMP). General guidance for protecting soils during development is also available in Defra's Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites, and should the development proceed, we recommend that relevant parts of this guidance are followed, e.g. in relation to handling or trafficking on soils in wet weather. The British Society of Soil Science has published the Guidance Note Benefitting from Soil Management in Development and Construction which sets out measures for the protection of soils within the planning system and the development of individual sites, which we also recommend is followed.	• 78.86% of Subgrade 3b Agricultural Land; • 0.32% of Grade 4 Agricultural Land; • 0.67% of Urban Land; • 0.13% of Non-Agricultural Land; and • 0.85% of Not Surveyed Land. In summary, of the area surveyed, 19% is comprised of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land, although in the majority of instances better quality grades show high spatial variability within larger areas of ALC subgrade 3b. BMV classification data for W1, W2 and W3, based on Site surveys and sampling, and for the Cable Corridors, based on a desk-based review, is provided in section 9.5 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9], including tabulated areas. The ALC survey is detailed in ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP6.20]. Mitigation, including the outline Soil Management Plan which can be found in section 9 of oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9], is discussed in section 9.6. of ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9].	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Natural England	Cable Corridor There is currently no proposal to survey the cable corridor. We advise ALC surveys should be undertaken for the full area covered by the redline boundary. The results from a detailed ALC survey provide soils data to inform an SMP for the whole site regardless of whether the use is permanent or temporary in nature. We note that DEFRA's Post-1988 ADAS surveys have been noted within the assessment (4.13) where these overlap with Whitestone 1 panel area. However we also note that the assessment does not include reference to the ADAS surveys which overlap with the proposed cable routes, and advise there are several sections where we identified the existence of surveys. This includes; the sections of the route to the east of Todwick village, and some of the route east of Wickersley village. We advise this information is also taken into the assessment as this will help inform the approach to avoiding or reducing impacts to BMV soils.	The potential impacts of the proposed cable laying on agricultural land are not considered as significant, regardless of their ALC, because: i) The trenching works required for the laying of the cables would be very short in duration, localised and linear with individual trench sections open only for a limited duration as construction activities progress incrementally along the Cable Corridor. The area of land subject to active disturbance at any one time would be small; ii) The land would be reinstated following installation and returned to agricultural use, using a method specifically designed to retain its general soil characteristics without loss of soil function; and iii) Installation and restoration works would be undertaken under a Soil Management Plan (SMP) and / or Excavated Materials Management Plan (EMMP). An outline SMP and outline EMMP is included in the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. For the purposes of the EIA, a reasonable worst-case scenario has been assumed whereby cable installation passes through agricultural land of the highest potential sensitivity, including BMV land. Even on this basis, effects on agricultural land and soil resources are assessed as temporary, reversible and Not Significant, due to the limited spatial extent of the works, their short duration, and the committed mitigation and reinstatement	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		measures in the SMP. Further, the EIA does not rely on the specific ALC grading of the Cable Corridors because the nature of the works and mitigation proposed would not result in permanent loss of soil function or agricultural capability and as such, further differentiation by ALC would not alter the outcome of the assessment nor identify any materially different mitigation requirements. The Applicant considers this to be proportionate and consistent with established practice for underground connection cables for solar infrastructure where soil resources are reinstated and returned to agricultural use. Recent NSIP precedent includes West Burton DCO where ALC surveys were not undertaken for underground cable corridors, on the basis that impacts were temporary and subject to soil management controls and Sunnica Energy Farm DCO in which the Secretary of State agreed with the approach of not proposing further ALC surveys for the Cable Corridors, given the limited and reversible nature of the works and controls secured through the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. BMV classification data for W1, W2 and W3, based on Site surveys and sampling, and for the Cable Corridors, based on a desk-based review, is provided in section 9.5 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9], including tabulated areas.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Mitigation measures to reduce the potential impact of the Proposed Development on soils, including the outline SMP, described in section 9 of the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] , are discussed in section 9.6 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9] .	
Natural England	Protected Species The conservation of species protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 is explained in Part IV and Annex A of Government Circular 06/2005 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation: Statutory Obligations and their Impact within the Planning System. Applicants should check to see if a mitigation licence is required using Natural England guidance on licensing Natural England wildlife licences. Applicants can also make use of Natural England's charged service Pre Submission Screening Service for a review of a draft wildlife licence application. Natural England then reviews a full draft licence application to issue a Letter of No Impediment (LONI) which explains that based on the information reviewed to date, that it sees no impediment to a licence being granted in the future should the DCO be issued. This is done to give the Planning Inspectorate confidence to make a recommendation to the relevant Secretary of State in granting a DCO. See Advice Note	An assessment of potential effects on Protected Species is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]. No significant effects on Protected Species are anticipated. Where disturbance to a Protected Species is unavoidable then a licence would be applied for from Natural England with an accompanying method statement which will set out the appropriate mitigation and compensation measures which will be conditioned through the licence. Although it is not known what licences may be required at this stage, appropriate licenses would be obtained prior to any works commencing, as noted in the Consents and Agreements Position Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.3].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	Eleven, Annex C – Natural England and the Planning Inspectorate National Infrastructure Planning for details of the LONI process Natural England has adopted standing advice for protected species, which includes guidance on survey and mitigation measures. A separate protected species licence from Natural England or Defra may also be required. For Great Crested Newts, use of the District Level Licencing Scheme may be appropriate for this project.		
Natural England	Although BNG is not yet a mandatory requirement for NSIPs, we strongly recommend that BNG provision is secured through this development. This will reflect the important role NSIPs must play in delivering the government's environmental targets. We broadly welcome the assumption that at least 10% BNG will be delivered for the project, and proposals will align with the LNRS. We have provided some advice on how BNG could be delivered below (Recommendations). The biodiversity baseline should include all land contained within the site's red line boundary and proposals can be iteratively refined over time and throughout detailed design. Biodiversity gains should ideally be secured for a minimum of 30 years and be subject to adaptive	A BNG assessment including enhancement proposals is presented in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20] and covers the full Order Limits. This also includes a commitment to at least a 30-year period for the BNG to be applicable (detailed in the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]). The design has been informed by extensive baseline field surveys and ecological assessment, enabling a targeted approach to habitat retention, creation, enhancement and long-term management. As set out in ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6], the Proposed Development will deliver Biodiversity Net	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	management and monitoring. BNG plans should be secured by a suitably worded requirement in the DCO.	Gain (BNG) well in excess of the forthcoming statutory 10% requirement. A requirement within Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] will secure the BNG commitment.	
Natural England	There are multiple opportunities within the project area that could be recognised as contributing to BNG, including: grassland enhancement beneath the solar panels and hedgerow connectivity (the South Yorkshire Local Planning Authorities have good datasets on hedgerows in their region). In addition, habitat creation and restoration such as wetland development in and around the Rother catchment and potential improvements to the Chesterfield Canal, where an uplift in watercourse units may be achievable. Aligning BNG delivery with the emergent Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) could allow for more targeted habitat creation. Natural England also advises that Green Infrastructure (GI) can contribute to BNG by offering additional benefits through environmental stacking, with the potential to encourage access to nature for nearby urban communities. This could include linking into the Rother Valley Country Park and supporting their community projects. Additionally, work could be done to help alleviate recreational pressure on sensitive sites such as Sprotbrough Gorge SSSI, which has been subject to mountain bike disturbance. This scheme could offer alternative locations for recreational access through GI, therefore offering wider SSSI benefits. The Green Infrastructure (GI) Framework can be used	A BNG assessment including enhancement proposals are presented ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20], which includes a commitment to at least a 30-year period for the BNG to be applicable (as detailed in the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]). The design has been informed by extensive baseline field surveys and ecological assessment, enabling a targeted approach to habitat retention, creation, enhancement and long-term management. As set out in ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6], the Proposed Development will deliver BNG well in excess of the forthcoming statutory 10% requirement. The approach to BNG, including detailed enhancement proposals and a commitment to a minimum 30-year management period, is presented in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. A requirement within Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] will secure two thirds of the BNG.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	for design of GI for infrastructure projects as well as housing.	The oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] details habitat enhancements, management, and creation to provide landscape level connectivity enhancements. Mitigation and enhancement proposals have been designed to: • Integrate the Proposed Development into its landscape setting, aiming to avoid or minimise adverse effects on the landscape, biodiversity, heritage and visual receptors; • Promote the conservation, protection, and enhancement of the physical, natural and historic environment within the Proposed Development and its surroundings; and • Diversify the ecological value of existing habitats. The proposals include hedgerow restoration, riparian corridor management, improving habitat and ecological connectivity (through habitat corridors), and the creation of an array of diverse habitats such as species-rich native hedgerows (with and without trees), native tree belts, mixed scrub, arable field margins, and species-rich grassland below solar panels. Wet grassland is also proposed to be introduced into Brampton Common Local Wildlife Site (LWS).	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		The LNRS is currently being prepared, and will be considered as the oLEMP is refined following submission. The Proposed Development also includes the provision of Permissive Paths within the Order Limits to connect up the PRow network and encourage access into nature. These are detailed within the oLEMP. These proposals will mitigate potential environmental impacts on sensitive receptors (for example where tree / hedgerow planting may reduce views of the Proposed Development from residential receptors), contribute to Biodiversity Net Gain, and have wider benefits on the landscape and ecological receptors.	
Natural England	1.1-1.3 Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) sampling density plays a crucial role in ensuring accurate land assessments for planning and development decisions. The density of sampling refers to the number of observations taken across a given land area, influencing the reliability of classification results. Higher sampling densities provide more detailed insights into soil properties and help improve ALC grade boundary accuracies. Conversely, lower sampling densities may lead to generalised classifications, reduced accuracy of grade boundary locations and potentially overlooking important variations within a site. Optimising sampling density ensures that land classification reflects the true agricultural potential	ALC surveys have been undertaken across the entirety of W1, W2 and W3. Post-1988 ADAS ALC data in the W1 area was also included in the assessment. A sampling density of one auger boring at 200 m intervals was used (with borings to a depth of 1.2m), and this was deemed sufficient to provide a robust survey of the Order Limits while being proportionate for the size of the Site. The ALC Surveys have covered the Site, but not the Cable Corridors, as the impact on soil within the Cable Corridors would be temporary, reversible and would cover a small area, and therefore no	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	of an area, supporting sustainable land management and policy decisions. In the absence of existing site-specific ALC data (such as Post 1988 ALC surveys), a detailed ALC survey is expected to inform development proposals. An ALC and soil survey of the agricultural land should be undertaken across the full study area (including cable route corridors), this should normally be at a detailed density of one auger core per hectare to a depth of 1.2 m, supported by soil pits dug in each main soil type to confirm the physical characteristics to a minimum depth of 1 metre. Soil data collected as part of an ALC survey can also be used to inform the Soil Management Plan (SMP) as set out in the Defra Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites. A reduced survey approach of 1 auger per 2 hectares may be agreed on occasion, if considered appropriate. Any reduced survey density approach would only be considered for land subject to temporary development. However, sufficient soil data is still required to inform soil handling, therefore a detailed ALC / soil survey may still be necessary.	impact on soil quality should occur if correct soil handling measures are utilised (as detailed in the outline Soil Management Plan included in the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]. The ALC surveys are detailed fully in ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP6.20]	
Natural England	2 It is unclear whether this report is to inform further detailed surveys.	The ALC Survey Report provided in the Draft ES detailed the ALC Surveys completed to date at the time of the release of the Draft ES (September 2025). Further ALC Surveys across the Site have been completed to inform the ES, and these are detailed in the updated ALC Survey Report provided at submission in ES Volume 3, Appendix	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP6.20]	
Natural England	3.3 See aforementioned advice (para 1.1-1.3) Table 2. There is a large proportion (28.5%) of un-surveyed land. Natural England refer to aforementioned advice (para 1.1-1.3)	The ALC Survey Report provided in the Draft ES detailed the ALC Surveys completed to date at the time of the release of the Draft ES (September 2025). Further ALC Surveys across the Site have been completed to inform the ES, and these are detailed in the updated ALC Survey Report provided at submission in ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP6.20] . With the updated surveys, only 0.85% of the Site remains un-surveyed which is due to woodland being on the land.	No
Natural England	4.8 According to available published information there is a small area of mapped Conway association (0811b) near junction 33 of the A630.	Noted. The Order Limits are no longer in the vicinity of Junction 33 of the A630, and so this is information is no longer relevant.	No
Natural England	4.13/14 Natural England notes the applicant's awareness of previous surveys and we would advise where previous MAFF surveys are available this would constitute a reasonable rationale for reduced density sampling to validate previous findings. The LDC survey does not scope in the cable route corridor however, we would like to draw to your attention the proposed route to the south of the development site near South Anston and towards the norther site near Branley have post 88 data available online.	Noted – publicly available online data has been utilised in the ALC assessment. This is detailed in ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP6.20] .	No
Natural England	Soil Type 3: Aberford Compared to other mapped soil types in the report there is a lack of confirmed soil property information for example Munsell colour and confirmed texture. Para 4.30 notes similarity between SSEW mapping	Noted. The Applicant can confirm that there is further detail on Soil Type 3 provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP6.20] . The majority of the areas where this soil type was	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	but it's unclear if this is in relation to extent of boundaries or soil type properties.	identified within the Draft ES have since been removed from the Order Limits, and therefore this Soil Type only covers approximately 4.62 ha of the Site.	
Natural England	4.54 Natural England support the use of 'trial pits' or topsoil pits as a way of confirming certain properties within topsoil.	Noted.	No
Natural England	4.58 Natural England do not see the relevance of this statement in this document. However, the statement is broadly plausible but needs refinement and supporting evidence to be robust. Modern four-wheel-drive machinery can and does allow some farming on steeper slopes than older guidance assumed, but slope suitability in the MAFF (1988) ALC guidance remains a relevant baseline and cannot be superseded without assessing soil loss from erosion, compaction, crop performance and operator safety.	Noted. The MAFF (1988) ALC guidance has been used for the determination of ALC grades, with Grade 3b including slopes of over 7 degrees, and Grade 4 including slopes of 11 – 18 degrees as per Table 1 in the guidance document. Further detail is provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP6.20] , and the MAFF 1988 guidance remains the relevant baseline used within the assessment.	No
Natural England	4.70 This statement is factually incorrect in the knowledge that much of the site (28.7%) is yet to be surveyed.	The ALC Survey Report provided in the Draft ES detailed the ALC Surveys completed to date at the time of the release of the Draft ES (September 2025). Further ALC Surveys across the Site have been completed to inform the ES, and these are detailed in the updated ALC Survey Report provided at submission in ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP6.20] . With the updated surveys, only 0.85% of the Site remains un-surveyed which is due to woodland being on the land.	No
Natural England	5.1 Natural England notes the ALC survey does not include the connection route corridors. The temporary displacement of soil during construction	The potential impacts of the proposed cable laying on agricultural land are not considered as significant, regardless of their ALC, because:	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	as a result of the underground cable installation and temporary haul roads/construction compounds can result in permanent land quality change and soil damage if undertaken inappropriately, therefore, Natural England advise degradation or permanent loss of BMV agricultural land should be considered in the ES and associated SMP. This is required for consultees and decision makers to understand the extent (ha) and likely long-term impacts on agricultural land quality (ALC grade). There is a risk of soil damage, ALC degradation and long term or permanent loss of BMV from cable installation (grid route). Soil will need to be handled according to best practice and reinstated to a high standard to reduce the impacts. The results from a detailed ALC survey would provide soils data to inform a soil management plan for the whole site regardless of whether the use is permanent or temporary in nature.	i) the trenching works required for the laying of the cables would be very short in duration, localised and linear with individual trench sections open only for a limited duration as construction activities progress incrementally along the Cable Corridor. The area of land subject to active disturbance at any one time would be small; ii) the land would be reinstated following installation and returned to agricultural use, using a method specifically designed to retain its general soil characteristics without loss of soil function; and iii) installation and restoration works would be undertaken under a Soil Management Plan (SMP) and / or Excavated Materials Management Plan (EMMP). An outline SMP and outline EMMP is included in this with the Application within the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]. For the purposes of the EIA, a reasonable worst-case scenario has been assumed whereby cable installation passes through agricultural land of the highest potential sensitivity, including BMV land. Even on this basis, effects on agricultural land and soil resources are assessed as temporary, reversible and Not Significant, due to the limited spatial extent of the works, their short duration, and the committed mitigation and reinstatement measures in the SMP. Further, the EIA does not rely on the specific ALC grading of the Cable Corridors because the nature of the works and	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		mitigation proposed would not result in permanent loss of soil function or agricultural capability and as such, further differentiation by ALC would not alter the outcome of the assessment nor identify any materially different mitigation requirements. The Applicant considers this to be proportionate and consistent with established practice for underground connection cables for solar infrastructure where soil resources are reinstated and returned to agricultural use. Recent NSIP precedent includes West Burton DCO where ALC surveys were not undertaken for underground cable corridors, on the basis that impacts were temporary and subject to soil management controls and Sunnica Energy Farm DCO in which the Secretary of State agreed with the approach of not proposing further ALC surveys for the Cable Corridors, given the limited and reversible nature of the works and controls secured through the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. Within ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9], mitigation, including the outline SMP, is discussed in Section 9.6. BMV classification data for W1, W2 and W3, based on Site surveys and sampling, and for the Cable Corridors, based on a desk-based review, is provided in Section 9.5, including tabulated areas.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Natural England	5.4 Restoration of BMV agricultural land: We advise that where land is being returned to an agricultural use that the land is restored to a high standard and to its original capability (Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) grade) as far as is practicable. This requires the retention and replacement of suitable topsoil and subsoil materials as well as the adoption of best practice techniques in soil handling. Where any BMV agricultural land is restored to a non-agricultural use (e.g. habitat, amenity use), it should be restored to its original physical capability.	Installation and restoration works would be undertaken under a Soil Management Plan (SMP) and / or Excavated Materials Management Plan (EMMP). An outline SMP and outline EMMP is included in this with the Application within the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] .	No
Natural England	5.5 When asserting delivery of long-term positive soil health outcomes, proposals must demonstrate that soil impacts have been fully assessed, avoided where possible, and positively managed in line with EN1 and EN3: provide baseline soil surveys and evidence of pre- and post conditions, quantify effects on soil organic carbon, structure, erosion risk and biodiversity, and set measurable monitoring and maintenance commitments; apply the sequential approach to site selection to avoid best and most versatile soils, explain how permanent and temporary development will not cause long-term degradation or sealing, and detail reversible, low-impact management practices (including grazing, native vegetation establishment and compaction remediation) to secure net environmental gain; include clear mitigation, contingency and long-term stewardship arrangements with binding management periods and reporting so decision makers can verify	The majority of the Site is underlain by non-BMV soils, with small areas of BMV dotted across the Site, predominantly in southern W1, Central W2, southeast W2, and south of Woodall in W3. These areas are not covered by permanent infrastructure, apart from 0.4ha in W1, by a substation compound. The ALC Survey Results are shown on ES Volume 3, Figure 9.2: ALC Survey Results [EN0110020/APP/6.19]. The ALC across the Order Limits (excluding the Cable Corridors) is as follows: • 0.94% of Grade 1 Agricultural Land; • 7.06% of Grade 2 Agricultural Land; • 11.16% of Subgrade 3a Agricultural Land; • 78.86% of Subgrade 3b Agricultural Land; • 0.32% of Grade 4 Agricultural Land;	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	claimed benefits against robust metrics and thresholds.	0.67% of Urban Land; 0.13% of Non-Agricultural Land; and 0.85% of Not Surveyed Land. In summary, of the area surveyed, 19% is comprised of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land, although in the majority of instances better quality grades show high spatial variability within larger areas of ALC subgrade 3b. BMV classification data for W1, W2 and W3, based on Site surveys and sampling, and for the Cable Corridors, based on a desk-based review, is provided in section 9.5 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9], including tabulated areas. The ALC survey is detailed in ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP6.20].	
Natural England	5.6 Natural England does not consider impacts that occur during the operational phase (sixty years) to be 'short term'.	Decommissioning of the Proposed Development has been assessed within the Environmental Statement, which assumes a 60-year operational life followed by full decommissioning (ES Volume 1 and ES Volume 2, Chapters 6–17), demonstrating that the Proposed Development are 'temporary' and 'short term'. The decommissioning phase is anticipated to involve the dismantling and recycling of the solar PV panels, with vehicle movements broadly comparable to, or less than, those during construction. Some components, such as mitigation planting, site access tracks and cabling ducts buried below plough-depth, may be retained subject to landowner agreement. These elements	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		would not prevent future land use and would be managed in accordance with industry best practice, with no adverse environmental effects anticipated. The Environmental Statement explains that the precise decommissioning methods cannot be fully defined at this stage, as engineering practices will continue to evolve over the lifetime of the project. A precautionary, reasonable worst-case approach has therefore been adopted, with decommissioning effects assumed to be similar to, or of a lesser magnitude than, construction effects. A detailed DEMP will be prepared and approved by the relevant planning authority prior to decommissioning, as secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. An oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/7.4] has been submitted with the Application.	
Natural England	5.8 All soils should only be handled in a dry and friable condition, and it is expected that soil handling will be confined to the drier summer period (April through September) to minimise risk of soil damage. This would minimise the need to recondition soils, which requires additional space and time. This is particularly important for land to be restored to agricultural use.	Soil stripping, handling, storage and reinstatement will be undertaken in accordance with a Soil Management Plan (SMP) to be secured through the CEMP. An outline SMP is included within the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] . Measures will include segregation of topsoil and subsoil, restriction of soil handling to dry and friable conditions, minimisation of trafficking, and reinstatement in the correct sequence to retain soil structure, function and agricultural capability.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		The oSMP recognises that soils vary in sensitivity across the Site and that soil handling methods will be proportionate to soil type, ALC classification, moisture condition and proposed land use following reinstatement. ALC data will be used to inform soil stripping depths, segregation requirements and reinstatement methods in the SMP.	
Natural England	5.18 Natural England partly agree with this statement, however not all development is considered temporary, the Applicant should provide temporary and permanent land take breakdowns for each of the individual components of the project. For example, total agricultural area impacted by scheme (split by scheme component and by ALC grade), total area of BMV agricultural land (split by component) and total BMV agricultural area permanently and temporarily required for the development (split by component).	The majority of the Site is underlain by non-BMV soils, with small areas of BMV dotted across the Site, predominantly in southern W1, Central W2, southeast W2, and south of Woodall in W3. These areas are not covered by permanent infrastructure, apart from 0.4ha in W1, by a substation compound. The ALC across the Order Limits (excluding the Cable Corridors) is as follows: • 0.94% of Grade 1 Agricultural Land; • 7.06% of Grade 2 Agricultural Land; • 11.16% of Subgrade 3a Agricultural Land; • 78.86% of Subgrade 3b Agricultural Land; • 0.32% of Grade 4 Agricultural Land; • 0.67% of Urban Land; • 0.13% of Non-Agricultural Land; and • 0.85% of Not Surveyed Land. In summary, of the area surveyed, 19% is comprised of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land,	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		although in the majority of instances better quality grades show high spatial variability within larger areas of ALC subgrade 3b. BMV classification data for W1, W2 and W3, based on Site surveys and sampling, and for the Cable Corridors, based on a desk-based review, is provided in section 9.5 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9], including tabulated areas. The ALC survey is detailed in ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP6.20]. In relation to the semi-permanent use of agricultural land associated with solar PV, and loss of land associated with substations, BESS, access tracks, mitigation planting and enhancement, and the temporary loss of agricultural land associated with construction compounds and Cable Corridors, the magnitude of impact is assessed as Low. Key reasons are: • The total area of land within the Site (1,151ha) represents a very small proportion (2.5%) of overall agricultural land available on farm holdings within the local Study Area of Rotherham and Doncaster (46,820ha). Analysis of DEFRA Predictive ALC data suggests that the BMV land within the Site could represent approximately 0.6% of BMV land within Rotherham and Doncaster;	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		• BMV land accounts for a relatively small proportion of the agricultural land in the Site at 19.17% or 220.48ha. ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20] notes that the volume of BMV is less than would be reasonably expected for a site of its size and location; • Land required for construction compounds and for the Cable Corridor, including BMV land, would be required temporarily during the construction phase only. The construction of the Cable Corridor would be phased and, once cables are laid, they would be covered over and the land returned to its previous use; • The change in agricultural land use required for solar PV, substations, BESS and access tracks would be reversible after 60 years on decommissioning and the land made available for arable use, subject to agreement with landowners. Recent ISEP (formerly IEMA) guidance recommends that solar PV leads to 'a semi-permanent reduction in land used for agriculture' following uncertainty around the temporal nature of solar developments in recent NSIP applications;	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		It is not known at this stage whether land required for mitigation planting and enhancement would be returned to agricultural use after 60 years. It is assumed that this change in use would be reversible and, based on ISEP (formerly IEMA) guidance, this is assessed as a semi-permanent impact.	
Natural England	5.20 Natural England notes and welcomes the applicant's commitments to providing a Soil Management Plan (SMP). The Environmental Statement and associated SMP needs to clearly demonstrate how the ALC Grades and soil types will inform soil handling and restoration, setting out the site specific mitigation measures with reference to the best practice guidance (Defra Construction Code of Practice), i.e. secondary mitigation measures. The British Society of Soil Science has published the Guidance Note Benefitting from Soil Management in Development and Construction which also contains useful guidance. The SMP should include the following: i. An assessment of agricultural land and soil resource of the site will be undertaken before work commences (as per Natural England's Guide to assessing development proposals on agricultural land) which is considered to represent UK good practice. ii. Mitigation should include reference to the Defra Construction Code iii. The methods by which the applicant intends to	Installation and restoration works would be undertaken under a Soil Management Plan (SMP) and / or Excavated Materials Management Plan (EMMP). An outline SMP and outline EMMP is included in this with the Application in the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]. The SMP and EMMP will be secured within the CEMP by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	restore appropriate affected areas to agricultural use after works including excavations and restoration has finished. iv. An aftercare programme which would enable a satisfactory standard of agricultural after-use to be reached, with regards to cultivating, reseeding, draining or irrigating, applying fertiliser, or cutting and grazing the site.		
Natural England	Natural England note there has been no consideration of Cumulative effects. Whilst we are unable to recommend a particular methodology for cumulative impact assessment, there is external guidance available that might be helpful when you are considering the cumulative impact of the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land in the ES: 1. The Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) have guidance on Land and Soils. The guidance is aimed at Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of projects 2. The IEMA guidance also refers to The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) (2019) LA109 Geology and Soils EIA Guidance which might also be a useful resource. The guidance sets out the assessment criteria and methodology for highway projects only, though parts of the DMRB guidance are sometimes applied to other project types.	Cumulative effects have been considered within each technical chapter of the ES, and are summarised in ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN0110020/APP/6.17]. Other projects identified in the Cumulative Long List provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 17.2: Long and Short List of Developments for the Cumulative Effects Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20] were reviewed. Of the projects reviewed with known ALC data, six would require BMV agricultural land. Based on the information available at the time of writing, it is estimated that these projects could require in the region of an additional 120ha of BMV land, a very small proportion (0.3%) of the BMV land available in the Study Area of Doncaster and Rotherham. If all other developments go ahead during the same temporal scope, it is likely that the scale of the of impact would be increased. However, cumulative effects are unlikely to be greater than	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		currently identified for the Proposed Development, as it is assumed that the Proposed Development in combination with the other consented developments would account for a relatively small proportion of the agricultural land, and BMV agricultural land, available within the local Study Area. Further information can be found in Chapter 15 Socio-Economics and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15] .	
Natural England	We require that land quality and soil resources information is gathered for any land that is disturbed by the development, so the cabling route should be surveyed. Ideally a full detailed ALC survey would have been carried out across the whole site. With the provisional mapping provided, it is recommended in this instance, that an ALC survey is undertaken within the cable route, with flexibilities around density depending on land quality identified in the Predictive ALC Mapping report (version 2). A semi detailed survey is acceptable where the site is clearly expected to be non-BMV (1 auger per 2 ha plus representative pits), but where BMV has been identified, a detailed ALC survey would be expected (1 auger per ha plus representative pits).	An ALC Survey has been completed for W1, W2 and W3, as detailed in Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP6.20] . Due to the temporary impact of the cable laying, it was deemed disproportionate to complete an ALC survey for the full cable route.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Natural England	Worst Case Scenario Deferring a small area of Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey to a planning condition is generally not recommended, particularly where the outcome could influence the planning balance or the identification of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land. The NPPF underscores the importance of protecting BMV land (Grades 1, 2, and 3a) and encourages the use of land of poorer quality where significant development of agricultural land is necessary. The NPPF also recognises soils as a natural capital asset, reinforcing the need for robust, up-front evidence on soil quality and land capability to inform sustainable development decisions. Assuming a worst-case scenario such as permanent loss of Grade 2 land may be acceptable in some Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) contexts as a precautionary approach, particularly where access constraints exist. This approach may also be appropriate in other circumstances, including: • Seasonal limitations (e.g. prolonged wet or frozen conditions outside the ALC survey window) • Landowner access restrictions unlikely to be resolved within the EIA programme • Health and safety concerns that prevent safe fieldwork • Ecological sensitivities, such as protected species or nesting birds • Programme-critical deadlines where deferral would delay submission of the Environmental	The ALC Survey Report provided in the Draft ES detailed the ALC Surveys completed to date at the time of the release of the Draft ES (September 2025). Further ALC Surveys across the Site have been completed to inform the ES, and these are detailed in the updated ALC Survey Report provided at submission in ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP6.20]. With the updated surveys, only 0.85% of the Site remains un-surveyed which is due to woodland being on the land. The extent of surveys completed for the ES is deemed to be sufficient to provide a robust assessment of the potential impact of the Proposed Development on agricultural land, and no worst-case assumptions have been required as the full Site has been surveyed.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	Statement or DCO application In all cases, the worst-case assumption should be: • Clearly justified and proportionate to the area in question • Documented transparently in the planning submission Accompanied by a commitment to complete the outstanding survey work at the earliest opportunity, ideally pre-construction The Defra Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites further reinforces the importance of early soil resource surveys, appropriate soil handling, and minimising degradation principles that rely on accurate baseline data such as that provided by ALC surveys. Deferring surveys risks undermining these principles and may compromise the ability to implement effective soil protection measures during construction. In addition, the Overarching National Policy Statements (NPS) for energy infrastructure EN-1 (Energy), EN-3 (Renewable Energy Infrastructure), and EN-5 (Electricity Networks Infrastructure) highlight the need to consider the permanent loss of agricultural land, particularly BMV land, as part of the planning and consenting process for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs). EN-1 specifically states that applicants should minimise impacts on BMV land and provide clear justification where such land is affected. These policy statements reinforce the need for a complete and defensible ALC evidence base to support decision-		

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	making and demonstrate compliance with national policy objectives.		

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Natural England	Initial screening for credible risk of an effect 1 Check Distance criteria - could significant emissions reach a protected site? Yes = move to Step 2 No = no further The Air Pollution Information System (APIS) includes an introduction to air pollution. APIS provides site specific information on the interest features of individual protected sites and the sensitivity to air quality impacts of those features. HRA required Please see Table 2 for industrial air pollution screening distances. For road traffic impacts, roads on the affected road network that lie within 200m of a designated site should be considered. Use Magic Map to check the location of designated sites. Search for the location then select the 'Designations' option.	Noted – potential impacts of air quality on ecological designated sites have been assessed within ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]. As no significant effects from air quality are anticipated for ecological sites, no corresponding significant effects on ecological receptors are anticipated. The methodology and traffic screening takes into account the designated ecological sites within 200m of relevant traffic routes as detailed in ES Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]. No impacts have been identified for internationally designated ecological sites and therefore an AA or HRA are not required. This approach has been agreed in consultation with Natural England.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Natural England	2 Check if the qualifying habitats or supporting habitat of qualifying species are sensitive to air quality impacts. Yes = move to Step 3 No = no further HRA required APIS Site relevant Critical Loads and Levels (based on literature and professional judgement) http://www.apis.ac.uk/src1 Some habitats may not have a critical load because there is not enough data. In these cases, you should find the critical load for a similar habitat type or feature. The qualifying features of Habitats Sites can be identified in the relevant Site Conservation Objectives and Supplementary advice packages, which include a definitive list of legally qualifying features. These objectives are available here. Alternatively, a list of qualifying features can also be found by searching for the Habitats Site and SSSIs on Designated Sites View , alongside Conservation Objectives and Supplementary Advice for Habitats Sites. The above links will also show whether any of the qualifying features for Habitats Sites have a Restore or Maintain Conservation Objective in relation to air quality thresholds (critical levels or loads). If the site is a SPA or an SAC/SSSI designated for an animal species (as opposed to a habitat), determine whether the predicted pollution effects	Noted – potential impacts of air quality on ecological nationally designated sites have been assessed within ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6 As no significant effects from air quality are anticipated for ecological sites, no corresponding significant effects on ecological receptors are anticipated. No impacts have been identified for internationally designated ecological sites and therefore an AA or HRA are not required. This approach has been agreed in consultation with Natural England.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	on the supporting habitat will have a negative effect on the notified species.		
Natural England	Undertake detailed modelling using a recognised dispersal model – i.e. Atmospheric Dispersion Modelling System (ADMS) Unless robust site-specific evidence is provided, we advise the lower range of the critical load should be used in modelling. If there are site specific reasons why it is Air Quality modelling should include relevant scenarios that are clearly identified. One such example of scenarios is a baseline plus future forecasts as follows: Baseline, a construction year, and future operational year(s), do nothing (without proposal), do something (with proposal); taking into account background trends for each pollutant). For proposals that will emit pollutants from a point source, it is helpful to provide isopleths of the dispersion modelling results, showing the predicted	Noted – potential impacts of air quality on ecological nationally designated sites have been assessed within ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]. As no significant effects from air quality are anticipated for ecological sites, no corresponding significant effects on ecological receptors are anticipated. Detailed modelling has not been completed as the change in construction vehicle flows generally does not pass the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM), DEFRA, and DMRB thresholds for assessment. Where roads are screened in, they have been screened out at the second stage due to the overall number of HGVs travelling along the	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	contours of pollutant concentration and deposition of the development. These may be assessed against the locations of protected sites and sensitive features within those sites. At least 3 years of meteorological data should be more appropriate to use the higher end of the range, then this should be clearly evidenced. included within the AQ modelling for sources other than for road transport modelling The Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) has produced the following document to assist its members in the assessment of the air quality impacts of development on designated nature conservation sites: air-	road and the length of the construction phase for the Proposed Development. Therefore, human and ecological receptors have been screened out of the air quality assessment, and no effects are anticipated. This is detailed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12].	
Natural England	4a Apply Screening Threshold Alone If below threshold alone, move to step 4b. If above = move straight to step 5 Ascertain the Process Contribution (PC) from the plan or project (emissions and predicted deposition). Apply Screening threshold (1% of critical level or load) alone using the annual averages. If the process contribution is less than 1% of the relevant long-term benchmark (Environmental Assessment Level, Critical Level or Critical Load), the emission is not likely to have a significant effect alone irrespective of the background levels.	Detailed modelling has not been completed as the change in construction vehicle flows generally does not pass the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM), DEFRA, and DMRB thresholds for assessment, therefore a 'Screening Threshold Alone' was not applied. Where roads are screened in, they have been screened out at the second stage due to the overall number of HGVs travelling along the road and the length of the construction phase for the Proposed Development. Therefore, human and ecological receptors have been screened out of the air quality assessment, and no effects are anticipated. This is detailed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]. Comparison to process contributions was therefore not required.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		This level of traffic associated with this phase will be insufficient to trigger the threshold for assessment as set out in the IAQM traffic screening methodology and therefore remains scoped out of this assessment.	
Natural England	4b Apply Screening Threshold In-combination. If below threshold in-combination = no LSE/significant risk of damage etc and no further assessment required. If above = move straight to step 5 Applicants might use the Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) 'decision-making thresholds' as a reason for not completing an in-combination assessment. If so, you should check they have correctly followed the JNCC guidance on decision-making thresholds. If this guidance shows they do not need to complete an in-combination assessment, continue to step 5. If applicants have not used the decision-making thresholds, or have not followed them correctly, they will need to provide an in-combination assessment. Use information from competent authorities (Planning Portal, PINS NSIP register or Environmental Permitting register) to determine if there are plans or projects in the pipeline (not	Detailed modelling has not been completed as the change in construction vehicle flows generally does not pass the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM), DEFRA, and DMRB thresholds for assessment, therefore 'Screening Threshold In-Combination' was not applied. Where roads are screened in, they have been screened out at the second stage due to the overall number of HGVs travelling along the road and the length of the construction phase for the Proposed Development. Therefore, human and ecological receptors have been screened out of the air quality assessment, and no effects are anticipated. This is detailed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]. Comparison to process contributions was therefore not required. This level of traffic associated with this phase will be insufficient to trigger the threshold for assessment as set out in the IAQM traffic screening methodology and therefore remains scoped out of this assessment.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	included in the current baseline) that should be considered in-combination If the combined process contribution is less than 1% of the relevant long-term benchmark (Environmental Assessment Level, Critical Level or Critical Load), the emission is not likely to have a significant effect in-combination irrespective of background levels.		

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Natural England	This step is to consider the ecological impacts of AQ on the interest features of the designated site and is not based only on numerical figures. If it is not certain whether sensitive features are located within the areas to be impacted, a site visit may be helpful to determine this. For SSSIs, this step should provide all the information necessary, including any required mitigation, for the decision maker to determine if there would be an adverse effect on a SSSI. If Habitats Sites are impacted by the proposals, move to Step 6. The following information is likely to be helpful for the decision maker: Is the sensitive feature(s) located within the pollution footprint? Should it be there for the site to meet its Conservation Objectives or is there some other, natural reason (e.g. hydrology), why the sensitive feature(s) would not be expected to occur there? Check APIS Trends Tab for reasonable expectation on whether background pollution may be decreasing or not. Habitats that have already been subject to high background nitrogen deposition can develop tolerance to further deposition. This cannot be used to justify further exceedance as it would undermine conservation objectives to reverse decline. You should consider predicted effects on the species richness of a habitat against the site's conservation objectives.	Noted – potential impacts of air quality on ecological designated sites have been assessed within ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]. As no significant effects from air quality are anticipated for ecological sites, no corresponding significant effects on ecological receptors are anticipated. No impacts have been identified for internationally designated ecological sites and therefore an AA or HRA are not required. This approach has been agreed in consultation with Natural England. The Applicant confirms that while there are no nationally designated statutory ecological receptors within 250m of the Order Limits, the closest SSSI is Crabtree Wood located approximately 920m away. Regarding locally designated statutory ecological sites, there are two within 250m of the Order Limits, including Firsby Reservoir Local Nature Reserve (LNR) and Anston Stones Wood LNR. In addition, there are three non-statutory locally designated Sites in close proximity to the Order Limits including Brampton Common Local Wildlife Site (LWS) on-site, Killmarsh Pond LWS 10m North and Ulley Country Park LWS adjacent to the Site. These are visually represented on ES Volume 3, Figure 3.4: Environmental Designations [EN0110020/APP/6.19].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		In addition, there are a number of designated ecological sites that are within 200m of construction traffic routes that feed into the Proposed Development as shown on ES Volume 3, Figure 12.1: Air Quality Study Area [EN0110020/APP/6.19]. It can be confirmed that human and ecological receptors have been screened out of the air quality assessment, and no effects are anticipated. The DEFRA Emissions Factor Toolkit has therefore not been used as no detailed assessment / modelling for air quality is required and negligible, not significant effects are anticipated from construction traffic.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Natural England	The competent authority to undertake their AA to conclude whether or not there will be an adverse effect on integrity (AEOI) of habitats sites. Any mitigation proposed should also be assessed at this point. Should the AA conclude that the proposal would have an AEOI that cannot be excluded with mitigation measures, consider the derogation route of the HRA process. Should compensation measures be required under derogation, please contact Natural England for specific advice. Note: If an AA has been undertaken of the proposals alone and concluded that there will not be an adverse effect on integrity, if there are residual impacts that are not fully mitigated, these will need to be considered in combination with other plans or projects Where mitigation is required to enable a conclusion of no adverse effect on integrity to be reached the AA must be able to show that mitigation measures can be relied upon to avoid adverse effects over the full lifetime of the project (ie construction, operation and decommissioning where relevant). To be viable, such measures should be effective, reliable, timely, guaranteed and of sufficient duration. The assessment of such measures should be supported by evidence. When deciding on whether the proposals set out in the NSIP will have an adverse effect on Integrity on a Habitats Site, the Conservation Objectives and any supplementary advice should be taken into	Noted – potential impacts of air quality on ecological designated sites have been assessed within ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]. As no significant effects from air quality are anticipated for ecological sites, no corresponding significant effects on ecological receptors are anticipated. No impacts have been identified for internationally designated ecological sites and therefore an AA or HRA are not required. This approach has been agreed in consultation with Natural England.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	account. Including whether the site is already exceeding the environmental thresholds for ammonia, nitrogen oxides and nitrogen deposition and has a restore conservation objective.		

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Natural England	Mitigation measures If you cannot conclude there is no adverse effect, the applicant will need to apply mitigation measures. Measures will only be appropriate if you can quantify their effectiveness in reducing emissions on the protected site. You should check that mitigation measures are in place to avoid adverse effects on site integrity over the lifetime of the project. Mitigation may include measures that: • the applicant volunteers • you impose through formal conditions or restrictions in any permission or authorisation – these may be different or stricter measures than ones proposed by the applicant Examples could include: • relocation or redesign of developments to avoid impacts on protected sites • control of other emissions of the same pollutants with an overlapping effect • a change in stack height for industrial processes • Euro 6 standards for construction machinery • adding wooded shelterbelts, trees, green walls and hedges to limit dispersal of emissions, as long as these measures in themselves would not negatively impact the protected site	Noted – potential impacts of air quality on ecological designated sites have been assessed within ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]. As no significant effects from air quality are anticipated for ecological sites, no corresponding significant effects on ecological receptors are anticipated. Mitigation measures for air quality impacts are detailed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]. Construction traffic impacts are predicted to be Negligible and therefore Not Significant on sensitive human receptors or ecological receptors. Construction dust impacts are predicted to be Negligible, or at worst Low, and therefore Not Significant, with the correct implementation of the recommended embedded mitigation on sensitive human receptors or ecological receptors. Embedded mitigation measures required in order to render the effects from construction phase as Not Significant are derived from IAQM guidance. Examples of embedded mitigation include: • Plan Site layout so that machinery and dust causing activities are located away from receptors, as far as is possible.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		- Erect solid screens or barriers around dusty activities or the Site Boundary that are at least as high as any stockpiles on Site. - Fully enclose site or specific operations where there is a high potential for dust production and the Site is active for an extensive period. - Avoid Site runoff of water or mud - Keep Site fencing, barriers and scaffolding clean using wet methods. - Remove materials that have a potential to produce dust from Site as soon as possible, unless being re-used on Site. If they are being re-used on-site cover as described below. - Cover, seed or fence stockpiles to prevent wind whipping. - Ensure all vehicles switch off engines when not in use - no idling vehicles. - Reduce the use of diesel or petrol powered generators and encourage use of mains electricity or battery powered equipment where practicable. - Impose and signpost a maximum-speed-limit of 15mph on surfaced and 10mph on unsurfaced haul roads and work areas (if long haul routes are required these speeds may be increased with suitable additional control measures provided, subject to the approval of the nominated undertaker and with the agreement of the local authority, where appropriate).	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Natural England	Additional advice Common Standards Monitoring is used to define the ecological condition of a protected site. It is undertaken on a broader level and does not currently consider air quality impacts. The relevant benchmark for assessing impacts is the critical thresholds. Therefore, the existing status of a designated site should not be the sole reason for judgement on potential impact. For many protected sites, the current background pollution may already be exceeding the relevant critical load/level from a different source type to the project being assessed (e.g. where the main source of background exceedance is due to agriculture, but the proposal is an industrial project). Proposals must consider their own impacts against the relevant environmental thresholds. There are many reasons why background levels are high, but the conservation objective is to 'maintain or restore' air pollutants to within these benchmarks. The objective would be undermined by proposals that add further emissions, including if it compromises any strategic initiatives to reduce air pollution levels. You must determine if there is evidence that the increased emissions represent a measurable risk and could compromise the strategic initiatives. You would need to consider information on: • the extent to which any declining national trends in air pollution, or strategic initiatives to tackle emissions affecting the site more locally, might otherwise lead to improvements	Noted – potential impacts of air quality on ecological designated sites have been assessed within ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]. However, in summary it can be confirmed that as there are no significant changes to airborne pollution levels anticipated from the Proposed Development, the background pollution level at the designated sites does not need to be considered. As no significant effects from air quality are anticipated for ecological sites, no corresponding significant effects on ecological receptors are anticipated.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	the rate at which such improvements are anticipated the extent of the impacts of a plan or project, and whether those impacts can properly be considered temporary and reversible If the affected area is small, consider the risk to site integrity proportionally. For example, how important is the area in terms of rarity, location, distribution, vulnerability to change and ecological structure. If it is a supporting habitat, consider its importance to the designated species on the site. Consider any site survey information that may provide evidence of existing impacts.		
Natural England	Emissions from road transport (if applicable): Emissions from road transport may be an operational impact or be limited to the construction phase of proposals. Roads on the affected road network that lie within 200m of a designated site should be considered. If all affected roads are further than 200m from a protected site, then there is no likely significant effect (habitats sites) or no impact (SSSIs) on protected sites from air pollution. Improvements in vehicle technology and a move to further electrification of the vehicle fleet will, over time, result in lower background levels of nitrogen deposition and nitrogen oxide pollution near to roads. As most sites are currently over the relevant thresholds and have a “restore” objective, this should be noted as a “retardation” of the restore objective and expressed in months and years. Retardation of less than one year is acceptable as air quality is considered against an annual average. Please note that ammonia impacts cannot be	The Air Quality assessment for the Proposed Development, including considering the impacts from traffic, is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]. During the construction phase, the change in traffic flows generally does not pass the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM), DEFRA, and DMRB thresholds for assessment. Where roads are screened in, they have been screened out at the second stage due to the overall number of HGVs travelling along the road and the length of the construction phase for the Proposed Development. Therefore, human and ecological receptors have been screened out of the air quality assessment, and no effects are anticipated. The DEFRA Emissions Factor Toolkit has therefore not been used as no detailed assessment / modelling for air quality is required and negligible, not significant effects are anticipated from construction traffic.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	assessed in this manner as there is no certainty of a declining trend.	Potential impacts of air quality on ecological designated sites have been assessed within ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]. As no significant effects from air quality are anticipated for ecological sites, no corresponding significant effects on ecological receptors are anticipated. No impacts have been identified for internationally designated ecological sites and therefore an AA or HRA are not required. This approach has been agreed in consultation with Natural England. There are no nationally designated statutory ecological receptors within 250m of the Order Limits, with the nearest being Crabtree Wood Site of Scientific Special Interest (SSSI) approximately 920m away. Within 250m of the Order Limits, there are two locally designated statutory ecological sites, which are Firsby Reservoir Local Nature Reserve (LNR) and Anston Stones Wood LNR, three non-statutory locally designated sites (Brampton Common Local Wildlife Site (LWS) – on-site; Ulley Country Park LWS – adjacent to the Site; and Killmarsh Pond LWS – 10m north), and two proposed non-statutory locally designated sites, Pebley Oaks Lane Proposed LWS – 95m south and Harthill Reservoir candidate LWS – adjacent to Site (see ES Volume 3, Figure 3.4: Environmental Designations [EN0110020/APP/6.19]).	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		There are a number of designated ecological sites that are within 200m of construction traffic routes that feed into the Proposed Development: Edlington Wood SSSI, Potteric Carr SSSI, Sprotbrough Gorge SSSI, Lindrick Golf Course SSSI, Anston Stones Wood SSSI and Crabtree Wood SSSI. ES Volume 3, Figure 12.1: Air Quality Study Area [EN0110020/APP/6.19] shows the locations of ecological sites in the area.	
Natural England	Defra Emissions Factor Toolkit The Defra Emission Factor Toolkit (EFT) allows for gradual introduction of electric vehicles into the fleet (cars and LGVs) up to 2050. These are the emission factors we advise that NSIPs should be using (which we advise should also consider ammonia emissions as well as NOx – using one of three sets of emission factors available). However, the User Guide to the EFT highlights that calculation tools only support assessment years 2018 up to 2030, reflecting that predictions and assumptions beyond then become less certain. Where EFT calculated emissions are to be used after 2030 to inform air quality assessments, the EFT indicates that appropriate caveats around the limitations of the analysis must be included to accompany the assessment. We therefore advise that emission factors no later than 2030 are used for HRAs– which would mean percentages of EVs are at predicted 2030 levels. A key concern is that,	During the construction phase, the change in traffic flows generally does not pass the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM), DEFRA, and DMRB thresholds for assessment. Where roads are screened in, they have been screened out at the second stage due to the overall number of HGVs travelling along the road and the length of the construction phase for the Proposed Development. Therefore, human and ecological receptors have been screened out of the air quality assessment, and no effects are anticipated. The DEFRA Emissions Factor Toolkit has therefore not been used as no detailed assessment / modelling for air quality is required and negligible, not significant effects are anticipated from construction traffic. The full Air Quality assessment for the Proposed Development, including considering the impacts from traffic, is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	although EVs themselves have no tailpipe emissions, and the percentage of them will increase, the remaining combustion engine vehicles on the road may become more polluting as they age as selective catalytic reduction technology may create 'ammonia slip' over time. Ammonia slip is the unreacted ammonia (NH ₃) that escapes from a selective catalytic reduction (SCR) or selective non-catalytic reduction (SNCR) system used to reduce NOx in exhaust gases.		
Natural England	Motorways within the affected road network There is potentially an added complexity to the need for in-combination assessments when considering traffic on motorways, as including these roads can mean that the assessment takes account of traffic growth related to strategic factors or long range (external) trips that are independent of the specific plan or project and neighbouring plans or projects. These roads are strategically important and tend to have high volumes of traffic as well as being well represented in traffic models. The air quality assessment should therefore include traffic flows on these roads, but the external trips can be excluded from the initial screening assessment. A justification and explanation of which journeys are included and excluded in the traffic model should be provided.	Key traffic routes, and the air quality impacts associated with increased traffic movements on these roads, are assessed from the motorway junctions and so assessment of the motorways themselves is not included in the ES, as it is assumed that construction vehicle movements would not affect the traffic movements on the motorways. During the construction phase, the change in traffic flows generally does not pass the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM), DEFRA, and DMRB thresholds for assessment. Where roads are screened in, they have been screened out at the second stage due to the overall number of HGVs travelling along the road and the length of the construction phase for the Proposed Development. Therefore, human and ecological receptors have been screened out of the air quality assessment, and no effects are anticipated. As this is the conclusion for local roads, it is likely that the same	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		is true for motorways and a detailed assessment would not be required. Further information on the air quality assessment for the Proposed Development is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12].	
Network Rail	Impact on Infrastructure Since your proposal would involve interaction with Network Rail's operational railway, it is strongly advised that you take all potential areas of concern to Network Rail into account, in their documentation for consideration at planning. Therefore, it is imperative that Network Rail's Asset Protection team in the eastern region be consulted directly by you, to ensure that all risks to our railway infrastructure are safely managed from all construction related activities associated with your proposed development.	The Network Rail Asset Protection team has been informed regarding potential interaction points. Engagement is ongoing to facilitate the Basic Asset Protection Agreement (BAPA). The Applicant has also commenced the relevant clearance processes with Network Rail's property team.	No
Network Rail	Investigation and Mitigation Network Rail would have an interest in understanding the full impact of your proposed development on all our infrastructure in the vicinity. This further understanding should identify improvements and/or mitigations required to facilitate your proposed development. As such, these will need to be funded by you to ensure the safe and efficient running of our operational railway. A Basic Asset Protection Agreement and/ or a Structures Agreement /Asset Protection Agreement	Details of the relevant interaction points have been shared with Network Rail's Asset protection team. The Applicant has initiated the BAPA process which will highlight the requirements and mitigation measures to facilitate detailed design works.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	with Network Rail may be required before you can proceed with any design or construction work alongside, above or below Network Rail's Infrastructure. Therefore, we request that you engage with Network Rail's Asset Protection Eastern team (AssetProtectionEastern@networkrail.co.uk).		
Network Rail	Network Rail have their own standard protective provisions for third-party developments that could potentially have an impact on Network Rail's operational railways, land and/or assets, and these must be included on the face of the DCO, as a minimum. To request a copy of our protective provisions and discuss any other agreements that will need to be entered with Network Rail, it is recommended that you contact both [redacted] through each of their respective email addresses	The Applicant's legal team is engaging with Network Rail's legal team to ensure that the appropriate Protective Provisions are in place and included in the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] .	No
Network Rail	Several legal and commercial agreements might also need to be entered, for example, method statements, connection agreements, property agreements as well as any other relevant legal and commercial agreements that are deemed necessary. Please note that this list is not exhaustive and will need to be reviewed after further details of the scheme are discussed between both parties. In addition, any easements required by you are required to go through Network	The business and technical clearance processes have also been initiated with Network Rail by the Applicant. Engagement is ongoing with Network Rail's property team to ensure that all relevant land and legal requirements are in place as and when required.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	Rail's business and technical clearance processes, as well as all other relevant rail industry processes.		
National Grid Electricity Transmission	Due to the proximity of some of our existing or future assets, NGET wishes to express their interest in further consultation while the impact on our assets is still being assessed. Where the Promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with or work within close proximity to any of NGET's apparatus and land, this will require appropriate protection and further discussion on the impact to its apparatus and rights.	The Applicant has considered NGET's guidelines for designing and building near existing assets to ensure that appropriate buffers are maintained. Interaction plans are being produced and are to be shared with NGET as part of the ongoing engagement to ensure that the relevant design requirements are met.	No
National Grid Electricity Transmission	NGET requests that all existing and future assets are given due consideration given their criticality to distribution of energy across the UK. We remain committed to working with the promoter in a proactive manner, enabling both parties to deliver successful projects wherever reasonably possible. As such we encourage that ongoing discussion and consultation between both parties is maintained on interactions with existing or future assets, land interests, connections or consents and any other NGET interests which have the potential to be impacted prior to submission of the Proposed DCO.	Noted – ongoing engagement with NGET is occurring regularly to minimize the impact of the Proposed Development on NGET assets.	No
National Grid Electricity Transmission	NGET's Overhead Line/s is protected by a Deed of Easement/Wayleave Agreement which provides full right of access to retain, maintain, repair and inspect our asset	Noted – Appropriate buffers have been put in place based on NGET guidance to avoid impacting OHLs and exclusion zones.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
National Grid Electricity Transmission	Statutory electrical safety clearances must be maintained at all times. Any proposed buildings must not be closer than 5.3m to the lowest conductor. NGET recommends that no permanent structures are built directly beneath overhead lines. These distances are set out in EN 43 – 8 Technical Specification for “overhead line clearances Issue 5 (2019)”.	Noted – NGET’s guidance has been considered in developing the design to ensure that safety clearances are in line with the relevant policies. GS6 Guidance (Avoiding Danger from Overhead Power Lines) has also been considered in the design process.	No
National Grid Electricity Transmission	If any changes in ground levels are proposed either beneath or in close proximity to our existing overhead lines, then this would serve to reduce the safety clearances for such overhead lines. Safe clearances for existing overhead lines must be maintained in all circumstances.	Noted – NGET’s guidance has been considered in developing the design to ensure that safety clearances are in line with the relevant policies. GS6 Guidance (Avoiding Danger from Overhead Power Lines) has also been considered in the design process.	No
National Grid Electricity Transmission	The relevant guidance in relation to working safely near to existing overhead lines is contained within the Health and Safety Executive’s Guidance Note GS 6 “Avoidance of Danger from Overhead Electric Lines” and all relevant site staff should make sure that they are both aware of and understand this guidance.	Noted – NGET’s guidance has been considered in developing the design to ensure that safety clearances are in line with the relevant policies. the Health and Safety Executive’s Guidance Note GS 6 “Avoidance of Danger from Overhead Electric Lines” has also been considered in the design process.	No
National Grid Electricity Transmission	Plant, machinery, equipment, buildings or scaffolding should not encroach within 5.3 metres of any of our high voltage conductors when those conductors are under their worst conditions of maximum “sag” and “swing” and overhead line profile (maximum “sag” and “swing”) drawings should be obtained using the contact details above.	Noted – NGET’s guidance has been considered in developing the design to ensure that safety clearances are in line with the relevant policies. GS6 Guidance (Avoiding Danger from Overhead Power Lines) has also been considered in the design process.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
National Grid Electricity Transmission	If a landscaping scheme is proposed as part of the proposal, we request that only slow and low growing species of trees and shrubs are planted beneath and adjacent to the existing overhead line to reduce the risk of growth to a height which compromises statutory safety clearances.	Noted – Landscaping plans/proposals near NGET assets will be discussed and agreed with NGET as part of the ongoing engagement.	No
National Grid Electricity Transmission	Drilling or excavation works should not be undertaken if they have the potential to disturb or adversely affect the foundations or “pillars of support” of any existing tower. These foundations always extend beyond the base area of the existing tower and foundation (“pillar of support”) drawings can be obtained using the contact details above.	Noted – the proposed buffer zones and safety clearances from NGET assets are in line with NGET guidance to ensure that excavation and drilling works will not impact foundations.	No
National Grid Electricity Transmission	NGET high voltage underground cables are protected by a Deed of Grant; Easement; Wayleave Agreement or the provisions of the New Roads and Street Works Act. These provisions provide NGET full right of access to retain, maintain, repair and inspect our assets. Hence we require that no permanent / temporary structures are to be built over our cables or within the easement strip. Any such proposals should be discussed and agreed with NGET prior to any works taking place.	Noted – there are no proposals to build over NGET cables or within easement strips. Any interactions with NGET assets will be reflected in the interaction plans and discussed with NGET as part of ongoing engagement.	No
National Grid Electricity Transmission	Ground levels above our cables must not be altered in any way. Any alterations to the depth of our cables will subsequently alter the rating of the circuit and can compromise the reliability, efficiency and safety of our electricity network and requires consultation with National Grid prior to any such changes in both level and construction being implemented	Noted - this will be considered in the detailed design to avoid such alterations to ground levels.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
National Grid Electricity Transmission	Further Advice We would request that the potential impact of the proposed scheme on NGET's existing and future assets as set out above and including any proposed diversions is considered in any subsequent reports, including in the Environmental Statement, and as part of any subsequent application. Where any diversion of apparatus may be required to facilitate a scheme, NGET is unable to give any certainty with the regard to diversions until such time as adequate conceptual design studies have been undertaken by NGET. Further information relating to this can be obtained by contacting the email address below. Where the promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with any of NGET apparatus, protective provisions will be required in a form acceptable to it to be included within the DCO. NGET requests to be consulted at the earliest stages to ensure that the most appropriate protective provisions are included within the DCO application to safeguard the integrity of our apparatus and to remove the requirement for objection.	Noted - Plans and proposals are being discussed with NGET as part of the ongoing engagement. The Applicant is not proposing diversions to NGET's existing assets based on The Proposed Development. The Applicant's legal team is engaging with NGET's legal team to ensure that the appropriate Protective Provisions are included in the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	No
Severn Trent	Please be advised there are Severn Trent Water assets within the proposed development site. Severn Trent Water records can be accessed via digdat.co.uk. Please visit www.digdat.co.uk(opens in a new window). Please keep any proposed building 5m clear of pressurised sewers, and 15m from any pumping	The stipulated clearances and buffer zones have been considered in developing the design of the Proposed Development. Interaction plans are being produced and will be discussed with Severn Trent as part of ongoing engagement. The Applicant has contacted Severn Trent's asset protection team and is currently in discussions	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	station. We do not allow building over of public sewers or water mains. Please note the following protective strips where no building will be allowed.	regarding interaction points and buffer zone requirements.	
Severn Trent	SEWERS Our records are a guide only, therefore you should carry out site investigation to confirm position, depth and size of sewers. · For sewers up to and including 225mm diameter Severn Trent requires a protective strip of 6m placed centrally over the pipe. · For sewers over 225mm diameter but less than 1000mm Severn Trent requires a protective strip of 10m placed centrally over the pipe. · For sewers greater than 1000mm Severn Trent requires a protective strip of 15m placed centrally over the pipe. · For Pumping Stations Severn Trent requires 15m protective strip from the edge of the compound	Noted – the stipulated clearances are considered in the design and reflected in the interaction plans being discussed with Severn Trent.	No
Severn Trent	WATER Our records are a guide only, therefore you should carry out site investigation to confirm position, depth and size of water mains (we require RAMS for this) Please note the following protective strips where no building will be allowed. · For water mains less than 300mm diameter Severn Trent requires a protective strip of 6m placed centrally over the pipe · For water mains 300mm diameter and above Severn Trent requires a protective strip of 12m placed centrally over the pipe	Noted – the clearance requirements have been considered in the design. Appropriate surveys will be carried out on site prior to construction works commencing to identify the exact positions and depths of Severn Trent's assets. Furthermore, protection for statutory undertakers' assets is included within the protective provisions in the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue	Guidance The FRS advises that the guidance in the following documents is considered as part of the design process: · NFCC Grid Battery Energy Storage Systems Planning – Guidance for FRS · Other guidance, as appropriate	The outline Battery Safety Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.15] considers NFCC guidance, and outlines other applicable standards the Applicant has considered.	
South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue	2. Firefighting Arrangements SYFR procedures for fighting BESS fires may involve the use of multiple high reach appliances. This is to ensure that sufficient distance can be created to safeguard our attending crews from residual electrical current. Please ensure that suitable access roads are provided to support the weight of these appliances; please also ensure that there are no overhead obstructions (i.e. trees or overhead power lines) in the area around the BESS	The Applicant has provided two points of access, one to East, and one to West of the selected BESS Works Area. A ring road has been allowed for within the layout for the BESS area. The applicant has also produced an oBSMP [EN0110020/APP/5.15] . Access has also been designed to be suitable for SYFRS Appliances, and the concept access designs appended to the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12] .	
South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue	3. Site Access Suitable facilities for safely accessing and egressing the site should be provided. The NFCC guidance states at least 2 separate access points to the site to account for opposite wind conditions/direction. Firefighters should not have to enter the BESS site or drive through a vapour / gas cloud to reach the scene of operation, therefore an alternative access point, taking into account wind direction, is preferable. The principles contained within Approved Document B, in support of B5 may assist in providing proportionate and adequate provision of access and facilities for firefighting. Section 15	The Applicant has provided two points of access, one to East, and one to West of the selected BESS Works Area. A ring road has been allowed for within the layout for the BESS area. The applicant has also produced an oBSMP [EN0110020/APP/5.15] . Access has also been designed to be suitable for SYFRS Appliances, and the concept access designs appended to the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12] .	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	provides information relating to access routes and hardstanding areas that consider the dimensions of fire service vehicles. Where access is over 20m from the access road, a turning circle, hammerhead or other point at which a vehicle can turn should be provided. Road / hard standing should be suitable to accommodate fire service vehicles in all weather conditions. Appliance dimensions are variable and designers should take account of this. SYFR appliance dimensions for the current fleet are as follows:		
South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue	4. Water Supply In the event of a fire involving BESS, it is likely that SYFR will need to apply a higher than average volume of water to restrict fire spread. Please ensure that there is an adequate water supply within 90m to allow continuous firefighting operations to take place; please also ensure due consideration has been given to containing fire water run-off. Separators, under the site can be introduced, to contain fire water run-off. Firefighting run-off water can have a serious impact on the environment and nearby open water. Having water separators under the site to contain this hazard means the water can be properly disposed of after the incident.	The oBSMP [EN0110020/APP/5.15] considers Water supply via tanks, as well as a fully lined drainage system for management of water from the BESS area.	No
South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue	5. Spacing between BESS units In order to restrict fire spread it is essential that suitable space be maintained around the BESS. If this space is not provided this may allow rapid fire	The oBSMP [EN0110020/APP/5.15] outlines the approach to separation and systems for the BESS, considering appropriate design guidance. This has been provided to SYFRS for comment previously	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	to spread to nearby structures and combustible items. The emergency response plan should be predicated on the scenario of the fire will not spread beyond the BESS container of origin. With fire and rescue operations limited to boundary cooling of surrounding BESS and monitoring the BESS involved in thermal event. This outcome can be achieved through a number of different routes including: · Adequate separation between the BESS enclosures to ensure that the radiant heat from a thermal event in one BESS will not trigger a secondary event. · Provision of fire resistant materials that will prevent direct flame impingement or radiated heat affecting adjacent BESS and allowing the incident to develop beyond BESS of origin. The provision of a suppression system to the BESS is unlikely to provide a compensatory feature to allow reduced spacing between BESS. the BESS of origin, then the developer should be referred to guidance such as the separation distances within NFPA 855 (current edition - 2023). NFPA 8551 states separation can be reduced to at least 3 feet or 0.914m between BESS if tests such as UL 9540A shows propagation does not occur. Consideration should also be given to the provision of automatic suppression systems within each container to delay fire spread to neighbouring BESS units. With consideration for 'In rack' suppression as the	and the Applicant will continue to consult on this, as it is a live topic, to manage good-practice in line with standards.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	external system may not penetrate the racks. Design of the suppression system is key to reducing the fire and fire spread, design of the system should be created by a Responsible Person such as a Fire Engineer. External audible and or visual warning to denote if the detection has activated or if the suppression has been deployed. Information and clear indication of warning and activation of systems is vital to fire operations on site. This will give notice to fire crews if another unit on site is affected by the fire or system malfunction. Remote activation of the suppression system so that the monitoring station can activate. When a site is monitored remotely, remote activation and communication between crews on site and the remote monitoring centre should be made available with clear instructions on how to do so with a 24hr telephone number. Blast walls across each entrance and between units to reduce the blast risk to first responders and limit radiated heat to other units. Reducing the risk of fire spreading to more than one unit a prioritised concern for the fire crews so any facilitation to reduce this risk is more than beneficial.		
South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue	6. Spacing to other buildings beyond site perimeter Proposed distances should take into account risks including the impact of any vapour cloud and also any mitigation factors that have been incorporated into the site design. However, an initial minimum distance of 30m is proposed prior to any mitigation such as blast walls.	The oBSMP [EN0110020/APP/5.15] outlines the approach to separation and systems for the BESS, considering appropriate design guidance. This has been provided to SYFRS for comment previously and the Applicant will continue to consult on this, as it is a live topic, to manage good-practice in line with standards.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	This distance is based upon the 100ft distance cited in NFPA 855 for remote installations		
South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue	7. Environmental Impact A well-developed fire involving BESS may have a large negative impact on the local environment. The Environment Agency should be involved at an early stage to discuss ways in which the environmental impact of this can be mitigated. A plan should be prepared to assist in discussions with developers and planners regarding the suitability of a site location highlighting all sensitive receptors within a 1km radius of the site to allow for appropriate emergency planning. Examples of sensitive receptors may include: · Schools, hospitals, nursing and care homes, residential areas, workplaces. · Protected habitats, watercourses, groundwater, boreholes, wells and springs supplying water for human consumption. Further habitat information can be found on the DEFRA MAGiC map website. · Roads, railways, bus stations, pylons (on or immediately adjacent to the site only), utilities, airports. Any plans created should have a compass rose showing north and the prevailing wind direction.	The Applicant has consulted with the EA, and in addition has produced a Plume Assessment [EN0110020/APP/7.2] to be submitted as part of the Application.	No
South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue	8. Emergency Plans Site operators should develop emergency plans and share these with the Fire and Rescue Service. A Risk Management Plan should be developed by the operator, which provides advice in relation to potential emergency response implications including:	The Applicant will develop emergency plans in collaboration with SYFRS as part of detailed design, once design is sufficiently progressed. The Applicant acknowledges the criticality of embedding safety, and has considered this in the oBSMP [EN0110020/APP/5.15]	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	· The hazards and risks at and to the facility and their proposed management. · Any safety issues for firefighters responding to emergencies at the facility. · Safe access to and within the facility for emergency vehicles and responders, including to key site infrastructure and fire protection systems. · The adequacy of proposed fire detection and suppression systems (e.g., water supply) on-site. · Natural and built infrastructure and on-site processes that may impact or delay effective emergency response. An Emergency Response Plan should be developed to facilitate effective and safe emergency response and should include: · How the fire service will be alerted · A facility description, including infrastructure details, operations, number of personnel, and operating hours. · A site plan depicting key infrastructure: site access points and internal roads; firefighting facilities (water tanks, pumps, booster systems, fire hydrants, fire hose reels etc); drainage; and neighbouring properties. · Details of emergency resources, including fire detection and suppression systems and equipment; gas detection; emergency eye-wash and shower facilities; spill containment systems and equipment; emergency warning systems; communication systems; personal protective equipment; first aid. · Up-to-date contact details for facility personnel, and any relevant off-site personnel that could		

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	provide technical support during an emergency. · A list of dangerous goods stored on site. · Site evacuation procedures. · Emergency procedures for all credible hazards and risks, including building, infrastructure and vehicle fire, grassfire and bushfire Site Information box (SIB) with action cards, plans and a risk assessment. Up to date and accurate site data will aid firefighters on arrival at site, upon fire incidents.		
South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue	9. Recovery A post-incident recovery plan should be developed that addresses the potential for reigniting of ESS and de-energizing the system, as well as removal and disposal of damaged equipment.	The Applicant will agree a recovery process in collaboration with SYFRS and the EA, to manage safety and contamination risk. The Applicant has already included some suggestions on approach on this in the oBSMP [EN0110020/APP/5.15].	No
South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue	Fire Protection SYFR would strongly recommend that consideration is given to installation of an Automatic Water Fire Suppression Systems (AWFSS) to promote life safety and property protection within the premises. SYFR is fully committed to promoting Fire Protection Systems for both business and domestic premises. A direct, 24-hour contact number should be provided to allow SYFR to contact the monitoring station for the site and request further information.	Dependent on the battery technology selected at the time of detailed design, a suitable technology would be provided. The approach to suppression has been outlined in the oBSMP [EN0110020/APP/5.15].	No
South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue	Before the site goes 'live' it is recommended that contact is made with the local fire station in order to arrange for Site Specific Risk Information (SSRI) to be collected, this will enable fire crews to familiarise themselves with the development and protection	The Applicant will work with SYFRS to ensure the topics in the Site Specific Risk Information (SSRI) are covered as part of the detailed BSMP as the design evolves. Currently, the Applicant has committed to completing a Hazard Identification	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	measures that have been installed and location of site information box and associated response plans.	(HAZID) and production of Emergency Plans which we believe covers the same topics. These are typical, and will allow safe and clear responses in the case of emergency, and support in designing out risk in the detailed design phase.	
Yorkshire Water	Assets YWS water and wastewater infrastructure is present within the development boundary of Whitestone Solar 1–3. Notably, parcel W1 S3 contains several clean water assets, including: • A 24” cast iron live water main • An 18” cast iron water main It is essential that the Whitestone project team identifies appropriate stand-off distances and implements safeguarding or protective measures for all YWS assets within the red line boundary. This responsibility lies with the project promoters. We recommend that the project team undertake a desktop study using YWS statutory mapping records available at http://maps.yorkshirewater.com. This will support the development of a crossing schedule identifying any groundworks likely to require asset diversion or protection. Where diversion of YWS assets is necessary the project team is invited to engage with our wastewater and water diversions teams at: www.yorkshirewater.com/developers/sewerage/sewer-diversions/ and www.yorkshirewater.com/developers/water/water-main-diversion/. YWS would welcome any engagement and asks that adequate assessment of our assets is given to minimise the need to	The presence of YW assets within the Study Area has been included in the baseline section of this Chapter. ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]. Construction in proximity to YW and private pipeline assets will not commence until the location of assets has been confirmed through consultation and ground-truthing where required. Appropriate stand-off distances will be incorporated into the detailed design and construction will be undertaken in accordance with relevant standards and appropriate mitigation to prevent impact to these public water assets as set out in this Chapter. ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10] Where crossings of cables, access tracks or other infrastructure is required, this will be agreed with Yorkshire Water. YW assets are covered in the baseline Section 10.5.52 of Chapter 10. Mitigation in relation to the assets is set out in Section 10.6.57 - 10.6.58 and Section 10.6.44.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	disrupt or divert utility assets. Under no circumstances should construction activity near YWS assets commence until the actual position of the company's assets within the draft order limits have been confirmed by trial holes.	Assessment of effects is covered in Section 10.7.55 and Section 10.7.102. ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10] .	
Yorkshire Water	Ongoing consultation There remain some unknown elements of this development and from the information provided it is likely there will be interaction with YWS assets. It is therefore essential that there is ongoing engagement. We would recommend further discussion on the following items: • Design of the scheme to minimise interaction with YWS assets and sensitive receptors. • Where interaction is identified details of required mitigation and / or diversion to be agreed with YW S in advance of development	The Applicant can confirm ongoing engagement with Yorkshire Water through protective provisions included in the Draft Development Consent Order [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. However, it can be confirmed that any construction in proximity to Yorkshire Water and private pipeline assets will not commence until the location of assets has been confirmed through consultation and ground-truthing where required. Appropriate stand-off distances will be incorporated into the detailed design and construction will be undertaken in accordance with relevant standards and appropriate mitigation to prevent impact to these public water assets as set out in ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]. Where crossings of cables, access tracks or other infrastructure is required, this will be agreed with Yorkshire Water.	No
Data Communications Company	Just to confirm we have received your letter attached. The DCC as a network operator for the smart energy system is not able to provide feedback on a	Noted.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	planning application such as this as we are not an authoritative party.		
Dŵr Cymru (Welsh Water)	Thank you for your email, it appears the site isn't in Welsh Waters operating area. If this is incorrect, please could you advise which part of our operating area this covers.	Noted.	No
North Yorkshire Police	I don't believe this is in our area. Please advise if you need any further information.	Noted.	No
Northern Gas Networks	Northern Gas Networks do not cover this area	Noted.	No
South West Water	We don't cover this area, please forward to the Water Regulations of the water undertaker in that area.	Noted.	No
Essex & Suffolk Water	Unfortunately, the area covered by this notice is not under our jurisdiction.	Noted.	No
West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue	Thank you for your email, however the proposed site appears to be located within South Yorkshire and not West Yorkshire therefore should be correspondence directed accordingly.	Noted.	No
West Yorkshire Police	I'm not sure if this has been sent to us in error as this does not appear to be in West Yorkshire?	Noted.	No
S42(1(a): Relevant Parish Councils			
Air Quality			
Edlington Town Council	Concerns around existing air pollution on the A630	Air quality effects associated with the Proposed Development have been assessed within ES Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12] . The assessment considers existing baseline air	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		quality conditions in the area, including the influence of major roads such as the A630. Construction-phase impacts from on-site activities and construction traffic were assessed on a semi-quantitative basis in accordance with IAQM guidance [REF-13], considering vehicle movements, construction activities and sensitive receptors. Construction traffic routes were selected to minimise effects and are detailed in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. A suite of embedded mitigation measures, derived from IAQM best practice [REF-13] and detailed in Table 12-11 of ES Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12], has been identified to limit any temporary effects. With these measures in place, all construction-phase air quality impacts are predicted to be Not Significant, as confirmed in Sections 12.6 and 12.7 of ES Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]. Mitigation will be secured through the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] and a detailed CEMP. Construction traffic was also screened against IAQM [REF-13], DEFRA and DMRB criteria, with predicted changes in pollutant concentrations below assessment thresholds. Accordingly, the Proposed Development would not worsen existing air quality conditions associated with the A630.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Harthill with Woodall Parish Council	Concerns around an increase in air pollution due to construction and traffic	Air quality impacts arising from construction activities and construction traffic associated with the Proposed Development have been fully assessed within ES Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]. Construction-phase air quality impacts arising from on-site activities and construction traffic have been assessed on a semi-quantitative basis in accordance with Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) guidance. The assessment considered construction activities, vehicle movements and the proximity of sensitive human and ecological receptors. Construction traffic routes have been selected to minimise potential effects and are detailed in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Embedded mitigation measures have been identified to limit any temporary construction-related effects. These measures are derived from IAQM best practice guidance and are detailed in Table 12-11 of ES Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]. With these measures in place, all construction-phase air quality impacts are predicted to be Not Significant, as set out in Sections 12.6 and 12.7 within ES Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]. The mitigation will be secured through the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		(oCEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.9] submitted with the Application. A detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) will be prepared and approved prior to the commencement of construction to ensure appropriate controls are implemented throughout the construction period. Construction traffic was also screened against IAQM [REF-13], DEFRA and DMRB criteria. Predicted changes in pollutant concentrations fall below the relevant assessment thresholds, and further detailed assessment for sensitive human and ecological receptors was therefore not required. As a result, no significant air quality effects are expected from construction traffic.	
Alternatives and Site Selection			
Anston Parish Council, Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council, Conisbrough Parks Parish Council, Firbeck Parish Council, Harthill Parish Council, Hooton Roberts Parish Meeting, Treeton Parish Council, Todwick Parish Council, Wales Parish Council	Concern about development on the Green Belt	National policy requires a mix of renewable energy technologies, delivered at a range of scales, to meet future energy demand and decarbonisation targets. While rooftop and small-scale solar installations make an important contribution, they cannot alone deliver the level of generation required. Large-scale solar developments are therefore necessary, as explained in the Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]. The starting point for site selection was the availability of grid connection capacity at Brinsworth substation, as new energy projects can only connect where capacity exists. Following the securing of a grid connection, land in the surrounding area was assessed for suitability,	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		having regard to environmental constraints, proximity to sensitive receptors and agricultural land quality. Details about site selection are provided in ES Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]. The Applicant recognises that the Site is on the Green Belt and has sought to develop the Proposed Development in a manner that supports many of the same goals as the Green Belt. This includes providing opportunities for ongoing agriculture under the panels through grazing, as well as continued recreational access through current public rights of way and new permissive paths across the site. As a solar farm, the Proposed Development will create habitats to support local wildlife and increase biodiversity, while letting the soil rest and recover. At the end of the lifetime of the Proposed Development, the solar panels will be removed, and agriculture could restart. See the Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7], Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6] and Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]. The Proposed Development is located on grey belt land and meets the tests for being not inappropriate within the Green Belt. Should the Secretary of State disagree with the position on grey belt, the Proposed Development is CNP Infrastructure, and as such, the starting point for	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		decision making is that the test of very special circumstances in Green Belt policy is satisfied. A summary of reasons why the Proposed Development would, in any case demonstrate very special circumstances concludes that the significant need for low carbon electricity generation infrastructure to meet the government's decarbonisation objectives, and wider environmental benefits of the proposal, including the significant increase in BNG and creation of new permissive paths locally, would outweigh any harm identified to the Green Belt, which is considered to be limited for the reasons set out in this assessment. A review and assessment of the Green Belt land within which the Proposed Development is located can be found in Planning Statement, Appendix 2: Green Belt Assessment [EN0110020/APP/5.4].	
Anston Parish Council, Harthill Parish Council, Treeton Parish Council	Concern about the impact to food security	National policy requires a mix of renewable energy technologies, delivered at a range of scales, to meet future energy demand and decarbonisation targets. While rooftop and small-scale solar installations make an important contribution, they cannot alone deliver the level of generation required. Large-scale solar developments are therefore necessary, as explained in the Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]. The starting point for site selection was the availability of grid connection capacity at Brinsworth substation, as new energy projects can only connect where capacity exists. Following the	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		securing of a grid connection, land in the surrounding area was assessed for suitability, having regard to environmental constraints, proximity to sensitive receptors and agricultural land quality. Details about site selection are provided in ES Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]. The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding the loss of agricultural land and has sought to avoid and minimise the use of best and most versatile (BMV) land where possible. The majority of the Site comprises non-BMV Subgrade 3b land (78.86%). ES Volume 6, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9], and ES Volume 6, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20] confirms that only a small proportion of the Site comprises BMV land, and this is largely not subject to permanent infrastructure, with the exception of approximately 0.4 ha associated with a substation compound. The ALC across the Order Limits (excluding the Cable Corridors) is as follows: • 0.94% of Grade 1 Agricultural Land; • 7.06% of Grade 2 Agricultural Land; • 11.16% of Subgrade 3a Agricultural Land; • 78.86% of Subgrade 3b Agricultural Land;	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		• 0.32% of Grade 4 Agricultural Land; • 0.67% of Urban Land; • 0.13% of Non-Agricultural Land; and • 0.85% of Not Surveyed Land. In summary, of the area surveyed, 19% is comprised of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land, although in the majority of instances better quality grades show high spatial variability within larger areas of ALC subgrade 3b. BMV classification data for W1, W2 and W3, based on Site surveys and sampling, and for the Cable Corridors, based on a desk-based review, is provided in section 9.5 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9], including tabulated areas. The ALC survey is detailed in ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP6.20]. Agricultural use will not be permanently lost across the Site, with the exception of the 0.4ha. The Proposed Development enables continued sheep grazing within solar areas, and following consultation, solar and mitigation areas have been reduced where possible to maximise land retained in agricultural use. Whilst also seeking to minimise the use of BMV land, the Applicant notes meeting national energy targets would only require 0.4% of the UK's land. The largest threat to agriculture is climate change,	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		which is already having impacts on crop production in the UK and around the world.	
Bramley Parish Council, Conisbrough Parks Parish Council, Harthill Parish Council, Hooton Roberts Parish Meeting, Todwick Parish Council, Treeton Parish Council, Ulley Parish Council, Wales Parish Council, Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council	Concern about the loss of agricultural land	National policy requires a mix of renewable energy technologies, delivered at a range of scales, to meet future energy demand and decarbonisation targets. While rooftop and small-scale solar installations make an important contribution, they cannot alone deliver the level of generation required. Large-scale solar developments are therefore necessary, as explained in the Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]. The starting point for site selection was the availability of grid connection capacity at Brinsworth substation, as new energy projects can only connect where capacity exists. Following the securing of a grid connection, land in the surrounding area was assessed for suitability, having regard to environmental constraints, proximity to sensitive receptors and agricultural land quality. Details about site selection are provided in ES Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]. The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding the loss of agricultural land and has sought to avoid and minimise the use of best and most versatile (BMV) land where possible. The majority of the Site comprises non-BMV Subgrade 3b land (78.86%). ES Volume 6, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9], and ES Volume 6,	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20] confirms that only a small proportion of the Site comprises BMV land, and this is largely not subject to permanent infrastructure, with the exception of approximately 0.4 ha associated with a substation compound. The ALC across the Order Limits (excluding the Cable Corridors) is as follows: • 0.94% of Grade 1 Agricultural Land; • 7.06% of Grade 2 Agricultural Land; • 11.16% of Subgrade 3a Agricultural Land; • 78.86% of Subgrade 3b Agricultural Land; • 0.32% of Grade 4 Agricultural Land; • 0.67% of Urban Land; • 0.13% of Non-Agricultural Land; and • 0.85% of Not Surveyed Land. In summary, of the area surveyed, 19% is comprised of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land, although in the majority of instances better quality grades show high spatial variability within larger areas of ALC subgrade 3b. BMV classification data for W1, W2 and W3, based on Site surveys and sampling, and for the Cable Corridors, based on a desk-based review, is provided in section 9.5 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9], including tabulated areas. The ALC survey is detailed in ES	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP6.20]. Agricultural use will not be permanently lost across the Site, with the exception of 0.4ha as set out above. The Proposed Development enables continued sheep grazing within solar areas, and following consultation, solar and mitigation areas have been reduced where possible to maximise land retained in agricultural use. Whilst also seeking to minimise the use of BMV land, the Applicant notes meeting national energy targets would only require 0.4% of the UK's land. The largest threat to agriculture is climate change, which is already having impacts on crop production in the UK and around the world.	
Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council, Conisbrough Parks Parish Council, Harthill Parish Council, Hooton Roberts Parish Meeting, Todwick Parish Council, Treeton Parish Council	Support for solar in other locations, including rooftops or brownfields	National policy requires a mix of renewable energy technologies, delivered at a range of scales, to meet future energy demand and decarbonisation targets. While rooftop and small-scale solar installations make an important contribution, they cannot alone deliver the level of generation required. Large-scale solar developments are therefore necessary, as explained in the Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]. The starting point for site selection was the availability of grid connection capacity at Brinsworth substation, as new energy projects can only connect where capacity exists. Once a grid connection had been secured, the Applicant then	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		looked for land that would be suitable for solar. This includes avoiding environmental constraints, proximity to sensitive receptors and avoiding areas with the highest quality agricultural land. Details about site selection are provided in ES Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]. During the site selection process, the Applicant undertook a brownfield site review, and this is set out in Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment of the Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]. Brownfield sites were discounted for reasons including size constraints, environmental designations, topography, proximity to settlements and landowner availability.	
Biodiversity			
Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council, Bramley Parish Council, Catcliffe Parish Council, Conisbrough Parks Parish Council, Treeton Parish Council, Wales Parish Council	General concern about loss of wildlife	In general, solar farms are very beneficial for local wildlife. After construction, there is little activity needed for maintenance and minimal noise. Unlike traditional agriculture, the fields will not require regular application of chemical fertilisers or pesticides, and the soil will be left to rest. This creates an ecosystem where local wildlife can thrive, and biodiversity will increase. With the measures and mitigations outlined below, the Proposed Development is assessed as having a Not Significant effect on wildlife. Solar areas will be fenced for safety, however, mammal gates will be included to ensure that	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		wildlife can traverse the Site. See Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.14]. In addition to the solar areas, the Applicant has included 458 hectares for mitigation land, which would not have any above ground infrastructure. These areas would be planted with a mix of wildflowers and native grasses to support wildlife and increase biodiversity. The Applicant recognises concerns regarding the potential loss of wildlife and has designed the Proposed Development to avoid, minimise and compensate for ecological effects in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy. The scheme incorporates an Indicative Landscape Masterplan and an oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13], which together are intended to deliver a substantial uplift in biodiversity and wider landscape benefits over the lifetime of the Proposed Development. The design has been informed by extensive baseline field surveys and ecological assessment, enabling a targeted approach to habitat retention, creation, enhancement and long-term management. As set out in ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6], the Proposed Development will deliver Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) well in excess of the statutory 10% requirement. The approach to BNG, including detailed enhancement proposals and a commitment to a minimum 30-year	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		management period, is presented in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Delivery of BNG will be secured through the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. The oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] provides prescriptive detail on habitat creation, enhancement and management across the Site, with a particular emphasis on improving ecological connectivity at both site and landscape scales. Proposed measures include new woodland planting, enhancement of grassland and hedgerow habitats, and the creation of habitat corridors and rides to maintain connectivity for mammals and other wildlife. Deer fencing is proposed where necessary to protect newly created habitats, with proportionate management of woodland areas during construction and operation. Sensitive, priority and irreplaceable habitats have been avoided wherever practicable. Ancient woodland and veteran trees are protected in line with current government guidance, including appropriate buffer zones. For cable corridors, trenchless construction techniques are predominantly proposed where sensitive habitats are present. Open trenching is limited to non-priority habitats such as arable fields, with all temporarily affected areas reinstated following construction in accordance with the	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] and embedded mitigation measures. A commitment to complete surveys is provided in embedded mitigation and the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] with the results informing post consent activities and details within CEMP secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	
Anston Parish Council, Bramley Parish Council, Conisbrough Parks Parish Council, Harthill with Woodall Parish Council, Hooton Roberts Parish Meeting, Treeton Parish Council	Concern about habitat loss and fragmentation	The Applicant recognises concerns regarding the potential loss of wildlife and has designed the Proposed Development to avoid, minimise and compensate for ecological effects in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy. The scheme incorporates an Indicative Landscape Masterplan and an oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13], which together are intended to deliver a substantial uplift in biodiversity and wider landscape benefits over the lifetime of the Proposed Development. With the measures and mitigations outlined below, the Proposed Development is assessed as having a Not Significant effect on habitat loss. The design has been informed by extensive baseline field surveys and ecological assessment, enabling a targeted approach to habitat retention, creation, enhancement and long-term management. As set out in Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation of the ES [EN0110020/APP/6.6], the Proposed Development will deliver Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) well in excess of the statutory 10% requirement. The	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		approach to BNG, including detailed enhancement proposals and a commitment to a minimum 30-year management period, is presented in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Delivery of BNG will be secured through the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. The oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] provides prescriptive detail on habitat creation, enhancement and management across the Site, with a particular emphasis on improving ecological connectivity at both site and landscape scales. Proposed measures include new woodland planting, enhancement of grassland and hedgerow habitats, and the creation of habitat corridors and rides to maintain connectivity for mammals and other wildlife. Deer fencing is proposed where necessary to protect newly created habitats, with proportionate management of woodland areas during construction and operation. Sensitive, priority and irreplaceable habitats have been avoided wherever practicable. Ancient woodland and veteran trees are protected in line with current government guidance, including appropriate buffer zones. For cable corridors, trenchless construction techniques are predominantly proposed where sensitive habitats are present. Open trenching is limited to non-priority habitats such as arable fields, with all temporarily affected areas reinstated following	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		construction in accordance with the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] and embedded mitigation measures. A commitment to complete surveys is provided in embedded mitigation and the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] with the results informing post consent activities and details within CEMP secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	
Wickersley Parish Council	Concern about how mitigation will be maintained	The oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] provides prescriptive detail on habitat creation, enhancement, management and maintenance across the Site, with a particular emphasis on improving ecological connectivity at both site and landscape scales. Proposed measures include new woodland planting, enhancement of grassland and hedgerow habitats, and the creation of habitat corridors and rides to maintain connectivity for mammals and other wildlife. Deer fencing is proposed where necessary to protect newly created habitats, with proportionate management of woodland areas during construction and operation.	No
Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council, Harthill with Woodall Parish Council	Concern about impact to badgers	The Applicant recognises concerns regarding potential effects of the Proposed Development on badgers and has undertaken detailed survey work to ensure their presence, movement and legal protection requirements are fully considered. Badger walkover surveys were carried out in accordance with current guidance across the Site and within 30 metres of the Order Limits, focusing	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		on all habitats identified as having high suitability for badgers. Surveys were completed during August and December 2024 and between March and November 2025, with accessible areas of the Cable Corridors surveyed in November 2025. The findings are reported in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.3: Confidential Badger Survey Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20], with sensitive location data appropriately anonymised. Badgers are a mobile species and that the absence of field signs at the time of survey does not indicate absence. Where land access was not available, professional judgement was applied using aerial imagery, desk study information and off-site observations to characterise likely badger use. The confidential survey information enables appropriate mitigation and, if required, licensing to be identified, ensuring compliance with legal protections for badger setts. Potential effects during construction and operation have been carefully considered. Perimeter fencing has the potential to restrict movement; however, the provision of mammal gates within fencing, as detailed in the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13], ensures permeability of the Site and maintains established commuting routes. As a result, effects associated with habitat fragmentation are reduced to neutral and not significant in the long term.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Badgers are predominantly nocturnal and may be sensitive to lighting disturbance. Perimeter fence lighting will therefore be avoided, with infra-red security systems used instead. Where security lighting is required within BESS and substation areas, it will be designed to avoid light spill into surrounding habitats in accordance with the Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]. The creation and maturation of grassland, hedgerows and woodland habitats will provide long-term benefits for foraging, commuting and shelter, resulting in a beneficial, not significant effect for badgers at a local scale.	
Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council, Bramley Parish Council, Harthill with Woodall Parish Council, Wales Parish Council	Concern about impact to bats	The Applicant recognises concerns regarding potential effects of the Proposed Development on bats and has undertaken a detailed programme of baseline surveys and assessment to inform the design and mitigation strategy. Interpretation of updated bat survey data is included within the Environmental Statement, with full details provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.10: Bat Survey Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Ground Level Tree Assessments (GLTA) were completed for approximately 83% of trees within the Site where access was available, together with accessible areas of the Cable Corridors. Of the trees surveyed, the majority were assessed as having low or negligible bat roost potential, with a proportion identified as containing Potential Roost	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Features (PRFs), enabling appropriate mitigation to be identified. Bat activity surveys, including walked transects, remote monitoring and call analysis, were undertaken between April and September 2025. These confirmed a diverse assemblage of bat species using the Site for commuting and foraging, dominated by common and soprano pipistrelles, with additional records of noctule, Myotis species, brown long-eared bat, Nathusius' pipistrelle and serotine bat. No Annex II species were recorded. Potential effects associated with lighting were carefully considered given the nocturnal and light-sensitive ecology of bats. Perimeter fencing lighting will be avoided, with infra-red security systems used instead. Where lighting is required within BESS and substation areas, it will be designed and controlled in line with Bat Conservation Trust best practice and the Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]. Residual effects from lighting are therefore assessed as very low adverse and not significant. The Proposed Development includes extensive habitat creation and enhancement through the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13], including new grassland, hedgerows and woodland planting. As these habitats mature, they will strengthen commuting and foraging corridors and may provide future roost features. The installation of 75 bat boxes on suitable retained trees will further	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		enhance roosting opportunities. Collectively, these measures are expected to result in long-term beneficial and potentially significant effects for bats at a district scale.	
Bramley Parish Council, Harthill with Woodall Parish Council, Ulley Parish Council	Concern about impact to birds	The Applicant recognises concerns regarding potential effects on birds and has undertaken a comprehensive programme of ornithological surveys to inform the Proposed Development. Breeding Bird Surveys, Wintering Bird Surveys and targeted species surveys were completed across the Order Limits and surrounding Study Areas between 2024 and 2025, with results reported in ES Volume 3, Appendices 6.5, 6.6 and 6.7 [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Baseline surveys identified a breeding bird assemblage typical of the predominantly arable landscape, including species of conservation importance such as lapwing, skylark, grey partridge and yellow wagtail. Wintering surveys recorded regular use of the Site by farmland birds and waders, particularly in winter stubble, pasture and cereal fields. While some displacement of breeding birds may occur within areas developed for solar infrastructure, the assessment confirms that impacts are appropriately mitigated through habitat retention, enhancement and, where necessary, compensation. The Proposed Development will replace intensive agricultural management with a more diverse mosaic of habitats, including species-rich	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		grassland, enhanced hedgerows and woodland planting. Evidence demonstrates that well-managed solar developments can deliver benefits to breeding birds by increasing habitat heterogeneity and reducing fertiliser and insecticide use. These measures are secured through the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] and are expected to deliver long-term benefits for the wider bird assemblage. Species-specific measures are included where required. Open habitats suitable for breeding skylark are retained where possible, including south of Kiveton, with off-site skylark plots provided where retention is not feasible. Lapwing breeding recorded in WS3 will be compensated through off-site habitat creation, with restoration of wet grassland west of Long Road further benefiting breeding waders. Barn owl is expected to benefit from habitat creation, supplemented by additional nesting boxes within the Order Limits. Temporary works to the Cable Corridors will result in short-term, reversible effects only. Nesting birds are protected through embedded mitigation secured via the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9], including pre-construction checks, seasonal controls and protection of active nests.	
Harthill with Woodall Parish Council, Wales Parish Council	Concern about impact to deer	The Applicant recognises concerns regarding the potential loss of wildlife, including deer, and has designed the Proposed Development to avoid, minimise and compensate for ecological effects in	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		accordance with the mitigation hierarchy. The scheme incorporates an Illustrative Masterplan (ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1) [EN0110020/APP/6.19] and an oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13], which together are intended to deliver a substantial uplift in biodiversity and wider landscape benefits over the lifetime of the Proposed Development. The design has been informed by extensive baseline field surveys and ecological assessment, enabling a targeted approach to habitat retention, creation, enhancement and long-term management. As set out in ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6], the Proposed Development will deliver Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) well in excess of the statutory 10% requirement. The approach to BNG, including detailed enhancement proposals and a commitment to a minimum 30-year management period, is presented in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Delivery of BNG will be secured through the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. The oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] provides prescriptive detail on habitat creation, enhancement and management across the Site, with a particular emphasis on improving ecological connectivity at both site and landscape scales. Proposed measures include new woodland	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		planting, enhancement of grassland and hedgerow habitats, and the creation of habitat corridors and rides to maintain connectivity for mammals and other wildlife. Deer fencing is proposed where necessary to protect newly created habitats, with proportionate management of woodland areas during construction and operation. Management of the Site in relation to mammal fencing and movement is noted, however in addition to mammal gates, habitat corridors and rides are proposed between fenced areas within the Proposed Development to ensure wildlife corridors are maintained for mammals. Further information is found in the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13].	
Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council	Concern about impact to Great Crested Newts	The Applicant recognises concerns regarding potential effects of the Proposed Development on Great Crested Newts (GCN) and has undertaken proportionate survey and assessment in line with current guidance. Detailed information is provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.8: Great Crested Newt Survey Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20], with survey coverage illustrated on Figures 6.8.1–6.8.4 [EN0110020/APP/6.19]. Habitat Suitability Index (HSI) assessments were completed for ponds within the Site and surrounding Study Area where access permitted. While a small number of ponds recorded 'Good' or 'Excellent' suitability, environmental DNA (eDNA) surveys undertaken in 2024 and 2025 confirmed	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		negative results for GCN in all ponds sampled, with no confirmed presence identified within the Order Limits or within 250 metres of them. Two ponds returned inconclusive eDNA results; however, no desk study records or biological records indicate the presence of GCN within the Study Area. As such, the presence of a connected GCN metapopulation is considered unlikely. Where pond access was not possible, precautionary measures were applied using desk study data, aerial imagery and avoidance through design, including cable micro-siting. Four ponds lie within 250 metres of the Cable Corridors; however, potential effects on core terrestrial and aquatic habitat can be avoided through careful routing and construction practices. Given the absence of confirmed GCN presence, District Level Licensing has not been progressed. Embedded mitigation measures will be implemented during construction to avoid harm to amphibians, where required, through the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]. Overall, the Proposed Development is not expected to result in significant effects on great crested newts.	
Harthill with Woodall Parish Council	Concern about impact to hedgehogs	Hedgehogs were identified only in very low numbers during baseline surveys, with limited evidence of their presence across the Site. On this basis, the assessment concluded that potential impacts on hedgehogs would be negligible and	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		they were not taken forward as an Important Ecological Feature for detailed assessment. Nonetheless, a range of embedded mitigation measures has been incorporated to protect hedgehogs and maintain opportunities for movement and foraging: • Installation of mammal gates within perimeter fencing to maintain connectivity and allow hedgehogs to move freely across the Site; • Implementation of good construction practices, including measures to prevent animals becoming trapped (e.g. covering excavations or providing escape routes); • Delivery of habitat enhancement and management (grassland and hedgerows) through the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13], supporting shelter and foraging opportunities. With these measures in place, residual effects on hedgehogs are assessed as not significant. Further information is provided in ES Volume 6, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6],	
Harthill with Woodall Parish Council	Concern about impact to owls	Barn owl has been identified as a sensitive species within the Study Area, and appropriate mitigation and enhancement measures are included to ensure it is safeguarded throughout construction and operation. Embedded mitigation within the	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] ensures that any potential disturbance during construction would be short-term, of negligible magnitude and not significant. Pre-construction checks of suitable nesting features will be undertaken, and where an active nest is identified, an appropriate buffer will be established in line with best practice guidance, remaining in place until breeding has concluded. During operation, the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] includes measures to protect nesting barn owl during routine maintenance activities. The Proposed Development is expected to provide long-term benefits to barn owl, as solar arrays can support perch-hunting and the establishment of grassland beneath and between panels can enhance foraging habitat. Management will encourage areas of rough, tussocky grassland where appropriate. As a further enhancement, a minimum of five barn owl nesting boxes will be installed and maintained within the Order Limits to increase nesting opportunities. With these measures in place, the Proposed Development is expected to result in a medium magnitude, long-term significant beneficial effect for barn owl.	
Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council	Concern about impact to water voles	Information about water voles and otters can be found in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.11: Otter and Water Vole Survey Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20] .	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Water vole has not been recorded in watercourses within the Site or where access has been possible within watercourses in the Cable Corridor and with survey and appropriate mitigation measures applied it is not anticipated that a Natural England water vole (CL31) displacement licence will be required. However, the Applicant will apply a precautionary approach as detailed within the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] to avoid potential effects to water vole. With the proposed mitigation in place, effects on otter and water vole are Negative, short term, of Negligible magnitude, local and Not Significant.	
Treeton Parish Council	Concern about impact to wintering birds	The Applicant recognises concerns regarding potential effects on birds and has undertaken a comprehensive programme of ornithological surveys to inform the Proposed Development. Breeding Bird Surveys, Wintering Bird Surveys and targeted species surveys were completed across the Order Limits and surrounding Study Areas between 2024 and 2025, with results reported in ES Volume 3, Appendices 6.5, 6.6 and 6.7 [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Baseline surveys identified a breeding bird assemblage typical of the predominantly arable landscape, including species of conservation importance such as lapwing, skylark, grey partridge and yellow wagtail. Wintering surveys recorded regular use of the Site by farmland birds and waders, particularly in winter stubble, pasture and	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		cereal fields. While some displacement of breeding birds may occur within areas developed for solar infrastructure, the assessment confirms that impacts are appropriately mitigated through habitat retention, enhancement and, where necessary, compensation. The Proposed Development will replace intensive agricultural management with a more diverse mosaic of habitats, including species-rich grassland, enhanced hedgerows and woodland planting. Evidence demonstrates that well-managed solar developments can deliver benefits to breeding birds by increasing habitat heterogeneity and reducing fertiliser and insecticide use. These measures are secured through the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] and are expected to deliver long-term benefits for the wider bird assemblage. To ensure effects remain minimal, the Applicant has embedded a range of mitigation measures into the design and construction approach. This includes limiting permanent habitat loss, with most impacts associated with temporary construction activities. Affected habitats, particularly along the Cable Corridor, will be reinstated following works. Measures secured through the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] will minimise disturbance from noise, lighting, and human activity during construction.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Existing habitats are retained wherever practicable, with enhancements delivered through the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]. These include improved grassland management and hedgerow enhancement, increasing habitat value for wintering birds over time. Habitat creation and management proposals within the Site (and, where necessary, off-site compensation) are expected to maintain or enhance foraging opportunities, ensuring wintering bird use can continue. With these measures in place, the development is assessed as having a Not Significant residual effect on wintering birds, and in the longer term may provide beneficial effects through habitat enhancement and improved ecological management. Further information is provided in ES Volume 6, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6],	
Conisbrough Parks Parish Council	Concern about impacts to Clifton Wetland	While the potential impact of the Proposed Development on Clifton Wetlands has not been specifically assessed, as the area lies outside the Order Limits, not direct impacts are anticipated. Based on the conclusions from the biodiversity and hydrology assessments within the EIA, no indirect impacts on the habitat or water quality are anticipated due to best practice construction techniques and pollution control measures secured in the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Catcliffe Parish Council	Concern about lack of information around wildlife mitigation	The Applicant recognises concerns regarding the potential loss of wildlife and has designed the Proposed Development to avoid, minimise and compensate for ecological effects in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy. The scheme incorporates an Indicative Landscape Masterplan and an oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13], which together are intended to deliver a substantial uplift in biodiversity and wider landscape benefits over the lifetime of the Proposed Development. The design has been informed by extensive baseline field surveys and ecological assessment, enabling a targeted approach to habitat retention, creation, enhancement and long-term management. As set out in ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6], the Proposed Development will deliver Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) well in excess of the statutory 10% requirement. The approach to BNG, including detailed enhancement proposals and a commitment to a minimum 30-year management period, is presented in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Delivery of BNG will be secured through the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. The oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] provides prescriptive detail on habitat creation, enhancement and management across the Site, with a particular emphasis on improving ecological	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		connectivity at both site and landscape scales. Proposed measures include new woodland planting, enhancement of grassland and hedgerow habitats, and the creation of habitat corridors and rides to maintain connectivity for mammals and other wildlife. Deer fencing is proposed where necessary to protect newly created habitats, with proportionate management of woodland areas during construction and operation. Sensitive, priority and irreplaceable habitats have been avoided wherever practicable. Ancient woodland and veteran trees are protected in line with current government guidance, including appropriate buffer zones. For cable corridors, trenchless construction techniques are predominantly proposed where sensitive habitats are present. Open trenching is limited to non-priority habitats such as arable fields, with all temporarily affected areas reinstated following construction in accordance with the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] and embedded mitigation measures. A commitment to complete surveys is provided in embedded mitigation and the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] with the results informing post consent activities and details within CEMP secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	
Bramley Parish Council, Harthill	Concern about loss of hedgerows and trees	The Applicant recognises concerns regarding the potential loss of hedgerows and trees and has	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
with Woodall Parish Council, Wickersley Parish Council		designed the Proposed Development to prioritise their retention and protection wherever possible. ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6] includes a detailed assessment of potential effects on trees, woodlands, hedgerows, ancient woodland, veteran trees and other irreplaceable habitats, with avoidance forming a key part of the embedded mitigation strategy. Avoidance of trees and hedgerows has informed the overall design, including the selection and alignment of Cable Corridors, with trenchless crossings proposed where practicable to avoid woodland and tree impacts. Most woodland within the Order Limits will be retained in full. Where individual trees are unavoidably affected, this is limited to non-TPO woodland and only where no satisfactory alternative exists. All ancient woodland and veteran trees will be avoided in accordance with current government guidance and the Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]. An arboricultural survey and Tree Constraints Plan (TCP) have been prepared in ES Appendix 6.14 [EN0110020/APP/6.14], with further surveys to be undertaken prior to construction. Protective measures will be implemented through the CEMP, secured via a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. To ensure compliance with BS5837:2012 during construction, operation and decommissioning. Hedgerows will be	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		retained wherever possible, with existing field gateways used to minimise removals. Where tree or hedgerow loss is unavoidable, Biodiversity Net Gain losses will be minimised, and compensation provided through extensive native tree planting, including the use of standard trees and hedgerow reinforcement across the Site. These measures are designed to deliver a significant net gain for tree and hedgerow habitats and long-term landscape connectivity.	
Hooton Roberts Parish Meeting, Wickersley Parish Council	Concern about BNG not being specific and verified	The design has been informed by extensive baseline field surveys and ecological assessment, enabling a targeted approach to habitat retention, creation, enhancement and long-term management. As set out in ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6], the Proposed Development will deliver Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) well in excess of the statutory 10% requirement. The approach to BNG, including detailed enhancement proposals and a commitment to a minimum 30-year management period, is presented in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Delivery of BNG will be secured through the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. The oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] provides prescriptive detail on habitat creation, enhancement and management across the Site, with a particular emphasis on improving ecological	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		connectivity at both site and landscape scales. Proposed measures include new woodland planting, enhancement of grassland and hedgerow habitats, and the creation of habitat corridors and rides to maintain connectivity for mammals and other wildlife. Deer fencing is proposed where necessary to protect newly created habitats, with proportionate management of woodland areas during construction and operation.	
Harthill with Woodall Parish Council	Concern that mitigation will not make a difference	The Applicant recognises concerns regarding the potential loss of wildlife and has designed the Proposed Development to avoid, minimise and compensate for ecological effects in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy. The scheme incorporates an Indicative Landscape Masterplan and an oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13], which together are intended to deliver a substantial uplift in biodiversity and wider landscape benefits over the lifetime of the Proposed Development. The design has been informed by extensive baseline field surveys and ecological assessment, enabling a targeted approach to habitat retention, creation, enhancement and long-term management. As set out in ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6], the Proposed Development will deliver Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) well in excess of the statutory 10% requirement. The approach to BNG, including detailed enhancement proposals and a commitment to a minimum 30-year management period, is presented in ES Volume 3,	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Delivery of BNG will be secured through the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. The oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] provides prescriptive detail on habitat creation, enhancement and management across the Site, with a particular emphasis on improving ecological connectivity at both site and landscape scales. Proposed measures include new woodland planting, enhancement of grassland and hedgerow habitats, and the creation of habitat corridors and rides to maintain connectivity for mammals and other wildlife. Deer fencing is proposed where necessary to protect newly created habitats, with proportionate management of woodland areas during construction and operation. Sensitive, priority and irreplaceable habitats have been avoided wherever practicable. Ancient woodland and veteran trees are protected in line with current government guidance, including appropriate buffer zones. For cable corridors, trenchless construction techniques are predominantly proposed where sensitive habitats are present. Open trenching is limited to non-priority habitats such as arable fields, with all temporarily affected areas reinstated following construction in accordance with the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] and embedded mitigation measures.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		A commitment to complete surveys is provided in embedded mitigation and the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] with the results informing post consent activities and details within CEMP secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] .	
Anston Parish Council	Impact to Anston Stones	Impact of the Proposed Development on the Anston Stones SSSI is assessed in Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]. Anston Stones SSSI has a hydrological link to the Site; however, the features for which it has been designated are terrestrial and not aquatic. With the pollution prevention measures detailed in the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] in place, there is not a pathway to affect these designation features (whether terrestrial or aquatic), with the duration of effect being short term, of negligible magnitude and Not Significant to IEFs of the SSSI.	No
Hooton Roberts Parish Meeting, Treeton Parish Council, Wales Parish Council	Concerns that the carbon footprint would not be offset if the panels were to be imported	As part of the procurement and contractor selection process, potential contractors will be assessed against multiple criteria, including their sourcing of materials and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions performance. The design of the Proposed Development retains a degree of flexibility to reflect ongoing advances in renewable technologies, including improvements in solar PV module efficiency, manufacturing processes and associated infrastructure, as detailed in ES	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]. The Proposed Development incorporates embedded mitigation measures to minimise GHG emissions across construction, operation, maintenance and decommissioning. These measures are secured through the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] and the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. Commitments include engineering design choices to reduce embodied carbon, the use of lower GHG-emitting technologies where practicable, minimisation of high-impact equipment such as SF₆-containing components, and the reuse and local recycling of materials and waste. While embodied emissions from equipment and raw materials represent the largest source of emissions, the GHG intensity of the Proposed Development is estimated at approximately 23 gCO₂e/kWh, substantially lower than gas-fired generation. Over its 60-year lifetime, the Proposed Development is expected to avoid approximately 18 million tonnes of CO₂e, delivering a clear net climate benefit and supporting regional and national net zero ambitions.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Community benefits			
Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council, Harthill with Woodall Parish Council, Ravenfield Parish Council, Treeton Parish Council, Wickersley Parish Council	Concern community benefits are not enough	While there is no statutory standard for community benefit funds, the Applicant has proposed a community benefit fund of £400 per MW per year, which is consistent with other solar developments in the UK, as described in the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] . The Applicant has also sought to minimise impacts through the design process, as described in the Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7] .	No
Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council, Harthill with Woodall Parish Council	Concern that community benefit should be linked to inflation	The Applicant is proposing £400/mw per year, which is consistent with other solar developments in the UK. Linking this funding to inflation would create more complexity in the model, making it difficult to anticipate future costs.	No
Bramley Parish Council, Harthill with Woodall Parish Council	Concern there is not enough information about the benefit scheme	The Applicant wishes to develop the community benefit package collaboratively with local communities and stakeholders. At the non-statutory consultation, the Applicant asked an open-ended question about what individuals would want to see in the community benefit package. To get further feedback, the Applicant held a workshop in July 2025 with local stakeholders to get more feedback around structure and implementation of the fund. This feedback was used to develop a more concrete proposal for a fund that would be administered through a nominated fund manager, to support local initiatives. The Applicant will continue to engage with local stakeholders to further refine this proposal as the Proposed	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Development continues through the development process. See the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] for further information.	
Treeton Parish Council	Concern about how the community benefit fund would be managed	The Applicant has proposed that the community benefit fund be administered by a nominated fund manager. See the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] for further information.	Yes
Bramley Parish Council, Treeton Parish Council	Request for reduced energy costs	The community benefit fund would support local initiatives and could include reduced energy costs. See the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] for further information.	Yes
Wickersley Parish Council	Request for rooftop panels for local buildings	The community benefit fund would support local initiatives and could include rooftop panels. See the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] for further information.	Yes
Consultation			
Anston Parish Council, Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council, Firbeck Parish Council	Concern about inadequate public notification of consultation	The Applicant notified the public of the consultation through several methods, as described in the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]. While the requirement in the PA2008 is to provide notice at least 28 days prior to the due date for the submission of feedback, the Applicant provided more than this required time period. This included: • a leaflet posted to the consultation zone on 10 September, • notices in local papers 10 -18 September • Emails to the Keep Informed list on 18 September • Emails to parish councils, community groups and other elected officials on 23 September.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Treeton Parish Council	Concern leaflets looked like junk mail	The Applicant produced a consultation leaflet to announce the upcoming consultation, see Consultation Report Appendix D Consultation Materials [EN0110020/APP/5.1] . If for any reason an individual did not open the post they had received, the Applicant also provided other methods to notify the community. This includes notices in newspapers, emails, and advertisements on social media as described in the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] .	No
Braithwell with Micklebring Parish Council Conisbrough Parks Parish Council, Ravenfield Parish Council	Concern consultation relied on digital documents and paper copies of the draft ES were available for a charge	The Applicant provided both paper and digital copies of all consultation materials. Paper copies were available at all of the public events and by request. The draft ES is a technical document that is written for technical audiences, however it was made available for interested parties for free through the website, by request on a USB, or in printed copy at the public events. Because of the size of the document at more than 8,000 pages, the Applicant did not provide this document for free in order to reduce potential paper waste and cost. See the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] for further information.	No
Harthill with Woodall Parish Council , Ravenfield Parish Council	Concern documents were too technical	The Applicant provided a variety of consultation materials written in varying levels of detail and technical complexity. For the Community, the key consultation document was the Consultation Booklet Consultation Report Appendix D Consultation Materials [EN0110020/APP/5.1] . This document was written in non-technical language for the general public, and provided enough information to engage with the	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		consultation. The Applicant also provided a non-technical summary of the draft ES and the full ES for anyone who wanted to view it. These documents are more technical in nature and written for technical audiences.	
Anston Parish Council, Braithwell with Micklebring Parish Council, Conisbrough Parks Parish Council, Hooton Roberts Parish Meeting, Ravenfield Parish Council, Treeton Parish Council	Concern consultation was not long enough	The PA 2008 requires a 28-day public consultation, however the Applicant provided 6 weeks to allow more time. Prior to the start of the consultation, the Applicant posted a leaflet to the consultation zone to notify the public that the consultation would be occurring, to provide additional time to organise and prepare. See the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] for further information.	No
Conisbrough Parks Parish Council	Concern that appendices may be missing from the Draft ES	The Applicant confirms that no Appendices were missing. The Applicant believes that this feedback comes from a misunderstanding of the numbering system for the Appendices, whereby if a chapter from the draft ES included appendices or figures, they were numbered according to the chapter number. For example, Chapter 3 did not include any appendices, so there was no Appendix 3, and they proceeded from 2.3 to 4.1. See Consultation Report Appendix D Consultation Materials EN0110020/APP/5.1] .	No
Aston-cum-Aughton Parish	Concern that final locations of components were not clear	One of the Gunning Principles for good consultation is that it should occur early in the	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Council, Treeton Parish Council		project's development process, so that the design is still flexible and can be altered in response to feedback. During the consultation, the Applicant presented the potential locations for substations, batteries, and cable routes in order to receive feedback that could inform their final locations. The Applicant explained the development process, to explain how final environmental results or final decisions on the locations of key components would be made, and how consultation feedback would be considered. See the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] for further information.	
Treeton Parish Council	Concern about ability to answer specific questions at events	One of the Gunning Principles for good consultation is that it should occur early in the project's development process, so that the design is still flexible and can be altered in response to feedback. For EIA developments, there is a requirement to consult on preliminary environmental information, so that the consultation feedback can be incorporated as the assessments are finalised. This means that information presented at each of the consultation periods was by definition indicative and included optionality in many cases. The Applicant through consultation materials explained the development process, to explain how final environmental results or final decisions on the locations of key components would be made, and how consultation feedback would be considered. See the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] for further information.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Conisbrough Parks Parish Council, Harthill with Woodall Parish Council	Concern about the freepost address	As described in the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] , there was no issue with the Freepost address which received roughly 9,000 pieces of freepost.	No
Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council	Concern the masterplan did not include a housing estate in Harthill	The Applicant has corrected the base map to the most current OS layer in the updated Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/5.7] . The Applicant notes that they were fully aware of this housing development throughout the pre-application period, including site visits during the consultations as described in the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] and relevant surveys.	Yes
Braithwell with Micklebring Parish Council	Concern that Roman Villa designation should require a new consultation	The Roman Villas was scheduled prior to the consultation, so its new status was included in all materials. Thus there was not a significant change in the proposed development that would have warranted a further consultation. See Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8] .	No
Firbeck Parish Council	Request for more visualisations	Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant provided updated masterplans showing how the Proposed Development had been updated and updated the project website to include a map of the Proposed Development that can be zoomed in to see specific properties. Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7] includes visualisation from viewpoints. See the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] for further information.	Yes
Braithwell with Micklebring	Concern about not enough events	The Applicant developed a programme of events at various days of week and time of day to	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Parish Council, Wales Parish Council, Treeton Parish Council		accommodate different work/life schedules. Many of these villages do not have public event space that is large enough and meets accessibility and safety requirements for public events. Furthermore, it would not be proportionate to hold an event in every village in the vicinity of the Proposed Development. The Applicant identified 8 locations across the Site that would be large enough for a public event, meet accessibility requirements, and be located so that an individual in the consultation zone was no more than 15 minutes away from any event. The Applicant consulted with local authorities on this proposed programme through the development of the Statement of Community Consultation. As a result of that consultation, the Applicant shifted the timings of events so that the next nearest event would occur at a completely different time of day and day of the week, so that if a person could not make the event nearest them due to scheduling, the next closest event would be more convenient. See the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] for further information.	
Todwick Parish Council	Concern about consultation in Todwick		
Treeton Parish Council	Concern about consultation in Treeton		
Bramley Parish Council	Concern there was not an event in Bramley		
Conisbrough Parks Parish Council	Concern there was not an event in Clifton		
Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council, Wales Parish Council	Concern there was not an event in Kiveton		
Wales Parish Council	Concern there was not enough consultation with Wales		
Braithwell with Micklebring Parish Council	Concern there weren't events in Firsby, Hooten Roberts or Clifton		
Cumulative impacts			
Anston Parish Council, Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council, Bramley Parish Council, Catcliffe Parish Council, Harthill with	General concern about other developments in the area	The Applicant has considered other developments in the local area and potential cumulative impacts. This has led to the reduction of solar areas around Common Farm, a solar farm under construction near Whitestone 2. The Applicant also altered the access point on the A630 to minimise potential traffic impacts due to the housing development that has been recently consented in this location. See	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Woodall Parish Council, Hooton Roberts Parish Meeting, Ravenfield Parish Council, Todwick Parish Council, Ulley Parish Council, Wickersley Parish Council		the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] and Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]. Cumulative effects have been assessed within ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects Assessment, supported by ES Volume 3 Figures 17.1–17.3 (long list and Zones of Influence within 1km and 10km) and ES Volume 3 Appendices 17.1–17.2 (policy/guidance and the long list of developments). The list of cumulative schemes has been continually reviewed and updated using Local Planning Authority planning registers, Landstack, and GIS mapping, and was finalised with input from CDC, RMBC and NEDDC. With embedded mitigation and topic-specific controls, the ES concludes that significant adverse inter-project cumulative effects are not anticipated, including in relation to the key nearby schemes such as Carr Lane, Ulley (RB2025/0029), Thurcroft Energy Park / Morthen Lane, Morthen (RB2025/0714), Common Farm Solar Farm (RB2022/1203) and Piper Lane Solar Farm (RB2025/0029). Cumulative effects are reported in two ways: • Inter-project effects (Whitestone combined with other schemes) are assessed within each topic chapter (see Section “.9” of ES Chapters 6–16).	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		• Intra-project effects on ecological receptors are considered within the biodiversity assessment. Biodiversity and Nature Conservation The assessment concludes no potential for cumulative effects for the majority of schemes considered. Two developments were identified as having potential cumulative interactions on birds: • Solar PV development off Carr Lane, Ulley (RB2025/0029) – potential cumulative effects on birds were assessed as not significant, with habitat enhancement associated with Whitestone expected to benefit the breeding bird assemblage. • Renewable energy park / Thurcroft Energy Park off Morthen Lane, Morthen (RB2025/0714) – potential cumulative effects were assessed as negligible or beneficial (subject to LPA requests being met), and not significant. Landscape and Visual For landscape character, while Whitestone would increase the prevalence of similar development within host Landscape Character Areas (LCAs), the cumulative change is not of sufficient magnitude to redefine LCAs/Landscape Character Types	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		(LCTs); therefore no significant cumulative effects are identified in construction or operation. For views and visual amenity, combined visibility with other schemes is limited and expected to reduce as mitigation planting matures across developments. Sequential visibility may occur notably with: • Common Farm Solar Farm (RB2022/1203); and • Thurcroft Energy Park (RB2025/0714) However, the assessment concludes no significant adverse cumulative effects during construction or operation. Cultural Heritage and Archaeology No inter-project effects are identified from direct/indirect physical impacts. Potential inter-project setting interactions were considered for eight schemes, but no inter-project effects were concluded for: • Blue Mans Bower (SM 1012201) • Conisbrough Castle (SM 1010828) • Conisbrough Parks Romano-British Villa (SM 1491715) • Barlborough Hall Registered Park and Garden (1001365) and associated Listed Buildings • Manor House (Grade II, 1151523)	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Hardwick Hall Farmhouse (Grade II, 1314636) A minor inter-project effect was identified for Ulley Conservation Area, arising from the Carr Lane, Ulley solar scheme (RB2025/0029), but this was assessed as not significant. Ground Conditions and Land Quality Of 38 long-list schemes, 24 were discounted due to distance and 14 were assessed. Inter-project effects range from negligible to minor (not significant), relating to non-BMV soil function loss and low-likelihood spill/leak risks. Whitestone is therefore not predicted to contribute to significant adverse cumulative effects for land quality/ground conditions. Water Resources and Flood Risk 22 cumulative developments were identified within the relevant Zol. Assuming standard good practice, appropriate mitigation and flood risk management measures across developments, no significant inter-project effects are predicted. Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases Inter-project effects are not considered relevant to the Climate Change Risk Assessment (CCRA) in line with guidance. The In-Combination Climate	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Impacts (ICCI) approach is addressed through topic chapters where effects are significant. For GHG emissions, the receptor is the global atmosphere and effects are not geographically constrained; an inter-project assessment is therefore not applicable. Whitestone, cumulatively with other renewables, would have an overall positive contribution by supporting net zero ambitions. Air Quality Construction dust from nearby sites was considered assuming best practice mitigation consistent with IAQM guidance and CEMPs. Inter-project dust effects are predicted to be Negligible to Low (Not Significant). Traffic effects for Whitestone were screened out, and operational dust impacts were scoped out (no combustion sources; low operational traffic), so no significant inter-project operational effects are predicted. Decommissioning effects are expected to be comparable to construction, with dust effects also Negligible to Low (Not Significant), with traffic emissions to be considered in the future DEMP. Traffic and Transport 23 cumulative developments were identified with potential construction overlap and shared routes. The assessment concludes the peak construction periods are unlikely to coincide, given different	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		consenting stages and programmes. Where overlap could occur, cumulative increases remain low in absolute terms; percentage increases on some links reflect low baseline flows rather than large vehicle numbers. Embedded mitigation remains effective and conclusions are not materially altered. If simultaneous construction were to occur, CTMPs and stakeholder coordination (including with RMBC and CDC) would manage disruption. Overall, cumulative effects are not predicted to change the significance of traffic impacts reported for Whitestone. Noise and Vibration Nine cumulative developments were identified with potential inter-project noise at shared receptors. Limited construction noise data prevents full quantitative assessment, but construction noise effects are expected to be short-term and unlikely significant. Where data exists (notably Piper Lane Solar Farm – RB2025/0029), inter-project construction noise is Not Significant. Operational inter-project noise has been calculated and is Not Significant at all assessed receptors. Socio-Economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use During construction, cumulative employment and GVA could increase where programmes overlap, but this is not expected to change overall	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		significance locally or nationally. Potential labour market pressure and displacement effects are reduced by access to a wider regional workforce and the expectation that many workers would travel daily. For PProWs/tourism/recreation receptors, while there is potential for combined disruption (traffic, noise, visual), the topic-specific conclusions indicate no significant inter-project effects overall. For agricultural land (including BMV), if all schemes proceed, the scale of land affected could increase; however, cumulative effects are unlikely to exceed those identified for Whitestone, as the combined footprint remains a small proportion of agricultural/BMV land available in the Study Area. Other Environmental Topics (Waste, Glint & Glare, MADs, EMF) • Waste: Very low landfill disposal volumes; Not Significant and not expected to contribute to significant cumulative effects. • Glint and Glare: Assessed cumulatively with Thurcroft Energy Park (RB2025/0714) and Piper Lane Solar Farm (RB2025/0029); due to low magnitude glare, screening and distance, no cumulative effects are predicted.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		• Major Accidents and Disasters (MADs): Interactions between accidental events across sites are limited; road accident inter-project effects are unlikely due to limited construction overlap and low traffic generation. With the outline Battery Safety Management Plan, other developments are not expected to increase BESS fire risks, assuming compliance with relevant standards across consents. Significant cumulative MAD effects are not anticipated. • EMF: Electrical infrastructure would be installed in accordance with relevant guidance; predicted magnetic field strengths remain below ICNIRP reference levels and cumulative effects are Not Significant.	
Wales Parish Council	Concern about BESS on Hard Lane	The Applicant has considered other developments in the local area and potential cumulative impacts, including the proposed BESS on Hard Lane. Cumulative effects have been assessed within ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.17], supported by ES Volume 3 Figures 17.1–17.3 [EN0110020/APP/6.19] (long list and Zones of Influence within 1km and 10km) and ES Volume 3 Appendices 17.1–17.2 [EN0110020/APP/6.20] (policy/guidance and the long list of developments). The list of cumulative schemes includes the BESS on Hard Lane and has been continually reviewed	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		and updated using Local Planning Authority planning registers, Landstack, and GIS mapping, and was finalised with input from CDC, RMBC and NEDDC. With embedded mitigation and topic-specific controls, the ES concludes that significant adverse inter-project cumulative effects are not anticipated, including in relation to the Hard Lane BESS.	
Treeton Parish Council, Ulley Parish Council	Concern about Common Farm	The Applicant has considered other developments in the local area and potential cumulative impacts. This has led to the reduction of solar areas around Common Farm, a solar farm under construction near Whitestone 2. See the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] and Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]. Cumulative effects have been assessed within ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.17], supported by ES Volume 3 Figures 17.1–17.3 [EN0110020/APP/6.19] (long list and Zones of Influence within 1km and 10km) and ES Volume 3 Appendices 17.1–17.2 [EN0110020/APP/6.20] (policy/guidance and the long list of developments). The list of cumulative schemes has been continually reviewed and updated using Local Planning Authority planning registers, Landstack, and GIS mapping, and was finalised with input from CDC, RMBC and NEDDC.	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		With embedded mitigation and topic-specific controls, the ES concludes that significant adverse inter-project cumulative effects are not anticipated.	
Harthill with Woodall Parish Council, Treeton Parish Council	Concern about Exagen's Thurcroft development	The Applicant has considered other developments in the local area and potential cumulative impacts. Cumulative effects have been assessed within ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.17], supported by ES Volume 3 Figures 17.1–17.3 [EN0110020/APP/6.19] (long list and Zones of Influence within 1km and 10km) and ES Volume 3 Appendices 17.1–17.2 [EN0110020/APP/6.20] (policy/guidance and the long list of developments). The list of cumulative schemes has been continually reviewed and updated using Local Planning Authority planning registers, Landstack, and GIS mapping, and was finalised with input from CDC, RMBC and NEDDC. With embedded mitigation and topic-specific controls, the ES concludes that significant adverse inter-project cumulative effects are not anticipated, including in relation to key nearby schemes such as Thurcroft Energy Park / Morthen Lane, Morthen (RB2025/0714).	No
Treeton Parish Council	Concern about other housing developments in the area	The Applicant has considered other developments in the local area and potential cumulative impacts. Cumulative effects have been assessed within ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.17], supported	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		by ES Volume 3 Figures 17.1–17.3 [EN0110020/APP/6.19] (long list and Zones of Influence within 1km and 10km) and ES Volume 3 Appendices 17.1–17.2 [EN0110020/APP/6.20] (policy/guidance and the long list of developments). The list of cumulative schemes has been continually reviewed and updated using Local Planning Authority planning registers, Landstack, and GIS mapping, and was finalised with input from CDC, RMBC and NEDDC. With embedded mitigation and topic-specific controls, the ES concludes that significant adverse inter-project cumulative effects are not anticipated, including in relation to key nearby housing schemes.	
Treeton Parish Council, Ulley Parish Council	Concern about Piper Lane	The Applicant has considered other developments, including Piper Lane Solar Farm (RB2025/0029), in the local area and potential cumulative impacts. Cumulative effects have been assessed within ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.17], supported by ES Volume 3 Figures 17.1–17.3 [EN0110020/APP/6.19] (long list and Zones of Influence within 1km and 10km) and ES Volume 3 Appendices 17.1–17.2 [EN0110020/APP/6.20] (policy/guidance and the long list of developments). The list of cumulative schemes has been continually reviewed and updated using Local Planning Authority planning registers, Landstack,	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		and GIS mapping, and was finalised with input from CDC, RMBC and NEDDC. With embedded mitigation and topic-specific controls, the ES concludes that significant adverse inter-project cumulative effects are not anticipated, including in relation to Piper Lane Solar Farm (RB2025/0029).	
Treeton Parish Council, Wickersley Parish Council	Concern about the BESS developments on Moat Lane	The Applicant has considered other developments in the local area and potential cumulative impacts. Cumulative effects have been assessed within ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.17], supported by ES Volume 3 Figures 17.1–17.3 [EN011020/APP/6.19] (long list and Zones of Influence within 1km and 10km) and ES Volume 3 Appendices 17.1–17.2 [EN0110020/APP/6.20] (policy/guidance and the long list of developments). The list of cumulative schemes has been continually reviewed and updated using Local Planning Authority planning registers, Landstack, and GIS mapping, and was finalised with input from CDC, RMBC and NEDDC. No HGV traffic is proposed to be routed on Moat Lane during the construction phase of the Proposed Development. See Figure 13.3 - Proposed HGV Routing - Whitestone 2 – Northwest [EN0110020/APP/6.19].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		With embedded mitigation and topic-specific controls, the ES concludes that significant adverse inter-project cumulative effects are not anticipated.	
Treeton Parish Council	Concern about the National Grid substation being considered	The Applicant has considered other developments in the local area and potential cumulative impacts. Cumulative effects have been assessed within ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.17], supported by ES Volume 3 Figures 17.1–17.3 [EN0110020/APP/6.19] (long list and Zones of Influence within 1km and 10km) and ES Volume 3 Appendices 17.1–17.2 [EN0110020/APP/6.20] (policy/guidance and the long list of developments). The list of cumulative schemes has been continually reviewed and updated using Local Planning Authority planning registers, Landstack, and GIS mapping, and was finalised with input from CDC, RMBC and NEDDC. With embedded mitigation and topic-specific controls, the ES concludes that significant adverse inter-project cumulative effects are not anticipated.	No
Decommissioning			
Hooton Roberts Parish Meeting, Treeton Parish Council	Concern about length of lifespan of the project	The proposed 60-year operational lifespan of the project is consistent with similar projects around the country and is in line with standard norms for renewable energy generation developments. Decommissioning of the Proposed Development has been assessed within the Environmental Statement, which assumes a 60-year operational	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		life followed by full decommissioning (ES Volume 1 and ES Volume 2, Chapters 6–17). Decommissioning is anticipated to involve the dismantling and recycling of the solar PV panels, with vehicle movements broadly comparable to, or less than, those during construction. Some components, such as mitigation planting, site access tracks and cabling ducts buried below plough-depth, may be retained subject to landowner agreement. These elements would not prevent future land use and would be managed in accordance with industry best practice, with no adverse environmental effects anticipated. The Environmental Statement explains that the precise decommissioning methods cannot be fully defined at this stage, as engineering practices will continue to evolve over the lifetime of the project. A precautionary, reasonable worst-case approach has therefore been adopted, with decommissioning effects assumed to be similar to, or of a lesser magnitude than, construction effects. A detailed DEMP will be prepared and approved by the relevant Local Planning Authority prior to decommissioning, as secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. An oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11] has been submitted with the Application.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Wales Parish Council	Concern about recycling the panels	The approach to waste generation and management during construction, operation and decommissioning is set out in ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16]. The primary waste stream associated with the Proposed Development is expected to be the solar PV modules and associated electrical infrastructure. Decommissioning would take place following an anticipated 60-year operational life and would be carried out in accordance with a DEMP, secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. The DEMP would apply the waste management hierarchy as a core principle, ensuring that materials are reused and recycled wherever practicable, with disposal only used as a last resort. An oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11] has been submitted with the Application. Together, these documents set a clear framework for responsible dismantling, recycling and waste management, in line with legislation and industry best practice at the time of decommissioning.	No
Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council., Wales Parish Council	Concern that insufficient information was provided about decommissioning	The project is anticipated to operate for up to 60 years, which reflects the expected lifespan of modern solar energy infrastructure and enables the delivery of long-term renewable electricity in support of national net zero objectives.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		The ES has assessed the Proposed Development on the basis that, at the end of this operational period, it would be fully decommissioned (ES Volume 1 and ES Volume 2, Chapters 6–17). Decommissioning is expected to take place over 12–24 months and would involve dismantling and recycling the solar PV arrays, with impacts similar to, or of a lesser magnitude than, those experienced during construction. No lasting environmental effects are anticipated beyond the completion of decommissioning works. Subject to agreement with the landowner, elements such as mitigation planting, site accesses and cabling ducts buried below plough-depth may remain, as these do not restrict future land use and may provide continued environmental benefits. A detailed DEMP would be prepared and approved by the relevant Local Planning Authority prior to decommissioning, as secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. An oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11] has been submitted with the Application, ensuring a clear and regulated framework for future site restoration.	
Treeton Parish Council	Concern that the land used for the Proposed Development will not be returned to its original state following decommissioning	The Proposed Development would have a maximum lifespan of 60 years, after which it would be fully decommissioned, as assessed within the Environmental Statement (ES Volume 2, Chapters 6–17 [EN0110020/APP/6.6 – 6.17]). A detailed DEMP will be prepared and approved by the relevant planning authority prior to	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		decommissioning, as secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. An oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/7.4] has been submitted with the Application. Decommissioning is anticipated to involve the dismantling and recycling of the solar PV arrays, with associated vehicle movements broadly similar to, or less than, those experienced during construction. The ES concludes that decommissioning effects on ground conditions and land quality would be temporary and of equal or lesser magnitude than construction impacts, with no lasting adverse effects following completion of this phase. Where agreed with the landowner, elements such as mitigation planting, site access tracks and cabling ducts buried below plough-depth may be retained, as these would not prevent future agricultural use and may provide ongoing environmental benefits. Decommissioning activities would be governed by a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP), to be approved by the relevant Local Planning Authority prior to works commencing, as secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. An outline Decommissioning Environmental Management	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Plan (oDEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.11] has been submitted with the Application, ensuring appropriate restoration and environmental protection in line with legislation and best practice.	
Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council	Concerns about decommissioning if the operator becomes insolvent	In the event that the operator of the Proposed Development became insolvent, the Proposed Development would likely require to be sold. In this event, all requirements of the DCO would be sold along with it and would require to be implemented in full by any future operator. Decommissioning is secured within the requirements in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] , so would be implemented in full by the operator in line with the DCO requirements.	No
Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council	Concerns about repanelling	Repanelling is considered within the relevant ES Chapters [EN0110020/APP/6.6-6.19] . No new significant impacts are found due to repaneling.	No
Developer Details			
Treeton Parish Council	Concern about where the funding for the project is coming from	Whitestone is a privately funded renewable energy project brought forward by Whitestone Net Zero Ltd, owned by Net Zero One Ltd, with Green Nation acting as overall project manager. As with other nationally significant infrastructure projects, private investment is essential to fund the design, environmental assessment, construction, operation and eventual decommissioning of a project of this scale. Solar farms like the Proposed Development do not receive any government subsidy and must be funded entirely through private sources. The	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Proposed Development relies on private investment and the long-term commercial operation of the site, including revenue from the sale of electricity, to ensure it can be delivered and managed responsibly over its anticipated 60-year operational life. This funding model is standard for nationally significant renewable energy infrastructure. In addition, the DCO process requires the Applicant to demonstrate that sufficient financial provision is in place. See also the Funding Statement [EN0110020/APP/4.2] .	
Treeton Parish Council	Concern about the Applicant's capacity to bring forward the Proposed Development	Whitestone is being brought forward by Whitestone Net Zero Ltd, with Green Nation acting as overall project manager. While Whitestone represents a larger scheme than individual projects previously managed by Green Nation, it builds directly on the company's extensive track record in renewable energy delivery. Green Nation currently manages 75 operational solar farms and over 700 rooftop solar installations across the UK, with a portfolio exceeding 200MW of electricity-generating capacity. It is also important to note that the scale of Whitestone means it is being progressed as a NSIP under the Planning Act 2008. This requires a DCO, which is a robust and transparent process involving extensive technical assessment, statutory consultation, independent examination by the Planning Inspectorate and a final decision by the Secretary of State.	No
EIA General			

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council, Bramley Parish Council, Conisbrough Parks Parish Council, Harthill with Woodall Parish Council, Hooton Roberts Parish Meeting, Treeton Parish Council, Wickersley Parish Council	Concern that assessments are incomplete	The ES details the environmental assessments that have taken place. During the statutory consultation, the draft ES was available to view, which explained the preliminary environmental assessments that had taken place. The environmental assessments have been ongoing throughout the development process, which has informed the ES submitted as part of the DCO application. ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: EIA Methodology [EN0110020/APP/6.2] explains the process undertaken for EIA assessments, along with the relevant technical chapters.	No
Flood risk, hydrology and drainage			
Anston Parish Council, Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council, Braithwell with Micklebring Parish Council, Catcliffe Parish Council, Conisbrough Parks Parish Council, Treeton Parish Council, Wales Parish Council	Concern about development increasing existing flooding	Impacts on water resources and flood risk are assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 10 Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]. The assessment considered potential impacts on surface water features (watercourses, waterbodies, canals, and reservoirs), flood risk, and designated sites. Following the implementation of embedded mitigation as set out in the ES Chapter, the significance of any adverse effects during construction, operational and decommissioning phases are all assessed as being negligible, or not significant in EIA terms.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Edlington Town Council	Concern about flooding on A630	Impacts on water resources and flood risk are assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]. Land adjacent to Ulley Reservoir, the River Rother, and Ulley Brook, east of the A630 and south of the M1, is mapped as vulnerable to flooding from a reservoir breach should this occur. With the implementation of the embedded mitigation set out in the ES Chapter, the significance of adverse effects during the construction phase are all assessed as Negligible (Not Significant).	No
Harthill with Woodall Parish Council, Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council	Concern about impacts to Chesterfield Canal and Broadland Dyke	Impacts on water resources and flood risk are assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]. The Chesterfield Canal crosses the Cable Corridor. Flooding from canals can occur via two primary mechanisms: overtopping or an embankment breach. Because the Chesterfield Canal is a heavily engineered and managed watercourse, water levels are strictly controlled through a series of local locks, sluices, and overflow weirs. While canals can sometimes act as a conduit for broader fluvial flood risk, a review of the available flood mapping confirms the risk of overtopping under normal rainfall, extreme rainfall, or fluvial events is considered low.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Broadridge Dyke feeder passes between parcels 1-3A. One proposed permanent new access track will cross the dyke. The implications of access track watercourse crossings are set out in Section 10.7.18 - 10.7.25 of Chapter 10, which also concludes with the embedded mitigation in place, there will be no Significant impacts to water quantity or quality as a result of watercourse crossings. Access rights for the maintenance of the feeder will also be agreed with Canals and Rivers Trust.	
Bramley Parish Council	Concern about impacts to drainage	Impacts on drainage are assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10] . An outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy [EN0110020/APP/5.17] is submitted with the Application. It includes initial hydraulic calculations, proposed SuDS features, and maintenance plans. This will be developed further throughout the detailed design phase.	No
Catcliffe Parish Council, Treeton Parish Council	Concern about worsening existing flooding at Treeton	Impacts on Treeton are assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10] . The construction phase of the Proposed Development has the potential to temporarily increase surface water runoff rates and volumes. This increase presents a flood risk due to the greater inflows to watercourses.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		As set out in the outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy [EN0110020/APP/5.17] , the Site's access roads will not lead to a substantive increase in impermeable area. Surface water falling on the access roads will runoff to the adjacent ground. However, with implementation of suitable runoff control and flood risk management measures outlined in Section 10.6.38 - 10.6.43, the magnitude of change is assessed as negligible to surface water features of high sensitivity and flood risk of medium sensitivity which is Negligible (Not Significant) in accordance with EIA Regulations.	
Conisbrough Parks Parish Council, Hooton Roberts Parish Meeting	Concern about worsening existing flooding of Kearsley Brook and Conisbrough	Impacts on Kearsley Brook and Conisbrough are assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]. The construction phase of the Proposed Development has the potential to temporarily increase surface water runoff rates and volumes. This increase presents a flood risk due to the greater inflows to watercourses. As set out in the outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy [EN0110020/APP/5.17], the Site's access roads will not lead to a substantive increase in impermeable area. Surface water falling on the access roads will runoff to the adjacent ground. However, with implementation of suitable runoff control and flood risk management measures outlined in Section 10.6.38 - 10.6.43, the magnitude of change is assessed as negligible to	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		surface water features of high sensitivity and flood risk of medium sensitivity which is Negligible (Not Significant) in accordance with EIA Regulations.	
Glint and Glare			
Harthill with Woodall Parish Council	Concern about glint and glare impact on homes	The Applicant has completed a glint and glare assessment, which is included in ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16] . Potential impacts to local homes have been identified, which could be mitigated through a combination of further analysis and screening, so there would be no remaining significant impacts to homes.	No
Harthill with Woodall Parish Council	Concern about glint and glare impact on roads	The Applicant has completed a glint and glare assessment, which is included in ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16] . Potential significant impacts were identified, so the Applicant included additional areas through the targeted consultation described in the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] where landscaping could be included to reduce potential impacts. There are no remaining significant impacts.	Yes
Heritage			
Conisbrough Parks Parish Council, Treeton Parish Council	General concern about impact to heritage	Impacts on heritage assets are assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8] . With the implementation of embedded mitigation measures, as outlined within Section 8.6 of this Chapter, no significant direct effects are predicted	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		at construction, operation and maintenance or decommissioning. No physical indirect significant adverse effects are predicted at construction, operation and maintenance or decommissioning. No Significant Adverse effects are predicted at construction, operation and maintenance or decommissioning. However, Moderate Adverse effects to two Scheduled Monuments are predicted: • 1010828 Conisbrough Castle • 1491751 Conisbrough Parks Romano-British Villa. These effects are considered to be Not Significant in terms of EIA regulations. Moderate Adverse effects have been predicted to Barlborough Registered Park and Garden and Barlborough Conservation Area. These effects are considered as Not Significant in the context of EIA regulations. Minor Adverse effects have been identified at Ulley Conservation Area.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Minor Adverse effects to two Grade II Listed Buildings have also been predicted: • 1314636 Hardwick Hall • 1151523 Manor House. As they are Minor Adverse effects they are, therefore, considered as Not Significant in the context of EIA regulations.	
Ulley Parish Council	Concern about heritage of Ulley	Impacts on heritage assets are assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]. With the implementation of embedded mitigation measures, as outlined within Section 8.6 of this Chapter, no significant direct effects are predicted at construction, operation and maintenance or decommissioning. Minor Adverse effects have been identified at Ulley Conservation Area. As they are Minor Adverse effects they are, therefore, considered as Not Significant in the context of EIA regulations.	No
Treeton Parish Council	Concern about heritage of Treeton	The setting of Conservation Areas such as Treeton has been considered. After the statutory consultation, the Applicant reduced the solar areas around Treeton to push the panels back along the crest of the hill to minimise potential visual impacts. See the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1], Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7] and ES Volume	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		2, Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7] assesses the visual impacts at Treeton and finds the impacts to be not significant.	
Bramley Parish Council	Concern about impact to Bramley conservation area	Impacts on heritage assets are assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8] . With the implementation of embedded mitigation measures, as outlined within Section 8.6 of this Chapter, no significant direct effects are predicted at construction, operation and maintenance or decommissioning.	No
Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council	Concern about impact to historic field boundaries and hedgerows	ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6] includes a detailed assessment of potential effects on trees, woodlands, hedgerows, ancient woodland, veteran trees and other irreplaceable habitats, with avoidance forming a key part of the embedded mitigation strategy. All ancient woodland and veteran trees will be avoided in accordance with current government guidance and the Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3] . An arboricultural survey and Tree Constraints Plan (TCP) have been prepared in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.14: Arboriculture Survey and Tree Constraints Plan [EN0110020/APP/6.20] , with further surveys to be undertaken prior to	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		construction. Protective measures will be implemented through the CEMP, secured via a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] , to ensure compliance with BS5837:2012 during construction, operation and decommissioning. Hedgerows will be retained wherever possible, with existing field gateways used to minimise removals.	
Braithwell with Micklebring Parish Council, Hooton Roberts Parish Meeting, Ravenfield Parish Council	Concern about Roman Villa being recently scheduled	Impacts on heritage assets are assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]. Scheduled Monument 1491751 Conisbrough Parks Romano-British Villa is located in the vicinity of the Proposed Development. There is no large-scale electrical infrastructure in the immediate landscape around the asset. The Proposed Development (W1) would place infrastructure, in the form of solar panels in fields to the south, albeit some 260m removed from the villa site. Solar panels would also be located in fields 80m west of the villa site. Infrastructure will avoid physical disturbance of the asset thus preserving core aspects of its historic and archaeological interest. A Small magnitude of impact is predicted to the Scheduled Monument, resulting in a Moderate Adverse effect. In the context of this monument, this is considered Not Significant. Core aspects of significance, namely the surviving subsurface remains would be unaffected. Setting Impacts would not be of sufficient magnitude to alter the	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		legibility of the monument or introduce a significant adverse effect. Following feedback received during statutory consultation, the villa has been removed from the Order Limits.	
Ravenfield Parish Council	Impact to Conisbrough Castle	Impacts to Conisbrough Castle are assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]. A moderate adverse effect is predicted to the setting of the castle, though this effect is considered to be Not Significant in terms of the EIA Regulations. The Proposed Development (W1) would be visible in views south-west from the upper levels of the castle's keep, with the panels of W1 visible in views beyond the town when looking along the length of the A630 Sheffield Road. The Proposed Development would not be visible from the lower, ground floor levels of the castle (see Statutory and Non-Statutory Historic Assets [EN0110020/APP/2.7]). In relation to its modern setting, only views south-west would be altered. These views, which take in some of the rural periphery of the town and lands associated with the Medieval Estate, would be changed, with the Proposed Development bringing additional infrastructure into views and resulting in further change to the character of the town's periphery. The Proposed Development would only be visible from the upper levels of the Keep, with	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		views unchanged for visitors to the castle at ground level. Any contribution to significance in views south-west lies with the Castle's association with the former Medieval Deer Park, which is located within the Site at W1.	
Conisbrough Parks Parish Council	Impact to Clifton conservation village	The Applicant has made significant changes around Clifton in response to consultation feedback, as described in the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] and Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7] . This includes removing the fields north and west of Clifton in the location around the Roman Villa, and removing the proposed solar and substation to the south of Clifton, as well as removing these fields from the Order Limits altogether.	Yes
Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council, Harthill with Woodall Parish Council	Impact to heritage of Harthill	Impacts on heritage assets are assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8] . This chapter considers the setting of Conservation Areas such as Harthill. Parcels to the west of Harthill Conservation Area have been removed to be more in line with the current bridleway which cuts across the field, after concerns were raised over its proximity and setting. With the implementation of embedded mitigation measures, no significant direct effects are predicted at construction, operation and maintenance or decommissioning.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		No Significant Adverse effects are predicted at construction, operation and maintenance or decommissioning.	
Conisbrough Parks Parish Council	Impact to the Conisbrough Deer Park	Impacts on heritage assets are assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]. Conisbrough Park (02958/01) is currently designated as a non-designated asset in terms of significance. Its description in the HER record acknowledges that its existence is known primarily through documentary sources and also acknowledges its changing use and form through economic and social changes. Whilst a recently found small ditch supports its historic use as a deer park, its current value as a deer park is low, due to its physical form having undergone many changes. Therefore, whilst the deer park is acknowledged, it is assessed as part of the Conisbrough Castle Setting assessment.	No
Land and soils			
Bramley Parish Council	Concern about impact to soil quality	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding the loss of agricultural land and has sought to avoid and minimise the use of best and most versatile (BMV) land where possible. The majority of the Site comprises non-BMV Subgrade 3b land (78.86%). ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9] , and ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20] confirms that only	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		a small proportion of the Site comprises BMV land, and this is largely not subject to permanent infrastructure, with the exception of approximately 0.4 ha associated with a substation compound. The ALC across the Order Limits (excluding the Cable Corridors) is as follows: • 0.94% of Grade 1 Agricultural Land; • 7.06% of Grade 2 Agricultural Land; • 11.16% of Subgrade 3a Agricultural Land; • 78.86% of Subgrade 3b Agricultural Land; • 0.32% of Grade 4 Agricultural Land; • 0.67% of Urban Land; • 0.13% of Non-Agricultural Land; and • 0.85% of Not Surveyed Land. In summary, of the area surveyed, 19% is comprised of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land, although in the majority of instances better quality grades show high spatial variability within larger areas of ALC subgrade 3b. BMV classification data for W1, W2 and W3, based on Site surveys and sampling, and for the Cable Corridors, based on a desk-based review, is provided in section 9.5 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9], including tabulated areas. The ALC survey is detailed in ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP6.20].	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Due to the presence of PV arrays and restricted access during the operational phase, the land will become grassland suitable for grazing rather than for arable purposes for the duration of the Proposed Development. It is anticipated that removal of this land from arable use for the duration of the Proposed Development will lead to improved soil structure, carbon content and fertility, supporting improved biodiversity, as the land will be rested from intensive farming practices such as ploughing, harvesting or chemical inputs, allowing natural recovery processes to take place. Therefore, there is no permanent loss of soil function over the great majority of the Proposed Development. Further information can be found in ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.19].	
Conisbrough Parks Parish Council	Concern that ALC survey results are different to common knowledge and DEFRA	To assess the agricultural quality of soils within the Site, intrusive ALC surveys have been undertaken in line with Natural England guidance. More information regarding ALC survey methodology and results can be found within ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.19] .	No
Land agreements & CPO			
Treeton Parish Council	Concern about landowners making a profit from the proposals	In the site selection process, the Applicant sought land that would be suitable for solar and landowners who wanted to be part of the Proposed Development. The Applicant has entered into commercial agreements with these landowners to	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		lease their land for use in the Proposed Development, though the details of those agreements are private. Farming can be a difficult financial venture. In many cases, solar farms can help farmers to diversify their finances in order to support ongoing agriculture in other locations.	
Harthill with Woodall Parish Council	Concern that landowners don't live in the area so do not know enough about the area when leasing their land for solar	The Applicant has established design principles to ensure that the Proposed Development is developed in a way that is sensitive to local communities and the environment, see Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]. This included multiple rounds of consultation with technical stakeholders and local communities to seek feedback that has led to significant changes to the Proposed Development, see the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]. Thus the residency of the landowners is not relevant, the Applicant has consulted and engaged with the relevant stakeholders to ensure local feedback is considered.	No
Treeton Parish Council	Concerns about potential use of compulsory acquisition powers	The Applicant is seeking to reach voluntary agreements with all land-owners. The Applicant has already negotiated and completed property agreements with the freehold owners of the land comprising the Site, which represents the significant majority of the Order Land. The Applicant is in negotiations to enter into voluntary agreements with the remaining freehold owners of the land comprising the Order limits where voluntary agreements are considered necessary. The Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		[EN0110020/APP/4.4] provides more information on the status of these negotiations. Compulsory acquisition powers are included in the DCO application in case it is not possible to secure voluntary agreements with all landowners, and, thus, to ensure deliverability of the Proposed Development. Feedback from land interests has led to design changes, including the decisions to reduce optionality in the cable corridors and other changes to the Order Limits. See the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1].	
Landscape and Visual Impact			
Firbeck Parish Council, Treeton Parish Council	General concern about visual impact	Through the design process, the Applicant has sought to minimise visual impacts by removing panels to create offsets around homes, villages, public rights of way, and other key locations, resulting a 37% reduction in developable areas as compared to the original design (See Design Approach Document [[EN0110020/APP/5.7]]). Where it was not possible or practical to further reduce panels, the Applicant has included landscaping to create a natural screening to reduce impacts, as shown in the Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7] and managed by the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/7.6]. The remaining visual impact is assessed in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7], which finds some remaining significant impacts.	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Treeton Parish Council, Anston Parish Council, Bramley Parish Council	General concern about impacts to countryside views	Through the design process, the Applicant has sought to minimise visual impacts by removing panels to create offsets around homes, villages, public rights of way, and other key locations, resulting a 37% reduction in developable areas as compared to the original design (See Design Approach Document [[EN0110020/APP/5.7]). Where it was not possible or practical to further reduce panels, the Applicant has included landscaping to create a natural screening to reduce impacts, as shown in the Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7] and managed by the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/7.6]. The remaining visual impact is assessed in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7], which finds some remaining significant impacts.	Yes
Bramley Parish Council, Conisbrough Parks Parish Council, Harthill with Woodall Parish Council, Ulley Parish Council, Wickersley Parish Council	Concern about visual impact from PRowS	Through the design process, the Applicant has sought to minimise visual impacts around public rights of way by including a 15m offset between PRowS and solar panels, while also seeking to remove panels from a field on one side of the PRow altogether, whenever possible. (See Design Approach Document [[EN0110020/APP/5.7]). Where it was not possible or practical to further reduce panels, the Applicant has included landscaping to create a natural screening to reduce impacts, as shown in the Illustrative Masterplan (ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1) [EN0110020/APP/6.19] and managed by the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13].	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		The remaining visual impact is assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7] , which finds some remaining significant impacts to PROWs.	
Bramley Parish Council, Hooton Roberts Parish Meeting, Treeton Parish Council, Wickersley Parish Council	Concern that mitigation is not sufficient for potential impacts	The Applicant has sought to minimise visual impacts first by removing solar panels around homes, villages, and public rights of way, resulting in a 37% reduction in developable areas as compared to the original design. (See Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]). Where it was not possible or practical to further reduce panels, the Applicant has included landscaping to create a natural screening to reduce impacts, as shown in the Illustrative Masterplan (ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1) [EN0110020/APP/6.19] and managed by the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] . The remaining visual impact is assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7] , which finds some remaining significant impacts.	No
Conisbrough Parks Parish Council, Hooton Roberts Parish Meeting, Ravenfield Parish Council	Concern about visual impact to Conisbrough Parks	The Applicant has made significant changes to the Proposed Development around Conisbrough Parks to reduce potential visual impacts, as described in the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] and Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7] . The remaining visual impact is assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7] , which finds some remaining significant impacts at viewpoints along Spring Bank Road, PRoW No 16, Clifton, Millenium Viewpoint, and Bridleway No 4 and No 2.	
Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council, Harthill with Woodall Parish Council	Concern about viewpoints around Harthill and Woodall	The Applicant has made significant changes to the Proposed Development around Harthill and Woodall to reduce potential visual impacts, as described in the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] and Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7] . The remaining visual impact is assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7] , which finds no remaining significant impacts in this area.	Yes
Wickersley Parish Council	Concern about impact to Winthrop Gardens	The visual impact around Wickersley and Slacks Farm is assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7] , which finds no remaining significant impacts in this area.	No
Treeton Parish Council	Concern about visual impact from Treeton	The Applicant has made changes to the Proposed Development around Treeton to reduce potential visual impacts, as described in the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] and Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7] . The remaining visual impact is assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7] , which finds no remaining significant impacts in this area.	Yes
Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council	Concerns that screening will take time to mature	The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		assesses potential visual impacts at two time periods: Year 1, represents the worst case scenario after construction is complete but before landscaping has had time to grow in, and Year 15 represents the time after landscaping should have become established. The chapter shows that several impacts that are identified at Year 1 have reduced by Year 15 due to the screening having time to mature.	
Masterplanning			
Anston Parish Council, Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council, Bramley Parish Council, Conisbrough Parks Parish Council, Harthill with Woodall Parish Council, Todwick Parish Council, Treeton Parish Council, Ulley Parish Council, Wickersley Parish Council	Objection to the size & scale of the proposals	Large scale solar developments are also needed to produce enough energy to meet our national energy goals. The Applicant has a grid connection agreement with National Grid for up to 750MW, and in order to meet this, the Proposed Development needed to be large scale. Through the design process, the Applicant has sought to minimise visual impacts by removing panels to create offsets around homes, villages, public rights of way, and other key locations, resulting a 37% reduction in developable areas as compared to the original design (See Design Approach Document [[EN0110020/APP/5.7]). Where it was not possible or practical to further reduce panels, the Applicant has included landscaping to create a natural screening to reduce impacts, as shown in the Illustrative Masterplan (ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1) [EN0110020/APP/6.19] and managed by the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/7.6].	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		The remaining visual impact is assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7] , which finds some remaining significant impacts.	
Catcliffe Parish Council, Harthill with Woodall Parish Council, Hooton Roberts Parish Meeting, Ulley Parish Council, Wickersley Parish Council, Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council	Concern about impacts to PRowS and permissive paths	Through the design process, the Applicant has sought to minimise visual impacts around public rights of way by including a 15m offset between PRowS and solar panels, while also seeking to remove panels from a field on one side of the PRow altogether, whenever possible. (See Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]). Where it was not possible or practical to further reduce panels, the Applicant has included landscaping to create a natural screening to reduce impacts, as shown in the Illustrative Masterplan (ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1) [EN0110020/APP/6.19] and managed by the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]. The remaining visual impact is assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7], which finds some remaining significant impacts to PRowS.	Yes
Wales Parish Council	Concern about PRowS between Harthill and Kiveton	The Applicant has made significant changes to the Proposed Development around Harthill and Kiveton, as described in the Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7] . This includes the addition of a new permissive path to connect Harthill and Woodall as shown on the Illustrative Masterplan (ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1) [EN0110020/APP/6.19] . Public rights of way would	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		all remain open, other than temporary closures which may be needed for safety reasons during construction, and would be managed by the Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.14] .	
Ulley Parish Council	Concern about cable and battery locations being too close to Ulley	The Applicant selected the location for the primary substation and battery to be sited along the M1 and near Upper Whiston in part because it is as close as possible to the grid connection point, and noise would be minimised by proximity to the motorway (See Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7] and ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]). There are no cable corridors in the area around Ulley, as shown in the Illustrative Masterplan (ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1) [EN0110020/APP/6.19] .	No
Ravenfield Parish Council	Concern about the size of the cable routes	The cable corridors currently shown on the Illustrative Masterplan (ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1) [EN0110020/APP/6.19] are search corridors which will be narrowed through further assessments and engagement. A much smaller area is needed for the construction and cables themselves and after construction, normal activities could continue above them, see also ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4] .	No
Hooton Roberts Parish Meeting	Concern that Firsby would be disconnected from Hooton Roberts by the Proposed Development	The Applicant has made significant changes around Firsby in response to consultation feedback, as described in the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] and Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7] . This	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		includes removing solar from both sides of the PRoW that connects Firsby and Hooton Roberts, and removing these fields from the Order Limits altogether.	
Treeton Parish Council	Requests for removal of panels near Treeton	Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has made further changes around Treeton, including the removal a line of solar panels between Treeton and crest of the hill that may have been viewable by some properties in Treeton. See the Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7] .	Yes
Noise & vibration			
Harthill with Woodall Parish Council	Concern about noise from PCS units	There will be no more than a 5db increase in nighttime noise above base levels, therefore there is no significant impact. Operational noise effects in connection with the container inverters are assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]. The design principles (ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]) for the Proposed Development have been established to prioritise locating potential sources of noise as far as reasonably practicable from noise sensitive receptors. Power conversion stations would be located less than 100m away from residential properties where practicable Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3].	Yes
Harthill with Woodall Parish Council	Concern about noise impact of rain on panels	Noise from rain falling on the solar panels has not been assessed in the ES. This is because it is extremely unlikely that noise caused by rain falling	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		on the solar panels will result in audible noise that can be distinguished from rainfall on other hard surfaces (e.g. roofs of buildings, hardstanding, etc.) at noise sensitive receptor locations.	
Wickersley Parish Council	Concern about noise impacts to Winthrop Gardens	The noise assessment in ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14] identifies multiple noise monitoring locations, including locations near Winthrop Gardens. The results of the assessment concluded that there are no significant impacts at any location.	
Harthill with Woodall Parish Council	Concern that noise mitigation would have visual impact	Noise mitigation is included in the parameters for the PCS units, which can be viewed in the Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3] and which found no significant visual impacts as per ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7] . The noise mitigation required has therefore been considered by the Applicant as having no significant visual impacts.	No
Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council	General concern about operational noise	The components of the solar farm that make noise are the power conversion stations, the batteries, and the substations. The batteries and substations have been selection in locations to minimise noise impacts and would be at least 300m from homes. The power conversion stations would be located at least 100m from homes and 50m from public rights of way, where practicable as defined in the Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3] . Operational noise effects are assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14] . No assessment locations	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		are expected to rating levels which exceed +5 dB above background, and therefore not triggering the potential for adverse impacts which could result in significant effects. Operational noise impacts for all receptors are either Negligible or Minor, which would be Not Significant in EIA Regulation terms.	
Planning			
Bramley Parish Council	Concern about the change in requirements from 50MW to 100MW for an NSIP	The Proposed Development is larger than 100MW, so it would be considered an NSIP using either threshold.	No
Firbeck Parish Council	Concern the project is described as one development	The Planning Act 2008 establishes that energy projects larger than 100MW are considered Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects. The Proposed Development has one grid connection point and is therefore considered to be a single development. Please see ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5] for description of the Proposed Development.	No
Safety & security			
Harthill with Woodall Parish Council	Concern about how emergency services could access site	The Applicant has considered emergency vehicle access around the battery site in the oBSMP [EN0110020/APP/5.15] to ensure there is room in the access design for safe manoeuvring.	No
Harthill with Woodall Parish Council	Concern about safety and risk of theft of panels	Security measures, such as fencing and CCTV, are included in the Proposed Development to prevent theft, as specified in the Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3] .	No
Socio-economics			

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Wickersley Parish Council	Concern about impact on local economy due to reduced tourism	The potential effects of the Proposed Development on tourism are assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation, and Land-Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15]. The Applicant has carried out assessments for the impact of the Proposed Development during the construction phase. Any adverse impacts will be temporary in nature, while there are no significant effects predicted from disruption to the PRoW network or from construction noise. Increase in demand for temporary accommodation is expected to be small and potentially beneficial, and there is likely to be enough capacity to absorb increased demand. The construction impact on tourism is expected to result in a Minor Adverse (Not Significant) effect overall. There is not expected to be an impact on tourism during the operational and maintenance phase of the Proposed Development. Users of the majority of PRoWs within the Study Area would not experience Significant visual effects during operation.	No
Wales Parish Council	Concern about impacts to property values	The potential economic effects of the Proposed Development are assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation, and Land-Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Potential impacts on residential or commercial property values were scoped out of the EIA assessment as these matters are beyond the scope of EIA regulations and difficult to attribute to the Proposed Development. However, the Applicant has made significant changes in response to consultation feedback to remove solar panels and create bespoke offsets around homes and villages to reduce potential visual impacts. Please see the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] and Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7] .	
Transport & access			
Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council, Bramley Parish Council, Conisbrough Parks Parish Council, Dalton Parish Council, Todwick Parish Council, Treeton Parish Council, Wales Parish Council, Wickersley Parish Council	Concerns about general disruption and increase in traffic due to construction	During the statutory consultation, the Applicant presented the draft Transport Statement and received feedback specifically about several access points and potential impacts to local roads. In response, the Applicant removed the proposed access point near Clifton, moved the access point on the A630 further down the road to reduce cumulative impacts with the housing development, and added another access point near Treeton to split construction traffic traveling down Long Lane. See Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] . The updated Transport Statement (ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2) [EN0110020/APP/6.20] includes trip generation, routeing and calculations and oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12] . The assessment uses the trip generation detail provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20] and	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		the mitigation measures outlined in the oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12] , which is secured by a requirement in the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] . The Applicant would mitigate the potential impacts of construction traffic with the mitigation measures in these documents.	
Harthill with Woodall Parish Council, Ravenfield Parish Council, Todwick Parish Council, Treeton Parish Council, Wickersley Parish Council	Concern about road safety for pedestrians and equestrians	ES Volume 3, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13] details the baseline collision data in the Study Area. Further details are set out in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20] including locations of the collisions for key junctions along the routes within the Study Area. The full result of the assessment is shown in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.4: Road User and Pedestrian Safety Data [EN0110020/APP/6.20] . The assessments conclude that the construction of the Proposed Development will result in a Negligible magnitude of impact on road user and pedestrian safety.	No
Bramley Parish Council, Harthill with Woodall Parish Council, Todwick Parish Council	Concern about lack of information around traffic management	Further detail on access strategy is included in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20] . The Applicant has submitted an oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12] with the Application. This document will form the basis of the CTMP which will be provided prior to the commencement of construction works. Full details of embedded	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		mitigation measures are presented in Section 4 and Section 5 of the oCTMP.	
Edlington Town Council, Hooton Roberts Parish Meeting, Ravenfield Parish Council	Concern about using Doncaster Road (A630) for access	In response to feedback from the statutory consultation and ongoing engagement with local highways, the Applicant has moved this access point further along the A630 to minimise potential cumulative impacts with the housing development at this location. See the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]. The Applicant notes the importance of maintaining safety on the A630 and has engaged with the LHA on the proposed concept access design. The Transport Statement (ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2) [EN0110020/APP/6.20] provides estimates of vehicle volumes considered, and known crash data.	Yes
Catcliffe Parish Council, Treeton Parish Council	Concern about use of Long Lane for access	In the statutory consultation, the Applicant received feedback about the proposed access point on Long Lane. In response, the Applicant added an additional access point to the south of this solar area, to reduce the construction traffic at the access point on Long Lane. See the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]. The Transport Statement (ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2) [EN0110020/APP/6.20] provides estimates of vehicle volumes considered at these locations. The percentage increase in HGV traffic on this link is primarily due to the low baseline flows (11 HGVs per day), whilst the magnitude of the predicted	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		increase is low in absolute terms (an additional 6 HGVs per day over the baseline). The increases in HGV traffic would only occur during the peak month of construction with no construction related HGVs associated with the Cable Corridor of the Proposed Development using this route. The change in HGV traffic is temporary, fully reversible and would only occur during peak month of construction. The proposed HGV routing along Long Lane indicates that HGVs will only be travelling along the north section of the road and will not travel through the settlement of Treeton. To effectively minimise any potential adverse effect on severance at this location, a number of measures are proposed as part of the oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12].	
Anston Parish Council	Concern about access off the A57	After the statutory consultation, the Applicant presented proposed changes to the Order Limits in a targeted consultation. This included Change 20, which provides for more road safety works at the access point on the A57 to ensure highway safety standards. See Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]. Preliminary vehicle tracking and visibility splay assessments in accordance with the relevant design guidance have been undertaken to inform the development of the proposed access strategy and to confirm that the accesses are capable of	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		accommodating the anticipated construction vehicles. Detailed access proposals will be developed and be supported, where appropriate, by Road Safety Audits undertaken at the detailed design stage following consent via a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. When the proposed routings of each PV Site and Cable Corridor are combined, a maximum of 215 daily two-way HGVs are expected on a single road within the Study Area (A57) as a worst-case scenario (both peak periods occurring at the same time). Over a 10-hour delivery window, the worst-case construction related HGV trips would be equivalent to approximately 22 two-way movements (11 inbound and 11 outbound) per hour. Further detail on access strategy is included in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20].	
Conisbrough Parks Parish Council	Concern about closing PROWs during construction and impact on emergency services	Access to PROWs supports mental and physical health. The Proposed Development has been designed to retain PROWs with continued access to the wider countryside along at least one side of the route or through appropriately sized corridors, as secured in the Works Plans [EN0110020/APP/2.3]. PROWs will remain open during construction, with only temporary closures or minor diversions where necessary (as set out in	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Outline PRow Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.14] . As a result, no adverse effects on human health from access to physical activity are anticipated.	
Conisbrough Parks Parish Council	Concern about whether construction traffic would impact the access of the emergency services.	Appropriate vehicle turning provision will be incorporated within the access/internal design, where required, to enable safe manoeuvring of emergency service vehicles. Access arrangements will be developed in accordance with guidance published by South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue and relevant national best practice guidance, including fire service access requirements issued by the National Fire Chiefs Council.	Yes
Edlington Town Council	Concern about pedestrian tunnel under A630 for TransPennine Trail	The Applicant has committed to retaining existing PRowS. During construction, there may be a requirement to temporarily close some PRowS, with temporary diversions provided for safety reasons. These closures and diversions would be managed via a Public Rights of Way Management Plan (PRowMP). An outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.14] has been submitted with the Application.	No
Ravenfield Parish Council, Conisbrough Parks Parish Council	Concern about the proposed access point near Clifton	During the statutory consultation, the Applicant presented the draft Transport Statement and received feedback specifically about several access points and potential impacts to local roads. In response, the Applicant removed the proposed access point near Clifton, moved the access point on the A630 further down the road to reduce cumulative impacts with the housing development,	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		and added another access point near Treeton to split construction traffic traveling down Long Lane. See Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] . The updated Transport Statement (ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2) [EN0110020/APP/6.20] includes trip generation, routeing and calculations and oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12] .	
Edlington Town Council	Concern about using B6376 for access	Based on feedback from the statutory consultation, the Applicant has removed the proposed substation that was located on Ruddle Lane, south of Clifton in response to concerns including traffic and safety impacts in this location (e.g. to local horse riding groups). Therefore, this access point is no longer needed and has been removed from the Proposed Development. See the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] and the Transport Statement (ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2) [EN0110020/APP/6.20] for further information.	Yes
Harthill with Woodall Parish Council	Concern about traffic impacts around Harthill	Traffic and transport impacts are considered in ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]. Sensitive receptors were identified at the following locations near Harthill, which were subject to Automatic Traffic Counts and assessed as part of the EIA process: • ATC 61: Hard Lane (South) • ATC 62: Woodall Lane Following assessment of traffic generated by the Proposed Development, both of these ATCs were subject to further assessment as part of the EIA	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		process. In no cases are any major adverse effects predicted for either ATC. In summary, the effects are predicted to be: • Non-motorised User Amenity: Large magnitude, moderate significance • Non-motorised Road User Delay: Large magnitude, moderate significance • Severance: Large magnitude, moderate significance • Fear and Intimidation: Negligible magnitude, negligible significance Further detail on access strategy is included in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. The Applicant has submitted an outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.12] with the Application. This document will form the basis of the CTMP which will be provided prior to the commencement of construction works. Full details of embedded mitigation measures are presented in Section 4 and Section 5 of the oCTMP.	
Wickersley Parish Council	Concern about traffic on Flash Lane	Traffic and transport impacts are considered in ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13] . Potential effects at Flash Lane (ATC 19) are assessed in Section 13.7.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		The relevant thresholds for percentage increases in traffic flows have been exceeded at ATC 19, meaning it was therefore subject to additional assessment as part of the EIA process. In no cases are any moderate or major adverse effects predicted for Flash Lane. In summary, the effects are predicted to be: • Non-motorised User Amenity: Negligible magnitude, minor significance • Non-motorised Road User Delay: Negligible magnitude, minor significance • Severance: Negligible magnitude, minor significance • Fear and Intimidation: Negligible magnitude, minor significance Further detail on access strategy is included in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. The Applicant has submitted an outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.12] with the Application. This document will form the basis of the CTMP which will be provided prior to the commencement of construction works. Full details of embedded	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		mitigation measures are presented in Section 4 and Section 5 of the oCTMP.	
Todwick Parish Council	Concern about traffic on Kiveton Lane	Traffic and transport impacts are considered in ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]. Sensitive receptors were identified at the following locations near Todwick, which were subject to Automatic Traffic Counts and assessed as part of the EIA process: • ATC 47: Kiveton Lane, located between the A57 and Todwick • ATC 59: Kiveton Lane, located between Kiveton Park and Todwick While no effects at ATC59 are projected to be of major significance, ATC is predicted to experience major significant effects from non-motorised user delay and severance as a result of the Proposed Development. Mitigation measures will be implemented during the construction phase to minimise disruption and manage the adverse effects of the construction activities. The Applicant has submitted an outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.12] with the Application. This document will form the basis of the CTMP which will be provided prior to the commencement of construction works. Full details of embedded	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		mitigation measures are presented in Section 4 and Section 5 of the oCTMP.	
Edlington Town Council	Concern about whether adverse weather has been considered for road safety	Traffic and transport impacts are considered in ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13] . Year-round weather conditions, including adverse weather where necessary, have been included in the assessment.	No
Wales Parish Council	Concern about who would pay for impact to local roads	The Applicant would perform condition assessments of the road in suitable locations pre-construction, to understand the baseline condition, and support in delivering repairs if required as a result of the Proposed Development's construction. Highway Works are sections of the highway network that will contain localised improvements, such as improvements to road edge where it is deteriorated, or temporary highway and traffic works required to safely accommodate the Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) deliveries. More information is in ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13] .	
Edlington Town Council	Concern about working hours impacting school opening and closing times	Where possible, routes have been planned to avoid road links with weight, height or width restrictions, as well as environmentally sensitive areas such as schools, active travel links and PRowS.	No
Edlington Town Council	Concern that there is not a Public Rights of Way Management Plan	An Outline PRow Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.14] has been submitted as part of the DCO application.	No
Edlington Town Council	Concern that there is no way to mitigate traffic impacts	Further detail on access strategy is included in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20] .	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		The Applicant has submitted an outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.12] with the Application. This document will form the basis of the CTMP which will be provided prior to the commencement of construction works. Full details of embedded mitigation measures are presented in Section 4 and Section 5 of the oCTMP.	
Catcliffe Parish Council	Request to consider Pleasley Road for access	In the statutory consultation, the Applicant received feedback about the proposed access point on Long Lane. In response, the Applicant added an additional access point to the south of this solar area on Wood Lane, to reduce the construction traffic at the access point on Long Lane, allowing for further flexibility for routing. See the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] for further information. The Transport Statement (ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2) [EN0110020/APP/6.20] provides estimates of vehicle volumes considered at these locations.	No
Wickersley Parish Council	Request to use Cumwell Lane for access	Using an access point off Cumwell Lane would not be possible as there would not be access to the Proposed Development from this point, as the cable corridor through here has been removed since the draft ES was produced, in response to consultation.	No
Supply Chain			
Treeton Parish Council	Concerns solar panels will come from China with forced labour implications	The applicant is committed to ensuring that all procurement activity undertaken in connection with the project is conducted in accordance with the highest ethical standards.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		All international suppliers will be required to meet the minimum standards of environmental, professional, and ethical working practice as established and agreed by the members of Solar Energy UK. These standards include, but are not limited to, the prohibition of suppliers or manufacturers that engage in slavery, forced labour, or any related form of exploitation. Compliance with these standards will be a condition of appointment and will be subject to ongoing due diligence throughout the project. Wider socio-economic considerations are assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socioeconomics, Tourism and Recreation and Land-Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15].	

Appendix E1.2 Feedback from s42(1)(b) consultees and Applicant Responses

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Amber Valley Borough Council	Thank you for your letter received on the 10th September 2025. Having reviewed the content of your letter, I am able to advise that the Borough Council has no comments to make in relation to the above development.	Noted.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Bolsover District Council	This Council had previously raised comments in respect of the proposals on 21st May 2025 in respect of some apparent shortcomings in the heritage information included with that earlier consultation. We note that this has been acknowledged, and steps taken to address this in the submitted heritage impact assessment documentation. We specifically note that regard is now had to the existence of the Grade 1 Listed Barlborough Hall (Historic England List Entry Number: 1108972). The heritage impact analysis carried out to date appears to be thorough and correctly identifies all relevant designated assets that may potentially be affected within this District Council area. The anticipated impacts on those assets have been identified with initial assessments undertaken, along with a commitment to use further assessment tools, including more detailed viewpoint analysis from the upper floors of the Grade 1 Hall, which will form part of the final documentation to be submitted with the upcoming DCO application. The District Council is generally satisfied with the quality of the works undertaken and note that it has been identified that there will be impact on Heritage Assets within this district area.	Noted.	No
Chesterfield Borough Council	Chesterfield Borough Council has considered the Consultation Materials and has no comments to make.	Noted.	No
Derby City	It is sufficiently remote from Derby city that I would have no further interest.	Noted.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	It is understood that National Grid are currently undergoing consultation on plans for the development of this new substation which the Applicant expects to be operational in time for the proposed development to connect in 2029. CDC understands therefore that this substation is therefore not included in the proposed development subject to this consultation and will be subject to a separate planning application taken forward by National Grid. As an overarching fundamental point, CDC would question the logic of bringing forward the solar project submission before planning permission has been secured for the new National Grid substation as the scheme would appear to be predicated on that separate project coming forward for which there is no certainty. On this basis, there is a strong argument to say the project in its entirety is premature. CDC is aware that the Examining Authority has raised a similar issue in respect of the Springwell Solar Farm, where the Examination has just closed. In that case, it is understood that the Examining Authority has made clear that in the event the DCO is granted, no part of the development should take place until planning permission has been granted for the National Grid Navenby Substation. Moreover, in the case of Whitestone, the Brinsworth site is located a significant distance from Whitestone 1, which brings into question the logic of including it within the Order limits at all, from both a logistical and environmental impact perspective. The sheer distance involved in connecting Whitestone 1 to a new National Grid substation at Brinsworth would involve such	The existing National Grid Brinsworth substation has sufficient capacity to accommodate the Proposed Development. However, National Grid is progressing reinforcement works, including a new 400kV substation at Long Lane as part of the wider Great Grid Upgrade. The Applicant's connection agreement reflects this updated infrastructure plan. The new substation is National Grid's responsibility and is subject to a Town and Country Planning Act 1990 application submitted to Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council in November 2025 (ref. RB2025/1468). Paragraph 4.11.8 of NPS EN-1 recognises that "<i>it may not be possible to coordinate applications</i>" and, together with paragraph 4.11.9, sets out the requirements for applicants in such circumstances. The Applicant has addressed these requirements, including demonstrating that there is no clear reason why the Long Lane 400kV substation application should be refused. However, if consent for the Long Lane substation is not granted, then National Grid has confirmed that the existing Brinsworth substation has sufficient capacity to provide a connection. It is worth noting that Springwell Solar Farm, which was granted consent in April 2026, confirms that the Secretary of State states that "<i>the Applicant has a grid connection agreement with National Grid Electricity Transmission ("NGET") to export power to the National Electricity Transmission System [ER</i>	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	extensive works through cable routing connections, which will only serve to exacerbate harmful impacts to the area. CDC therefore strongly questions the rationale for this approach.	4.3.36] and that NGET, as a regulated business, has a legal obligation to meet any requests for new power connections from developers that make such requests". Therefore indicating that should the Long Lane 400kV substation be refused, National Grid are legally obliged to connect the Proposed Development to the existing Brinsworth Substation. Regarding CDC's comment on the distance between Whitestone 1 and Brinsworth, Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment of the Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4] confirms that proximity to the point of connection was a key consideration when assessing sites within the 12km search area. Whitestone 1 emerged as one of the closest and most suitable locations for the Proposed Development. The Environmental Statement also demonstrates that the connection to Brinsworth results in minimal impacts on the surrounding area, as all cable works are underground.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	CDC acknowledges the need to increase renewable energy generation and in 2019 declared a climate and biodiversity emergency. Policy 58 of the Doncaster Local Plan (2021) sets out the strategy for supporting the development of (inter alia) solar farms. Notwithstanding this, CDC would like to record that in general terms it remains concerned, and has significant reservations, about the number of proposals coming forward incrementally for solar farms of varying scales across its administrative area, particularly in areas in proximity to Whitestone 1 which are intrinsically rural in character and altogether less well connected in terms of supporting infrastructure.	An inter-cumulative (between different projects) effects assessment has been completed for each technical topic, and is provided in each technical chapter of the ES (ES Volume 2, Chapters 6 to 16 [EN0110020/APP/6.6 – 6.16]). These effects are also summarised in ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN0110020/APP/6.17]. Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment of the Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4] confirms that cumulative impacts were considered by the Applicant. A range of additional factors also informed the identification of the Order Limits as the preferred location for the Proposed Development, with the primary driver being the grid connection at the National Grid Long Lane 400kV Substation. As set out in Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment of the Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4], the Applicant assessed a number of sites which demonstrates that Whitestone 1 is a suitable and policy-supported location for solar development, contributing to the UK Government's 2030 clean energy objectives.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	Furthermore, CDC considers that at this stage of the Project, there is a stark and fundamental omission from the Applicant's supporting evidence insofar that there is no overt breakdown in the level of energy that could be generated by each of the distinct parcels comprising the Order limits. CDC would therefore question the amount of energy capable of being generated specifically by Whitestone 1 when compared to Whitestone 2 and 3. This is important to quantify given that if this Project progresses to Examination there will need to be an evidenced based balancing exercise undertaken, effectively offsetting the benefits of allowing the Project (which are founded principally in renewable energy generation) against all relevant adverse impacts, which in the case of Whitestone 1 are many. Even the Draft ES itself describes the Project as being of a disassociated nature meaning that the likely significant impacts in each topic area have been based upon the findings associated with each of the individual areas of Whitestone 1, 2 and 3 and the cable corridor options. With this in mind, CDC submits that it is not enough to generally assert that the Project would bring about benefits from the generation of 750 megawatts (MW) of energy as a whole; to do so effectively warps, and vastly overstates, the benefits arising when viewed against the harms arising to Whitestone 1.	Throughout the pre-application period, the Applicant has received feedback consultation and ongoing stakeholder engagement to identify potential significant issues and address them wherever possible. For the Proposed Development as a whole, this has resulted in a reduction in the developable area of 37%, but for Whitestone 1, this has resulted in a larger reduction of 49% in order to reduce potential visual impacts as well as on consideration of heritage and ecologically sensitive areas. The mission statement for the Proposed Development is: <i>"to embed good design by maximising the amount of clean energy generated to export to the National Grid, crafting a development that is socially and environmentally sensitive; engaging in meaningful conversation with communities and taking account of people's visual amenity. The project will embed sustainability and resilience, enhancing biodiversity and recreational access across the landscape".</i> Thus, the balance of producing sufficient levels of renewable energy while reducing potential impacts has been key to the design process. (See the Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]) The Proposed Development must be viable, and elimination of Whitestone 1 would threaten the Proposed Development's ability to be operationally viable.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Interim Baseline Biodiversity Net Gain Report (EN0110020) sets out that the Applicant is committed to delivering a minimum of 10% BNG for the proposed development, albeit caveating that the areas to be allocated for habitat creation and enhancements are still presently under consideration. CDC considers that expressing an intention to achieve a 10% minimum gain does not go far enough and would expect to understand the detailed gains that would be secured, rather than simply stating a minimum to be achieved. It is understood that this more detailed approach is what the Secretary of State is increasingly expecting from these projects, and as such it should be addressed at this stage rather than further along in the Examination process.	The creation of new habitats and enhancements to existing habitats within the Site will ensure that the forthcoming statutory BNG of 10% will be exceeded. Recent planning changes now recognise this percentage threshold at policy level. The expected BNG is detailed within ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20] and a requirement within Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] will secure two thirds of the BNG. The strengthening of existing habitat features and habitat connectivity through enhancements and management, along with new habitat creation prescriptions are detailed in the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13], which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	No
City of Doncaster Council	Furthermore, given the specific nature of the Project overall, with the Order limits comprising three very separate and distinct land parcels, CDC's expectation would be for each of the parcels to be appraised individually for their biodiversity net gain opportunities, and for those to be clearly set out and quantified separately within the final ES, and the DCO itself.	The creation of new habitats and enhancements to existing habitats within the Site will ensure that the forthcoming statutory BNG of 10% will be exceeded. Recent planning changes now recognise this percentage threshold at policy level. The expected BNG is detailed Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20] and a requirement within Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] will secure two thirds of the BNG. The strengthening of existing habitat features and habitat connectivity through enhancements and	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		management, along with new habitat creation prescriptions are detailed in the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] , which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] .	
City of Doncaster Council	It is also understood that an Outline Biodiversity Gain Plan will be submitted as part of the DCO application. CDC would expect to be given the opportunity to comment on this outline plan at the very earliest opportunity. In terms of the management and monitoring of habitat enhancements over the life of the project, CDC would expect the Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) and/or DCO itself to include provision for a monitoring fee to be paid to the Council. CDC actively reviews monitoring reports when they are submitted and would expect to do so in this case in the same way. CDC would welcome discussions on the mechanism for achieving this at the earliest opportunity	The strengthening of existing habitat features and habitat connectivity through enhancements and management, along with new habitat creation prescriptions are detailed in the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]. The oLEMP also includes details on agreed monitoring, frequency of monitoring, reporting and report review periods. The expected BNG is detailed within ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Further reference to the oLEMP and embedded mitigation is made in ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6] where reference is made to statutory BNG and legal agreements.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	Firstly, CDC would highlight that the selection process for the cable corridor route is fundamentally flawed in that habitat type does not appear to be a factor in the consideration process, but rather consideration of impacts will follow once a route has been agreed. Habitats such as woodlands should be avoided as cable trenching in woodlands can be extremely disruptive and may result in much wider and extensive impacts than anticipated. This should be taken into account before a final route option is decided upon, rather than an approach which seeks to mitigate impacts arising once a route has been selected. A question is raised as to whether the impact on habitats would only be felt in the short-term as suggested, and whether therefore those impacts could reasonably be concluded to be of low impact for the operational life of the project. This matter should be revisited in the assessments taking place.	Environmental constraints (including ecological) were considered in the Cable Corridor optioneering process, which included seeking to avoid Cable Corridors with Open Mosaic Habitat (OMH), woodland blocks, and ponds potentially supporting protected species such as GCN or bats. Trees and woodlands will be retained and avoided wherever possible within the Cable Corridor. Tree loss locations are identified on the Vegetation Removal Plan [EN0110020/APP/2.9]. An arboriculture survey, and Tree Constraints Plan (TCP) has been provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.14: Arboriculture Survey and Tree Constraints Plan [EN0110020/APP/6.20] the scope of which covered access points to the Proposed Development. The retained trees and woodlands will be protected by mitigation measures set out within the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]. Further arboriculture surveys will be undertaken prior to construction and appropriate mitigation measures included within the CEMP (secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]) to ensure trees and woodland are protected during construction, operation and decommissioning in compliance with BS5837:2012.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	Habitually, it is CDC's experience that the operational impacts arising from the development of solar farms are not afforded sufficient consideration. The images provided of typical arrays of panels indicate that there would be significant areas of grassland created, which would be in deep shade (under the panels), with insufficient height to allow for effective management to take place, whether that be mechanically or through grazing. If grassland management cannot be carried out as planned, then the target condition of the grassland cannot be achieved, and this has implications for the overall effects of the project in this respect. CDC would therefore expect for long-term management plans to be provided in detail, with clear contingencies in place should condition expectations not be realised throughout the lifetime of the project. This should be regularly and effectively monitored.	The protection, creation and management of grassland habitats is proposed for inclusion within the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]. Measures for the protection of grassland habitat during construction are included within the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] Please see ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6] and oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13].	No
City of Doncaster Council	It is understood that bat surveys have only been partially complete, with some sound analysis identifying up to seven species in the initial stages. Given that the proposals will cover extensive areas, transect results should be converted to 'heat maps' which can be rapidly interpreted and mitigation measures accurately targeted.	The Applicant recognises concerns regarding potential effects of the Proposed Development on bats and has undertaken a detailed programme of baseline surveys and assessment to inform the design and mitigation strategy. Interpretation of updated bat survey data is included within the Environmental Statement, with full details provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.10: Bat Survey Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Ground Level Tree Assessments (GLTA) were completed for approximately 83% of trees within the Site where access was available, together with accessible areas of the Cable Corridors. Of the	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		trees surveyed, the majority were assessed as having low or negligible bat roost potential, with a proportion identified as containing Potential Roost Features (PRFs), enabling appropriate mitigation to be identified. Bat activity surveys, including walked transects, remote monitoring and call analysis, were undertaken between April and September 2025. These confirmed a diverse assemblage of bat species using the Site for commuting and foraging, dominated by common and soprano pipistrelles, with additional records of noctule, Myotis species, brown long-eared bat, Nathusius' pipistrelle and serotine bat. No Annex II species were recorded. Potential effects associated with lighting were carefully considered given the nocturnal and light-sensitive ecology of bats. Perimeter fencing lighting will be avoided, with infra-red security systems used instead. Where lighting is required within BESS and substation areas, it will be designed and controlled in line with Bat Conservation Trust best practice and the Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]. Residual effects from lighting are therefore assessed as very low adverse and not significant. The Proposed Development includes extensive habitat creation and enhancement through the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13], including new grassland, hedgerows and woodland planting. As these habitats mature, they will strengthen	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		commuting and foraging corridors and may provide future roost features. The installation of 75 bat boxes on suitable retained trees will further enhance roosting opportunities. Collectively, these measures are expected to result in long-term beneficial and potentially significant effects for bats at a district scale.	
City of Doncaster Council	Chapter 9 of the Draft ES sets out that only nine ponds have been sampled for Environmental DNA (eDNA). Given the significant scale of the Order limits proposed, a serious question is raised as to whether only these nine ponds should have been surveyed. Further explanation of this should be provided. The overall approach to Great Crested Newts (GCN) at both construction and operational phases is inconclusive and CDC wishes to see further detail and be able to comment accordingly. It would also be helpful to understand if the Applicant is considering entering into a District Level License to address the management of GCN.	Great Crested Newt has not been identified within the Order Limits or 250m of it, therefore District Level Licenses have not been explored. Where access has not been possible, either data from other existing sources or avoidance measures have been applied to confirm that DLL is not required.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	The documentation at this stage does not mention potential impacts on invertebrates. It is accepted that given the extensive agricultural nature of the Order limits there are unlikely to be any exceptional invertebrate assemblages that would be directly impacted. However, in creating improved conditions for bats and farmland birds there should be some consideration of invertebrates that will be necessary for healthy bird and bat populations. CDC therefore requests that this is given further consideration by the Applicant.	Habitats or botanical species or assemblages known to specifically support priority or rarer species of invertebrates are absent from the Order Limits, however, consideration to the planting of a wider range of botanical species within planting mixes is included in the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] . The species mix includes those associated with night scented botanical species known to attract nocturnal invertebrates predated on by bats.	No
City of Doncaster Council	CDC would also like to take the opportunity to remind the Applicant that if any invasive alien species are found on site, a management and removal strategy to ensure no offences are committed in respect of environmental protection legislation should be implemented. This should be incorporated into the relevant habitat management and monitoring plans.	Where identified, invasive species have been recorded during ecological surveys and have been assessed within ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6] . Measures to prevent the spread of invasive non-native species are provided in oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] .	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	Whitestone 1 comprises of arable farmland. It is located to the south of Conisbrough, covering the Conisbrough Parks and former royal hunting grounds. It is predominately located within the Doncaster Landscape Character Area: A1: Conisbrough and Denaby Coalfield Farmlands, and two field parcels are located within C1: Stainton to Edlington Limestone Plateau. In respect of Area A1, the Doncaster Landscape Character Area and Capacity Assessment Study identifies that this is a simple, intact historic landscape designated as an Area of Special Landscape Value. It is a strongly rural and in places tranquil landscape due in part to the lack of roads. Overall, the landscape value and quality are considered to be high. Similarly, the landscape of Area C1 is described within the Council's assessment as being distinctive, intact and of a high quality, and also an Area of Special Landscape Value. In both cases, the landscape strategy of the Council is to conserve. When having regard to the national policy requirements set out above, CDC submits that the special landscape character of Whitestone 1 is a fundamental and overriding consideration that should ultimately preclude the inclusion of it within the Order limits in totality. This special character has not been attributed sufficiently high status in the assessments that have taken place to date, and this results in an inherent failing in the subsequent conclusions drawn. Moreover, it appears that the viewpoints relied upon to undertake the assessment have been selected specifically in an attempt to downplay this special landscape character. CDC considers that the Applicant has significantly	The Applicant conducted a design review of the Proposed Development and as a result reductions to W1 have been made in addition to revisions to the mitigation proposals including further set back from Clifton and Firsby and where possible avoidance of 'encircling' of residential areas by solar panels. Overall, this process has resulted in the reduction in developable areas, for W1, this has resulted in a larger reduction of 49% as compared to the original design (See Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]). Where it was not possible or practical to further reduce panels, the Applicant has included landscaping to create a natural screening to reduce impacts, as shown in the Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7] and managed by the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/7.6]. Visualisations are provided in ES Volume 3, Figures 7.6.1 to 7.6.58: Representative Viewpoints. The remaining visual impact is assessed in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]. Within the Landscape Character Area (LCA) are two of the Doncaster Areas of Special Landscape Value (ASLV), the one in the west being existing and the one in the east of the LCA being potential additional areas. The landscape has scenic merit. Taking into consideration the local designations and scenic merit a medium value is given. This has been taken into account in ES Appendix 7.3 Landscape Character	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	downplayed the importance of the landscape character of Whitestone 1, seeking to rely on the fact that it does not fall within any statutory landscape designation and that the Area of Special Landscape Value is not subject to a current local plan policy that would hold any planning weight. This is an altogether disingenuous approach.	Assessment and has led to the removal of the developable areas referenced above in W1. The design changes to the Proposed Development including those made to W1 are described in ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4].	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	The fact remains that the area is inherently prized for its landscape characteristics precisely because of its very special quality and value in this area. Whether or not the designation is subject to a specific local plan policy at this time does not negate this importance or render the quality of the landscape any less valued or important in real terms and it is this value that warrants protection from development. Fundamentally, the proposed development would completely destroy the special character of this highly valued landscape and is perhaps one of the main areas of concern raised with the Council by local residents/community groups, Ward Councillors and MP's. Quite plainly, it would result in an intrusive, urban development right across the landscape, with no visual relief whatsoever. In seeking to mitigate these far reaching landscape impacts, the consultation documents set out a suite of proposed measures. The operational mitigation put forward (see Appendix 5.1: Indicative Operation Masterplan and Volume 3, Appendix 5.3: Indicative Mitigation Masterplan) is – in CDC's view - wholly generic in nature and detail and does nothing to acknowledge the special landscape characteristics of Whitestone 1. Moreover, CDC considers that the Draft ES wrongly downplays the significance of the longer term effects of the development for those years taking into account the mitigation becoming embedded. Ultimately, this conclusion has incorrectly been founded in the Applicant's view that the proposed mitigation will not have a significant effect on the intrinsic landscape character of the area in its own right, but rather will	CDC's comments and views are noted. Within the LCA are two of the Doncaster Areas of Special Landscape Value (ASLV), the one in the west being existing and the one in the east of the LCA being potential additional areas. The landscape has scenic merit. Taking into consideration the local designations and scenic merit a medium value is given. This has been taken into account in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.3 Landscape Character Assessment and has led to the removal of the developable areas referenced above in W1. Subsequent to CDC's comments a design review of the Proposed Development has been undertaken and reductions to W1 have been made in addition to revisions to the mitigation proposals including further set back from Clifton and Firsby and where possible avoidance of 'encircling' of residential areas by solar panels. Overall, this process has resulted in a 37% reduction in developable areas, for W1, this has resulted in a larger reduction of 49% as compared to the original design (See Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]). Where it was not possible or practical to further reduce panels, the Applicant has included landscaping to create a natural screening to reduce impacts, as shown in the Illustrative Masterplan (ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1) [EN0110020/APP/6.19] and managed by the OLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]. Visualisations are provided in ES Volume 3, Figures 7.6.1 to 7.6.58:	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	assist in screening the development and creating visual buffers.	Representative Viewpoints [EN0110020/APP/6.19]. An assessment of effects on the character of the landscape and views and visual amenity is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]. The design changes to the Proposed Development including those made to W1 are described in ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4].	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	However, CDC submits that the proposed mitigations are all interventions which would themselves fundamentally and irrevocably change the important and special landscape character of large swathes of Whitestone 1. It is the view of CDC that this demonstrates that Whitestone 1 is fundamentally incapable of accommodating the proposed development in an acceptable manner and should therefore be discounted from the project.	CDC's comments and views are noted. Subsequent to CDC's comments a design review of the Proposed Development has been undertaken and reductions to W1 have been made in addition to revisions to the mitigation proposals including further set back from Clifton and Firsby and where possible avoidance of 'encircling' of residential areas by solar panels. Overall, this process has resulted in a 37% reduction in developable areas, for W1, this has resulted in a larger reduction of 49% as compared to the original design (See Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]). Where it was not possible or practical to further reduce panels, the Applicant has included landscaping to create a natural screening to reduce impacts, as shown in the Illustrative Masterplan (ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1) [EN0110020/APP/6.19] and managed by the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]. Visualisations are provided in ES Volume 3, Figures 7.6.1 to 7.6.58: Representative Viewpoints [EN0110020/APP/6.19]. Within the LCA are two of the Doncaster Areas of Special Landscape Value (ASLV), the one in the west being existing and the one in the east of the LCA being potential additional areas. The landscape has scenic merit. Taking into consideration the local designations and scenic merit a medium value is given. This has been taken into account in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.3: Landscape Character Assessment and has led to	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		the removal of the developable areas referenced above in W1. An assessment of effects on the character of the landscape and views and visual amenity is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7] and associated appendices. The design changes to the Proposed Development including those made to W1 are described in ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4].	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	Notwithstanding CDC's position above, and on a without prejudice basis, the further detailed comments in respect of landscape and visual matters are provided as follows: i. The area to the immediate south of the Clifton Reservoir and beyond towards the M18 should be removed from the Order limits. ii. The buffers in totality as proposed are arbitrary and wholly inadequate and should be completely reconsidered with greater consideration given to utilising the landscape features already in situ. iii. The lack of available highway access points to Whitestone 1 will result in a highly damaging network of construction routes across the site. iv. There is only very minimal separation proposed between development parcels and residential properties, which in some cases could be entirely encircled by panels. Far more visual relief should be afforded to these receptors, by reducing the extent of the Order limits. v. Every effort should be taken to minimise the scale of any such fencing and to incorporate any screening features that may be reasonably incorporated. The Draft ES indicates that perimeter fencing around the solar PV array is anticipated at a maximum height of 2.2m. Incorporating fencing of this height and scale would be a further visual intrusion into the landscape and should be avoided.	CDC's comments and views are noted. Subsequent to CDC's comments a design review of the Proposed Development has been undertaken and reductions to W1 have been made in addition to revisions to the mitigation proposals including the removal of the area to the immediate south of the Clifton Reservoir and beyond towards the M18, further set back from Clifton on the west and where possible avoidance of 'encircling' of residential areas by solar panels. Overall, this process has resulted in a 37% reduction in developable areas and for W1, this has resulted in a larger reduction of 49% as compared to the original design (See Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]). Where it was not possible or practical to further reduce panels, the Applicant has included landscaping to create a natural screening to reduce impacts, as shown in the Illustrative Masterplan (ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1) [EN0110020/APP/6.19] and managed by the OLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]. In response to feedback from the statutory consultation and ongoing engagement with local highways, the Applicant has moved the W1 access point further along the A630 to minimise potential cumulative impacts with the housing development at this location. See the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]. The Applicant notes the importance of maintaining safety on the A630 and has engaged with the LHA	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		on the proposed concept access design. The Transport Statement (ES Volume 3, Appendix: 13.2) [EN0110020/APP/6.20] provides estimates of vehicle volumes considered, and known crash data. Details on access points for construction and operational traffic are included in ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]. As part of the design process through to the final LVIA and ES, residential properties in proximity to the Proposed Development have been identified within ES Volume 3, Figures 7.4.4 to 7.4.6 [EN0110020/APP/6.19]. As part of the embedded mitigation for the Proposed Development a minimum 250m offset to the BESS and substations has been included from the outer edge of the property boundary. The solar arrays have also been set back from residential properties as part of the iterative design process. The setback distance to properties varies and is based on an evaluation of the likely changes to views and the need for a suitable separation so as not to result in an overbearing effect on the views and visual amenity experienced from a property during both the construction and decommissioning phases, noting that at decommissioning visual effects would be further reduced by the maturation of the mitigation planting. An assessment of effects on the character of the landscape and views and visual amenity is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7].	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		The design changes to the Proposed Development including those made to W1 are described in ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]. Visualisations are provided in ES Volume 3, Figures 7.6.1 to 7.6.58: Representative Viewpoints [EN0110020/APP/6.19]. Fencing requirements for the Proposed Development are considered in this assessment and presented where relevant on the visualisations provided in ES Volume 3, Figures 7.6.1 to 7.6.58: Representative Viewpoints [EN0110020/APP/6.19].	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	Historic Landscape: CDC cannot emphasise strongly enough the importance of Conisbrough Parks in both heritage and archaeological terms. The historic significance of this area has defined the landscape present today and is a primary contributory factor to the special landscape quality already discussed above. As with landscape and visual matters above, CDC is concerned that this importance has been substantially downplayed in the assessments undertaken to date and this should be rectified. CDC submits that the only rational conclusion arising from a correct and thorough assessment in these respects would be to remove Whitestone 1 from the Order limits in its entirety. The Conisbrough Park area is a most unique area when taken in conjunction with the limestone ridge upon which Clifton and Beacon Hill sit, overlooking the undulating Conisbrough Park. The gently rolling character of Conisbrough Park complements the limestone ridge. It is located at around 60 m above sea level around Sheffield Road to the South of Conisbrough and over a 2 Km distance extending beyond the dismantled railway towards Clifton it rises to around 80 - 85 metres before climbing more steeply on the Ridge. Beacon Hill has a height of 142 m (Trig point). This increase is quite modest except for the undulations which are steep in places. Field boundaries within the Conisbrough Park area are likely to be historic and formed the deer park associated with Conisbrough Castle. An important feature associated with the enjoyment of this land are the long range views of the undulating land against the backdrop	Further details can be found in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8] for details of SYAS Consultation. Conisbrough Park (02958/01) is currently designated as a non-designated asset in terms of significance. Its description in the HER record acknowledges that its existence is known primarily through documentary sources and also acknowledges its changing use and form through economic and social changes. Whilst a recently found small ditch supports its historic use as a deer park, its current value as a deer park is low, due to its physical form having undergone many changes. Therefore, whilst the deer park is acknowledged, it is assessed as part of the Conisbrough Castle Setting assessment. The results of this dynamic assessment have been incorporated into the Setting assessment for Conisbrough Castle in ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Impacts to Conisbrough Castle are assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]. The Applicant removed proposed solar removes to further offset from Conisbrough, so that the nearest solar panel is now 1.8 km from the castle. A moderate adverse effect is predicted to the setting of the castle,	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	of the Limestone ridge in the background. This is an important contributory factor to the significance of this area in heritage terms. This historic significance would be destroyed as a result of the proposed development. Moreover, this significance arising through the sense of openness and the presence of historic field boundaries would be lost through proposed mitigation measures, which would also vastly change the historic character of the landscape here. This considerable damage is completely at odds with the purported design principles of the proposed development, which are discussed in more detail later in this response. It also further demonstrates that the harmful impacts arising from the development cannot be successfully mitigated whatsoever.	though this effect is considered to be Not Significant in terms of the EIA Regulations. The Proposed Development (W1) would be visible in views south-west from the upper levels of the castle's keep, with the panels of W1 visible in views beyond the town when looking along the length of the A630 Sheffield Road. The Proposed Development would not be visible from the lower, ground floor levels of the castle (see Statutory and Non-Statutory Historic Assets [EN01100020/APP/2.7]). In relation to its modern setting, only views south-west would be altered. These views, which take in some of the rural periphery of the town and lands associated with the Medieval Estate, would be changed, with the Proposed Development bringing additional infrastructure into views and resulting in further change to the character of the town's periphery. The Proposed Development would only be visible from the upper levels of the Keep, with views unchanged for visitors to the castle at ground level. Any contribution to significance in views south-west lies with the Castle's association with the former Medieval Deer Park, which is located within the Site at W1. Key changes around Conisbrough include the removal of a solar field along the A630, removal of fields south of Conisbrough to isolated dwellings, removal of solar and proposed substations near	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Clifton, and removal of fields around Firsby. Key changes were made around homes, villages, and public rights of way to preserve views and minimise visual impacts wherever possible, while also balancing the need to produce renewable energy in line with national energy goals. A full Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is included in ES Volume 2, Chapter 7 [EN0110020/APP/6.7] .	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	Clifton Conservation Area: The village of Clifton is situated one mile south of Conisbrough on an elevated position on the Magnesian Limestone ridge. The village is an agricultural settlement based on farms and associated dwellings and the whole settlement is designated as a conservation area. Importantly, one of the key characteristics of the Conservation Area relates to the historic linear development along the edge of the limestone ridge escarpment contrasted with the agricultural surrounding land below the limestone ridge. The undulating topography of the land to the west contributes importantly to this setting. Again, this provides an indication of the importance of this special landscape in heritage terms. Clifton was part of the Manor of Conisbrough in the medieval period and the survival of 'Back Lane' is suggestive of an old street pattern surviving to modern times. The form of the village has changed little from the earliest Ordnance Survey maps (1850s) although there has been substantial infilling. The narrow informal lanes connecting the village are an important part of its character. Traditional buildings are constructed in random coursed rubble limestone with pitched pantile roofs. The character of the village derives from the traditional forms and materials of these buildings and their associated boundary walls though modern forms and materials now compete with this leaving the character of the conservation area delicately balanced. The character of the area is also influenced by the strong contrast between the built form of the village and	The results of this dynamic assessment have been incorporated into the Setting assessment for Clifton Conservation Area in ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. As part of this, design refinement has removed the parcels to the south of Clifton from the Order Limits, along with reducing the parcels to the west of the Conservation Area.	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	the rural character of the surrounding Green Belt and there are important views out of the village towards Conisbrough to the north. With these characteristics in mind, it is without question that the proposed development would significantly harm the setting of the Conservation Area. CDC notes that only a nominal change has been made when compared to earlier stages of the process in respect of the proposed development when considering its relationship to Clifton. These changes relate solely to the removal of the area designated as a Scheduled Ancient Monument (but only just taking that designation out of the area earmarked for solar panels and swapping it to mitigation/enhancement areas), which further comments are provided on below, and the creation of some very minor landscape buffers along the eastern edge of the Order limits. This change from earlier iterations of the scheme is negligible and in no way overcome the harm that would arising to the setting of Clifton Village.		

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	Summary Overall, whilst the methodology utilised is acceptable, further field evaluation is required to adequately inform the assessment of heritage significance. Wider consideration of operational and decommissioning direct impacts is also required to establish the full-lifetime impact of the proposals. Mitigation measures outlined could reduce or avoid significant impacts but will need to be tied to an appropriate outline archaeological management plan to demonstrate the options available and how they will be delivered. As such, the current assessment of impacts to archaeological remains must be considered provisional. Further archaeological information is required as significant impacts could still occur.	Noted. The assessment of the Proposed Development on heritage assets and archaeology is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8] and its accompanying appendices. An Archaeological Preservation Strategy (APS) has been presented with the ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7: Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. The APS formalises the strategy by which: - known significant archaeological remains identified for preservation in situ will be protected during installation, operation, and decommissioning; and - as yet unrecorded significant archaeological remains, such as might be identified during post-consent field investigations, and determined to warrant preservation in situ, will be protected during installation, operation, and decommissioning. In summary, the strategy provides for the use of non-intrusive infrastructure and a sensitive installation / decommissioning strategy, the detail of which is described in full. The APS would be maintained, and the measures it contains adhered to, by the Site administrator, or	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		their successor(s) in title, through to point of decommission. Embedded mitigation measures include: • Changes to the Order Limits, such as pulling back from Clifton Conservation Area, Ravenfield Conservation Area and the Firsby Pottery works, removing the Roman Villa and a large portion of the eastern side of W1. • Where possible and practicable, within the confines imposed by other site constraints, there is a preference to avoid disturbing subsurface archaeological remains unnecessarily. Preservation in situ by implementing the Archaeological <u>Investigation and Preservation Strategy (AIPS)</u> (presented with the ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7 Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]), is proposed for areas of 'heightened archaeological sensitivity' (HAS), which are defined as heritage assets of known regional research value, or with the potential to be of regional research value. • The HAS areas and the requirement for implementation of avoidance is secured within ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7: Archaeological Investigation and	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20] and o WSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]. This mitigation can take the form of: • Creation of Exclusion Zones within which no infrastructure is placed and no ground disturbance allowed, with the exception of planting associated with BNG; • Micro siting and avoidance; and • The use of alternate construction methods, which allow for the placement of infrastructure above heritage assets, or below in the case of the Cable Corridors, without causing physical disturbance or truncation of those assets.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	Archaeological Baseline The draft ES incorporates a chapter on Cultural Heritage and Archaeology that presents the findings of an assessment of the predicted presence and significance of heritage assets of archaeological interest and anticipated options for mitigation to reduce impacts. This has been established using appropriate desk-based sources, supported by a geophysical (magnetometry) survey for large parts of the application area. A six-step assessment methodology for assessing impact is presented in the draft ES (8.5.45) and this has identified previously unrecorded archaeological features and provided additional detail on known features, ranging from the prehistoric to post-medieval period, within each of the three principal development areas. However, it is important to note that the process is still within the first two steps of that methodology (1. Identify known and potential heritage assets & 2. Assess the heritage significance of those assets). Whilst the geophysical survey is effective in identifying potential archaeological sites, it does not provide a full picture of the character, age or state of preservation of the remains. Consequently, although the draft ES makes progress towards defining areas of heightened archaeological sensitivity and the significance of effect of impacts arising from the proposal, the evidence base on which this assessment has been made is not yet sufficiently robust to draw accurate conclusions. As such, any conclusions must be considered provisional at this stage. Further field evaluation is required to investigate and	Since the Draft ES, the baseline understanding and assessment of potential effects on heritage assets and archaeology have been updated, and is detailed within ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8] and its accompanying appendices, including ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Baseline [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. An Archaeological Preservation Strategy (APS) (presented with the ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7 Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]) has also been prepared. ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7: Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20] is referenced within the Outline WSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16] as the mechanism for delivering the mitigation measures outlined in the APS. The oWSI is submitted with the Application and secures the commitment to deliver the measures presented in the AIPS. The APS formalises the strategy by which: - known significant archaeological remains identified for preservation in situ will be protected during installation, operation, and decommissioning; and - as yet unrecorded significant archaeological remains, such as might be identified during post-consent field investigations, and determined to	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	more fully describe the significance of affected archaeological remains. This is acknowledged in paragraphs 8.5.13 - 8.5.16 of the draft ES, which sets out a process of consultation, which is ongoing, through which the necessary works will be agreed. The strategy currently under consideration includes: The completion of magnetometer survey for all areas where solar infrastructure is proposed, including the preferred cable corridor; • The undertaking of complementary forms of geophysical survey (such as electromagnetic induction) where the magnetometry survey has been less effective due to the presence of adverse site conditions (such as green waste) or where the nature of potential remains is less conducive to detection by that method (such as stone built structures); and • The undertaking of a programme of evaluation trenching to test the results of the geophysical survey and to accurately describe the significance of effected archaeological remains. The design of the trenching scheme will take a zoned approach, considering areas of heightened archaeological sensitivity identified through previous stages of evaluation and the different levels of impact arising from the scheme. The detail of this further field evaluation is still to be agreed but it is expected that these works will set out a proportionate strategy for assessing the significance of heritage assets of archaeological interest within the proposed order limits. They will need completing ahead of submission of the final ES.	warrant preservation in situ, will be protected during installation, operation, and decommissioning. In summary, the strategy provides for the use of non-intrusive infrastructure and a sensitive installation / decommissioning strategy, the detail of which is described in full. The APS would be maintained, and the measures it contains adhered to, by the Site administrator, or their successor(s) in title, through to point of decommission.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council and RMBC	Impact Assessment The draft ES identifies the range of anticipated impacts that will arise from construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning. Whilst SYAS consider that the majority of construction impacts have been identified, greater consideration needs to be given to the potential for impacts to emerge during operation, maintenance and decommissioning. In particular, the risks of groundworks extending outside of construction impacts during any refitting works and the potential for remediating soil compaction post-decommissioning to return land to agricultural use. Full acknowledgement of these risks is necessary so appropriate mitigation measures can be incorporated in the management documents. This should also be reflected in the commitments register in Appendix 2.3 and impact assessment in section 8.8. The potential for indirect impacts arising from the operation of the scheme to heritage assets whose settings are sensitive to change within the development area are assessed in Vol.3 App.8.4. In relation to heritage assets of archaeological interest, SYAS agree with the identification of the Scheduled Monuments of Blue Man Bower, Conisbrough Castle and Conisbrough Parks Roman Villa as potentially sensitive receptors. Furthermore, whilst no non-designated assets have been assessed to have settings sensitive to the development, given the degree of public interest in Conisbrough Deer Park we would recommend that this is added to the assessment. The methodology applied in assessing these impacts is appropriate, but the conclusions should be viewed as provisional at this	An Archaeological Preservation Strategy (APS) (presented with the ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7 Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]) has been prepared alongside this Chapter. The APS formalises the strategy by which: - known significant archaeological remains identified for preservation in situ will be protected during installation, operation, and decommissioning; and - as yet unrecorded significant archaeological remains, such as might be identified during post-consent field investigations, and determined to warrant preservation in situ, will be protected during installation, operation, and decommissioning. In summary, the strategy provides for the use of non-intrusive infrastructure and a sensitive installation / decommissioning strategy, the detail of which is described in full. The APS would be maintained, and the measures it contains adhered to, by the Site administrator, or their successor(s) in title, through to point of decommission.	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	stage, subject to completion of the forthcoming field evaluation. This work may provide further information on the setting of these monuments, and identify new sensitive receptors, which will need consideration. For instance, discussion of potential impacts to the setting of the scheduled monument within the proposed order limits, Conisbrough Parks Roman Villa, acknowledges that currently unidentified Roman archaeological remains may extend beyond the current boundaries of the scheduling and that there is evidence in the wider area to suggest possible surviving Romano-British structures associated with the villa estate. Quantifying this potential will be one of the aims of the further field evaluation. Should such features be identified, their contribution to the setting of the villa will need to be assessed. Irrespective of the assessed scale of effect (the finalisation of which is subject to the completion of the additional field evaluation set out above), a range of mitigation measures are proposed in the draft ES (section 8.7) by which direct impacts can be reduced or avoided. For subsurface remains of known or potential regional value, preservation in situ is identified as the preferred option with a summary of construction options to achieve this identified. Whilst this approach is supported, a detailed archaeological management plan will be required to outline the options and the process by which their details will be approved in order that such works can be designed and implemented post-consent. The draft ES identifies that mitigation measures will be included in the Construction Environmental Management Plan		

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	(CEMP; section 8.7.19), however SYAS would recommend that a specific Archaeology Management Plan is prepared which sets out the mitigation measures for the different phases of the schemes lifetime which can then be referred to in the other specific management plans (such as the oCEMP/ oLBMP/ oOEMP/ oDEMP).		

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council and RMBC	Offsetting and Public Benefit The draft ES identifies the requirement for archaeological works to offset any harm caused by the development to the archaeological resource through: • recording archaeological remains in advance of their loss and disseminating the associated reports and archives; and • public engagement and community involvement SYAS confirm that these measures are appropriate and that we would recommend they are secured within the DCO requirements for delivery post-consent. There are benefits of early public engagement and SYAS support the draft ES proposal that opportunities are to be developed with Conisbrough Research and Archaeology Group for community fieldwork during the evaluation stage. We would recommend that this programme is informed through consultation with other local heritage organisations within the scheme to identify and develop suitable opportunities. Such engagement will assist in offsetting the loss of access such groups will have for conducting research within land utilised by the development. Noting the advice given by SYAS above, CDC would strongly contend that in fact the Conisbrough Parks Romano-British Villa – Ancient Monument should be removed entirely from the Order limits along with additional areas surrounding it to address the setting of the Ancient Monument. The "setting" of a scheduled ancient monument is also an important consideration and refers to its surroundings, which include physical elements, natural landscapes, and the visual and non-visual relationships with other historic features. It is a crucial aspect of the	Consultation has been conducted with local heritage groups and SYAS, and is detailed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]. This engagement will continue throughout the examination phase. The Romano-British Villa Ancient Monument has been removed from the Order Limits. The change to Order Limits is discussed within ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4] and Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]. An Archaeological Preservation Strategy (APS) (presented with the ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7 Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]) has also been prepared. The APS formalises the strategy by which: • known significant archaeological remains identified for preservation in situ will be protected during installation, operation, and decommissioning; and • as yet unrecorded significant archaeological remains, such as might be identified during post-consent field investigations, and determined to warrant preservation in situ, will be protected during installation, operation, and decommissioning.	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	monument's significance because it influences how it is understood and appreciated, and it can include both tangible and intangible elements like social practices and tranquillity. When considering development, it is important to assess how changes to the setting will impact the monument's overall significance, even for sites that are entirely underground	In summary, the strategy provides for the use of non-intrusive infrastructure and a sensitive installation / decommissioning strategy, the detail of which is described in full. The APS would be maintained, and the measures it contains adhered to, by the Site administrator, or their successor(s) in title, through to point of decommission.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	Taken in combination, CDC submits that on these further grounds, Whitestone 1 is fundamentally incapable of accommodating the proposed development in an acceptable manner and should therefore be discounted from the project. Notwithstanding CDC's position above, and on a without prejudice basis, the further detailed comments in respect of cultural heritage and archaeology are provided as follows: i. As a minimum, the entire area east of Conisbrough Parks Farm, towards Clifton Village, including the Designated Scheduled Ancient Monument (Conisbrough Parks Romano-British Villa) should be removed from the Order limits.	Throughout the pre-application period, the Applicant has received feedback consultation and ongoing stakeholder engagement to identify potential significant issues and address them wherever possible. For the Proposed Development as a whole, this has resulted in a reduction in the developable area of 37%, but for Whitestone 1, this has resulted in a larger reduction of 49% in order to reduce potential visual impacts as well as on consideration of heritage and ecologically sensitive areas. The mission statement for the Proposed Development is: <i>"to embed good design by maximising the amount of clean energy generated to export to the National Grid, crafting a development that is socially and environmentally sensitive; engaging in meaningful conversation with communities and taking account of people's visual amenity. The project will embed sustainability and resilience, enhancing biodiversity and recreational access across the landscape"</i>. Thus, the balance of producing sufficient levels of renewable energy while reducing potential impacts has been key to the design process (see the Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]). The Proposed Development must be viable, and elimination of Whitestone 1 would threaten the Proposed Development's ability to be operationally viable.	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Therefore, while the Applicant has not removed the entirety of Whitestone 1 from the Proposed Development, parcels to the south of Clifton have been removed from the Order Limits, along with reducing the parcels to the west of the Conservation Area.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	Ground conditions and contaminated land: The Whitestone 1 Masterplan indicates that Hellanby Landfill, near Conisbrough Grange Farm is in the vicinity of a potential cable corridor boundary. Any works in this area should be subject to an appropriate risk assessment. It also indicates that Mill Lane Landfill near Conisbrough Park Farm to be in the vicinity of a potential cable and vehicle crossing point. Again, any works in this area should be subject to an appropriate risk assessment The Draft ES indicates that a Phase 1 and Coal Mining Risk Assessment will be carried out, which is welcomed.	Due to changes in the design, Hellanby Landfill is the only landfill that may be impacted by the Proposed Development. Appropriate site investigations and risk assessments will be put in place in this area prior to any construction works, and this is detailed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9] and the oCEMP [EN/0110020/APP/5.9].	Yes
City of Doncaster Council	At the time of writing, technical advice from the Lead Local Flood Authority is awaited. CDC therefore reserves it's right to provide further detailed comments in this respect and undertakes to submit these under separate cover at the earliest opportunity.	Noted.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	CDC are concerned by the assertion at this stage that construction traffic impacts will not have a significant impact on air quality and would expect to see further evidence to evidence this assertion. This is based on the sheer number of HGV round trips that are anticipated to occur each day combined with the fact that the Applicant is proposing to use the A630 through AQMA5. As such, CDC would expect an assessment of the impacts of this additional traffic on concentrations through the AQMA and would wish to better understand what alternatives have been considered and why these were discounted. The Applicant should carefully consider the Council's published Air Quality Action Plan ³ and an Air Quality Assessment should form part of the evidence base accordingly. CDC would need to be assured that the proposed development would not render parts of the Air Quality Action Plan unworkable, in the interests of human health.	The IAQM traffic methodologies applied in this assessment consider the additional traffic through the AQMA with consideration given to the Council's Air Quality Action Plan. Details of the construction routes selected to be used by the Proposed Development are provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. The routes considered are outlined as the best options available to minimise impacts. The assessment of potential impacts on traffic and transport is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13] and the assessment of potential impacts on air quality is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	Proposed Access Arrangements: Figure 13.2 Proposed HGV Routing for Whitestone 1 sets out the proposed routing to the two proposed access points into the site (SR-01 & BL-03). The fact that only two access points are being proposed from the adopted highway, being 'SR-01' from the A630 Sheffield Road at Conisbrough and 'BL-03' from Beacon Lane, Clifton, in order to access to the whole of the development, means these access/junctions will be carrying a significant number of vehicles, which overall is a key concern, and further demonstrates the unsuitability of Whitestone 1 overall for the proposed development. The constrained nature of the site here means that it is only feasible in highway terms to utilise these two access points. However, in practical terms this means that an extensive network of internal access tracks will be required to facilitate the construction phase. Whilst these tracks will only be required for the duration of the construction phase, this is a prolonged period, and the character of the landscape will mean they are highly visible and will cause detriment throughout the construction phase. This is particularly pertinent when considered from a highway perspective, there will be a need for those construction routes to be of a sufficient size to allow for appropriate tracking for the largest vehicles that might be utilising them, and for them to pass each other. This is further demonstration that Whitestone 1 cannot suitably accommodate the development as proposed. In terms of technical highway matters, the intensity and frequency of the use of these two access points will	During the statutory consultation, the Applicant presented the draft Transport Statement and received feedback specifically about several access points and potential impacts to local roads. In response, the Applicant removed the proposed access point near Clifton, moved the access point on the A630 further down the road to reduce cumulative impacts with the housing development. See Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] for further information. This further de-risks tracking concerns, as more major roads are being used, and if AIL's are required, would have specific controls in place to maintain safety (e.g. for delivery of the transformer). The updated Transport Statement (ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2) [EN0110020/APP/6.20] includes trip generation, routing and calculations. The Applicant notes the importance of maintaining safety on the A630 and has engaged with the LHA on the proposed concept access design. ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20] provides estimates of vehicle volumes considered, and known crash data. The access at Beacon Lane has been removed, which should ease the amount of traffic transiting Edlington Road.	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	mean that the detailed design will need to be carefully considered to ensure the existing highway network is not adversely affected. There is not sufficient detail provided at this stage to comment further on this aspect of the development. However, CDC can advise that it expects Stage 1 and Stage 2 Road Safety Audits to be undertaken on the preliminary and detailed design proposals, with a Stage 3 Audit to be carried out upon completion. Furthermore, no information has been provided at this stage as to where any site compounds will be located, or what size they might be. It is not known whether they will include welfare facilities for construction workers, as well as parking, storage and unloading areas to be accounted for. These aspects all have important implications for how impacts will be assessed in highway terms. Additionally, in terms of construction traffic management plans, CDC would expect the following to be included: • Road conditions surveys, and provision for any necessary repairs to be undertaken via dilapidation surveys. • Provision of wheel washing facilities which are of a sufficient standard and type to suitably account for the specific land conditions of the rural locality of Whitestone 1. CDC would welcome the opportunity to provide further advice on these matters.	Impacts on traffic are assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]. The Applicant has removed the proposed substation that was located on Ruddle Lane, south of Clifton in response to concerns about traffic and safety impacts in this location. Therefore, this access point is no longer needed and has been removed from the Proposed Development. With the access on Beacon Lane removed, the traffic transiting Edlington Road should be eased. Details on how consultation specific to trip generation, routing and calculations are provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. It should be noted that the working hours and delivery hours have been chosen based on reasonable site requirements and as a result of previous experience from developing other DCO solar farm schemes in the UK. The Applicant or appointed contractor will review peak traffic period for the main project related access locations prior to the commencement of construction and adjust timings if required. The potential impacts of internal access tracks are considered in ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7], ES Volume 2, Chapter 10:	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10], and ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]. Details on internal access track locations and construction are presented in ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5] and the Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]. Details of the construction compounds are provided in ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5], Works Plans [EN0110020/APP/2.3], and ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1: Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/6.19]. Mitigation measures in relation to construction traffic arrival, access to construction compounds and wheel washing are provided in the oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12].	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	Traffic Generation: In respect of the Transport Statement (EN0110020), the following detailed comments are provided. Paragraph 1.1.155 (Construction Worker Trip Generation) as drafted sets out the morning peak hour as being 08:00-09:00 and the evening peak as being 17:00-18:00. The Applicant should be aware that the Doncaster Traffic Sensitive peak periods are defined as being between 0730hrs and 0930hrs (AM peak) and 1530hrs and 19:00 (PM peak) (subject to the specific location this may be reduced to 1830hrs). This approach is supported by traffic flow data for the A630. The final ES should be updated to reflect this. Paragraph 1.1.155 onwards (Construction Worker Trip Generation) sets out assumptions concerning the number of workers who would use sustainable modes of transport and an indication that 20% of workers would be transported by shared minibuses. CDC would question how this would be secured through the detailed documents and would require further information that sets out how this would be ensured and enshrined through any consent given.	Details on how consultation specific to trip generation, routing and calculations are provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. It should be noted that the working hours and delivery hours have been chosen based on reasonable site requirements and as a result of previous experience from developing other DCO solar farm schemes in the UK. The Applicant or appointed contractor will review peak traffic period for the main project related access locations prior to the commencement of construction and adjust timings if required. Arrival and departure times will be managed to minimise the number of HGVs travelling to the Proposed Development during the network peak hours for the local highway network. The timing restrictions, considered likely to be implemented within the CTMP are: • Avoiding arrivals or departures on a weekday during the network peak hours (08:00–09:00 and 17:00–18:00); • Limiting deliveries to between the hours of 09:00 and 16:00; • No arrivals or departures on Saturday before 08:00 or after 13:00; and • No arrivals or departures on Sundays or public holidays. HGVs will be required to follow the approved designated routes and where possible, the re-use of HGVs such as backloading will be encouraged	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		where practical; The use of a traffic marshalls will be considered to improve the safety and efficiency of HGVs near the proposed access points. Worker movements will be managed through the implementation of the following measures: • Implementation of a Worker Travel Plan; • Worker arrival and departure times; • Limited and allocated car parking; • Car sharing; and • Minibus service. The trip generation for construction workers has been calculated based on the total number of workers expected at each Site area with modal splits applied to reflect anticipated travel behaviour. A daily total of 600 construction staff is expected across the Site during the peak construction periods. It was assumed that 20% of workers would travel by sustainable modes while another 20% would be transported via shared minibuses. The remaining 60% of workers would be assumed to travel by car. Further detail on the modal split methodology can be found in Section 5.2 of ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. More detail about the use of minibuses can be found in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20].	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	Highway Network Management: It is important to understand that any routing of cables in the highway must be referred to the Council's Network Compliance Team. In normal circumstances, a Statutory Undertaker would install and maintain all apparatus in the highway. However, if this is not the case in respect of the proposed development, a license will be required under Section 50 of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (NRSWA). In providing such a license, special conditions would be applied to indemnify the Council as Highways Authority for the duration of the licence (the lifetime of the project). This could include the requirement for a deposit or bond to ensure compliance with the license. Any works on or adjacent to the highway will be subject to a Permit to Work that applies to any contractor, and for most schemes is applied for and road space booked electronically. However, for these types of developments, this is managed via the Council's Project Design and Technical Services Department, which ensures there are no conflicts with other works nearby and the appropriate permissions have been granted. Road space booking forms must be used to authorise the use of temporary traffic signals and the erection of any signs on the highway for the duration of the works. In the above respects, CDC would like to draw the Applicant's attention to its specific expectations as to how any Development Consent Order (DCO) should be drafted to account for our highway network management requirements. The draft DCO in respect of the Fenwick Solar Farm Project gives a clear indication of these expectations and the content of this should be	The draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1], and as explained in the Explanatory Memorandum [EN0110020/APP/3.2] seeks to modify the application of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 in relation to works carried out under the powers of the Order. This is required because street works will be carried out under Order powers subject to the provisions and requirements of the Order and not, for instance, under Highways Act 1980 powers. The Applicant notes CDC's request that content in the Fenwick Solar Farm DCO should be reflected in this draft DCO. It is the Applicant's view, that at this stage, any approach agreed between the Applicant and CDC needs to be reflective of the specific circumstances of this Application. It would be inappropriate to assume that matters agreed in the context of the Fenwick Solar Farm Order should be mandated to this Application.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	reflected in any put forward by the Applicant. More information can be found here: Documents Fenwick Solar Farm		

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	Public rights of way: Please note that this commentary also applies in respect of the socio-economic considerations of the scheme (Draft ES Chapter 15 refers). There is a general concern that the consultation has not sought to differentiate between the different categories of public rights of way. The assessment focuses on walkers and cyclists and does not pay enough attention to equestrian users of the network. This is an altogether narrow approach to the assessment and undermines its efficacy in seeking to identify impacts. Paragraph 13.6.9 of the Draft ES incorrectly cites Park Lane as being part of the local road network. In fact, this is a public bridleway for use by pedestrians, equestrians and cyclists. This error is more fundamental than simply applying an incorrect assumption, in fact it betrays a complete misunderstanding of the area comprising Whitestone 1. The fact that the area is not served by a local road network does not appear to have been properly understood by the Applicant, and this is another telling example of the lack of meaningful understanding of the site, its constraints and its special character. Detailed comments in respect of PROW are provided as follows: Proposed buffers between panels and public rights of way are minimal and overall, woefully inadequate, creating little to no visual relief from panels for users, to the detriment of their enjoyment of the countryside and valued landscape. • Park Lane should not be used by development traffic whatsoever.	Details on all PROWs users, including equestrian use, is presented in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20], summarised and assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]. During the evolution of the Proposed Development since Draft ES, certain Automatic Traffic Counts (ATCs) that were initially included within the Study Area (that could potentially be used as construction access routes) were removed. The Applicant can confirm that Park Lane is no longer being used as a route for construction traffic and is not referenced further in the ES or ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. The design has incorporated at least a 15m buffer for PROWs, with the aim of reducing any potential impacts to sensitive receptors where practicable. This is set out in Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/5.8APP/7.3]. It is acknowledged that temporary diversions and management measures may be required for some of the paths within the Site. An oPROWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14] has been submitted with the Application and includes details of specific routes that may be affected and also sets out any proposed mitigation required to mitigate the impacts of the	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	- Any temporary closures of public rights of way should be for the minimum time possible, and alternative routes should be provided whenever possible do so. - A question is raised as to why permissive paths would not be available for use by equestrians. This should be further explored by the Applicant. - Would welcome the opportunity to further discuss the route and extent of permissive paths proposed. Whilst these are welcomed, CDC would submit that more could be achieved in these respects, not only by including use by equestrians but also to further contribute to the network and accessibility. - Concern is raised about the proximity of a potential cable route corridor to Bridleway Number 4. This is an important access route to the network of public rights of way in the area and therefore must remain open at all times. - Would welcome more detail regarding path improvements across the Order limits, along with an explanation regarding how these would be maintained and by whom. - Further information is also required about what would happen to additional widths of paths and hedges at the decommissioning stage.	potential interactions between construction traffic and the users of the PRow network. The Streets, Rights of Way, and Access Plans [EN0110020/APP/2.4] shows the proposed temporary PRow closures and diversions, along with paths remaining open and new permissive paths. The Applicant is only proposing to temporarily close one PRow with no diversion (Whiston Footpath No.12). Some footpaths will be temporarily diverted for a short period of approximately 2-3 weeks each. The Applicant is proposing new additional permissive paths to enhance connectivity across the site. This includes 14.5km of new paths to create circular routes and connect key locations, presented in Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7]. All proposed permissive paths would include equestrians. Conisbrough Parks no.4 PRow would remain open but with a temporary diversion during the construction phase while the cable route is laid, for approximately 2-3 weeks.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	The large development only comes close to a very small part of Doncaster and noise is not considered to be a huge concern. However, the Council will await the findings of the noise impact assessment. From the information provided, CDC understands that the target level for new development is indicated to be +5dB. CDC can advise that the adopted Local Plan (at Appendix 11) makes clear that the target for all new noise generating development should be +0dB above the existing background levels. This should be taken forward in the final technical documents	Operational noise has been assessed by implementing BS 4142 in the context of NPSE to avoid significant adverse effects at +5 dB above background depending on context. Embedded mitigation for the Proposed Development is to avoid effects at +5 dB above background depending on context. This will be developed as part of detailed design post consent. Section 14.7 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14] presents the assessment of effects during operation of the Proposed Development. Section 14.8 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14] includes a sensitivity analysis of additional mitigation requirements for compliance of +0dB above background.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	Loss of best and most versatile agricultural land: Agriculture is the main land use within the Borough making up nearly two thirds of the total land area. The soils found in the Borough vary in quality from high-grade arable farmland (grades 2 and 3) and its extensive network of drains and channels in the east of the Borough, land reclamation on former colliery sites, through to remediated brownfield sites within former industrial areas. Around half of the land area of the Borough is given over to arable farming. The adopted local plan recognises that Doncaster's high quality agricultural land needs to be protected from inappropriate development so that we can maximise its economic benefits such as local food production. The Local Plan goes on to set out that where significant development is unavoidable, preference will be given to the use of poorer quality agricultural land in preference to higher quality land. Care should also be taken to avoid damage or disturbance to soils of high environmental value and other soils that contribute significantly to ecosystem services. Local Plan Policy 60 refers specifically to the protection of BMV and the need to conserve and minimise the loss of Doncaster's extensive area of high-quality arable farmland, noting that agriculture is the main land use within Doncaster, making up nearly two thirds of the total area. Appendix 9.6 - Agricultural Land Classification Soil Resource Assessment – sets out that the proposal site has the potential to impact 1370 hectares (ha) of agricultural land of which 976 ha have been surveyed to date. Of the area surveyed, 21.3% (207.07 ha) is	ALC surveys have been undertaken across the entirety of W1, W2 and W3. The findings of these surveys are shown in ES Volume 3, Figure 15.6: Agricultural Land Classification [EN0110020/APP/6.19] and have informed the baseline and assessment in this chapter. Desk-based review of ALC classification of land within the Cable Corridors has been undertaken. The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding the loss of agricultural land and has sought to avoid and minimise the use of best and most versatile (BMV) land where possible. The majority of the Site comprises non-BMV Subgrade 3b land (78.86%). ES Volume 6, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9], and ES Volume 6, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20] confirms that only a small proportion of the Site comprises BMV land, and this is largely not subject to permanent infrastructure, with the exception of approximately 0.4 ha associated with a substation compound. The ALC across the Order Limits (excluding the Cable Corridors) is as follows: • 0.94% of Grade 1 Agricultural Land; • 7.06% of Grade 2 Agricultural Land; • 11.16% of Subgrade 3a Agricultural Land; • 78.86% of Subgrade 3b Agricultural Land;	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	comprised of best and most versatile (BMV) land, of which 12.70 ha is of excellent quality ALC Grade 1, 89.97 ha of very good quality ALC Grade 2 and 105.03 ha of good quality ALC subgrade 3a. The remainder of the site that has been surveyed has been graded as ALC subgrade 3b (762.83 ha) or grade 4 (5.83 ha). CDC at this stage considers the loss of 207.07 ha of BMV productive agricultural land as significant. In addition, Figure 15.6, Volume 2 – Agricultural Land Classification Plan indicates that a significant proportion of Whitestone 1 has yet to be surveyed at this point. This raises significant concerns and means that CDC is unable to offer any more detailed comments in this respect at this time other than to highlight the position that preserving productive farmland is essential for ensuring local and national food security, especially in the face of global climate pressures and rising population demands.	• 0.32% of Grade 4 Agricultural Land; • 0.67% of Urban Land; • 0.13% of Non-Agricultural Land; and • 0.85% of Not Surveyed Land. In summary, of the area surveyed, 19% is comprised of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land, although in the majority of instances better quality grades show high spatial variability within larger areas of ALC subgrade 3b. BMV classification data for W1, W2 and W3, based on Site surveys and sampling, and for the Cable Corridors, based on a desk-based review, is provided in section 9.5 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9], including tabulated areas. The ALC survey is detailed in ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP6.20]. Agricultural use will not be permanently lost across the Site, with the exception of 0.4ha as set out above. The Proposed Development enables continued sheep grazing within solar areas, and following consultation, solar and mitigation areas have been reduced where possible to maximise land retained in agricultural use.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	Employment generation: CDC would note at this stage that albeit any benefits in employment terms would be temporary in nature, opportunities to maximise utilising the local workforce, and maximising the socio-economic benefits of the scheme, should be fully explored. In this respect, CDC would strongly encourage the Applicant to engage positively with Business Doncaster⁴ who are expertly placed to provide valuable insight into local markets. Through harnessing the local connections, intelligence and support networks that Business Doncaster has, we can ensure that the scheme achieves maximum output and added value in this respect. Furthermore, with regards to the wider opportunities to incorporate community benefits, teams within the wider council will have a strong understanding of local needs and would welcome the chance to work collaboratively with the applicant and local community.	An assessment of employment generation due to the Proposed Development has been provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-economics, Tourism and Recreation, and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15]. An outline Skills and Supply Chain Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.18] is submitted as part of this Application and sets out measures that will be put in place to support delivery of employment, training and supply chain opportunities during the construction and operation of the Proposed Development. The Applicant is aware of the importance of collaboration between local businesses, the LPA, and other authorities to ensure job opportunities and training are retained within the local area. Based on professional judgement and understanding of local and national supply chains, it is assumed that approximately 10% of construction spend will occur within Doncaster and Rotherham, 20% elsewhere in England, and 70% outside of England (further information is provided in Section 15.7 and details of the Proposed Development's contribution to local supply chain is provided in the outline Skills and Supply Chain Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.18]. During operation and maintenance, it is assumed that approximately 25% of spend will occur within Doncaster and	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Rotherham, 40% elsewhere in England, and 35% outside of England. The Applicant will work with established local networks to identify potential suppliers to the scheme. The first step will be to engage with Doncaster and Rotherham local initiatives. If suitable candidates cannot be found locally, the focus will extend to areas outside of the Rotherham and Doncaster districts. Doncaster Chamber of Commerce has in the past run supply chain expos and Business Doncaster may potentially be able to assist the Applicant with arranging a “meet the buyer” event. The Applicant is currently in talks with representatives from both CDC and RMBC to further explore this and firm up events.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	Glint and Glare: Table 16.2.11: Aerodromes within 20 km of the Proposed Development of the Glint and Glare Report contained at Volume 3, Appendix 16.2 sets out Doncaster Sheffield Airport is just 12km from the proposed site. Paragraph 16.2.69 provides a “Holding Note”, which states as follows: “It is noted that Doncaster Sheffield Airport has received funding at the time of writing, to reopen from 2027. Given the timing of the announcement of the reopening of this airport, it has not been included in the assessment of this Draft ES Appendix. Further assessment of the aviation assets associated with this airport will be undertaken for the ES.” CDC would emphasise in the strongest of terms that the reopening the airport is a key strategic priority for the Council, with a plan for passenger flights to resume⁵. As such, CDC requests that the impacts on the airport be fully accounted for within the final ES and that the baseline for all relevant assessments contained within it are with the airport as fully operational. This is further highlighted by Policy 58(B) of the adopted Local Plan sets out that in all cases low carbon and renewable energy proposals will be supported where they (inter alia) allow the continued safe and efficient operation of Doncaster Sheffield Airport.	The Applicant can confirm that aviation receptors, including Doncaster Sheffield Airport, have been considered within the Glint and Glare Assessment provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.2: Glint and Glare Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. It is noted that Doncaster Sheffield Airport has received funding at the time of writing, to reopen from 2027. Given the timing of the announcement of the reopening of this airport, the respective runways have been included in the assessment and details. For Doncaster Sheffield Airport, both Runways 02 and 20 presented no green, yellow or red glare occurring from any of the solar panels. Therefore, the impact on this receptor can be classified as None.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	CDC is satisfied with the approach taken to cumulative developments set out in Chapter 17. The Applicant may wish to note that the following applications are currently under consideration. Whilst at this stage, these do not constitute committed developments, the Applicant should keep this under review as the EIA work progresses. 23/02634/FULM Land to the South of Barnsley Road, to the East and West of Marr Grange Lane, Marr Installation of ground mounted photovoltaic farm with associated infrastructure, engineering works, access, and landscaping. 25/01535/FULM Land off Elmsall Lane and North of Moorhouse Lane, Moorhouse Installation of ground mounted photovoltaic farm and battery energy storage development with associated infrastructure, engineering works, landscaping and access. Furthermore, CDC has recently issued a Screening Opinion under our reference 25/01250/SCRE for 9.9MW ground mounted solar farm and co-located 30MW battery energy storage system (BESS), on land off Bilham Lane, Hooton Pagnell, Doncaster. Again, at this time this is not committed development for the purposes of EIA, but it may be worth continuing to monitor as we expect the application to be submitted imminently (notwithstanding determination dates are unknown at this time).	The Applicant can confirm that discussions regarding the additions of these planning applications have taken place between the Applicant and City of Doncaster Council. As a result of these discussions, it can be confirmed that ref. 23/02634/FULM has been added to the cumulative effects longlist in ES Volume 3, Figure 17.1: Long-List of Cumulative Developments [EN0110020/APP/6.19]. It can also be confirmed that the Screening Opinion included within City of Doncaster Council's response, later was submitted for a full application under ref. 25/02389/FULM which was added to the cumulative longlist and included within the Cumulative Effects Assessment. The Applicant confirmed with the City of Doncaster that Ref. 25/01535/FULM was not to be added to the longlist because it fell out of the cumulative 10km Search Radius. Further information around the cumulative assessment can be found within ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN0110020/APP/6.17], ES Volume 3, Figure 17.1: Long-List of Cumulative Developments [EN0110020/APP/6.19], ES Volume 3, Figure 17.2: Cumulative Effects Assessment – Zones of Influence within 1 km [EN0110020/APP/6.19] and ES Volume 3, Figure 17.3: Cumulative Effects Assessment – Zones of Influence within 10 km [EN0110020/APP/6.19].	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	Purported “Design Principles”: CDC is significantly concerned that in reality the overriding design principle guiding this Project remains centred on the need to maximise the amount of renewable energy provided to the National Grid. The position on this as set out in the National Policy Statements is well understood by CDC but it submits in the strongest of terms that this should not be at all costs. The Design Principles set out by the Applicant seemingly indicate that the Project will be informed by an understanding of what is important to people about the local area. However, the very highly valued characteristics of the landscape, which is intrinsically linked in many ways to the significant and unique heritage of Whitestone 1, has been entirely downplayed by the Applicant at every opportunity. This is an altogether cynical and disingenuous approach. Whilst the purported Design Principles put forward by the Applicant seek to demonstrate a commitment to: • Enhancing recreational access across the landscape • Respecting landscape character and cultural heritage and • Minimising visual impact. This simply does not follow through to the proposed development itself, either in the broadest of senses when considering the altogether disconnected and dispersed nature of the Project, through to the more detailed mitigation proposed to be incorporated.	The Proposed Development is being brought forward to meet the UK’s need for home-grown, renewable energy. The Applicant has been clear through consultation materials during the pre-application period and this DCO application that the goal was to develop a project that is sensitive to the local environment and communities. The mission statement for the Proposed Development is <i>“To embed good design by maximising the amount of clean energy generated to export to the National Grid, crafting a development that is socially and environmentally sensitive; engaging in meaningful conversation with communities and taking account of people’s visual amenity. The project will embed sustainability and resilience, enhancing biodiversity and recreational access across the landscape”</i>. The mission statement and design principles, as set out in the Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7], exist to help strike the balance, to both maximise renewable energy production while minimising impacts on the local environment. To meet the principle of enhancing recreational access across the landscape, the Applicant has consulted with the community and local stakeholders to identify existing permissive paths and propose new permissive paths to create circular routes across the Site and improve access being key locations.	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		To meet the principle of respecting landscape character and cultural heritage, the Applicant has reduced the developable area by 37%. This includes creating appropriate offsets around heritage assets such as Conisbrough Castle and the scheduled Roman Villa, as well as heritage villages such as Clifton and Brampton en le Morthen. To minimise visual impact, the Applicant conducted a comprehensive consultation and engagement strategy to achieve specific feedback from near neighbours, stakeholders, and members of the community. The Applicant reduced the developable areas by 37% to create bespoke offsets around homes near the Order Limits, villages, and public rights of way. In addition, the Applicant is proposing landscaping to help minimise visual impacts where possible, while also supporting wildlife and increasing biodiversity. See also: • ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4], Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1], • Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]. • Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.13].	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	Based on all the above considerations, CDC recommends in the strongest possible terms that Whitestone 1 be removed from the project in its entirety. Notwithstanding the fact that it is entirely disconnected from the remainder of the Project in straightforward locational terms, there are fundamental and overriding planning harms arising from its inclusion, which simply cannot be successfully mitigated at any level and for which there is no clear justification.	Removing Whitestone 1 entirely would be inconsistent with the design principles as set out in the Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7] and national energy targets, and would threaten the viability of the Proposed Development as a whole. In order to balance the need to produce renewable energy while doing so in a manner that is sensitive to the local environment and communities, the Applicant has made significant reductions to the solar areas in Whitestone 1. While the solar areas in the entire Proposed Development have been reduced by 37%, the reduction in Whitestone 1 is 49% to create offsets around homes, villages and hamlets, heritage assets and ecological sensitive areas. The Applicant regards this as a proportionate response.	Yes
City of Doncaster Council	On a without prejudice basis, should Whitestone 1 remain part of the proposals going forward, it should be substantially reduced in extent and scale, at the very earliest opportunity, in the following ways (and as an absolute minimum), and CDC would also emphasise that it is important that the views of local residents/community groups feeding into this statutory consultation process are also taken into account: • All land to the east of Conisbrough Parks Farm should be removed from the Order limits entirely, accounting for the Scheduled Ancient Monument Designation and the setting of the Clifton Village Conservation Area. Additionally, a significant buffer to the west of the Scheduled Ancient Monument should also be	Removing Whitestone 1 entirely would be inconsistent with the design principles as set out in the Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7] and national energy targets, and would threaten the viability of the Proposed Development as a whole. Therefore, the Applicant has made most of the suggested changes in the Illustrative Masterplan (ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1) [EN0110020/APP/6.19] , including: • Removing the area above the scheduled monument and the field	yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	incorporated. It is not sufficient to propose these areas for mitigation/enhancement. • The parcels of land identified as “where no access exists” on the Access Limitations Plan (Draft ES Volume 2, Document 6.6.2) should be removed from the Order limits entirely. Again, it is not sufficient to propose these areas for mitigation/enhancement. • In respect of all residential properties (including Hilltop Farm, Conisbrough Park Farm and Conisbrough Lodge Farm), an increased offset between them and any solar PV panels should be integrated in order to ensure outlook from these properties is suitably and effectively preserved. It is not sufficient to simply incorporate nominal buffers between the boundaries of these properties and the panels. • Northern pockets where panels are identified between Parks Farm Cottages and Conisbrough Park Farm should be removed and given over for mitigation/enhancement rather than panels, in order to create a much more resilient and comprehensive buffer at this northern end. In addition, for the same reasons, panels to the west and south of Conisbrough Park Farm should be removed. • Much larger buffers should be incorporated to either S1 or S2 given the scale and especially given the proximity to Park Lane to the east – the lack of suitable buffers along Park Lane and the extent of operational development on either side will result in an altogether enclosed and urban experience.	northeast of it from the Proposed Development. • Removing the fields south of Clifton from the Proposed Development • Creating larger offset around Hill Top Farm, Conisbrough Park Farm, and Conisbrough Lodge, and removing the mitigation areas around isolated dwellings including Hill Top House, Spring Bank Bungalow and Park Farm Cottages so that these areas are no longer part of the Proposed Development. Figure 6.6.2 in the Draft ES refers to access for breeding bird surveys (where access was not provided, surveys were not completed), not whether access to land parcels is possible by construction / operation vehicles. Some of the parcels marked have been removed from the Order Limits due to proximity to the Roman Villa Scheduled Monument, but not all the areas have been removed, as these areas can be accessed through internal tracks. The Applicant has maintained the two fields of solar that are located between Parks Farm Cottages and Conisbrough Parks Farm and included landscaping mitigation to reduce visual impacts. Regarding the substation, the Applicant has selected the location in the centre of Whitestone 1. While the masterplan shows this is taking up the	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		entire field, in fact it will only need a small portion of the field and will be placed as far from Park Lane as possible, subject to further ground investigations. Further information is set out in the Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7].	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	It is acknowledged that Population and Human Health is addressed through various technical chapters of the Draft ES where applicable. Notwithstanding this, CDC's Public Health – Healthy Places Team has provided feedback from its perspective on the proposals and highlights the importance of considering the impact of the proposed development on the population's physical health, mental health and well-being. These comments are reproduced below and should be read in conjunction with all other comments made above in respect of the specific Draft ES chapters, acknowledging that topics relating to (for example) landscape, air quality, noise and vibration, socio-economics, tourism and land use have an important and interrelated bearing on public health considerations. Those chapters should, where applicable: • Description of the existing population, including demographic data, health status, and deprivation levels. • Summary of baseline conditions for potential impact areas like air quality, noise levels, and traffic. Within the ES chapters the following areas should be assessed in respect of public health considerations: • Physical health: Assess potential impacts from construction and operation, such as dust, noise, and traffic, which can affect air quality and lead to issues like respiratory problems or hearing loss. • Mental health and well-being: Evaluate effects on mental well-being and emotional health, potentially caused by visual impacts, construction noise, or changes to the local environment. This may include perceptions of safety concerns creating barrier to	A description of the existing population of the relevant Study Areas is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-economics, Tourism and Recreation, and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15]. This includes demographic data, community health, and deprivation. Impacts on human health, where relevant, are assessed within ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality, ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport, ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.12-6.15] and summarised in ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.17]. The technical assessments have concluded that due to the appropriate mitigation measures being in place, and best practice construction methods being used, individually there would be no impact on human health from each environmental effect. Effects on mental health and wellbeing of the general population as result of landscape and visual impacts are considered in the intra-projects effects section in ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.17]. Extensive consultation has been held with local residents to discuss key concerns regarding the Proposed Development, and their feedback has	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	walking, wheeling or cycling in the area. • Recreation and access: Analyse how the project might affect access to open spaces, public rights of way, and recreational activities. All users should be considered including but not limited to those walking, wheeling and cycling. Each chapter should include appropriate mitigation considering all that may be impacted: • Propose specific mitigation measures to avoid, reduce, or offset potential adverse impacts. • Outline measures to enhance health and well-being benefits, such as creating new green spaces, crossing points or providing local employment and training opportunities. • Address any unintended consequences and consider how to manage them.	been taken into account to ensure impacts to communities are mitigated as much as possible. Access to PRowS supports mental and physical health. The Proposed Development has been designed to retain PRowS with continued access to the wider countryside along at least one side of the route or through appropriately sized corridors, as secured in the Works Plans [EN0110020/APP/2.3]. PRowS will remain open during construction, with only temporary closures or minor diversions where necessary (as set out in Outline PRow Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.14]). As a result, no adverse effects on human health from access to physical activity are anticipated.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	Public rights of way (PROW): • What measures will be implemented to ensure PROW remain safe and accessible for all users throughout the construction phase? • If any PROW require closure, what will be the duration and how will this be communicated to the local community? • What provisions will be made to ensure safe access for residents from Sheffield Road? This could include the installation of a crossing to support safe pedestrian movement. • Provide details of screening to be put in place along the PROW. Any screening put in place needs to be established. A maintenance plan of the planted screening also needs to be in place to ensure paths are always usable.	Details on all PROWs users, including equestrian use is presented in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20], summarised and assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]. The potential visual impacts on PROW users are assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual [EN0110020/APP/6.7] ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13] details the baseline collision data in the Study Area. Further details are set out in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20] including locations of the collisions for key junctions along the routes within the Study Area. The full result of the assessment is shown in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.4: Road User and pedestrian Safety Data [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Where public rights of way interact with the Site, these areas will be managed to ensure safe passage for both pedestrians and vehicles. The assessments conclude that the construction of the Proposed Development will result in a Negligible magnitude of impact on road user and pedestrian safety.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		In response to feedback from the statutory consultation and ongoing engagement with local highways, the Applicant has moved the W1 access point further along the A630 to minimise potential cumulative impacts with the housing development at this location. See the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] for further information. The Applicant notes the importance of maintaining safety on the A630 and has engaged with the LHA on the proposed concept access design. The Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20] provides estimates of vehicle volumes considered, and known crash data. The Applicant has committed to retaining existing PRowWs. During construction, there may be a requirement to temporarily close some PRowWs, with temporary diversions provided for safety reasons. These closures and diversions would be managed via a Public Rights of Way Management Plan (PRowWMP). An oPRowWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] has been submitted with the Application. The Streets, Rights of Way, and Access Plans [EN0110020/APP/2.4] shows the proposed temporary PRowW closures and diversions, along with paths remaining open and new permissive paths. The Applicant is only proposing to temporarily close one PRowW with no	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		diversion (Whiston Footpath No.12). Some footpaths will be temporarily diverted for a short period of approximately 2-3 weeks each.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	Permissive path • The proposed path must be of a high standard to ensure it is accessible to all user groups, including pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrians. Please provide further information on how the permissive path will link to the current footway on Firsby Lane and integrate with the wider PRow network. Also, the PRow near Parks Farm Cottages to Conisbrough Park Farm. • In order to create resting places Public Health would request benches to be included in the plans as well as information boards highlighting PRow routes.	The Applicant is including 14.5km of permissive paths across the entire Site. In Whitestone 1, this includes a new circular path that connects Firsby northeast to Park Lane, north towards the A630, and then south west to Firsby Lane. There are also permissive paths included to connect into the existing PRow that connect Firsby to Micklebring. These paths would be open to pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians for the life of the Proposed Development. While benches are not included in ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1: Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/6.19] at this stage, this is something that could be developed through ongoing engagement in the detailed design stage, or through use of the community benefit fund.	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	Noise • Please provide detailed information on the anticipated noise levels during both the construction and operational phases, particularly in relation to local residents living near the access point on Sheffield Road. • In addition, has consideration been given to other user groups who may be affected by noise such as pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians using the Public Rights of Way • We would like to know how you plan to assess how noise may influence the experience, safety, and wellbeing of these groups, especially in areas where PRow pass through or run adjacent to construction zones. • Please outline the mitigation measures proposed to manage noise impacts on the local residential area near Sheffield Road. Will this include whether mitigation strategies vary depending on operating hours (e.g. early mornings, evenings, weekends).	The noise assessment for the Proposed Development is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14] and the accompanying appendices in ES Volume 3. The potential effects of construction noise connected to the Proposed Development are considered in ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]. Construction noise impacts are generally predicted to be negligible or minor, though a small number of moderate or major impacts may result for some assessment locations, for instance during the installation of Cable Route B, highways alterations, and construction of other cable corridors. Any major impacts would be very brief in nature, and no moderate impacts would occur more frequently than advised by best practice application of BS 5228-1. Therefore, the assessment considers that construction noise impacts to be Not Significant in EIA Regulation terms. The components of the solar farm that make noise are the power conversion stations, the batteries, and the substations. The batteries and substations have been selection in locations to minimise noise impacts and would be at least 300m from homes. The power conversion stations would be located at least 100m from homes and 50m from public rights	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		of way, where practicable as defined in the Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]. Operational noise effects are assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]. No assessment locations are expected to rating levels which exceed +5 dB above background, and therefore not triggering the potential for adverse impacts which could result in significant effects. Operational noise impacts for all receptors are either Negligible or Minor, which would be Not Significant in EIA Regulation terms. The Applicant has carried out assessments for the impact of the Proposed Development during the construction phase. Any adverse impacts will be temporary in nature, while there are no significant effects predicted from disruption to the PRoW network or from construction noise. Increase in demand for temporary accommodation is expected to be small and potentially beneficial, and there is likely to be enough capacity to absorb increased demand.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	Air Quality As a main access route that construction traffic is proposed to take including numerous daily HGV trips will be through AQMA 5, a detailed assessment of what impact this will have is required.	The IAQM traffic methodologies applied in this assessment consider the additional traffic through the AQMA with consideration given to the Council's Air Quality Action Plan. Details of the construction routes selected to be used by the Proposed Development are provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20] the routes considered are outlined as the best options available to minimised impacts. During the construction phase, the change in traffic flows generally does not pass the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM), DEFRA, and DMRB thresholds for assessment. Where roads are screened in, they have been screened out at the second stage due to the overall number of HGVs travelling along the road and the length of the construction phase for the Proposed Development. For AQMA 5 in particular, the AQMA shows a downward trend in monitored NO₂ and shows values under the Air Quality Standard for the last three years of monitoring as of 2023 when the last annual status report was available. As such it can be argued that the more stringent IAQM AQMA screening criteria is not suitable for the links within these areas and these links can therefore be screened out. Detailed modelling has therefore not been completed for these roads. In summary, human and ecological receptors have been screened out of the air quality assessment,	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		and no effects are anticipated. The DEFRA Emissions Factor Toolkit has therefore not been used as no detailed assessment / modelling for air quality is required and negligible, not significant effects are anticipated from construction traffic. Further details can be found in ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12].	
City of Doncaster Council	Road Safety Due to the increase in vehicles including HGV's please provide information on the impact to the local community and plans for mitigation in both Conisbrough and Edlington. • Please provide information on how the safety of pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrians using the surrounding roads will be considered and maintained throughout the construction phase. • What specific provisions will be made to ensure the safety of both residents and construction workers when crossing Sheffield Road? Such as the installation of a pedestrian crossing on Sheffield Road to support: i. Safe access to the PRow for residents ii. Safe crossing for workers accessing the site, particularly those travelling via public transport and using the bus stop at Micklebring Grove Community Insight from the Edlington Walking, Wheeling and Cycling Masterplan highlights 'safety as a key factor with many responses calling for slower traffic and quieter streets. Survey respondents also commented that pavement parking and vehicles blocking road junctions cause safety concerns.' Responses stated	The Applicant has produced a Transport Statement (ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2) [EN0110020/APP/6.20], an oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12] and oPRowMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14] to facilitate the safe delivery of the Proposed Development. In addition, the Applicant welcomes further collaboration on the oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12] to inform the CTMP and incorporate local requirements. The Transport Statement also highlights locations where the applicant has avoided routing HGVs through, in response to consultation.	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	'Edlington Lane is dominated by vehicular traffic and is an oppressive and unfriendly environment for non-car methods of transport' 'Edlington Lane was also identified as the key route for journeys made by pupils at Hill Top Primary Academy during a mapping activity at the school engagement session. This demonstrates the route's importance to a number of vulnerable members of Edlington's community.' We would request the above insight is taken into consideration in regard to the HGV journeys and how they might exacerbate safety concerns already evident in Edlington. These safety concerns can create barriers to walking, wheeling and cycling therefore what mitigation measure will the applicant put in place particularly paying attention to vulnerable road users.		
City of Doncaster Council	Glint and Glare Information should be included on how pedestrians, cyclists, equestrians and all road users could be affected and what mitigation is to be put in place to address these impacts.	The glint and glare assessment for the Proposed Development is provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.2: Glint and Glare Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20] and summarised in ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16]. This includes details of the assessed receptors (including PRow and road users) and mitigation proposals. Embedded mitigation includes: Solar PV modules would be black, blue, or dark grey in colour with an anti-reflective coating, as mentioned within the Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1: Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/6.19] has been prepared which proposes various screening methods (i.e. landscape planting), which are fully described in the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13].	
City of Doncaster Council	Excavations close to the Anglo-Saxon church at Conisbrough, South Yorkshire, UK, revealed a plank-walled construction dated by dendrochronology to the late sixth or early seventh century. It is suggested that this formed part of a stock pond for fish, associated with an elite residence to which a partly surviving Anglo-Saxon church incorporating Northumbrian features is related. Environmental evidence shows a neglected wood pasture landscape associated with the infilling of a ditch which cuts through the structure. This is likely to be related to a deer park established shortly after the Norman Conquest and associated with the castle.	Noted. Conisbrough Park (02958/01) is currently designated as a non-designated asset in terms of significance. Its description in the HER record acknowledges that its existence is known primarily through documentary sources and also acknowledges its changing use and form through economic and social changes. Whilst a recently found small ditch supports its historic use as a deer park, its current value as a deer park is low, due to its physical form having undergone many changes. Therefore, whilst the deer park is acknowledged, it is assessed as part of the Conisbrough Castle Setting assessment in ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	Key Arboricultural Concerns: 1. Vegetation Removal Without Supporting Arboricultural Documentation The proposal includes the removal of hedgerows and tree belts, especially along the Cable Corridor Options and within the W1 and W2 parcels. However, no Tree Survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA), or Tree Protection Plan (TPP) has been provided. These are essential to assess the impact on tree assets and ensure compliance with BS5837:2012. 2. Impact on Mature and Ancient Tree Features The LVIA identifies tree belts and ancient woodland adjacent to the site (e.g. Hooton Cliff and Spring Wood), yet there is no clear strategy for their protection. The absence of detailed root protection measures and offset distances raises concerns about potential indirect impacts during construction and cable trenching. 3. Conflict with Policy 32 – Green Infrastructure Protection Policy 32 requires developments to protect and enhance green infrastructure, including trees and hedgerows. The scale of proposed vegetation clearance, particularly without a clear mitigation hierarchy (avoid, reduce, compensate), is contrary to this policy. 4. BNG Risk from Tree Loss While the applicant commits to a 10% Biodiversity Net Gain, the removal of mature tree features—without quantifying their ecological value—risks undermining this target. Replacement planting (e.g. 0.3–0.6 m transplants) will take years to establish and cannot immediately offset the loss of mature canopy cover or	The design of the Proposed Development has incorporated a number of standard buffers for the location of infrastructure from easily identifiable features, with the aim of reducing any potential impacts to sensitive receptors where practicable. These buffers, as set out in the Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3], are: • 5m from hedgerows; • 25m from woodland; and • 15m from individual trees With reference to the demonstration of ‘tree-led design’, the Proposed Development has sought to minimise vegetation loss across the extent of the Order limits. As well as the buffers detailed above, the extent of works has been designed to fit within the existing structure of vegetation (trees and hedgerows). The location of access points on the edge of, and within, the Order Limits has been designed to maximise use of existing access points or gaps in vegetation as far as practicable. Where limited removal has been identified this is detailed on the Vegetation Removal Plan [EN0110020/APP/2.9] has been submitted with the Application. Where this is required, replacement planting is proposed. Details of how vegetation loss and the proposed mitigation planting have been included in the detailed BNG assessment are provided in ES	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	habitat connectivity. 5. Lack of Tree-Led Design Integration There is no evidence that tree constraints have informed the layout of infrastructure or cable corridors. Trees should be treated as design assets, not obstacles. The absence of early-stage arboricultural input is a missed opportunity to reduce conflict and improve outcomes. Conclusion In the absence of the required arboricultural documentation and given the scale of potential tree and hedgerow loss, I must object to this application on grounds of non-compliance with Policy 32. I recommend the applicant be required to submit: • A full Tree Survey, AIA, and TPP • A revised layout that demonstrates tree-led design principles • A clear mitigation strategy for any unavoidable losses	Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Avoidance of trees and hedgerows has informed the overall design, including the selection and alignment of Cable Corridors, with trenchless crossings proposed where practicable to avoid woodland and tree impacts. Most woodland within the Order Limits will be retained in full. Where individual trees are unavoidably affected, this is limited to non-TPO woodland and only where no satisfactory alternative exists. All ancient woodland and veteran trees will be avoided in accordance with current government guidance and the Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]. An arboricultural survey and Tree Constraints Plan (TCP) have been prepared in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.14: Arboriculture Survey and Tree Constraints Plan [EN0110020/APP/6.14], with further surveys to be undertaken prior to construction. Protective measures will be implemented through the CEMP, which is secured via a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. To ensure compliance with BS5837:2012 during construction, operation and decommissioning. Hedgerows will be retained wherever possible, with existing field gateways used to minimise removals. Where tree or hedgerow loss is unavoidable, Biodiversity Net Gain losses will be minimised, and	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		compensation provided through extensive native tree planting, including the use of standard trees and hedgerow reinforcement across the Site. These measures are designed to deliver a significant net gain for tree and hedgerow habitats and long-term landscape connectivity.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	The A630 is a principal route proposed for access to W1, It is a busy A road that connects Rotherham to the A1 passing Doncaster. It is the principal route identified by Whitestone, but it has a documented history of road safety concerns. The A630 has experienced several serious collisions, including fatal incidents, underscoring ongoing safety risks for motorists and pedestrians alike. This includes five teenagers who were killed in a horror smash in November 2014 just three years after a trio of town teens also died in a collision on part of the A630 where Doncaster Road turns into Sheffield Road in Conisbrough. Historic accident data reveals multiple recorded collisions along this stretch, amplified by high traffic volumes and complex junctions. Press reports have called the area an accident black spot where eight teens died and STILL one of area's most dangerous roads. Since the press report the A630 continues with a heavy fast traffic flow, with numerous videos on social media regarding anti-social use of the road. These risks are heightened by increased construction and operational traffic linked to the proposed development. The table above, prepared by Whitestone, indicates the need for mitigation measures and alternative routes to ensure the safety of all users, as it represents data collected between 2019 and 2023. However, the scope of the data is limited, as it does not extend far enough back to capture historical fatal accidents on the proposed road network or reflect current trends accurately. Open-source research indicates that a fatal collision occurred on B6376 Edington Lane April 12th, 2025.	The Applicant understands the importance of safety and has consulted with the Local Highway Authority on the draft access designs and will continue to refine the oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12] to reflect appropriate controls. The Applicant considered multiple routes into W1 in optioneering and believes that the A630 remains the most suitable option as this avoids unduly impacting smaller villages or causing damage to smaller roads that are less suitable to HGV traffic.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	Additionally, a fatal accident was reported on Ruddle Lane, Micklebring, Doncaster in February 2016. Importantly, Section 7 of the Transport Statement by Whitestone projects a 116.6% increase in HGV traffic along Ruddle Lane, raising substantial concerns for both road users and residents. These fatalities and missing information appear to downplay the significance and cast doubt on the figures and further concern as sensitive receptors such as schools and pedestrian crossings are on this route.		

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	2. Traffic Congestion and Impact on Road Network The A630 is already identified as a heavily trafficked corridor both from the directions of the A1 and Rotherham, frequently experiencing congestion during peak hours. The anticipated increase in construction and operational traffic for W1 is expected to exacerbate these issues, resulting in longer delays and reduced network resilience. Notably, congestion on the A630 has a knock-on effect on the A1, a key strategic route in the region, as delays and incidents can quickly propagate, affecting broader network reliability and journey times. Concerns have also been raised about the suitability of the A630 as the sole A-road access given its current usage and congestion levels. Alternative main arterial routes should be identified and considered by the applicant to mitigate alongside resilience to manage and foresee issue the amount of HGV activity would facilitate should any of the route be shut off. During flooding episodes or collisions tail backs go as far as Dalton and Kilnhurst in Rotherham to the west and to the A1 to of the west of the A630.	The Applicant has considered peak hours in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20], with the goal to minimise impacts during this time such as scheduling deliveries outside of 8:00-9:00 or 17:00-18:00. The Applicant took an approach to minimise traffic on local road networks where reasonable, to reduce the quantity of HGVs in these locations.	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	3. Air Quality and Pollution Air pollution along the A630 and A6023 crossroads outside Conisbrough Castle is a significant concern, as highlighted by Doncaster Free Press article written by Robert Cumber as recent as July 2025. These roads are already THE most polluted in the borough of Doncaster, with nitrogen dioxide (NO2) levels regularly exceeding recommended limits, this is already above the UK Legal Limit. The expected increase in vehicular movements associated with W1 will worsen local air quality, causing additional health impacts for residents and sensitive receptors such as schools (Hilltop Primary School). Any development that increases traffic on these corridors must be carefully scrutinised for its impact on air quality and compliance with local and national targets. specifically looking at the Doncaster Plan Policy 50 (Health) / Rotherham Plan Core Strategy 27 Community Health and Safety This conflicts with Whitestone's Transport-Statement Section 1.1.185 where routes were planned to avoid environmentally sensitive zones, Due to it being above nitrogen dioxide (NO2) levels above the UK Legal Limit, this should be a serious consideration and mitigated by the applicant.	The air quality assessment for the Proposed Development, including consideration of traffic emissions, is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	There is significant local opposition, not only to the development due to its size and scale, but also the proposed route and access arrangements, particularly regarding the use of the A630 and B6376 as the only routes and limited access points. Recent housing applications on Doncaster Road, including one near the Hilltop pub, have highlighted community concerns about traffic impacts, congestion, and road safety. Objections have been lodged by residents and local businesses, who cite increased journey times, reduced air quality, and diminished quality of life. Statutory consultees have been urged to consider these objections seriously within the planning process.	The Applicant has considered the access point proposed for the housing development, to minimise interface risk with the proposed Development, as part of design. Consultation with the Local Highway Authority will continue as each scheme progresses, and detailed design is completed.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	5. Sensitive Receptors, Funeral Processions and Community Impact, Businesses and the community along the stretch of the A630 and B6376 need to be consulted in relation to such a large development and potential traffic issue for staff and customer welfare and strains on day-to-day life of residents and commuters. The two cemeteries and school should be classed as sensitive receptors with the Whitestone methodology. The impact of increased traffic on funeral processions travelling through Conisbrough to the cemetery is a particular concern as it is so close the access point. Edington Cemetery on Edlington Lane is also set to be passed by a number of HGV on the lesser route. Additional congestion would negatively affect the dignity and timing of funeral cortèges, potentially disrupting the final moments for bereaved families. The need to maintain unimpeded and respectful passage for such processions should be a key consideration in any access strategy for the site. Edlington Lane is totally unsuitable due to the amount of shops, pedestrian users and community buildings. (See Section 9 for further sensitive receptors such as Hill Top Primary School)	The Applicant can confirm that Edlington Lane has been removed for HGV traffic as a result of the design changes and consultation, with Appendix A.2 of the oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12] which outlines the proposed HGV routing along the A630.	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	6. Flooding Events and Traffic Disruption Conisbrough has experienced significant flooding in recent years, resulting in major well documented traffic disruptions. Flood events have previously led to the national leaders of political parties to attend to draw further attention to the issues. The flooding has led to road closures, particularly on routes towards the A1, causing severe delays and congestion. The increased pressure on the A630 as the primary access route exacerbates vulnerability to such incidents, with limited alternative options available during flood events. Ensuring network resilience and emergency access during adverse weather remains a critical consideration alongside the flooding caused by the work on excessive works on Conisbrough Parks and added drainage issues caused by the potential works. The A630 at Hooton Roberts in Rotherham has flooding issue regularly flooding causing back up to beyond the access point on the A630 Conisbrough side. This should cause serious considerations to the access points and routes with a review of alternatives to mitigate this problem which will only worsen due to global warming and extreme weather conditions.	The Applicant will have standard weather monitoring and response procedures as part of construction and engage with Local Highway Authorities as required. Keeping HGVs to major roads limits the risk in these scenarios, but monitoring approaches in the oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12] will enable reporting and management.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	7. Route Analysis The feasibility of using A630 Sheffield Road as an access route has been assessed and found unsuitable due to its connections with minor local roads and bridleways (Park Lane / Firsby Lane), restricting its capacity and suitability for construction or operational traffic. Alternative routes through Clifton, Micklebring, and Braithwell, Ravenfield have also been evaluated. While Whitestone has proposed that construction traffic be routed via Clifton or Braithwell, these alternatives present their own challenges and assessed as unsuitable. Micklebring, for example, would see up to 38 two-way trips, primarily involving worker vehicles. However, it is accepted by the applicant that these villages are not designed to accommodate sustained construction traffic volumes, and local road geometry, sensitive receptors, community concerns and the potential for disruption render these options largely unfeasible. Within the Draft Environmental Statement Volume 3 13.2 Table 2-20 2028 AADT Future Baseline + Construction Traffic (Two-way) has identified that Ruddle Lane, Braithwell (Between Carr Ln and Shipman Balk) would see an increase in HGVs of 116.6%. Beacon Lane in Clifton / off Edlington Lane has been identified as having a 1060.3% (one thousand and sixty) increase in HGVs, this is clearly unsuitable as an alternative.	The Applicant assessed roads to Whitestone 1 that were most suitable for the project requirements, and the A630 presented the most acceptable approach, in response to avoiding villages where reasonable, as raised in the consultation feedback. See also the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1].	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	8. Mitigation Measures Whitestone Solar has acknowledged the constraints and concerns associated with the proposed access routes. The Draft Environmental Statement (Volume 3, 13.2 Transport Statement) outlines a series of mitigation measures, to be formalised in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP), however as you will see there is no real alternatives or mitigations given to the issue. Within the initial non statutory consultation in November 2024 a number of concerns have been documented within the Draft Environmental Statement (Volume 3, 13.2 Transport Statement) showing the following concern and responses by the applicant. To summarise - mitigations fails to balance the concerns of the feedback and include prioritising higher-capacity routes, implementing safety improvements, and scheduling vehicle movements to minimise disruption. Nevertheless, the mitigation strategy is limited by the fundamental capacity and safety issues inherent to the existing road network and lack of entry points and access which is clearly unsuitable under the current plans.	The Applicant has updated the values seen in the Transport Statement (ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2) [EN0110020/APP/6.20] and oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12] based on design changes, and welcomes further commentary from the City of Doncaster Council.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	9. Weight and Volume of Loads National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure Energy (EN-3) (2023) states Paragraph 2.10.125 states that “Applicants should ensure all sections of roads and bridges on the proposed delivery route can accommodate the weight and volume of the loads and widths of the vehicles. Although unlikely, where modifications to road and/or bridges are required, these should be identified, and potential effects addressed in the ES”. Having reviewed the Transport Statement Draft-ES-Volume-3-Appendix-13.2_Transport-Statement Section 1.1.185 states routes were planned to avoid roads with weight, height, or width restrictions, school areas, and roads with high pedestrian activity. Considerations should be given to the pedestrian tunnel which runs underneath the A630 at the TransPennine Trail leading to Conisbrough Viaduct. Thousands of heavy articulated HGV journeys over years should be mitigated and protected for the public who use this popular trail. Conisbrough Castle should also be a sensitive receptor due to the status and tourism of the scheduled monument. Transport Statement Paragraph 1.1.52 states Edlington Lane is a local road serving residential areas. It provides access to local amenities and schools, and street lighting is present. The road supports two-way traffic. The road runs between the A630 and Carr Lane. The speed limit is mostly 60mph, 30mph in built up areas and 40mph just before the roundabouts with Edlington Lane and Ruddle Lane. What paragraph 1.1.52 of the transport statement fails to acknowledge is	Edlington Lane has been removed for HGV traffic as a result of the design changes and consultation, with Appendix A.2 of the oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12] outlining the proposed HGV routing along the A630. Further works to assess bridge loadings will continue as detailed design progresses, in collaboration with National Highways.	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	that Hill Top Primary School is on Edlington Lane, alongside high pedestrian activity including a pedestrian crossing, supermarkets, shops and a social club, confirming misalignment with (EN-3) (2023) states Paragraph 2.10.125 and the Transport Statement Section 1.1.185. There should be an alternative route to this to show some mitigation however the roads leading from Edlington Road would not be suitable for the HGVs. A630 High Road Table 2-19 2028 Average Daily Two-Way Movements (AADT Baseline) Page 48 showing that the total will be a total of 27,183 Journeys (576 Daily). On that stretch of Road this is clearly unsustainable. Due to the amount of vehicle added to the already congested area should there be any accidents on the route there are no places for the HGVs to have any alternate routes making W1 an unsuitable location, with no options.		

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
City of Doncaster Council	Whilst I support renewable energy in principle, this particular site is entirely inappropriate for such a large-scale industrial development and in particular the proposed route you intend to take through Edlington, past the immediate entrances to 2 schools and an Adult Learning/Community Centre, as well as the adjacent Secondary school, en route to accessing the site at Beacon Lane, is totally unacceptable, flagrantly dangerous and irresponsible. The route also runs past 3 other schools in near vicinity off Edlington Lane further along this road (Edlington Victoria with some 300 pupils, St Mary's RC and a further RC private school). The most direct negative impact on me and my family is the road route you have proposed through Edlington, bringing all your construction traffic, abnormal loads and deliveries along the B6376 through Edlington and Old Edlington to the 2 mini-roundabouts before turning into Ruddle Lane.	Regarding Edlington Lane, the Applicant can confirm that this has been removed for HGV traffic as a result of the design changes and consultation, with Appendix A.2 of the oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12] outlining the proposed HGV routing along the A630.	Yes
City of York Council	I have forwarded this onto the highways team. If you require any further information on any other Council Service please visit www.york.gov.uk	Noted.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Kirklees Council	I write in response to your below email on behalf of Kirklees Council / LPA. We have no comment to make.	Noted	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
North East Derbyshire District Council	The council supports moving the solar panels away from built up areas and increasing the area to be set aside for landscaping and biodiversity net gain. The council supports the creation of permissive paths which would provide opportunities for recreation, The applicant is encouraged to think carefully about where these paths start and finish to provide a useable network allowing access from built up areas. Power conversion stations and (If proposed in W3) BESS schemes should be positioned in areas which minimise their impact on green belt openness and the character of the landscape. Given the need for tall fencing, screening should be considered with particular thought to the layout of existing field boundaries and using planting which reflects the guidance for the Landscape Character Type. Cable Route 3D appears to be in North East Derbyshire. This is a short section which crosses the M1, the council has no objection under ground cables as described. The council would expect appropriate contaminated land (including Coal mine risk where appropriate), ecology, archaeology. Landscape visual impact and flood risk assessments to be carried out. The council supports the potential employment opportunities and would hope that staff could be sourced from the local area where appropriate.	The design of the Proposed Development has been amended in response to consultee comments, public feedback, and environmental assessments and surveys. ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4] and Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7] details the design process. It can be confirmed that there will be no BESS proposed in Whitestone 3. The Power Conversion Stations would be positioned in line with the Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3] to help minimise noise impacts and coloured sensitively to blend in with the local environment. The requested assessments of contaminated land, ecology, archaeology, LVIA, and flood risk have all been provided within the ES, respectively as: • ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9] • ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]. • ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		• ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7] • ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10].	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
North Lincolnshire Council	I can confirm that after consultation with our internal technical consultees that North Lincolnshire Council has no comments or objections to raise in respect of this project with the proposed development not likely to result in any significant impact upon North Lincolnshire.	Noted.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	It is noted that for Volume 1 Chapter 6 Biodiversity and Nature Conservation, that the designated local wildlife sites included on the adopted Policies Map and within the zone of influence, have not all been considered. No explanation is provided within the draft ES as to why this is the case. This issue will need to be rectified in the submission ES although at that stage there will be no opportunity for RMBC to consider the impacts arising for these Local Wildlife Sites. This is a major omission and significantly impacts the quality of the draft ES. The Environmental Statement Masterplans need to consider the emerging Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS), seeking nature's recovery, and making areas for nature bigger, better and more joined up. The solar farm NSIP proposals will significantly change the landscape and natural environment of this Borough. It is imperative therefore that all appropriate planning policies, allocations and designations included on Rotherham's Local Plan Policies Map are appropriately considered, as Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) will be one of the building blocks for opportunity areas for nature's recovery in the emerging LNRS.	The LWS baseline has been checked and assessment of all sites of relevance are now provided within ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	The protection of existing and creation of more wildlife corridors and areas supporting nature's recovery; promoting the principles of the Rotherham Biodiversity Action Plan, specific to site; and opportunities for developing further sensitive routeways linking the existing recreational rights of way network through linear corridors for biodiversity enhancements as well as providing access to natural greenspace for recreational purposes and improving the nation's health. The building of solar arrays within designated local wildlife sites including Brampton Common, and abutting other LWS sites, is not supported. It appears that, at this draft ES public consultation stage, there has been insufficient consideration of the details of mitigation of the negative impacts, and the likely compensation required, arising from the loss of this LWS. The inclusion of Brampton Common LWS within the NSIP project is not supported as no evidence is provided regarding potential mitigation arising from the destruction of the current habitat within hedgerow boundaries. The solar arrays should be removed from this parcel, and this should be an area for mitigation for the wider scheme parcels within WS2.	The enhancement and management of hedgerows and grassland prescriptions are included within the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] which will be applicable across the Site, including Brampton Common LWS. Protective mitigation measures are included within ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6], oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] and within the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] which will also be applied to Brampton Common LWS. Enhancements to Brampton Common LWS listed below are proposed with agreement sought from RMBC and LWS steering group partners on a management approach that will support the features for which the LWS was designated: • Improve habitat connectivity in the landscape through habitat enhancement both within, and outside the LWS. • Several "mitigation" fields lie adjacent to and around the LWS and can be used to increase available habitat and strengthen wider habitat connectivity. • Plant new hedgerow networks within the site where hedgerows may have been present historically and promote hedgerow planting beyond the site's limits. • Strengthen habitat connectivity features through the addition of tree planting within hedgerows	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		and thicken hedgerows through additional hedgerow species planting. • Improve and manage habitats for at least 30 years least 30 years including improvements for designated features within, and adjacent to the LWS. • Manage hedgerows sensitively for wildlife through reducing the extent of hedgerow cutting on a 3 yearly rotational basis to ensure hedgerows have sections that are at least 2m in height (or 3m with trees). • Ensure that an agreed site specific LWS Management Plan (to be appended to the final oLEMP, as required in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]) is produced and conservation practices enacted to meet the plan's objectives in reinstating a favourable condition to the hedgerow and grassland habitats present and enable the support of breeding skylark populations. • Assess potential for community benefits by increasing access for the local population, particularly for school age children and vulnerable adults, to include upgraded and maintained access points and defined footpath routes.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	It is noted that details are to be provided, in an outline Biodiversity and Environmental Management Plan, for submission to the Secretary of State, by the applicant in due course. However, there is great concern, given the current lack of habitat management details and mitigation proposed, during this public consultation stage, that the Council and other stakeholders, has no opportunity to influence the applicant's response to such losses. It is noted that local ornithologists are also concerned by the lack of details within the draft ES, and these comments have been provided under separate cover.	A meeting was held with RMBC, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust, Sheffield Wildlife Trust, and SYMCA on 12.01.26 (see Table 6.4 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]) to discuss The Proposed Development's interaction with Brampton Common LWS and to explore opportunities to enhance it. Proposed enhancements to Brampton Common LWS listed within Table 6.12 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6] are proposed with agreement sought from RMBC and LWS steering group partners to secure management to benefit the features for which the site was designated. The oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] provides prescriptive detail on habitat creation, enhancement and management across the Site, with a particular emphasis on improving ecological connectivity at both site and landscape scales. Proposed measures include new woodland planting, enhancement of grassland and hedgerow habitats, and the creation of habitat corridors and rides to maintain connectivity for mammals and other wildlife. Deer fencing is proposed where necessary to protect newly created habitats, with proportionate management of woodland areas during construction and operation. The oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] is secured via a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		[EN0110020/APP/3.1] and will be subject to approval from the relevant planning authority. Engagement on the plan will continue to be undertaken during the examination phase.	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	There are also designated Tree Preservation Orders (not LWS) that have not been considered. This omission should also be rectified	Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) apply to woodland blocks adjacent to the Site and embedded mitigation measures, the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] and buffers specified in the Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3] that are applicable to woodland also apply in the same way to those woodlands that have TPO status. All TPO woodland and trees to be avoided, with none present within the Order Limits other than at Cuckoo Way/Chesterfield canal, where trenchless crossing of the canal will avoid this TPO woodland. Further information on embedded mitigation is included in Section 6.6 of oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] and Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	There are concerns regarding the proposed substation and cabling at W2P1 and its impact on the SM Blue Mans Bower, the watercourse and the LWS36 Whiston Meadows, the River Rother, Ulley Brook and Whiston Brook. The potential for pollution of watercourses is greatest where proposals are in close proximity to such receptors	In a video call discussion on 26 January 2026, it was clarified with RMBC that the substation option to the west of Blue Man's Bower (named as W2 P1 at Draft ES stage) has since been removed in the design refinement. Further details of this are presented in ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4] .	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Sheep grazing is noted in the draft ES. This is not supported in this Borough and may have even greater negative impacts in destroying or preventing the creation of habitat enhancements within solar arrays. The long-term management of the land within the solar arrays and the provision of wide field margins to hedgerows/ trees/ ditches and the creation of scrapes and the creation of ponded areas within the solar arrays all need to be considered. These details are currently not available for review and discussion with local stakeholders and local communities.	The Applicant has proposed sheep grazing as a method to encourage ongoing agricultural production under and around the solar panel areas, partially in response to feedback about concerns around using farmland for the Proposed Development. The oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] submitted with the Application describes that sheep grazing is a considered as an option to manage and maintain the green infrastructure and landscaping. The Applicant will continue to engage with RMBC through the detail design stage and finalisation of the LEMP to minimise potential impacts. See further information in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4] and the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] .	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Macro organisms (visible to the naked eye) include: • Earthworms – Improve soil structure and nutrient cycling. • Insects – Beetles, ants, and termites help decompose organic matter and aerate soil. • Arachnids – Such as spiders and mites, which are predators of other soil organisms. • Micro organisms (microscopic life) • Bacteria – Essential for nutrient cycling (e.g., nitrogen fixation, decomposition). • Fungi – Including mycorrhizal fungi that form symbiotic relationships with plant roots. • Protozoa – Single-celled organisms that feed on bacteria and help regulate microbial populations. • Nematodes – Microscopic worms, some of which are beneficial, while others are plant parasites. The Council do not recall seeing reports within the ES on the impact of metal stands to 4 metres depth and shading of the soils for a significant period of time, therefore if this information is not currently available, it should be provided within the final documentation.	The assessment of potential effects of the Proposed Development on ecological and ornithological species and receptors, including those visible to the naked eye, are provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6] and accompanying appendices in ES Volume 3 [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. During the operation and maintenance phase of the Proposed Development, habitat enhancement and creation would mature, and soils would recover from as a result of the reduction or cessation of fertiliser and insecticide inputs. It is expected that biodiversity at all levels of the ecosystem would benefit, with the abundance and richness of flora and fauna expanding over time. This would provide a Beneficial, long term, and of a Low to Medium magnitude which would be Significant for a range of species, habitats, and designations within the Proposed Development and within the respective Aols. Consideration of the impact of metal stands to 4m depth on ecological receptors has not been included in the ES, as the small area of disturbance is unlikely to disrupt the biodiversity within the soil. The assessment of the impact of the Proposed Development on habitats and soil function is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6] and ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9] respectively. Due to embedded mitigation measures of avoidance, soil handling guidelines, and the outline Soil Management Plan included in the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9], no significant effects on soil function are anticipated. Regarding shading, when proposing the habitat that will be established under the solar PV panels within the Proposed Development, a precautionary approach has been taken to ensure the proposals are realistic and suitable for the conditions under the solar panels. 'Proposed tussock and grassland seed mix' is proposed under the solar PV infrastructure as this is commonly recorded under solar panels, and has been used in the BNG calculations in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20].	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	That the solar arrays proposed for LWS027 Brampton Common are removed and this LWS site is used for habitat enhancements for WS2 given its current local wildlife designation status.	The enhancement and management of hedgerows and grassland prescriptions are included within the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] which will be	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		applicable across the Site, including Brampton Common LWS. Specific enhancements for the Brampton LWS are detailed in Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]. Enhancements to Brampton Common LWS listed below are proposed with agreement sought from RMBC and LWS steering group partners on a management approach that will support the features for which the LWS was designated: • Improve habitat connectivity in the landscape through habitat enhancement both within, and outside the LWS. • Several “mitigation” fields lie adjacent to and around the LWS and can be used to increase available habitat and strengthen wider habitat connectivity. • Plant new hedgerow networks within the site where hedgerows may have been present historically and promote hedgerow planting beyond the site's limits. • Strengthen habitat connectivity features through the addition of tree planting within hedgerows and thicken hedgerows through additional hedgerow species planting. • Improve and manage habitats for at least 30 years least 30 years including improvements for designated features within, and adjacent to the LWS. • Manage hedgerows sensitively for wildlife through reducing the extent of hedgerow cutting	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		on a 3 yearly rotational basis to ensure hedgerows have sections that are at least 2m in height (or 3m with trees). - Ensure that an agreed site specific LWS Management Plan (to be appended to the final oLEMP, as required in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]) is produced and conservation practices enacted to meet the plan's objectives in reinstating a favourable condition to the hedgerow and grassland habitats present and enable the support of breeding skylark populations. - Assess potential for community benefits by increasing access for the local population, particularly for school age children and vulnerable adults, to include upgraded and maintained access points and defined footpath routes.	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	That the "confidential" badger report and all species/bird surveys and GIS mapping is provided to the Biological Records Office for review.	The Applicant confirms that the confidential badger report will be provided to the Biological Records Office for information.	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	That the NTS is re-drafted to clarify all points raised regarding designated LWS.	Where LWS are now being avoided, these will be removed from the NTS. The updated Non-Technical Summary [EN0110020/APP/6.21] has been submitted with the application.	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	That a Soil Assessment is carried out and the applicant commits to following best practice principles set out in the Council's adopted Soils Supplementary Planning Document to minimise impacts from construction and	The soil assessment comments are noted. Appropriate soil management measures are set out in the Outline Soil Management Plan submitted within the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] .	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	the creation of hardstanding for roads and tracks and to remove/replace soils within field boundaries/ the wider local area where possible	The following principles will guide soil management during the construction phase: Minimisation of Soil Disturbance • Soil disturbance will be minimised wherever practicable through design and construction planning; and • Soils will be retained in situ where ground disturbance is not required. Timing of Soil Handling • Soil stripping, handling and trafficking will only be undertaken when soils are in a suitable, dry and friable condition; and • Soil handling will be avoided during periods of excessive rainfall or when soils are at or above their plastic limit. Protection of Soil Profiles • Where soil stripping is required, topsoil and subsoil will be stripped and stored separately; and • Soil horizons will not be mixed during stripping, storage or reinstatement. Prevention of Compaction • Vehicle movements will be restricted to defined routes; • Low-ground-pressure machinery will be used where practicable; and • Trafficking on stripped or exposed soils will be minimised.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	That the RBAP is consulted in the preparation of habitat creation and habitat enhancement plans specific to site including, ponds, scrapes, ditches, hedgerows, tree planting, and the use of natural landscaping to ensure secured by design principles can be achieved, limiting the use of intrusive fencing and cameras in the open countryside.	Proposed mitigation and ecological enhancements are detailed in the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] , ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6] and ES, Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20] . Local Biodiversity Action Plans, including the Rotherham BAP, have been used to inform the proposals, and the LPAs will have the opportunity to provide comments on the proposals through the examination period.	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	That the oLEMP is shared with the two local authorities and discussions are entered into before submission to the Secretary of State for Energy.	The oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] has been submitted with the Application. The LPAs will have the opportunity to comment and consult on this document with the Applicant throughout the examination period. This is secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] , subject to the approval of the relevant planning authority.	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	It is essential that long term management and maintenance of any habitat creation including, habitat and species surveys, are carried out over the lifetime of the project if there are to be positive enhancements to biodiversity and nature's recovery. It is anticipated that the results of all survey work undertaken will be submitted to the local authority or agreed successor body for inclusion with the Enhanced Biodiversity Duty Reports and for the monitoring of the LNRS over time. This is a significant change to current land management practices within open countryside (Green	The oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] will detail the long-term management and maintenance activities required for the habitat creation included with the Proposed Development. The oLEMP is secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] subject to the approval of the relevant planning authority. Some of the long-term management measures include:	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	Belt) and such changes, both beneficial and negative, need to be regularly monitored and remedial action taken where this is necessary. This is the approach taken within BNG areas and Habitat Banks. It is only if such agreements are placed on the DCO that the possible benefits of a significantly sized solar farm can be achieved.	- Hedgerows required for screening purposes will be managed and maintained at a height of 3 m – 4 m, whilst individual tree species planted within hedgerows will be allowed to establish and left to reach maturity; - Cutting of hedgerows will take place outside of the bird nesting season_(from March to August inclusive), preferably_at the end of winter_ in February_ to allow berries to stay in place for the maximum period of time throughout the winter; - Native tree belts will be left to reach maturity, with careful thinning to avoid any one species becoming dominant; - Any branches/growth that overhangs or obstructs PRoWs or access tracks will be cut back to keep routes clear to use; - Within the first 12 months after sowing, the tussock and grasses will be cut to help the sown species to establish. Where practicable, the cuttings will be left for a period of seven days before being removed to appropriate storage areas on site. - Once the areas are fully established, typically the second Spring after sowing, the area will need to be cut in the Spring (before April) to control the growth of the weeds from the soil.	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	That a proportion (minimum of 50%) of the Community Fund is provided to RMBC and other appropriate organisations (e.g. the Local Wildlife Trusts of SRWT/YWT) or successor bodies, to administer for the enhancement of local wildlife sites within this Borough	The Applicant has committed to providing a Community Benefit Package to support local initiatives. At this time, it is not envisioned that the funds would be distributed directly to the local authorities, but rather available through a	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	and achieving the aims and objectives of the LNRS once adopted and other Strategies and Plans (including the Rotherham Local Plan) of the Council.	nominated fund manager and open to applications. Wildlife trusts and other organisations would be able to apply for funding. The Applicant will continue to develop this proposal through ongoing engagement with stakeholders, including the local authorities.	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	The Council is in the process of commissioning a specialist landscape consultant team to undertake a comprehensive review of the submitted LVIA and ES and therefore the Council reserves the right to provide additional detailed comments on the LVIA process at a later stage in the consultation process.	Noted.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Assessment / criteria for Magnitude of change The applicant's criteria for Landscape magnitude of change is given below. Concerns are raised over the limited description provided for each criteria. Only, the High criteria includes any descriptor for duration and reversibility, when duration of effects and reversibility should be considered for all magnitudes of change. The Council ask that additional detail be added to the criteria table, so that it is clearer what each level of magnitude of change may comprise. For example, a High magnitude of change could include either / both a substantial change in landscape characteristics such as large scale loss of existing landscape features/ characteristics, or introduction of new large scale features (fencing and solar arrays) which detract from the existing landscape character area. GLVIA section 5.49 page 90 describes this as the effect of both loss of existing features and the introduction of additional features.	The magnitude of change criteria is provided in the updated methodology to the LVIA in ES Volume 3, Technical Appendix 7.2: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Methodology [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Detail has been added to the criteria with regards to duration and reversibility of effects, and the criteria are summarised as follows: • High Magnitude of Change – substantial change in landscape characteristics and/or over an extensive geographical area and/or which may result in an irreversible impact; typically of long-term duration; • Medium Magnitude of Change – moderate change in landscape characteristics and/or which may occur over a large geographical area; typically of medium to long term duration; • Low Magnitude of Change – small change in landscape characteristics and/or over a relatively localised geographical area; typically of short duration; and • Negligible Magnitude of Change – barely perceptible change in landscape characteristics and/or focussed on a small geographical area; typically of short or very short duration.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Landscape effects The most significant landscape effects appear to be experienced within LCA 8 which hosts most of W2, and W3 along with a significant proportion of the proposed cable runs. LCA 5b also includes part of W2 and some cable runs. LCA 7 includes a small part of W3, and LCA 9a includes some cable runs. In reviewing the draft landscape effects, at this stage there appears to be a lack of detail in respect of the description of effects as a result of the introduction of the solar panels and fencing will have on the landscape character areas. This may be due to the fact that the exact location of the solar arrays and fenced parcels is not yet fixed at this draft stage. The Council would expect more detailed description of the urbanising effects of the introduction of such industrial features within the landscape to be provided and for this to be considered closely in the final assessment of magnitude of landscape effects.	The assessment of landscape and visual effects from the Proposed Development, including consideration of Local Character Areas, is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual [EN0110020/APP/6.7] and ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.3: Landscape Character Baseline and Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Further details are provided in these documents since the Draft ES, and the solar panels and fencing within the Proposed Development have been taken into account for the assessment of effects of the Proposed Development on landscape character.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Viewpoint Photographs The following issues or notable omissions were identified within the viewpoint photography. It may be that viewpoints 61-67 are recently added viewpoints following the scoping stage and so there has been no opportunity as yet to record winter photographs. This should be addressed before the ES is finalised for submission in the spring.	The Applicant can confirm that winter photography has now been collected for viewpoints 61 – 67 and this is provided within ES Volume 3, Figures 7.6.1 – 7.6.58 [EN0110020/APP/6.19]. This new winter photography is considered within ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual [EN0110020/APP/6.7].	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	The applicant sets in their Table 7.4.2 that further design reviews will be carried out to reduce the likely significant effects where possible. At this stage the Council do not yet have final detail of the solar arrays, final cable run location or final Battery storage / substation locations. The LVIA will need to be reviewed and refined and updated once this information is known. At what stage in the process will the final site layouts be known in terms of extent of solar panels, final locations of battery storage facilities and final locations of substations? These final locations of these should be informed by the assessment of effects and should be sited in the least visually intrusive locations.	The layout and extent of the Proposed Development have been through four formal iterations, and the final stage (Stage 4) forms the design for the Application and has been used for the assessments within the ES. The design is detailed in ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4] and the Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]. The final detailed design process will take place following consent to reach a final design for the Proposed Development. This will be based on the Works Plans [EN0110020/APP/2.3], Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3] and ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1: Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/6.19]. The LVIA has been completed based on these indicative plans and layouts.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Mitigation proposals must do more than focus only on Biodiversity Net Gain. Any opportunities to reinforce and repair existing hedgerow field boundaries should be taken. Mitigation proposals must identify where planting is performing a visual screening or landscape mitigation as its primary function. Whilst it is understood that national character areas have been scoped out of the ES, consideration needs to be given to these and in particular the locations of limestone plateau areas in order that both soil strategy and species selection for mitigation are appropriate and reflect the underlying soil geology and maintain the natural existing natural pH. How will the urbanising effects of this large-scale development be mitigated and compensated for within the most adversely effected local communities? Are there any proposals to include community grants as part of this development?	Mitigation and enhancement proposals have been designed to: • Integrate the Proposed Development into its landscape setting, aiming to avoid or minimise adverse effects on the landscape, biodiversity, heritage and visual receptors; • Promote the conservation, protection, and enhancement of the physical, natural and historic environment within the Proposed Development and its surroundings; and • Diversify the ecological value of existing habitats. The proposals include hedgerow restoration, riparian corridor management, improving habitat and ecological connectivity (through habitat corridors), and the creation of an array of diverse habitats such as species-rich native hedgerows (with and without trees), native tree belts, mixed scrub, arable field margins, and species-rich grassland. These proposals will mitigate potential environmental impacts on sensitive receptors (for example where tree / hedgerow planting may reduce views of the Proposed Development from residential receptors), contribute to Biodiversity Net Gain, and have wider benefits on the landscape and ecological receptors.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Mitigation proposals, and their management, are detailed in the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13].	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Photomontages The Council would appreciate the opportunity to be consulted on and agree the locations for photomontage visualisations for this development. Photomontages should be provided for each of the site parcels W1, W2 and W3 from a range of representative viewpoints demonstrating a range of effects not just those which are significant. This would also help the local communities understanding of the nature of the effects. These should also clearly show the effects of proposed mitigation where this has a key role in reducing effects. Photomontage locations should include viewpoints where sub-stations and BESS will feature in the view also. Consideration of colour options of fencing and BESS units should also be set out and the least intrusive, most recessive colours selected. Fencing within the countryside itself has a visual impact and wherever possible natural vegetation screening should be used.	The Applicant confirms that the proposed photomontage locations were discussed and agreed with RMBC as detailed in Table 7.4. of ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]. The full suite of representative viewpoints are provided in ES Volume 3, Figures 7.6.1 to 7.6.58: Representative Viewpoints [EN0110020/APP/6.19]. Due to the design of the Proposed Development and proposed mitigation planting, views of the substations and BESS are limited from the photomontages and viewpoint locations. Consideration of fencing types and the colour of infrastructure is set out in the Outline Design Principles [EN0110020/APP/7.3] which are included in the Application and secured through the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Hooton Roberts Hooton Roberts is a small historic village which has seen little growth from the C20th onwards. As such, it enjoys a largely unspoilt rural setting, albeit on the A630 road, which is one of the main roads between Rotherham and Doncaster. In spite of its historic appearance, Hooton Roberts does not have a Conservation Area. The designated heritage assets affected by the proposals are identified below: • Hooton Roberts Rectory Grade II listed. This property is located within the centre of the village of Hooton Roberts, as the Whitestone solar farm is located some considerable distance to the west, it is considered that its setting is not significantly affected. • Church of St John The Baptist Grade II*. This Church has a relatively low tower and is situated on land higher than the adjacent A630 and the neighbouring Earl of Strafford public house. Due to the relatively low height of the tower it is not a prominent landscape feature, though is clearly visible within wider views in the surrounding countryside. It is noted that the land slopes to the west, where the solar farm would be located. Concerns are raised about the wider setting to the west from the proposed solar farm. The larger solar arrays would have a significant, though less than substantial impact on the setting of this Grade II* listed building from views to the west. It is concluded that the harm to	Noted. The heritage assets listed in relation to Hooton Roberts have all been considered in the assessment provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]. No significant direct effects or indirect effects on setting are anticipated for these assets.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	the setting of this Grade II* listed building would be less than substantial. • The Earl of Strafford Public House Grade II listed. This property is located within the centre of the village of Hooton Roberts, as the Whitestone solar farm is located some considerable distance to the west, it is considered that its setting would not be adversely affected. • The Coach House approximately 20 metres to the south of the Earl of Strafford Grade II listed. This property is located within the centre of the village of Hooton Roberts, as the Whitestone solar farm is located some considerable distance to the west, it is considered that its setting is not affected. • Barn approximately 35 metres to the southeast of Church of St John the Baptist Grade II listed. This barn is located within the centre of the village of Hooton Roberts, with a nursery to the southeast with open fields further to the south and southeast. Due to the height of the barn, it does not appear prominently within wider public views within the surrounding area. The proposed solar arrays would lead to some degree of harm to the wider setting of this Grade II listed building, though this harm would be relatively low and less than substantial harm.		

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Firsby • Barn fronting onto bridle path on east side of Firsby Hall Farmyard Grade II listed. The listed building enjoys a rural location which greatly enhances its setting. It is noted that the solar arrays would be located at some distance to the north and east with potential landscape mitigation and enhancement areas immediately adjacent. There is clearly significant potential to improve the immediate setting of this Grade II listed building in this enhancement areas as well as blocking views of the solar arrays. It is considered that the immediate setting of this Grade II listed building could be preserved and potentially enhanced. However, visual harm would occur to the wider setting and from long range views to and from this Grade II listed building, this harm would be less than substantial. • Garden Wall with pedestrian entrance archway fronting onto bridge path on East side of Firsby Hall Farm Grade II listed. The listed building enjoys a rural location which greatly enhances its setting. It is noted that the solar arrays would be located at some distance to the north and east with potential landscape mitigation and enhancement areas immediately adjacent. There is clearly significant potential to improve the immediate setting of this Grade II listed building in this enhancement areas as well as blocking views of the solar arrays. It is the Council's opinion that the	Noted. The heritage assets listed have all been considered in the assessment provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]. It can be confirmed that no significant direct effects or indirect effects on setting are anticipated for these assets.	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	immediate setting of this Grade II listed building could be preserved and potentially enhanced. However, visual harm would occur to the wider setting and from long range views to and from this Grade II listed building, however due to the relatively small size of this listed building would be limited and relatively minor. • In the hamlet of Firsby is a candidate for the South Yorkshire Local Heritage List, Firsby Lane, Bridge, Firsby. Though this bridge does not currently benefit from a designation on the Local List its inclusion is imminent. At the present time it is an undesignated heritage asset. However, owing to the small size of the bridge and the fact that it is largely surrounded by landscape mitigation, it is not envisaged that any harm to its setting would arise.		

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Ravenfield There are a number of designated heritage assets within the village of Ravenfield along with the Ravenfield Conservation Area. Due to the distance to the proposed solar farm, the impact on setting is considered collectively. The following listed buildings and their setting are considered together, due to their close visual and historic association: • Farmbuilding approximately 140 metres to north of Ravenfield Hall Farmhouse Grade II listed • Enclosure wall to north of Ravenfield Hall Farmhouse with attached farmbuildings at south end of east side Grade II • Stable Block approximately 40 metres to north east of Ravenfield Hall Farmhouse Grade II • Entrance Gateway and attached railings to Ravenfield Hall Farm These important grouping of listed buildings that formally related to the now demolished Ravenfield Hall are located on land sloping upwards from Ravenfield Ponds and the hamlet of Firsby. The solar farm would be located at a significant distance to the west and would be clearly visible within their wider setting to the west. It is considered that the proposed solar farm would lead to harm to the wider setting of	Noted. The heritage assets listed have all been considered in the assessment provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]. The Applicant has pulled the Order Limits boundary back from Ravenfield Conservation Area to reduce the potential significance of effect to heritage assets. No significant direct effects or indirect effects on setting are anticipated for these assets.	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	these designated heritage assets, though this harm would be less than substantial. • Church of St James Grade II* listed building. The Church of St James is a small Parish Church designed by the prominent architect John Carr. It is located to the northeast of Ravenfield village within open countryside, which increases its visual prominence within the wider landscape. The solar farm would be located at a significant distance to the west and would be clearly visible within the Church's wider setting when viewed to the west. It is considered that the proposed solar farm would lead to less than substantial harm to the setting of this Grade II* Listed Building. There are a number of listed buildings within the village of Ravenfield, however, these are located within the village and it is considered that their setting would not be affected by the proposed solar farm. Ravenfield Conservation Area enjoys a rural setting, which greatly enhances its character as a small and relatively unspoiled historic village. The solar farm would be located at a significant distance to the west and would be clearly visible within certain parts of the Conservation Area and impacts on its wider setting to the west. It is considered that the proposed solar farm would lead to harm to the wider setting of the Conservation Area, though this harm would be less than substantial.		

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Aston The proposed solar farm is located at some distance to the north of the village of Aston. The Aston Conservation Area abuts open countryside to the north. The designated heritage assets affected are as follows: • The Aston Conservation Area abuts open countryside to the north. The solar farm is located some distance to the northwest and further to the north of the Conservation Area to the south of the village of Ulley. It is considered that the impact on the setting of the Aston Conservation Area would be low.	Noted. The heritage assets listed have all been considered in the assessment provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]. No significant direct effects or indirect effects on setting are anticipated for these assets.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Wickersley The part of the solar farm closest to Wickersley is located to the southwest of Morthen Road in countryside between the south of Wickersley and the M1 motorway. It is considered that due to the nature of the settlement the Wickersley Conservation Area and the large number of listed buildings within Wickersley would not be affected by the proposal and their setting would be unaffected. The only listed building affected would be as follows: • Barn adjoining west end of Moat Lane Farmhouse Grade II. The proposed solar farm would be located to the west of this listed building. Views from the west to this listed building are largely obscured by Moat Farmhouse, however, large sections of the listed barn remain visible within wider views to the west, though not prominent. The proposed solar farm is considered to have little impact on the wider setting of this listed building.	Noted. The heritage assets listed have all been considered in the assessment provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]. The Applicant can confirm no significant direct effects or indirect effects on setting are anticipated for these assets.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Brampton-en-le-Morthen The hamlet of Brampton-en-le-Morthen contains a high concentration of listed buildings and almost entirely falls within a Conservation Area. Brampton-en-le-Morthen is largely a collection of farms centred around Brampton Road and to a lesser extent Toad Lane in a relatively close arrangement. The listed buildings to the north of Toad Lane are considered not to be affected by the solar farm. With regards to the grouping of listed buildings to the south mainly centred around Manor Farm and Townend Farm, it is noted open countryside would remain with buffer areas of potential landscape mitigation and enhancement proposed, that could significantly enhance the setting of these groupings of listed buildings and the Brampton-en-le-Morthen Conservation Area. Due to the distances to the solar farm to the south and the presence of these landscape mitigation and enhancement areas it is considered that any harm to the setting of these listed buildings or to the Brampton-en-le-Morthen Conservation Area would be low, however, this would need to be demonstrated through the submission of the LVIA and heritage statement, photomontages would also be necessary to be prepared to be able to fully assess the visual impact on setting.	Noted. The heritage assets listed have all been considered in the assessment provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]. The Applicant has reduced the Order Limits to the south-east of Brampton en le Morthen, after concerns were raised over the proximity and setting to these assets. The Applicant can confirm no significant direct effects or indirect effects on setting are anticipated for these assets.	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Thurcroft It is considered that no listed buildings or locally listed buildings are affected by the proposals in Thurcroft	Noted.	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Upper Whiston It is considered that only listed building affected by the proposals is The Heights Farmhouse, Upper Whiston Lane, Grade II. The proposed BESS/Substation or Solar arrays to the west of this property have the potential to harm the wider setting of this Grade II listed building.	Noted. The heritage asset mentioned has been considered in the assessment provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]. The Applicant can confirm no significant direct effects or indirect effects on setting are anticipated for these assets.	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Guilthwaite It is considered that no designated heritage assets are affected by the proposals for Guilthwaite	Noted.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Whiston The main concentration of listed buildings and Whiston Conservation Area are contained in the historic centre of Whiston, which is largely surrounded by C20th housing. Due to the distance of the proposals from Whiston Conservation Area it is considered that any harm to its setting would be low. The designated heritage assets affected are as follows: • The Grade II* Church of St Mary Magdalene. This important Church does not enjoy great visual prominence within the wider landscape. Though is on the edge of the village close to attractive open countryside to the south and east that greatly enhances its setting. The proposals for the solar farm are located at some distance away to the south of the M1 and to the east of Pleasley Road. It is considered that though there is potential for harm to the wider setting of the Church, due to its lack of prominence and from the submitted information, the impact would be very minor harm at worst to neutral at best, to its wider setting. • Blue Man's Bower Scheduled Ancient Monument. This important Scheduled Moated Site is located on flat land to the southeast of Whiston in the Rother valley, the surrounding land is open and exposed. The proposed solar farm and in particular the greater visual impact of the proposed substation adjacent J33 of the M1 and to a lesser extent the potential substation at Brinsworth B, to the west of Long Lane have the potential for substantial harm to the setting of this Scheduled	Noted. The heritage assets listed have all been considered in the assessment provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]. The land parcel and cable route proposed to the west of Blue Man's Bower Scheduled Ancient Monument have been removed from the Order Limits, and therefore no direct impacts are anticipated. No significant direct effects or indirect effects on setting are anticipated for the other assets mentioned by RMBC.	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	Ancient Monument. The immediate setting of Blue Mans Bower remains rural which greatly enhances and preserves its setting. Though the M1 and the A630 harm its wider setting, the presence of the raised A630 screens the existing Brinsworth substation from views from the site. The proposed substation extension to the east of the A630 would substantially harm the wider setting of this Scheduled Ancient Monument and coupled with the proposed substation to the east of Long Lane would lead to at worst substantial harm and at best less than substantial harm at the higher end. Further survey work would need to be carried out to ascertain the full visual impact and harm to this Scheduled Ancient Monument. However, at the present time concern is raised about the visual harm to the setting of this site.		

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Treeton The village of Treeton is highly distinctive in the Borough sitting on a hill within the wider landscape. This gives prominence to the village but also to the Tower of the Grade I listed Church of St Helen. Though the Conservation Area like many others in the Borough is surrounded by C20 & C21 housing so the visual impact on setting is low. The designated heritage assets affected are as follows: • The Grade I listed Church of St Helen with its unusual tower, constructed of contrasting ashlar limestone to the upper stages, enjoys greater visual prominence within the wider landscape due to being located on the highest point of the village, with the village being constructed on high land within the surrounding landscape. The proposed solar farm to the west would directly impact on the wider setting of the village when viewed from the west and north, diminishing the rural setting to this side of the village. It is considered that the harm to the setting of the Grade I listed building is less than substantial. • Farmbuilding at Spa House Farm Approximately 12 metres to the southwest of Farmhouse Grade II listed. The proposals include a large area of solar arrays close to the east of this Grade II listed building. It is therefore considered this close proximity to the listed building along with the lack of landscape mitigation and enhancement would directly harm its setting, by “industrialising” the wider landscape and removing the	Noted. The heritage assets listed have all been considered in the assessment provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]. The Applicant can confirm no significant direct effects or indirect effects on setting are anticipated for these assets.	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	rural context of this historic farmstead. The harm due to proximity is substantial and as such significant concerns are raised. • Farmbuilding at Spa House Farm approximately 35 metres to north of farmhouse Grade II listed. This listed building forms the northwestern boundary of this grouping of agricultural buildings at Spa House Farm. Its visual prominence is greater in the public realm due to the presence of a public right of way directly adjacent. The close proximity of the solar farm to this Grade II listed building, and in particular its proximity to public views, would lead to substantial harm to its setting.		

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Ulley Ulley is a small village with its Conservation Area surrounding most of the settlement and adjoins countryside for most of the boundary, except for a small southwestern corner of the village. The designated heritage assets affected are as follows: • Ulley Conservation Area. It is noted that landscape mitigation and enhancement areas are located to the north of the village and to the east, which has the potential to enhance the immediate setting of the Conservation Area from these locations. However, the LVIA should address views to Ulley Conservation Area from these directions. Concerns are raised about the proximity of the solar farm immediately to the southernmost section of the Conservation Area adjacent to Turnshaw Farm and Ulley Hall Farm. In my view the proximity of the solar farm to this part of the Conservation Area would lead to less than substantial harm to its wider setting. Concerns are also raised about the potential impact on the setting of the Conservation Area from wider views to the west looking towards the Conservation Area, however, the landscape mitigation could reduce this level of harm. Though without any details of the planting in this location my view is that the harm to the setting of the Conservation Area is less than substantial. However, considerable concerns are raised about the proximity of the solar farm to the southernmost section of the Conservation Area.	Noted. The heritage asset listed have all been considered in the assessment provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]. The Applicant can confirm no significant direct effects are anticipated for this asset. Indirect impacts to the setting of Ulley Conservation Area are detailed in ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. A minor, adverse indirect effect on setting is anticipated for Ulley Conservation Area, and this is a not significant effect. There would be some change to outward views beyond the immediate periphery of the village, most notably in views east from Turnshaw Road between the village pub and Ulley Hall. In addition, views south from Ulley Hall Farm may also be eroded, with solar panels in close proximity to the southern edge of the Conservation Area. Beyond those Indirect Effects to Setting are limited to a change to the views along the main approaches from the east and south. Solar panels would be visible in fields adjoining Penny Hill Lane up until the final 120m approach to the Conservation Area. Beyond this, views would open up to take in farmland immediately adjacent to the village. Solar panels would also be visible on the southern approach along Turnshaw Road, with panels becoming visible 250m south of the village, before becoming	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		obscured by topography and vegetation on the final approach and entrance. The western approach would be unaffected. Infrastructure is confined to fields south and east of the village. As such, there is considered to be some reduction in the legibility of the Conservation Area as a historic medieval settlement within an agricultural landscape. As shown in the ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1: Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/6.19] and the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13], mitigation measures consisting of introducing new hedgerows and enhancing the existing hedgerows within fields to the north-east, east, south-east, and south of Ulley Conservation Area will reduce the visual impact of these changes upon the setting of the asset.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Hardwick The hamlet of Hardwick consists of three isolated farmsteads with a small number of additional dwellings. The designated heritage assets affected are as follows: • Hardwick Hall Farmhouse Grade II listed. This property and its curtilage listed barns are in the closest proximity to the solar farm to the north. In my view the wider setting to the north of this Grade II listed building and its grouping of curtilage listed barns would be harmed by the proposals. This harm would be less than substantial. • Hardwick Grange Farmhouse Grade II. The property is located further to the south of the proposed solar farm though maintains an open aspect to the north so there is potential for harm to its wider setting. This harm is likely to be at the lower end and with suitable landscape screening would not reach the level of harm to be considered to be less than substantial. However, this would need to be successfully demonstrated. • Dovecote approximately 40 metres to the southwest of Vesey Close Farmhouse. The relatively small size of this building and its location to the south of Vesey Close Farm largely obscures it from the wider views of the solar farm. As such, there would be no harm to the setting of this Grade II listed building from the solar farm.	Noted. The heritage assets listed have all been considered in the assessment provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]. No significant direct effects or indirect effects on setting are anticipated for these assets. Indirect impacts to the setting of Hardwick Hall Farmhouse are detailed in ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20], with a minor adverse (not significant) indirect effect anticipated for this asset. The Proposed Development is sited in fields immediately north of the farmstead. The presence of this infrastructure is predicted to erode aspects of the assets historic interest, which are derived from its association with nearby fields owned and worked by the farm. Its association with adjoining fields, contribute to our understanding of the farm's role in the rural economy and place the farm in its historic rural landscape. Its architectural interest would be unchanged as would its association with the farmstead. To reduce the visibility of the infrastructure from this asset, additional screening will be implemented, in the form of planting new hedgerows along the south-eastern edge of parcel 133, alongside with enhancing the existing hedgerows already there.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		This will help retain the rural character of the area, as well as reducing the visibility of the infrastructure for this asset. Despite the partial change in character of some of the fields to the north and east, the ability to appreciate the significance of the asset through its historic and architectural interest would largely be unaffected.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Todwick The main impact to the village of Todwick would be from the solar farm to the north east to the north of the A57. The countryside in this part of the Borough is very open and allows for long distance views to Todwick as well as to South and North Anston. The designated heritage assets affected are as follows: • 44 – 46 Kiveton Lane, Todwick Grade II. There is potential for harm to the wider setting of this property from the northeast. This harm is likely to be less than substantial or potentially neutral. • The Church of St Peter and Paul Grade II*. There is potential for harm to the wider setting of this Grade II* listed Church from the solar farm to the northeast. This harm is likely to be less than substantial but needs to be demonstrated by suitable photomontages. • The Manor House Moated Site, Scheduled Ancient Monument. This important moated site is located on the edge of village of Todwick and is adjacent to open countryside. Concern is raised about views from this site over to towards the solar farm to the northeast. The harm is likely to be less than substantial. • Kiveton Hall Grade II listed. There is potential to harm to the wider setting of this Grade II listed building from views to the northeast. The harm is likely to be less than substantial.	Noted. The heritage assets listed have all been considered in the assessment provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]. No significant direct effects or indirect effects on setting are anticipated for these assets.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	North Anston No designated heritage assets would be affected by the proposals in North Anston.	Noted. North Anston Conservation Area (and associated Listed Buildings) has been included in the setting assessment provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. The Proposed Development would not be visible from anywhere within the Conservation Area due to a combination of topography and intervening buildings. The ability to appreciate the significance of monument through its architectural and historic interest would not be affected. No change is predicted, resulting in no effect to significance. This is Not Significant.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Church of All Saints Grade I listed Laughton-en-le-Morthen The Grade I listed Church of All Saints is one of the Borough's most prominent and beautiful Churches. It sits on high land at the top of the village of Laughton-en-le-Morthen and its spire is a notable landmark within the southern part of the Borough. It can be clearly viewed from the A57 between J31 and North and South Anston. From the submitted information it is not clear what the visual impact would be on the Church from the solar farm to the north of the A57 around Hardwick and to the east of North Anston. However, due to the scale of the development significant harm is likely to the wider setting of this Grade I listed building. Though due to distance this harm is likely to be less than substantial, considerable weight needs to be given to the harm to the setting of this Grade I listed building due to its high status and visual prominence. The Council therefore raises significant concerns on this basis.	Noted. The heritage asset mentioned has been considered in the assessment provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8], and the Laughton en le Morthen Conversation Area (and associated Listed Buildings) has been included in the setting assessment provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. The Proposed Development would not be visible from within the Conservation Area and would not erode key local views to or from it. The key relationships between its internal architecture and historic buildings as well as the relationship to the villages immediate rural periphery would not be changed. The ability to appreciate the significance of the asset through its architectural and historic interest would not be affected. No Impact is predicted to this high value asset, resulting in no effect to significance. This is Not Significant.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Church of St James Grade I listed South Anston The Grade 1 Church of St James and its spire is less visually prominent in the wider landscape than the Church of All Saints. However, there is potential for harm to its wider setting when viewed from the east. From the submitted information, it is not clear what level of harm to its wider setting would occur. This would need to be looked at in more detail. However, considerable concerns about potential impacts should be noted.	Noted. The heritage asset mentioned has been considered in the assessment provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8], and the South Anston Conversation Area (and associated Listed Buildings) has been included in the setting assessment provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. The Proposed Development would not be visible from anywhere within the Conservation Area due to intervening buildings. The ability to appreciate the significance of monument through its architectural and historic interest would not be affected. No change is predicted, resulting in no effect to significance. This is Not Significant.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Wales The solar farm is located to the south of Wales Conservation Area. There is a significant distance between the southern boundary of the Conservation Area and the site, however, there is an extensive network of public rights of way allowing public views to the Wales Conservation Area and to the tower of the Church of St John the Baptist. The designated heritage assets affected are as follows: • There is potential for harm to the wider setting of the Wales Conservation Area in terms of diminishing the rural nature of its southern setting. This harm would be less than substantial. • The Grade II* listed Church of St John the Baptist. This important church enjoys a semi-rural setting to the east with open countryside running close to the Church Yard down into open fields to the south. There is potential to harm the wider setting of this Grade II* listed building, in particular from public views from rights of way to the south. This harm is likely to be less than substantial.	Noted. The heritage assets listed have all been considered in the assessment provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8], and the Wales Conservation Area (and associated Listed Buildings) has been included in the setting assessment provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. The Proposed Development would not be visible from the main residential areas of the village and Conservation Area, namely along Manor Road or Church Lane. Neither would the Proposed Development be visible from the southern limit of the Conservation Area, with the cemetery of St John the Baptist, intervening farmland and copse woodland providing screening. The Proposed Development is located over 500 m from the southern edge of the Conservation Area. Internal views that contribute to core elements of its historic and architectural interest are unaffected. Local, external views which contribute directly to setting and significance would be unaffected by the Proposed Development. The ability to appreciate the significance of monument through its architectural and historic interest would not be affected. No change is predicted, resulting in no effect to significance, which is Not Significant.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Kiveton Park The only affected designated heritage asset in Kiveton Park would be the locally listed Tommy Flockton's Field between Hard Lane to the east and the railway track to the north. There is potential for harm to the wider setting of this site from the solar farm to the east of Hard Lane from long range views. The harm would be less than substantial.	Noted. The heritage asset mentioned has been considered in the assessment provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]. The Applicant confirms no significant direct effects or indirect effects on setting are anticipated for this asset.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Harthill The solar farm to the east of Hard Lane comes close to the northern boundary of the Harthill Conservation Area and to a public right of way to the north of the village. The designated heritage asset affected are as follows: • It is considered that there is significant visual harm to the wider setting of the Harthill Conservation Area by diminishing this rural setting from the solar farm. The large number of public rights of way to the northeast of Harthill and Kiveton Park and Wales increases this level of harm as it increases the level of public views to the designated heritage asset. The harm to the setting of the Conservation Area would be less than substantial. The impact on the solar farm adjacent to Harthill Reservoir has the potential to have significant visual impact on the wider setting of the Harthill Conservation Area when viewed from the southwest. • The tower of the Grade I listed Church of All Hallows is visually prominent from Hard Lane to the north and is visible from wider views in the surrounding landscape. The proposed solar farm to the east of Hard Lane would harm the wider setting of this Grade I listed building. This would be the case from public views from a public right of way to the northeast of Harthill and from a network of public rights of way between Harthill, Kiveton Park and Wales. The fact that the views to the Church Tower would be harmed by the solar farm from public rights of way, increases the level of harm to its	Noted. The heritage assets listed have all been considered in the assessment provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8], and the Harthill Conservation Area (and associated Listed Buildings) has been included in the setting assessment provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. The placing of electrical infrastructure within the rural periphery of the village, and in fields just beyond this rural periphery, would mean that this infrastructure is visible from isolated locations within the village and on the northern approach. The southern and western approaches would be largely unaffected. Infrastructure is confined to fields north-west and south-west of the village. Fields immediately west, to the north, south and east are free of infrastructure. As such, there is considered to be no erosion to the legibility of the Conservation Area as a historic medieval settlement within an agricultural landscape. No Impact is predicted to the Conservation Area resulting in a no effect to significance. This is Not Significant. No significant direct effects or indirect effects on setting are anticipated for these assets.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	setting as public views are compromised and harmed. This harm cannot be fully assessed by the submitted information. The harm is likely to be less than substantial. However, considerable weight needs to be given to the harm to the setting of this Grade I listed building due to its high status and the Council raises significant concerns on that basis.		

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Woodall With regards to Woodall village there is only one designated heritage asset the Grade II* listed 4 Walseker Lane. This property is largely obscured from view of the solar farm adjacent to Harthill Reservoir, with views to it and from the property highly restricted from Woodall Lane. For this reason, it's setting is not expected to be compromised by the proposals.	Noted. The heritage asset listed has been considered in the assessment provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]. The Applicant confirms no significant direct effects or indirect effects on setting are anticipated for this asset.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	The above comments identify the designated heritage assets affected by the proposals. Before a full detailed analysis of the impact upon their setting can be made, full photomontages of the development from all affected viewpoints are required. The methodology for these should be agreed with the Council before the work is undertaken and should be prepared by Heritage professionals. It is expected that this work should dovetail with the Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). The photomontages would also need to be submitted showing the impact of proposed landscape mitigation and enhancement areas. This will need to be done in phases throughout the lifetime of the development. The first set will need to show the visual impact on year 1 then year 5 then year 10, then year 20, year 30. However, noting that the methodology may already have been agreed for the LVIA. Further information in the form of plans detailing what would happen to the land after decommissioning and in particular the landscape mitigation and enhancement areas is also required. This is particularly important as the loss of these landscape and enhancement areas could significantly alter the setting of the identified designated heritage assets. Following the receipt of this additional information and the submission of the LVIA, the Council reserve the right to comment on any other designated heritage	Noted. The heritage assets listed in the RMBC response have all been considered in the assessment provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]. Cultural heritage viewpoints and visualisations have been agreed with RMBC, and are provided in ES Volume 3, Figures 8.41 – 8.4.13 [EN0110020/APP/6.19]. These have been produced in line with LVIA requirements, and therefore the photomontages show Year 1 and Year 15 views. This is deemed to be sufficient to provide a worst-case view (Year 1) when planting has not established, and a realistic view (Year 15) to demonstrate the effect of mitigation planting once it has established. Further details of what will occur in the decommissioning phase, and what is proposed for the mitigation areas is provided in ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5] and the oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11], which is secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. Decommissioning is expected to involve the dismantling and recycling of the solar PV arrays. Certain components, such as landscape and biodiversity mitigation and site access tracks would be left in place, subject to landowner agreement.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	assets that it may consider to be adversely affected by the proposals.		

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Conclusion The size and scale of the proposed Whitestone Solar Farm would represent the largest single development (in terms of scale) that the Borough has ever seen. It would radically alter the Borough's landscape and the wider setting of the identified designated heritage assets, set out above. There would be harm (or potential harm) to the setting of 4 No. Grade I listed buildings and 5 No. Grade II* listed buildings as well as substantial harm to the setting of a Scheduled Ancient Monument and potential harm to a separate Scheduled Ancient Monument. In addition, the setting of a large number of Grade II listed buildings would be harmed as well as the setting of 4 No. Conservation Areas, with potential for harm to be identified to additional designated heritage assets and undesignated heritage assets. The cumulative harm to the historic environment of the Borough, and in particular to some of the Borough's highest Graded listed buildings, would be very high. The Borough has a long history of coal mining that shaped and scarred the landscape. In the last 30 years through coalfield reclamation, the Borough's landscape has considerably improved visually, which in turn has allowed the enhancement of a large number of designated heritage assets, The NPPF requires substantial harm to a designated heritage asset to provide substantial public benefits or	The heritage assessment for the Proposed Development is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8] and the accompanying appendices, including a consideration of cumulative effects. No inter-project effects are identified from direct/indirect physical impacts. Potential inter-project setting interactions were considered for eight schemes, but no inter-project effects were concluded for: • Blue Mans Bower (SM 1012201) • Conisbrough Castle (SM 1010828) • Conisbrough Parks Romano-British Villa (SM 1491715) • Barlborough Hall Registered Park and Garden (1001365) and associated Listed Buildings • Manor House (Grade II, 1151523) • Hardwick Hall Farmhouse (Grade II, 1314636) A minor inter-project effect was identified for Ulley Conservation Area, arising from the Carr Lane, Ulley solar scheme (RB2025/0029), but this was assessed as not significant.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets to provide public benefits. Whilst the identified harm is in most cases is less than substantial, collectively the harm to the historic environment in the Borough and to the highest grade of designated heritage assets would be significant. Though there would be public benefits in terms a relatively small number of jobs created and green energy generation, when balanced against the harm to the historic environment, these benefits do not outweigh this level of harm. It is for this reason that significant concerns to the proposals from a heritage perspective are raised.		

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	The following comments are provided by South Yorkshire Mining Advisory Service (SYMAS): 5.5.7 The assessment looks into the risks to the Proposed Development based on past coal mining activities. According to the Mining Remediation Authority's online mapping, W1 is located in a Coal Mining Reporting area. Two High Risk Development Areas have also been identified in the northeast of W1 containing three mine entries associated with probable shallow coal mine workings. More information can be found in NTS Appendix 1, Figures 5.5.1, 5.5.2 and 5.5.3: Coal Mining High Risk Development Areas W1-3. 5.5.8 Phase 1 Coal Mining Risk Assessments are being undertaken to evaluate risks to ground conditions and land quality from historic coal mining. These will be available as part of the ES. 5.5.9 They will consider: • A review of public environmental data on geology, sensitive land uses, hydrogeology, and hydrology. • An analysis of Coal Authority Reports for High-Risk Areas within the Proposed Development, including datasets on underground coal mining (past, present, future), mine entries, coal mining geology, opencast coal mining, subsidence, mine gas, coal mining hazards, mine water treatment schemes, managed tips and abandonment plans (if necessary). This concurs with records held by SYMAS and providing further submissions are secured which details the mitigation works required to ensure safe development, in this case from three mine shafts and	Cable Corridor options included within the draft ES previously included crossing the landfills as referenced, but these options have not been brought forward and the Cable Corridors in the ES avoid these large landfills. Cable Corridors do still intersect very small areas of registered and historic landfills in four locations and Phase 2 intrusive investigations would be required in these areas prior to final engineering design. These are secured as a Schedule 2 requirement within the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. No permanent infrastructure, including any requiring deep foundations, are located on landfills or land affected by coal mining. Coal mining and other land stability risks will be further addressed as part of the post consent detailed design development by targeted ground investigation undertaken prior to construction in areas where risk of unstable ground has been identified to inform design. A 20-metre Zone of Influence (ZOI) around known mine entries has been used to avoid ground stability issues with installed infrastructure, and targeted ground investigations under the oversight of the MRA are required if construction within the zone is required. Further information can be found in ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.7 – 9.9: Phase 1 Contaminated Land Reports [EN0110020/APP/6.20] and ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.10 – 9.12: Phase 1 Coal Mining Risk Assessments [EN0110020/APP/6.20].	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	MRA areas of 'probable shallow coal workings', then SYMAS would have no objections to the proposals. Given the above SYMAS will look forward to further submissions regarding the coal mining legacy aspect in due course.		

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	The applicant should remove the Maltby Landfill Site/Cable Route option from further design development. For the Kiveton Park Cable Route, the applicant should undertake: • A detailed Landfill Infrastructure Risk Assessment, and Intrusive Ground Investigation complete with gas monitoring, to demonstrate safety and no interference with existing control systems and no risk to the environment, human health etc. Any future works in close proximity to the Councils managed landfills must be subject to: • Approval by the Councils Landfill Management Team • Supervision during works to protect existing gas/leachate systems • Method Statements demonstrating how risks will be mitigated. No construction works should proceed within or adjacent to Council managed landfill sites without prior written consent from the Councils Environmental Protection/Contaminated Land/ Landfill Management Team.	The design of the Proposed Development has been refined such that Cable Corridors avoid the most significant potential sources of contamination (Maltby Brickworks and Kiveton Park Landfills). Remaining potential sources identified in the Phase 1 CLR's include named historic landfill sites within Cable Route B (Lidget Lane, Hellaby Landfill, Hellaby Park Farm and Bantry Road), records of small areas of potentially infilled land and land associated with historic coal mining, including mine entries and historic surface mining. No permanent infrastructure, including any requiring deep foundations, are located on landfills or land affected by coal mining. Coal mining and other land stability risks will be further addressed as part of the post consent detailed design development by targeted ground investigation undertaken prior to construction in areas where risk of unstable ground has been identified to inform design. A 20-metre Zone of Influence (ZOI) around known mine entries has been used to avoid ground stability issues with installed infrastructure, and targeted ground investigations under the oversight of the MRA are required if construction within the zone is required. Phase 2 intrusive investigations would be required in these areas of potential contamination prior to final engineering design. These are secured as a	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Schedule 2 requirement within the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. Further information can be found in ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.7 – 9.9: Phase 1 Contaminated Land Reports [EN0110020/APP/6.20] and ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.10 – 9.12: Phase 1 Coal Mining Risk Assessments [EN0110020/APP/6.20].	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) Locations and Ground Stability The draft ES provides insufficient detail regarding the proposed locations, design and number of BESS units. Without this information, it is not possible to assess the potential risks associated with ground conditions, contamination and land stability in areas where these installations are proposed. BESS compounds typically require substantial foundations. A land stability assessment and intrusive site investigation/detailed risk assessment for each proposed BESS compound will be required. Until such information is submitted and assessed, the Council is unable to confirm whether the proposed BESS locations are suitable or stable for development.	The Applicant will be required to complete further design as part of detailed design, and manage any stability risks in collaboration with RMBC and National Highways. As the final quantity and manufacturer of equipment is not known, a final assessment cannot be completed. The Applicant has allowed sufficient flexibility in the Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3] for foundation designs to enable safe delivery, however. Details of proposed BESS location can be found on ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1 - Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/6.19]	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Ground Investigation Requirements in High-Risk Areas The draft ES makes mention to the need to adequately address ground stability and contamination issues within areas identified as being of development high risk due to coal mining legacy, historical landfilling or infilled ground. These works are welcome, and it should be noted that the ground conditions may present a range of hazards, including but not limited to:	No permanent infrastructure, including any requiring deep foundations, are located on landfills or land affected by coal mining. Coal mining and other land stability risks will be further addressed as part of the post consent detailed design development by targeted ground investigation undertaken prior to construction in areas where risk of unstable ground has been identified to inform design. A 20-metre Zone of Influence (ZOI) around known mine entries has been used to avoid ground	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	• Shallow mine workings and mine entries • Void Collapse or differential settlement • Presence of ground gases (methane, carbon dioxide) and migration • Ground contamination and variable geotechnical strength associated with infilled or made ground. Prior to any construction or groundworks, the applicant must undertake comprehensive site investigation and risk assessment in accordance with current UK guidance for contaminated land and ground gas risk assessment. Comprehensive ground investigation and stability assessment must be undertaken in all areas identified as being within coal mining high risk development areas, historical landfills, refuse sites or infilled ground. The investigations must demonstrate that the ground is suitable and stable, that there are no unacceptable risks to human health, property or the environment and that appropriate remedial or mitigation measures will be identified.	stability issues with installed infrastructure, and targeted ground investigations under the oversight of the MRA are required if construction within the zone is required.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Conclusions The Council objects to the proposed cable route option through Maltby Landfill Site and expresses strong concern regarding the cable alignment adjacent to Kiveton Park Landfill Site. Both sites contain active environmental protection systems that are critical to maintaining containment integrity and protecting nearby receptors, including a school and residential areas. The applicant must amend the proposed cable route options to avoid these areas or provide robust evidence-based assessments demonstrating that risks can be fully mitigated to the Councils satisfaction.	Cable Corridor options included within the draft ES previously included crossing the landfills as referenced, but these options have not been brought forward and the Cable Corridors in the ES avoid these large landfills. It should be noted that Cable Corridors do still intersect very small areas of registered and historic landfills in four locations and Phase 2 intrusive investigations would be required in these areas prior to final engineering design. These are secured as a Schedule 2 requirement within the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	Yes
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Further clarification is also required regarding the siting, the scale/number of BESS units to ensure that land stability and contamination risks will be properly assessed. Without this information the Council cannot confirm the suitability of these proposals.	During the statutory consultation, the Applicant consulted on the proposed options for the location of the BESS. In response to feedback and technical assessments, the Applicant selected the location closest to the National Grid substation and near the M1 to minimise potential impacts. See Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] for further information. The BESS is proposed to be located adjacent to the M1. Substations and the BESS have been located away from all of the areas with potential for deleterious ground conditions described above, although solar arrays, low-voltage and high-voltage Cable Corridors and access tracks do overlap with relatively small areas with the potential hazards described above. However,	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		with the proposed embedded mitigation the likelihood of occurrence of this effect is considered to be 'low'. Further information can be found in ES Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.19].	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Comprehensive investigation and risk assessment within former coal mining, landfill and infilled ground areas will be essential to ensure that the proposed development does not pose unacceptable risks to human health, property and the environment.	Coal mining and other land stability risks will be further addressed as part of the post consent detailed design development by targeted ground investigation undertaken prior to construction in areas where risk of unstable ground has been identified to inform design. A 20-metre Zone of Influence (ZOI) around known mine entries has been used to avoid ground stability issues with installed infrastructure, and targeted ground investigations under the oversight of the MRA are required if construction within the zone is required.	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	The FRA methodology is robust. Final FRA submission should confirm compensatory storage volumes and demonstrate no increase in flood risk elsewhere	ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20] that accompanies this Chapter discusses floodplain storage and demonstrates that there will be no increase in flood risk elsewhere as a result of the Proposed Development.	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	The final Surface Water Drainage Strategy should include detailed hydraulic calculations, exceedance flow routing, and maintenance plans for SuDS features.	An outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy [EN0110020/APP/5.17] is submitted with the Application.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		It includes initial hydraulic calculations, proposed SuDS features, and maintenance plans. This will be developed further throughout the detailed design phase.	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Watercourse consent applications should include ecological impact assessments and demonstrate compliance with the mitigation hierarchy	Noted. It is not known at this stage what permits / consents will be required for the Proposed Development. Appropriate watercourse consents will be applied for when and where required, and the applications will contain the relevant information regarding ecological impact assessment and mitigation. Watercourse crossings are listed and assessed within ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10] . Potential effects of watercourse crossings relating to ecological receptors are covered in ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6] .	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Groundwater protection measures should be secured via the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and monitored during construction	Groundwater protection is discussed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9] . These measures are also included in the outline Excavated Materials Management Plan (oEMMP) within the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] .	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Reservoir impact assessments should be included in the final ES, with buffer zones and construction controls clearly defined.	Groundwater protection is discussed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9] . These measures are also included in the outline Excavated Materials Management Plan (oEMMP) within the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] .	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Permit applications should be submitted early to avoid delays, and include method statements, pollution prevention plans, and hydraulic assessments.	It is not known at this stage what permits / consents will be needed for the Proposed Development. Noted that permits and consents should be sought in advance and be supported by any required method statements, pollution prevention plans and hydraulic assessments. Engagement will be had with the relevant authorities when / if permits are required.	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Duration of storage: Consider longer-duration storage options or hybridisation (e.g. flow batteries alongside lithium-ion) to improve resilience and reduce reliance on fossil fuel generation for peak loads. Is there a battery recycling or circular economy plan in place for end-of-life, given the critical mineral use?	ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4] and ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5] present the battery storage design and the alternative design options that have been considered for the Proposed Development. The Proposed Development involves solar panels and BESS and is designed to maximise the amount of clean energy exported to the National Grid and account for other environment impacts including climate change and GHG emissions. ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16] describes the approach to the impacts of waste during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. The primary waste stream associated with the Proposed Development will be the solar PV modules and associated electrical infrastructure. Decommissioning will take place after an anticipated 60 years of operation and be	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		undertaken in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] . The DEMP will apply the waste management hierarchy at its core and any material assets will be recycled where practicable to do so.	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	How will soil compaction during construction be mitigated to preserve infiltration and carbon storage potential?	Construction activities may lead to temporary soil function loss, compaction, contamination risks, and groundwater disturbance. These potential impacts will be mitigated by implementing best practice construction techniques through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and associated Soil Management Plan (SMP), which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] . These are included in the DCO application in outline as the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] . The outline Soil Management Plan (oSMP) within the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] lays out principles during the construction phase, which include the prevention of compaction by restricting vehicle movement to defined routes, using low-ground-pressure machinery where practicable and minimising trafficking on stripped or exposed soils. The embedded mitigation methods will preserve infiltration and carbon storage potential.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Embodied carbon in panels and batteries: The ES accounts for lifecycle GHGs but doesn't mention supplier screening. Specify requirements for low-carbon manufacturing e.g., solar modules produced using renewable electricity, or batteries with recycled content. Scope 3 emissions: Strengthen commitments to track and report Scope 3 emissions from construction, maintenance and replacement cycles.	As part of the procurement and contractor selection process, potential contractors will be assessed against multiple criteria including their sourcing of materials and greenhouse gas emissions. As detailed in ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5], the design of the Proposed Development has some flexibility as renewable technology continues to develop rapidly, and the performance and design of the solar PV modules, BESS and associated infrastructure may evolve by the time the Proposed Development is constructed. The Greenhouse Gas Assessment, as set out in ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11] has been updated and uses activity data to assess the impact of GHG emissions across each phase of the Proposed Development. In addition, the GHG Assessment calculates and reports the total GHG emissions related to Scope 1, Scope 2 and Scope 3 for all phases of the Proposed Development. Scope 1 GHG emissions arise from sources that are owned or controlled by the Proposed Development; Scope 2: GHG emissions arise from the generation of purchased electricity; and Scope 3 GHG emissions occur as a result of the activities	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		of the Proposed Development, but occur from sources not owned or controlled by the Proposed Development. For further details of the sources of GHG emissions see Section 11.4 of the ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]. ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11] details the assessment methodology, significance criteria and the assessment of GHG emission effects.	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Will the project commit to annual public reporting on carbon savings, energy generation vs forecast, and biodiversity outcomes? How will technology upgrades (higher efficiency panels, new BESS systems) be integrated over 60 years to avoid technological lock-in?	The GHG Assessment in ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11] reports the anticipated carbon savings (i.e., the GHG emissions avoided and displaced by the Proposed Development). Biodiversity outcomes are described in ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]. The Proposed Development will report on carbon savings, energy generation and forecasts during the lifecycle of the Proposed Development. ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5] presents the design of the Proposed Development. The design has some flexibility as renewable technology continues to develop rapidly, and the performance and design of the solar PV modules, BESS and	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		associated infrastructure may evolve by the time the Proposed Development is constructed. In addition, the design has some flexibility to adapt to future technological advancements to avoid technological lock-in.	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Albeit not directly related to the draft Environmental Statement, we are concerned to highlight exposure to Modern Slavery within the solar PV supply chain. We recommended that this issue be included in the EIA either as a 'wider socio-economic effect' or addressed separately through a Modern Slavery Transparency Statement. Whilst we note that 'Socioeconomics and Land Use' constitutes Chapter 15 of the draft ES, Modern Slavery has not been referenced once in this chapter.	The applicant is committed to ensuring that all procurement activity undertaken in connection with the project is conducted in accordance with the highest ethical standards. All international suppliers will be required to meet the minimum standards of environmental, professional, and ethical working practice as established and agreed by the members of Solar Energy UK. These standards include, but are not limited to, the prohibition of suppliers or manufacturers that engage in slavery, forced labour, or any related form of exploitation. Compliance with these standards will be a condition of appointment and will be subject to ongoing due diligence throughout the project. Wider socio-economic considerations are assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socioeconomics, Tourism and Recreation and Land-Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	In its Consultation Booklet of 18 November 2024 – 17 January 2025, the applicant stated that, “If constructed, Whitestone would generate up to 750 MW of energy, which is enough to power up to 250,000 homes”, based on an average annual energy consumption of 3,200 kWh per household. In paragraph 5.1.2 of the draft Environmental Statement (ES) [and elsewhere in its consultation literature, including its ‘Whitestone 1 Consultation Booklet’, dated 16 September – 28 October 2025], the applicant again refers to a total installed capacity of “approximately 750 megawatts”. However, in a statutory consultation briefing organised for RMBC and City of Doncaster Council officers, agents acting on behalf of the applicant emphasised a large reduction in the proposed area of solar panels, with 279 out of 1,100 ha removed from the project design, in response to the first, non-statutory round of community consultations. How can the applicant justify no change in the proposed installed capacity and generated output from a project, which has been cut by 25%? Or were the ‘potential solar panels and associated infrastructure areas’ nearest to homes and villages never intended to be developed – but included in the project design, only to present the illusion that local concerns were being heard?	The consultation booklets at both stages of consultation explained the grid connection, which is 750 MW, not the installed capacity of the development. The reductions in solar areas after each stage of consultation were genuine. The Applicant removed one quarter of the solar areas after the non-statutory consultation, and then further reduced after the statutory consultation so that the final developable area is now 37% less than the original. This change will impact the generating capacity of the Proposed Development, but was provided to respond to consultation feedback and address potential significant impacts. Regardless of the final installed capacity, the grid connection agreement would remain 750MW. The Applicant has presented the grid connection rather than the installed capacity, as the capacity number is subject to a number of changing factors as the Proposed Development continues through design.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	In its consultation literature as referenced above, the applicant assumes an average annual energy demand of 3,200 kWh per home, without justification. This assumption yields a potentially misleading estimate of the proposed development's total generated electricity output, as being sufficient to power 250,000 homes. If the figure refers only to electricity demand, it is too high; if it refers to total household energy demand (as in fact it would seem, from the applicant's choice of phrase) then it is much too low. In Rotherham, combined annual domestic energy demand for electricity and natural gas heating was 14,460 kWh per household, in 2023. Accounting for a transition to low-carbon domestic heating systems over the lifetime of the proposed development, as committed by Government policy - by assuming general adoption of air source heat pumps as the leading technological alternative to natural gas boilers [and ca. three times more efficient] – local households' future annual energy demand may be reasonably projected as 6,200 kWh per annum. It may be that the applicant further assumes the widespread adoption of rooftop solar PV by households, which could account for the difference between the above figure and that supplied in the consultation literature. If this is the case, then it is worth stating such an assumption in the interest of transparency – not least because rooftop solar has attracted interest as a potential 'alternative' to large-	The last Typical Domestic Consumption Values by Ofgem (2023), put a mid-range home at 2,700-3,900kWh for electricity, which aligns with the Applicant's Assessment. While there are increases in electrical consumption due to electrification of EVs and Air Source Heat Pumps replacing gas boilers, there is also widespread adoption of Solar PV on rooftops – also a positive benefit to the community.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	scale, ground mounted installations of the type proposed; whereas the above analysis underlines that both widespread domestic adoption of rooftop solar and large solar farms will be needed, to deliver sufficient clean energy to fulfil the UK's climate change commitments.		
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Whereas the applicant quotes an estimated 16,000,000 tCO ₂ e total greenhouse gas emissions avoided, as a result of the proposed development. Which figure is incorrect? 250,000 homes, 3,200 kWh per year per home, 16,000,000 tCO ₂ e – or all three?	The GHG Assessment in ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11] uses the most up to date GHG reporting guidance, emission conversion factors and methodologies. The methodology calculates the total GHG emissions avoided or displaced using guidance by the UK Government. The GHG assessment in ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11] calculates that the total GHG emissions avoided or displaced by the Proposed Development for its 60-year lifetime. The calculation is as follows: • Total annual output Proposed Development * 60 years = approximately 44 TWh; • UK natural gas (CCGT) conversion factor 2025 is 0.202 kgCO₂e divided by 50% load factor; and • Therefore, 44 TWh multiplied by 0.414 kg CO₂e = around 18 million tCO₂e.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		The assessment of the GHG emissions avoided or displaced has been updated to reflect the current design stage and the latest GHG emission factors (i.e., Department for Energy Security and Net Zero, 2025).	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Whereas the applicant estimates total greenhouse gas emissions avoided on this basis, as a result of the proposed development, as 32,000,000 tCO ₂ e. Again, how does the applicant account for this discrepancy?	The GHG Assessment in ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11] uses the most up to date GHG reporting guidance, emission conversion factors and methodologies. The methodology calculates the total GHG emissions avoided or displaced using guidance by the UK Government. The GHG assessment in Section 11.7 calculates that the total GHG emissions avoided or displaced by the Proposed Development for its 60-year lifetime. The calculation is as follows: • Total annual output Proposed Development * 60 years = approximately 44 TWh; • UK natural gas (CCGT) conversion factor 2025 is 0.202 kgCO₂e divided by 50% load factor; and • Therefore, 44 TWh multiplied by 0.414 kg CO₂e = around 18 million tCO₂e. The assessment of the GHG emissions avoided or displaced has been updated to reflect the current design stage and the latest GHG emission factors	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		(i.e., Department for Energy Security and Net Zero, 2025).	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	In Table 11.14, the applicant notes that “Construction activities may lead to... Moderate adverse effects expected in relation to permanent soil loss.” Soil erosion is a recognised source of carbon emissions (especially over shorter timescales) and yet is absent from greenhouse gas assessment of the construction phase of the project, according to its scope as defined at paragraph 11.5.41 of the draft ES: • Extraction, manufacture and transport of materials • Emissions associated with the construction processes onsite (including fuel consumed by equipment and vehicles used to construct the Proposed Development; and fuel used in generators for electricity supply during construction) • Disposal and/ or recycling of the materials and equipment Will the applicant ensure that the carbon impact of soil loss is accounted for in its [non-draft] Environmental Statement?	As detailed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9], the Proposed Development is primarily located in areas with Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) grades between 1 and 4. The ALC across the Order Limits (excluding the Cable Corridors) is as follows: • 0.94% of Grade 1 Agricultural Land; • 7.06% of Grade 2 Agricultural Land; • 11.16% of Subgrade 3a Agricultural Land; • 78.86% of Subgrade 3b Agricultural Land; • 0.32% of Grade 4 Agricultural Land; • 0.67% of Urban Land; • 0.13% of Non-Agricultural Land; and • 0.85% of Not Surveyed Land. In summary, of the area surveyed, 19% is comprised of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land, although in the majority of instances better quality grades show high spatial variability within larger areas of ALC subgrade 3b. BMV classification data for W1, W2 and W3, based on Site surveys and sampling, and for the Cable Corridors, based on a	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		desk-based review, is provided in section 9.5 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9], including tabulated areas. The ALC survey is detailed in ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP6.20]. Given the low carbon content of ALC grades 1-4 soil, the carbon impact of soil loss is not accounted for in this ES as it is not relevant to the Proposed Development.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Is the applicant not concerned that no climate risk affecting the proposed development is assessed to be significant (Table 11.13, draft ES)? An all-green risk register is often a sign of poor risk management, or appraisal. An assessment that the consequence of “Increased extreme heat days causing overheating in substations and BESS [battery energy storage systems], leading to thermal shutdowns, fire hazards and operational disruption” is Minor (my emphasis) is hard to credit. Albeit the applicant has committed to prepare an outline Battery Safety Management Plan, it would do better not to appear to downplay such a risk, in its Environmental Statement. Since the applicant does not provide an assessment of climate risks in the absence of embedded mitigation measures, it is not possible to form an impression of their effectiveness. In the interest of transparency, the applicant should consider publishing risks’ assessed significance, with and without embedded mitigation measures.	ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11] describes the Climate Change Risk and Resilience (CCRR) assessment methodology and significance criteria. Legislation and best practice guidance have both informed the approach taken by the Applicant. The CCRR accounts for embedded mitigation in the assessment of effects and applies the standard EIA approach for significance assessments as described in ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: EIA Methodology [EN0110020/APP/6.2]. The CCRR describes the baseline and future climate conditions associated with extreme heat. Solar, BESS and associated infrastructure have been designed to withstand significantly higher temperatures than the baseline and future climate scenarios. Therefore, the CCRR Assessment, including mitigation measures, is a reasonable assessment of the climate risk of extreme heat.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	In Tables 11.7 (Climate Baseline Data per Indicator) and 11.8 (Climate Indicator Data for Proposed Order Limits Resolution) the applicant refers to the McArthur Forest Fire Danger Index (FFDI) as its adopted measure of wildfire risk, within the proposed order limits. Did the applicant in fact use this measure, or has it applied the alternative Grassland Fire Danger Index, which would seem more appropriate to the site in question? Regardless of which index the applicant has used in its assessment, would it not have been more appropriate to consult local records held by South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service? That a measure has been “widely used in Australia for several decades” (Table 11.7) is hardly proof of its suitability: Australia has a much more dispersed population than the UK, where accidental and deliberate ignition from human disturbance greatly exacerbates background/meteorological wildfire risk.	The McArthur Forest Fire Danger Index is the most comprehensive database that exists for wildfire risk. This index presents the indicators to assess climate-induced wildfires. This index, despite its name, covers all regions across UK. The index also covers many different climate indicators to complete a comprehensive assessment of wildfires based on climate-induced conditions. Local indexes such as the South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service present indicators of human-induced wildfires and are not appropriate or relevant to the CCRR Assessment. ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11] describes the CCRR Assessment methodology, significance criteria and assessment of effects.	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	At paragraph 11.6.13 of the draft ES the applicant concedes that mean wind speed cannot account for the increases in the frequency and severity of storms and extreme gusts (and their potential damage to electricity infrastructure, including solar panels). Why then has it not chosen a more suitable climate indicator?	Wind speed is the most appropriate climate indicator to assess storm severity and extreme gusts. The UK Met Office states that storms and extreme gusts are complex, and storminess is difficult to measure with no compelling trends identified. As a result, the assessment has used mean wind speed as the most appropriate and relevant indicator to assess extreme wind.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Sections 11.4 to 11.7 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11] describe the CCRR Assessment methodology, significance criteria and assessment of effects.	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	At paragraph 11.5.28, the applicant cites a 2012 study by the United States National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) assessing the lifecycle emissions of large-scale solar PV installations. An updated assessment is available, published in March 2024: https://docs.nrel.gov/docs/fy24osti/87372.pdf	The reference provided of an update to the NREL life cycle assessment is noted. GHG Assessment in ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11] has been updated and uses activity data where available to assess the impact of GHG emissions across each phase of the Proposed Development. However, the 'median' value of the operation and maintenance phase of the NREL assessment has been used to calculate the GHG emissions that arise from the electricity and fuel use during the operation and maintenance phase of the Proposed Development. The NREL Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Solar Photovoltaics is the most appropriate data source for this calculation. ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11] details the assessment methodology, significance criteria and the assessment of GHG emission effects.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Decision tree criteria presented in Plate 1 (page 15 of Chapter 11, draft ES) are flawed: a fairer appraisal of climate hazards' likelihood would not consider a hazard unlikely, if it had exceedances across multiple climate change scenarios, but in only one timeframe. It goes against the term's natural interpretation, to determine as unlikely an event which may be very probable across all climate change scenarios by the 2080s, though not before. This could be addressed in a 'Step 2' which asked "Are there exceedances across EITHER multiple timeframes OR multiples SSPs?" and so on. This is not an abstract point but rather has material consequences for the way climate risks are assessed in the draft ES.	It is agreed that the assessment of likelihood methodology should address either multiple timeframes or scenarios. The CCRR likelihood assessment has been updated to evaluate the exceedances across either multiple timeframes or multiple scenarios and the CCRR Assessment reflects these criteria. ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11] describe the CCRR Assessment Methodology, Significance Criteria and Assessment of Effects.	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Albeit the climate risk assessment considers receptors within the proposed order limits, the proposed development may be expected to exacerbate some climate risks. Whereas implications for fluvial and pluvial flood risk beyond the site boundary are treated in Chapter 10, there is no consideration in the draft ES of how such extensive development of existing green space may exacerbate near surface air temperatures and hence people's exposure to extreme heat.	There is uncertainty surrounding the impact of solar farms / parks on surface temperatures (e.g., air and land). However, spacing solar PV modules allows for improved airflow, which consequently reduces the likelihood of increased surface temperatures. There would be a minimum of 3.5m between each row of solar PV modules and as a result, the Proposed Development is not anticipated to exacerbate near surface air temperatures. This is detailed in the Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Users of PRowWs could be exposed to potential increases in near surface air temperatures, however, the solar PV modules would be located a minimum of 15m from PRowWs, as outline in the oPRowWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]. Given the limited duration of exposure and heat dissipation processes the exposure of users of PRowWs to increased near surface air temperature is considered to be extremely unlikely. The effect of the Proposed Development on near surface air temperatures and people's exposure is, therefore, not considered further.	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Traffic generation – The Council's confirm the general approach is acceptable and that the assumptions made are reasonable, but the issue of individual junction impact will need to be addressed.	Details on trip generation, including construction worker transport, are provided in both ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20] and oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]. The Transport Statement provides information on the access points into the Proposed Development for construction traffic. While the Traffic and Transport assessment provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13] does not assess every individual junction, the assessment considers the impact on each road link where a traffic count has taken place This includes all the roads where a proposed access point into the Proposed Development is located.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Access – Whilst the proposed access locations are indicated, detailed information will be required to assess the locations. As previously stated, all accesses should comply with industry standards and both tracking exercises and Road Safety Audits will be required in support. It is worthy of note that the proposed access on Sheffield Road which is the former trunk road and is the A57 main link between the M1 and A1 should be relocated and served from an alternative highway.	Preliminary vehicle tracking and visibility splay assessments in accordance with the relevant design guidance have been undertaken to inform the development of the proposed access strategy and to confirm that the accesses are capable of accommodating the anticipated construction vehicles. Detailed access proposals will be developed and be supported, where appropriate, by Road Safety Audits undertaken at the detailed design stage following consent via a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. Further detail on access strategy is included in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Mitigation measures in relation to management of construction traffic are provided in the oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12].	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Routing – tracking exercises demonstrating two HGV's passing may be required in certain locations.	Mitigation measures in relation to management of construction traffic are provided in the oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]. The assessment presented in ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13] uses detail provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20] and the mitigation	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		measures outlined in the oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12] .	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Dilapidation Survey – Prior to the commencement of works a dilapidation survey should be agreed with RMBC	Road condition surveys will be agreed and undertaken as part of the detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan. This is secured in the oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12] .	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	The Council wish to be involved in the discussions around detailed design / routing / timings etc	Noted. Per the requirements contained in Schedule 2 to the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] no part of the authorised development will be able to commence until the detailed design for that part has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority. Furthermore, mitigation measures in relation to management of construction traffic including details of the outline junction design are provided in the oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12] . The Applicant is committed to engaging the relevant authority in the process of producing the CTMP prior to construction as required in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO . That notwithstanding, details on how consultation specific to trip generation, routing and calculations are provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20] .	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	RMBC would welcome sight of the Outline PROW Management Plan once prepared.	An oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14] has been submitted with this Application to outline how PRoWs will be managed by the Applicant. Mitigation measures include:	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		• Maintaining access to/along PRowWs during construction, including any minimum legal widths for PRowW users, with one exception temporarily during adjacent construction works. • Providing temporary PRowW diversion routes where necessary to avoid any PRowW closures. Each diversion will be clearly marked out, along with appropriate signage at either end of the diversion. The diversion routes will be agreed with relevant local councils prior to the commencement of construction.	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Additional and like many local authorities, Rotherham Council has a standing Local Access Forum who are a statutory, independent public consultee for matters relating to Countryside Access and we will involve them in feedback and comments from that Management Plan. It would be welcome to see the future proposals take account of the guidance issued by the British Horse Society on solar developments in this plan, as this offers some very sensible and practical advice that is applicable to all users. In particular it would be beneficial to embrace the guidance on construction within the advice, and also note the concerns riders have about noise issues and how this can be alleviated.	Noted.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	The Council understand the need to protect public safety during development and would, as in many other developments across the borough, be happy to collaboratively to ensure public safety whilst retaining (and potentially enhancing) access during the construction phase.	Noted.	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Rotherham Council are, like other highway authorities, in receipt of a number of claims for public rights on paths used by the public and which are not shown on our Definitive Map of rights of way presently. The attached maps show these routes, which are denoted by red lines.	Noted.	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Finally, the Council would welcome the opportunity to work with the applicant and the Local Access Forum to explore options for permissive path dedication for the duration of the development, and trust that an offer to work with the local community on such proposals is embraced as part of the PROW Management Plan. Enhancing public access alongside this development would be of great benefit to users for a number of years.	The Applicant is proposing new additional permissive paths to enhance connectivity across the site. This includes 14.5km of new paths to create circular routes and connect key locations, presented in Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7]. Further information can be found in the Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]. The Applicant or appointed contractor is committed to engaging with the Local Access Forum and the Council in the preparation of the detailed PROWMP to be prepared pre-construction which will be in accordance with the oPROWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	It is noted that in Chapter 14, Section 14.7.4 of the Draft Environmental Statement that the operational construction hours are proposed to be 07:00-19:00 Mondays to Fridays and 07:00 - 13:00 on Saturdays. Such early morning works especially in rural locations is likely to result in disturbance to local residents/nearby sensitive receptors. It is therefore the Council's opinion that a start time of 08:00hrs Mondays to Fridays and 09:00hrs on Saturdays be implemented. This would protect nearby sensitive receptors from adverse impact, and it would be in line with current practices within the Rotherham borough	Construction noise is assessed assuming that construction could take place as early as 07:00 on weekdays or Saturdays, in line with the working hours set out in the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/7.2]. The oCEMP also identifies the mitigation requirements for the construction period, which includes: - Noisier activities will be scheduled, where practicable, during daytime periods when ambient sound levels are higher; - Exhaust silencers will be installed on vehicles and mechanical plant and regularly maintained; - Inherently quieter plant will be selected, where appropriate; - Mufflers or silencers will be installed on ancillary pneumatic percussive tools; - Machines will be shut down between work periods or throttled down to a minimum; - All equipment used on-site will be regularly maintained, including maintenance related to noise emissions; - Vehicles will be loaded to ensure minimal drop heights; - Ancillary plant (such as generators and pumps) will be positioned to minimise noise disturbance and, where necessary, temporary acoustic screens or enclosures will be provided;	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		• Mobile plant will be fitted with directional white noise reversing alarms to avoid tonal noise from the Site; • Noise generating equipment will not be used within 10 m of receptors; • On-site construction traffic routes will be selected to maintain a minimum distance of 100 m from noise sensitive properties, where practicable, unless it can be demonstrated in the final construction plan that impacts can be appropriately managed through alternative means; • High voltage cable installation works will not occur adjacent to sensitive receptors for 10 or more days or nights in any 15 consecutive days or nights, or exceed a total of 40 days in any 6 consecutive months, where practicable; • Launch pads for trenchless crossing drilling rigs will be installed no less than 80 m from the nearest noise sensitive receptors and will include acoustic site hoardings; and • Temporary acoustic barriers in the form of site hoardings will be installed around substation construction areas to limit construction noise impacts adjacent to these areas.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Noise Categories have been set for each location under the ABC method as described in BS5228-1:2009+A1:2014 and maximum noise levels as a result of the construction works have been calculated/modelled based on plant and equipment that is proposed to be used on site. Table 14.3-7 and 14.3-8 of Appendix 14.3 shows exceedances of the noise limits (labelled as 'Moderate') at various receptor locations. Where this is the case further mitigation is necessary and needs to be detailed in the Construction Environmental Management Plan. Noise levels need to be reduced so as not exceed the threshold within the relevant Noise Category for each receptor location. Active noise monitoring also needs to be provided whilst construction works are being undertaken to demonstrate compliance with the specified noise limits.	Operational noise has been assessed by implementing BS 4142 in the context of NPSE to avoid significant adverse effects at +5dB above background depending on context. Embedded mitigation for the Proposed Development is to avoid effects at +5 dB above background depending on context. This will be considered as part of detailed design post consent. Section 14.7 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14] presents the assessment of effects during operation of the Proposed Development. Section 14.8 ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14] includes a sensitivity analysis of additional mitigation requirements for compliance of +0dB above background.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Appendix 14.3, table 14.3-9 shows levels of vibration from the proposed construction works calculated at each receptor location. Vibrations over 1.00 mm/s will likely result in complaints. It is evident that some receptor locations are predicted to experience levels of vibration of up to 4.8 mm/s and this will therefore result in adverse impact. Mitigation measures including vibration monitoring needs to be implemented as well as suitable methods of liaison with the public. All measures need to be detailed within the Construction Environmental Management Plan.	ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN010020/APP/6.14] presents details of mitigation measures that will be implemented during the construction phase as part of the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/7.2], which include: - Noisier activities will be scheduled, where practicable, during daytime periods when ambient sound levels are higher; - Exhaust silencers will be installed on vehicles and mechanical plant and regularly maintained; - Inherently quieter plant will be selected, where appropriate; - Mufflers or silencers will be installed on ancillary pneumatic percussive tools; - Machines will be shut down between work periods or throttled down to a minimum; - All equipment used on-site will be regularly maintained, including maintenance related to noise emissions; - Vehicles will be loaded to ensure minimal drop heights; - Ancillary plant (such as generators and pumps) will be positioned to minimise noise disturbance and, where necessary, temporary acoustic screens or enclosures will be provided;	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		• Mobile plant will be fitted with directional white noise reversing alarms to avoid tonal noise from the Site; • Noise generating equipment will not be used within 10 m of receptors; • On-site construction traffic routes will be selected to maintain a minimum distance of 100 m from noise sensitive properties, where practicable, unless it can be demonstrated in the final construction plan that impacts can be appropriately managed through alternative means; • High voltage cable installation works will not occur adjacent to sensitive receptors for 10 or more days or nights in any 15 consecutive days or nights, or exceed a total of 40 days in any 6 consecutive months, where practicable; • Launch pads for trenchless crossing drilling rigs will be installed no less than 80 m from the nearest noise sensitive receptors and will include acoustic site hoardings; and • Temporary acoustic barriers in the form of site hoardings will be installed around substation construction areas to limit construction noise impacts adjacent to these areas.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Noise from the proposed development has been calculated/modelled based on plant and equipment as detailed in Table 14.4-2 of Appendix 14.4. The calculated rating levels as detailed in Tables 14.3-3 and 14.4-4 shows that the Council's criteria of a noise rating level of no more than 0dB above background noise level is exceeded at various locations. There is therefore the potential for adverse impact on nearby sensitive receptors. Further to this given the rural locations where the development is proposed, and the continuing trend of installing these types of equipment in such locations there is concern about creeping backgrounds. Volume 1, Draft Environmental Statement, Chapter 14, Section 14.7.16 mentions that further mitigation is to be considered and implemented where necessary and practicable. When considering mitigation at the detailed design stage this needs to ensure that a rating level of no more than 0dB(A) above the prevailing background noise levels is achieved at all receptor locations and it is necessary that this rating level is not exceeded. As it currently stands the proposal can be considered as not being suitable due to it having the potential for adverse impact on some noise sensitive receptor locations as a result of operational noise.	Operational noise has been assessed by implementing BS 4142 in the context of Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE) to avoid Significant Adverse effects at +5dB above background depending on context. Embedded mitigation for the Proposed Development is to avoid effects at +5dB above background depending on context. This will be considered as part of detailed design post consent. The assessment of potential noise impacts is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14], and Section 14.8 within this Chapter includes a sensitivity analysis of additional mitigation requirements for compliance of +0dB above background. The oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/7.2] identifies the mitigation requirements for the construction period, which include: • Noisier activities will be scheduled, where practicable, during daytime periods when ambient sound levels are higher; • Exhaust silencers will be installed on vehicles and mechanical plant and regularly maintained; • Inherently quieter plant will be selected, where appropriate; • Mufflers or silencers will be installed on ancillary pneumatic percussive tools;	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		• Machines will be shut down between work periods or throttled down to a minimum; • All equipment used on-site will be regularly maintained, including maintenance related to noise emissions; • Vehicles will be loaded to ensure minimal drop heights; • Ancillary plant (such as generators and pumps) will be positioned to minimise noise disturbance and, where necessary, temporary acoustic screens or enclosures will be provided; • Mobile plant will be fitted with directional white noise reversing alarms to avoid tonal noise from the Site; • Noise generating equipment will not be used within 10 m of receptors; • On-site construction traffic routes will be selected to maintain a minimum distance of 100 m from noise sensitive properties, where practicable, unless it can be demonstrated in the final construction plan that impacts can be appropriately managed through alternative means; • High voltage cable installation works will not occur adjacent to sensitive receptors for 10 or more days or nights in any 15 consecutive days or nights, or exceed a total of 40 days in any 6 consecutive months, where practicable;	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		• Launch pads for trenchless crossing drilling rigs will be installed no less than 80 m from the nearest noise sensitive receptors and will include acoustic site hoardings; and • Temporary acoustic barriers in the form of site hoardings will be installed around substation construction areas to limit construction noise impacts adjacent to these areas.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	The Local Policy section at 15.2.3 should reference all relevant parts of the Rotherham Local Plan which includes the following documents that are not mentioned: The Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Plan (adopted 2012) and Dinning St Johns Neighbourhood Plan (adopted 2021). Furthermore please note relevant SPD: 2. Air quality and Emissions (adopted June 2020), 3. Development in the Green Belt (adopted July 2023), 5 Equal and Healthy Communities (Adopted June 2020), 11 Natural Environment (Adopted June 2021), 12 Transport Assessments, Travel Plans and Parking Standards (Adopted June 2021), 14 Trees (adopted July 2023), 15 Preparing a soils strategy (adopted July 2023), 16 biodiversity net gain- pre-mandatory but adopted by Cabinet available as agenda item 13	The Local Policy Section within ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation, and Land-Use provides an overview of the policy considered within the assessment, and does not list individual policies. Further information on policy is provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 15.1: Legislation, Policy and Guidance.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Socio-cultural effects are framed by health concerns within the borough please see RMBC Public Health Comments. The engagement with the local communities should be very robust before the spade hits the ground, during and after construction. Ensure consideration is given to all life stages of the development. Perception of change in local identity and sense of place needs further exploration and results fed into mitigation plans; please see Landscape Team comments.	Engagement with local communities has taken place throughout the development of the Proposed Development, and will continue to take place. Potential human health impacts have been considered within the relevant ES chapters, and have considered all life stages of the Proposed Development. An overview of potential human health effects is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN0110020/APP/6.17]. Extensive consultation has been held with local residents to discuss key concerns regarding the Proposed Development, and their feedback has been taken into account to ensure impacts to communities are mitigated as much as possible. The technical assessments have concluded that due to the appropriate mitigation measures being in place, and best practice construction methods being used, individually there would be no impact on human health from each environmental effect.	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	It is noted that the Neighbourhood Study Area Wards do not include all wards affected.	The Neighbourhood Study Area is detailed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation, and Land-Use [EN0110020/APP6.15] and are shown on Figures 15.1 and 15.2 in ES Volume 3 [EN0110020/APP/6.19]. The Neighbourhood Study Areas comprises wards from Doncaster and Rotherham that have been selected	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		to determine an area of 'best fit' with the local potentially affected neighbourhoods.	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	The text says "Socio-cultural effects: Socio-cultural effects are not likely to be significant at a national or local level but may be perceived or observed at a neighbourhood level" – it is noted the scheme crosses local authority boundaries and affects multiple wards. The impact is beyond neighbourhood level and have impacts at a subregional level.	Noted. This has been amended in the Environmental Statement to say that "Socio-cultural effects are not likely to be Significant at a national level but may be perceived or observed at a local or neighbourhood level". The neighbourhood and local Study Areas have therefore been used in the assessment of socio-cultural effects. The socio-economic assessment has been updated and is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation, and Land-Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15] .	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	It is considered people's perception of the affected areas, including those of visitors could potentially change. The solar farm is located along key arteries in the borough. The success of the mitigation to be put in place will be critical.	Noted. The proposed mitigation is included in the assessment of landscape and visual effects provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual [EN0110020/APP/6.7] , including the residual visual impacts at year 1 and year 15 after landscaping has had time to grown in. Details of the mitigation planting are provided in the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] submitted with the Application and secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] , which guides the management of existing vegetation and establishment of the proposed new planting to provide mitigation. The design principles for the Proposed Development are detailed in ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4] .	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	The Rotherham Local Plan Sites and Policies must be considered as part of the future baseline. The future baseline needs to consider the evolving new Local Plan which will be based on new housing targets from central government. The need to mitigate and adapt to climate change should be considered in preparing and assessing planning applications (NPPF S163). Though it is noted that the loss of land to renewables infrastructure will reduce the total area of land available for other uses including potential options for housing and employment land. It will reduce the area of open countryside. The substantial extent of the solar farm infrastructure will significantly and negatively impact on communities and visitor perceptions of this borough.	The Applicant can confirm that the Rotherham Local Plan is considered within the Future Baseline Section within ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation, and Land-Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15] .	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Please see previous comments on the Draft ES chapter, the ecological impact needs to be included in the baseline assessment. Recommendation to substantively amend the ecological chapter have already been provided. An ecosystem services approach should be applied.	The comments provided by RMBC regarding the ecological chapter are responded to within this appendix and within ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6] . As the ecological chapter focusses on ecological receptors, there is limited overlap with the tourism and recreation assessment and therefore it is not included in the baseline assessment, although Country Parks and community woodlands have been considered within the assessment in ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation, and Land-Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15] . The mitigation measures and biodiversity enhancements detailed	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		in ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1: Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/6.19] and the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] have also been considered in the assessment.	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	This section says 'Following decommissioning, it is assumed that it will be possible for most of the land required for the construction and operation and maintenance phases of the Proposed Development to be returned to use for arable farming or other uses that preceded the Proposed Development' please provide further information and assurance that it will be possible to return the land to arable farming or previous land use with the scheme proposed. It is noted the success of land restoration depends on several factors including soil management during the solar farm's operation, the decommissioning strategy, and the original condition of the land. Please see Rotherham Local Plan Preparing a Soil Strategy Supplementary Planning Document.	A DEMP will be prepared at the cessation of operations at the Proposed Development in line with the Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.11] and is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. A Decommissioning Traffic Management Plan will be included in the DEMP. An oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11] which will form the basis of the full DEMP has been submitted as part of the Application. This covers matters including the restoration of land to previous uses as part of decommissioning. The Proposed Development would have a maximum lifespan of 60 years, after which it would be fully decommissioned, as assessed within the Environmental Statement (ES Volume 2, Chapters 6–17). A detailed DEMP will be prepared and approved by the relevant planning authority prior to decommissioning, as secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. An oDEMP	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		[EN0110020/APP/7.4] has been submitted with the Application. Decommissioning is anticipated to involve the dismantling and recycling of the solar PV arrays, with associated vehicle movements broadly similar to, or less than, those experienced during construction. The ES concludes that decommissioning effects on ground conditions and land quality would be temporary and of equal or lesser magnitude than construction impacts, with no lasting adverse effects following completion of this phase. Where agreed with the landowner, elements such as mitigation planting, site access tracks and cabling ducts buried below plough-depth may be retained, as these would not prevent future agricultural use and may provide ongoing environmental benefits. Details of soil management measures are provided in the outline construction, operational and decommissioning management plans provided with the Application and secured through requirements in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. Details of the decommissioning phase is provided in ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5].	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Decommissioning activities would be governed by a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) , to be approved by the relevant planning authority prior to works commencing, as secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] . An oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/7.4] has been submitted with the Application, ensuring appropriate restoration and environmental protection in line with legislation and best practice.	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	This section says 'Tourism impacts beyond 5 km of the Site are excluded due to the limited geographic influence of the Proposed Development' it is considered there might be some impact on tourism and sense of place depending on sight lines chosen.	A 5 km Study Area for potential effects on tourism receptors has been deemed appropriate and is explained in ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation, and Land-Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15] .	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	This includes a table of visitor attractions for Rotherham in 2024 but does not include any of Rotherham's three country parks. Include consideration of scheme's impact on all of Rotherham's country parks: Ulley Country Park (UCP), Thrybergh Country Park (TCP) and Rother Valley Country Park (RVCP) within the ES. These areas traditionally provide gateways into the countryside and provide a green lung. The surrounding countryside will be urbanised by these developments. Opportunities to improve linkages and trails out from the parks should be explored and quality trails through	The Country Parks listed are now provided and considered in the assessment as recreational receptors within ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation, and Land-Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15] . The impact on tourism, including Country Parks, is expected to result in a Minor Adverse (Not Significant) effect overall. Potential impacts on Local Wildlife Sites / Local Nature Reserves are considered within ES Volume	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	the solar farm provided. UCP can be visited on a circular walk from Ulley village, the path that would go through the proposed mitigation area. This walk needs to be accommodated within the mitigation plans for the solar farm to support users of the Country Park. It is noted all of Rotherham's country parks include LWS and offer wildlife watching opportunities as part of a suite of countryside activities including the quiet enjoyment of the countryside. Greenspace Team have informed me visitor numbers are generally around 150,000 at TCP and 40,000 at UCP. It is anticipated visitor numbers will be highest at RVCP for the three country parks. The purposes of a Local Nature Reserves (LNR) is to conserve and enhance locally important wildlife and geological sites, provide educational opportunities for the public to learn about nature, and offer spaces for people to enjoy and connect with the natural environment for health and well-being. Consideration should be given how the development will impact the LNRs, particularly at Firsby Reservoir LNR. The Tropical Butterfly House at North Anston is located near the proposed solar farm and a popular visitor attraction, it is not mentioned in the ES.	2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]. The Applicant is assessing potential for community benefits by increasing access for the local population, particularly for school age children and vulnerable adults, to include upgraded and maintained access points and defined footpath routes.	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Please include reference to the Round Rotherham Walk/tralk/race that passes through the application site.	The Applicant can confirm that reference has been given to the Rotherham Round Walk in ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation, and Land-Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	The ES does not explore the impact of the scheme of the farming community. How many farmers/tenant farmers will be affected by these proposals? What assessment has been undertaken of the viability of farming for impacted businesses and individuals? Are fields remaining to farmers still suitable for farming? Have all landowners been contacted that would suffer impact by the proposed scheme?	The socio-economic assessment includes consideration of agricultural land and production within ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation, and Land-Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15]. The assessment has identified a Moderate Adverse (Significant) effect on the availability of BMV agricultural land and a Minor Adverse (Not Significant) effect on the availability of non-BMV agricultural land. The effect would be reversible on decommissioning, and there is the potential for alternative agricultural uses, such as grazing of sheep, that can continue during the lifetime of the Proposed Development. No assessment has been completed regarding specific farmers / tenants, as this not required as per solar guidance. However, the Applicant has agreed options with 28 landowners to lease part of their land. This means the Applicant is providing income to ~6% of all the agricultural businesses in Doncaster and Rotherham without using the whole of anyone's land. The Applicant will provide continuing work to farmers and contractors on the solar land, for example hedge-trimming, grass cutting, ditch clearing and raising sheep, which is a small part of the agricultural sector in the area with the potential to grow.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	The mitigation measures in this chapter are insufficient. How exactly will PROW be affected? Will mitigation be drawn up in discussion with RMBC PROW team and local user groups? How will the changes affect local informal use such as dog walkers and walkers/joggers for health? Discussion with local groups will be essential in design of mitigation plans that work for all users and provide optimal solutions.	Potential impacts on PROWs have been assessed throughout the ES, including relating to visual impacts, and access. An oPROWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14] will accompany the Application, and is secured via a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. Mitigation measures include: • Maintaining access to/along PROWs during construction, including any minimum legal widths for PROW users, with one exception temporarily during adjacent construction works. • Providing temporary PROW diversion routes where necessary to avoid any PROW closures. Each diversion will be clearly marked out, along with appropriate signage at either end of the diversion. The diversion routes will be agreed with relevant local councils prior to the commencement of construction. The Streets, Rights of Way, and Access Plans [EN0110020/APP/2.4] shows the proposed temporary PROW closures and diversions, along with paths remaining open and new permissive paths. The Applicant is only proposing to temporarily close one PROW with no diversion (Whiston Footpath No.12). Some	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		footpaths will be temporarily diverted for a short period of approximately 2-3 weeks each. The Applicant is proposing new additional permissive paths to enhance connectivity across the site. This includes 14.5km of new paths to create circular routes and connect key locations, presented in Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7]. All proposed permissive paths would include equestrians.	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Only construction phase GVA impacts are provided and subsequent stages in the life cycle of the development in this chapter are not included.	The Applicant confirms that construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phase GVA impacts are all considered and provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation, and Land-Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15] .	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Information should be provided on the impact on the tourism sector beyond construction phase.	Construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phase tourism impacts are provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation, and Land-Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15] .	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	As requested earlier more information is required on the impact on agriculture, soils, a Soil Resources Plan and impact on farming community is requested including the tenant farmers. In section 15.8.34 please expand on what is meant by alternative suppliers. The effect on food production through cumulative loss of land should be explored. Information on the national context of agricultural soil conservation should be provided. More information on soils should be provided and a deeper robust study provided.	Details of soil management measures are provided in the oSMP within the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] which accompanies the Application, and which will be secured via a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. The following principles will guide soil management during the construction phase: Minimisation of Soil Disturbance • Soil disturbance will be minimised wherever practicable through design and construction planning; and • Soils will be retained in situ where ground disturbance is not required. Timing of Soil Handling • Soil stripping, handling and trafficking will only be undertaken when soils are in a suitable, dry and friable condition; and • Soil handling will be avoided during periods of excessive rainfall or when soils are at or above their plastic limit. Protection of Soil Profiles • Where soil stripping is required, topsoil and subsoil will be stripped and stored separately; and • Soil horizons will not be mixed during stripping, storage or reinstatement. Prevention of Compaction • Vehicle movements will be restricted to defined routes;	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		• Low-ground-pressure machinery will be used where practicable; and • Trafficking on stripped or exposed soils will be minimised. Section 15.8.34, as per the draft ES, has been updated in the ES and no longer refers to alternative suppliers. The socio-economic assessment includes consideration of agricultural land and production within ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation, and Land-Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15].	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Further confidence is needed in the ES regarding treatment of hedgerows. Brampton Common LWS qualifying interest includes its hedgerow interest. Hedgerows contribute to landscape character by providing historic and local distinctiveness, defining land use, and creating visual and structural patterns. They are historically significant features that can indicate past land divisions and management practices. What studies have been done of other significant hedgerows in the borough? Can mitigation measures for protecting hedgerows be strengthened. A mitigation hierarchy should be followed to protect assets (avoid, minimise, mitigate, compensate). The scheme should avoid and buffer all LWS and candidate LWS, and protect and enhance natural networks and linkages between them. Please see Rotherham Landscape Character Assessment and Landscape Capacity Study including the character areas distinctive features and characteristics and the comments from RMBC on landscape.	The enhancement and management of hedgerows and grassland prescriptions are included within the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] which will be applicable across the Site, including Brampton Common LWS. Specific enhancements for the Brampton LWS are detailed in Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]. Enhancements to Brampton Common LWS listed below are proposed with agreement sought from RMBC and LWS steering group partners on a management approach that will support the features for which the LWS was designated: • Improve habitat connectivity in the landscape through habitat enhancement both within, and outside the LWS. • Several “mitigation” fields lie adjacent to and around the LWS and can be used to increase available habitat and strengthen wider habitat connectivity. • Plant new hedgerow networks within the site where hedgerows may have been present historically and promote hedgerow planting beyond the site's limits. • Strengthen habitat connectivity features through the addition of tree planting within hedgerows and thicken hedgerows through additional hedgerow species planting. • Improve and manage habitats for at least 30 years least 30 years including improvements for	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		designated features within, and adjacent to the LWS. • Manage hedgerows sensitively for wildlife through reducing the extent of hedgerow cutting on a 3 yearly rotational basis to ensure hedgerows have sections that are at least 2m in height (or 3m with trees). • Ensure that an agreed site specific LWS Management Plan (to be appended to the final oLEMP, as required in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].) is produced and conservation practices enacted to meet the plan's objectives in reinstating a favourable condition to the hedgerow and grassland habitats present and enable the support of breeding skylark populations. • Assess potential for community benefits by increasing access for the local population, particularly for school age children and vulnerable adults, to include upgraded and maintained access points and defined footpath routes.	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Figure 15.4 needs a better key to understand the map	The Applicant can confirm that Figure 15.4: Index of Multiple Deprivation [EN0110020/APP/6.19] has been updated with a better legend for the DCO Application submission.	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Figure 15.7 Consider inclusion of LNRs, and the Round Rotherham Walk. Numbers are provided on the map, but it is not clear what they relate to from the key.	Local Nature Reserves are considered within ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and are displayed on ES Volume 3, Figure 8.1: Local Designated Sites [EN0110020/APP/6.19] .	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		ES Volume 3, Figure 15.7: Public Rights of Way and Country Parks [EN0110020/APP/6.19] has been updated with the Round Rotherham Walk and to clearly show what the numbers refer to.	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Figure 16.2.2 Provide receptors for the developments around WP2B1 and Brinsworth B and B1 substations.	Figure 16.2.2 in ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.2: Glint and Glare Report shows the receptors assessed within the glint and glare assessment. No receptors are near the substation locations, as substations do not cause glint and glare impacts.	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Figure 17.1 Update this record as further solar farm applications have been received.	ES Volume 3, Appendix 17.1: Legislation, Policy and Guidance [EN0110020/APP/6.20] has been updated in line with the long list of cumulative developments provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 17.2: Long List of Developments for Cumulative Effects Assessment [EN0110020/AP/6.20] as agreed with the Local Planning Authorities.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	The draft ES acknowledges impact on Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land (Grades 1–3a) (207 hectares based on surveys to date) and concludes this would result in a moderate adverse (significant) effect. However: • The assessment is incomplete, with cable corridor land yet to be assessed. • There is no clear mitigation strategy for minimising BMV land take. • The ES does not quantify the impact on local food production resulting from future restrictions to grazing use, despite acknowledging the importance of arable land. Recommendation: The final ES should include a completed land survey, a justification for BMV land use, and a clearer strategy for minimising and mitigating long-term agricultural displacement.	A completed ALC Survey is provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20] and an assessment of the potential impact of the Proposed Development on BMV land is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation, and Land-Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15]. The ALC across the Order Limits (excluding the Cable Corridors) is as follows: • 0.94% of Grade 1 Agricultural Land; • 7.06% of Grade 2 Agricultural Land; • 11.16% of Subgrade 3a Agricultural Land; • 78.86% of Subgrade 3b Agricultural Land; • 0.32% of Grade 4 Agricultural Land; • 0.67% of Urban Land; • 0.13% of Non-Agricultural Land; and • 0.85% of Not Surveyed Land. In summary, of the area surveyed, 19% is comprised of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land, although in the majority of instances better quality grades show high spatial variability within larger areas of ALC subgrade 3b. BMV classification data for W1, W2 and W3, based on Site surveys and sampling, and for the Cable Corridors, based on a desk-based review, is provided in section 9.5 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9], including tabulated areas. The ALC survey is detailed in ES	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP6.20].	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	The draft ES estimates 12,568 person-years of employment during construction and 94 FTEs during operation, with associated GVA benefits. However: • Only 25% of construction spend is assumed to occur locally, based on professional judgement rather than empirical data. • It does not clearly demonstrate how the development aligns with local employment and skills priorities. • There is no commitment to local hiring, training, or apprenticeships, despite the area's high unemployment and skills gaps. • The benefits are classified as “not significant”, which may understate their potential importance for a potential growth sector in a deprived area. Recommendation: The applicant should commit to a Local Employment and Skills Plan, including targets for local hiring, training partnerships, and apprenticeships, particularly in construction and renewable energy sectors.	An assessment of the potential impact of the Proposed Development on employment is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation, and Land-Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15]. The Applicant has submitted an Outline Skills Supply Chain and Employment Plan (oSSCEP) [EN0110020/APP/5.18] with the Application. This document demonstrates how the development aligns with local employment and has a commitment to local hiring in training in section 4, 6 and 7. On the basis that the majority of the solar PV manufacturing supply chain is located outside the UK, it is estimated that up to 60%-70% of CAPEX could be spent outside the national Study Area of England. The remaining 30%-40% would be spent within England, of which it is estimated that ~10% could be spent on goods and labour within the local Study Area, with a further 20%-30% elsewhere in England. The final outcome could change depending on the availability of workers and suppliers with the necessary capabilities within the Study Area. The construction phase would create an estimated 1,077 FTE person years per annum of employment elsewhere in England (lasting two years). The sensitivity of the labour market for the national Study Area is assessed as Low due to the	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		size and flexibility of the labour market nationally. The magnitude of the impact is assessed as Negligible because the effect would be temporary and barely perceptible increase compared to the national labour force. This results in a Negligible Beneficial (Not Significant) effect. As explained in Section 15.4, the assessment of employment effects within the EIA is at local authority and national level, as effects at ward or neighbourhood level are difficult to predict accurately. However, further consideration of the potential impact of jobs and training opportunities on the economies of particular towns and settlements within the local Study Area, for example Conisbrough, is provided in the oSSCEP [EN0110020/APP/5.18], which sets out measures to maximise opportunities for local businesses, supply chains, and the workforce.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Community Benefit Strategy There is no reference to a community benefit fund or other mechanisms to ensure that host communities share in the long-term benefits of the development. Recommendation: The applicant should outline a Community Benefit Strategy in the final ES, including potential funding for local infrastructure, education, or energy initiatives.	The Applicant has committed to providing a community benefit package, which is described further in the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]. This is a voluntary agreement, which is not part of the DCO. The Applicant will continue to engage with local stakeholders to refine the proposal to ensure that there are local benefits that support local initiatives.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Access to Services and Demographic Change The draft ES concludes that impacts on local services (e.g. health, education) and demographics will be negligible based on the assumption that most workers will commute, with limited evidence provided. Recommendation: The final ES should include a quantitative assessment of temporary demand and consider mitigation if appropriate. Conclusion The draft ES provides a solid foundation for assessing socio-economic and land use impacts, but more is needed in terms of: • Minimising BMV agricultural land loss and justifying its use. • Maximising local socio-economic benefits through targeted commitments and • Engaging with local stakeholders to co-develop benefit-sharing mechanisms.	A fully quantitative assessment of temporary demand for health services hasn't been completed, but the assessment utilises data available from the House of Commons Library constituency data and Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government data to inform the baseline of the assessment. The socio-economic assessment has been updated since the Draft ES, and is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation, and Land-Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	The following comments originate from the Councils Public Health Team and whilst they are not specific to one Chapter, it is considered that they should be considered within the realms of socio economics: Mental Health, Wellbeing and Community Engagement Solar farms, like any large development, may create a number of impacts on the local environment that can affect mental and physical health. Whether these impacts lead to significant positive or negative health effects is dependent on the impact and the sensitivity of the local populations, including any vulnerable populations. The level of perceived and actual impact on health and wellbeing can and should be determined with robust community engagement in advance of the developed, during the construction phases and in the period post completion, not just singular consultation events during the application stage. The draft ES should revisit and outline with the communities involved the significance of effects, including the cumulative effects experienced by the local communities by recent, current and planned future developments. The Council note that the next phase of community meetings has been scheduled and does not provide the communities to be involved in robust community engagement activity relating to the development now or in the future. This should be addressed, and engagement activity planned throughout the planning phase.	Human health impacts have been considered where relevant throughout the ES, including with regards to landscape and visual impacts, noise, air quality, transport, and access to medical services. An overview of potential human health impacts is provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN0110020/APP/6.17]. The assessment confirms no significant effects on human health receptors are identified. The Applicant has developed and implemented a comprehensive community consultation and ongoing engagement strategy, as described in the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]. The Applicant held two consultations on the Proposed Development as a whole, as well as two targeted consultations, to secure feedback that has led to meaningful changes to the Proposed Development, including a 37% reduction in solar areas. (See the Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]). In addition to these consultation periods, the Applicant provided regular updates to elected officials and members of the community to explain how the design had changed and next steps. Now that the DCO Application has been submitted, the community will have the opportunity to engage with the examination process and submit their feedback directly to the Planning Inspectorate. The Applicant will continue to engage with the community at key milestones.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
	The commitment to ongoing community engagement to address local concerns and anxieties should be explicit and to ensure transparency throughout the project lifecycle. Access to information via planned consultation is only available either at one of the planned meetings or as a digital download. Additional measures to access information and means of communicating with residents should be discussed with those communities and additional approaches adopted to ensure access to information and engagement opportunities for those that are digitally excluded and or unable to travel / attend your scheduled sessions due to the timings. Charging for printed versions of you documentation excludes the digitally excluded, those who may need to see printed versions as they cannot access timetabled sessions or those who may require adapted versions of the information	The Applicant provided both digital and paper versions of materials during the consultation periods, as described in the Consultation Report. [EN0110020/APP/5.1].	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Visual Impact and Landscape The impact on the visual and functional changes to the landscape have already been identified by the local communities as an issue and negative impact and cause of stress and anxiety, impacting on mental wellbeing. The mitigation solutions and ongoing engagement relating to these concerns over the differing sites should be clearly formulated and articulated in advance of the 'spade hitting the ground' and throughout the construction phase to address anxieties. This issue should be given further consideration within the ES and will require further impact assessments and engagement activity to be conducted. Again, local communities and groups of interest are best place to support the proposal with practical, acceptable solutions whilst respecting the unique character of the areas in contention, supporting our prosperous rural economy and not having a negative impact on rural tourism and public access.	Through the design process, the Applicant has sought to minimise visual impacts by removing panels to create offsets around homes, villages, public rights of way, and other key locations, resulting a 37% reduction in developable areas as compared to the original design (See Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]). Where it was not possible or practical to further reduce panels, the Applicant has included landscaping to create a natural screening to reduce impacts, as shown in the Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7] and managed by the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/7.6]. Potential human health impacts from landscape and visual effects are considered within ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual [EN0110020/APP/6.7], and an overview of potential human health impacts are provided in ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN0110020/APP/6.17]. Engagement with local communities will be ongoing through the examination phase.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Public Rights of Way Access to public green spaces including Public Rights of Way needs a clearer strategy for management during the construction phases and the ongoing management post construction. Rotherham is 75% rural in nature and the use of public green space is an important resource for health and wellbeing, recreation and rural tourism. This issue should be given further consideration within the ES and will require further impact assessments and engagement activity to be conducted. Our communities and groups of interest are best placed to support your proposal with practical, acceptable solutions whilst respecting the unique character of the areas in contention, supporting our prosperous rural economy and not having a negative impact on rural tourism and public access.	The potential impact of the Proposed Development on PRowS is assessed where relevant throughout the ES, including with regards to visual impacts, glint and glare impacts, noise impacts, and access. The outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.14] accompanies the Application and is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. PRowS will remain open during construction, with only temporary closures or minor diversions where necessary (as set out in oPRowMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]). The Streets, Rights of Way, and Access Plans [EN0110020/APP/2.4] shows the proposed temporary PRow closures and diversions, along with paths remaining open and new permissive paths. The Applicant is only proposing to temporarily close one PRow with no diversion (Whiston Footpath No.12). Some footpaths will be temporarily diverted for a short period of approximately 2-3 weeks each. The Applicant is proposing new additional permissive paths to enhance connectivity across the site. This includes 14.5km of new paths to create circular routes and connect key locations, presented in Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7]. All proposed permissive paths would include equestrians.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Noise and Disruption Working with the communities, relevant partners of interest and local authority colleagues throughout the process can mitigate perceived and actual negative impacts for our residents. These should be communicated clearly in lay terms, not technical language addressing potential noise and disruption impacts from construction and operational equipment, such as noise-reducing technologies, careful equipment selection and appropriate construction scheduling, to ensure noise levels are within acceptable limits and don't cause cumulative effects.	Mitigation of potential noise impacts is detailed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14] . The ES is summarised in lay terms within the Non-Technical Summary [EN0110020/APP/6.21]	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Ongoing engagement is key to ensure that the development addresses the concerns of our local communities and does not have an unacceptable negative impact on people or disruption on local roads	The Applicant will continue to engage with RMBC as part of Examination and post consent. For measures regarding traffic during construction please refer to the oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12] .	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Health protection and emergency planning responses need to be clearly articulated for the duration of the development, construction and operational phases. The local emergency response services should be engaged and consulted during this process.	The Applicant has committed to producing emergency management plans for the BESS in the oBSMP [EN0110020/APP/5.15] . Within the oBSMP, the Emergency Response Plan (ERP) will provide information that supports operators and the Fire and Rescue Service in effectively responding to an incident at the BESS Site. To ensure the safety of the overall system, various levels of fire detection and suppression mechanisms have been incorporated. These mechanisms have been designed to promptly identify and mitigate any potential risk of	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		thermal runaway and the conditions that may lead up to it. In the unlikely event that a fire does occur, the spacing and location of the units have been carefully considered to eliminate any possibility of fire spreading between units, ensuring the situation does not escalate. BESS units shall be selected that are designed to self-contain fire risks.	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Local Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) data has not been considered as evidence in the ES. This should be used to understand the needs of the local and wider communities living and working in the immediate and surrounding areas, informing engagement strategies and specific nuances associated with those communities. NPPF principles should be explicitly outlined in further development work. Meaningful engagement, recognising the local character of the areas in contention (each are distinct, areas, with their own unique needs), promoting health and wellbeing and addressing cumulative impacts of recent developments, contemporary and planned work should be explicitly addressed.	Engagement has been completed throughout the development of the Proposed Development, and will continue into the future. Potential cumulative impacts have been considered within the ES technical chapters, and are summarised in ES Volume 3, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN0110020/APP/6.17] .	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	The Council note mental health is to be included within the landscape and visual impact assessment of the ES but the health impacts relate to more than that issue. The development of a separate, comprehensive Health Impact Assessment (HIA) should be incorporated into the project, this can specifically capture the health and wellbeing concerns and mitigations, including emergency planning. Associated with the differing phases of the development and differing issues raised during the first phase of consultation. The HIA can sit outside of the Environmental Impact Assessment and clearly outline the health impacts, support the communities need and implementation of long-term community engagement plan. This will also support meaningful community engagement.	A detailed human health impact assessment was scoped out of the ES at the EIA Scoping stage, with the Scoping Opinion provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 2.2 [EN0110020/APP/6.20] , but an overview of potential human health impacts is provided in Section 17.5 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN0110020/APP/6.17] .	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Digital exclusion and wider access to information needs to be considered to reduce inequalities and enable meaningful engagement at all stages of the project. It is essential for residents to have a say in the transition to a net zero borough, and to also feel the benefits from it.	The Applicant has included a variety of mechanisms for individuals to engage with the Proposed Development during the pre-application period. This includes digital and traditional methods, as described further in the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] .	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council operates a social value policy. The Council recognises that more can be done to support and strengthen the local economy and supply network and the region's economic resilience, whilst also maximising the amount of social value delivered by companies based outside the area. The Council is pursuing social value outcomes through a Local Labour Policy Interim Planning Statement. This sets out the requirement for major and/or employment generating developments to enter into Local Labour Agreements, increasing the opportunities for local people to access training and local employment. This is something that should be covered by Whitestone as part of this NSIP proposal.	The Applicant has submitted an Outline Skills and Supply Chain Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.18] with the DCO Application. This document sets out the need for opportunities for local people to access training and local employment.	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Other Environmental Topics (Chapter 16) It is noted that this Chapter refers to topics including Waste, Glint and Glare, telecommunications & Utilities, Major Accidents & Disasters and Electromagnetic Fields. At present the Council do not wish to make any formal representation on any of these topic areas but reserves the right to make further comment once external consultants are instructed.	Noted.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Cumulative Effects (Chapter 17) The Council is satisfied with the approach taken to cumulative developments set out in Chapter 17. The Long and Short List at appendix 17.2 provides a comprehensive list of determined and proposed developments within the relevant catchments. It would however be useful if the list could be expanded to include the address of each development to make it more user friendly. Additionally, as, and when the Council receive new applications and/or requests for Screening Opinions within the area of influence, these should be fed into the assessment. The Council will commit to keeping the applicant up to date on these matters.	Noted. The list has been expanded in consultation with RMBC for the ES, and also includes the address of each development. The updated long list is provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 17.2: Long List for Cumulative Effects Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20].	No
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	There are concerns regarding the height of the post and wire fencing at 2.2metres high and surrounding all solar arrays; this fencing will be significantly above head height and has the potential to be intrusive in the currently open countryside landscape. Consideration should be given to appropriate native landscaping that will restrict access into the solar arrays rather than the imposition of incongruous post and wire fencing at 2.2 metres high across significant tracts of Green Belt in Doncaster City and Rotherham Borough. It is also noted that there will be “cameras” pointing along the line of the fencing – again this is an intrusion into open countryside and will be incongruous additional paraphernalia within the Green Belt.	The Applicant has sought to balance visual impact of the fencing with safety and security concerns. Fencing around the solar areas would be wooden post with wire, which is commonly referred to as ‘deer fencing’ and is typical in agricultural settings. In some locations, galvanised welded wire fencing would be needed for additional security. These fencing options would be no more than 2.2m tall as set out in Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.14]. Cameras would be used for safety and security concerns, but oriented into the solar farm. Fencing will be offset by at least 10m from public rights of way to maintain a sense of openness. In many instances this distance is exceeded. Where	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		practicable, one side of public rights of way have been kept free from solar specifically to maintain wider views across the landscape. As shown on the ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1: Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/6.19] , where fencing is proposed, this is typically proposed to be screened by new planting. The list of species proposed and the associated establishment and maintenance is detailed in the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] provided as part of the DCO Application. The details of the proposed planting will be subject to agreement with host authorities as part of detailed design.	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Numbering of the parcels on the Masterplans would have enabled greater attention to detail in providing these comments, unfortunately parcel numbering is provided separately and is not reiterated on each Masterplan requiring opening of many documents and changing of documents to identify correct parcels. Needless to say, there appears to be a dearth of appropriate details, in terms of location and the species that could/are proposed to be planted. It appears within the Masterplans that many of the solar array parcels rely on existing landscaping such as hedgerows and post and wire fencing, that is at 2.2metres is well above head height. There needs to be sufficient and appropriate approach to all fencing to boundaries of the solar arrays.	Regarding the numbering of parcels, numbers are provided on the Works Plans [EN0110020/APP/2.3] , provided with the DCO Application, to aid in the discussion of individual parcels and make a clear connection to the proposals detailed for each parcel in the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] .	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	It is noted that there is no Green Belt assessment provided. Therefore, the Council is unable to appropriately assess the impacts of the BESS, Substations, converters, fencing and solar arrays in the openness of the Green Belt and the impacts on the quiet enjoyment of the open countryside for recreational purposes and for those people living and working within and on the edge of these areas.	A full Green Belt Assessment has been prepared by the Applicant in Appendix 2 of the Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4] which sets out the Applicant's position on the impacts of the Proposed Development on the openness, and purposes of the Green Belt as set out in national and local planning policy. The Proposed Development is located on grey belt land and meets the tests for being not inappropriate within the Green Belt. Should the Secretary of State disagree with the position on grey belt, the Proposed Development is CNP Infrastructure, and as such, the starting point for decision making is that the test of very special circumstances in Green Belt policy is satisfied. A summary of reasons why the Proposed Development would, in any case demonstrate very special circumstances concludes that the significant need for low carbon electricity generation infrastructure to meet the government's decarbonisation objectives, and wider environmental benefits of the proposal, including the significant increase in BNG and creation of new permissive paths locally, would outweigh any harm identified to the Green Belt, which is considered to be limited for the reasons set out in this assessment. A review and assessment of the Green Belt land within which the Proposed Development is located can be found in Planning Statement, Appendix 2 – Green Belt Assessment [EN0110020/APP/5.4].	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	It is unclear currently how many BESS units are proposed within the scheme, although their land take is noted. together with the requirement to place palisade fencing around them. Accordingly, there will be impacts on the openness of the green belt, and encroachment into open countryside but there is no green belt assessment provided to enable a full understanding of these impacts.	A reasonable worst-case assessment has been undertaken, on basis that the entire BESS Works Area is utilised for energy storage. ES topic assessments correspond with this. A review and assessment of the Green Belt land within which the Proposed Development is located can be found in Planning Statement, Appendix 2 – Green Belt Assessment [EN0110020/APP/5.4].	
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	We have recently been contacted by an elected ward member asking why the draft ES has not included a rationale for discounting brownfield sites. I note in NPS EN-3, Paragraph 2.10.29 that while land type should not be the overriding factor in site selection, applicants should, where feasible, prioritise the use of previously developed (brownfield), contaminated, or industrial land. Paragraph 2.10.31 further states that applicants should justify their site selection, acknowledging the preference for brownfield, industrial, and lower-grade agricultural land. At present, the draft ES does not appear to provide a robust justification for the exclusion of previously developed, brownfield, contaminated, or industrial land, as recommended by EN-3. I would therefore be grateful if you could take this email into consideration as an additional comment to the Council's previous response to the draft ES.	It is acknowledged that NPS EN-3 places emphasis on large scale solar utilising either previously developed land, brownfield land, contaminated land, industrial land or lower grade (3b, 4 or 5) land and, where possible, avoiding BMV agricultural land. Paragraph 2.10.21 of NPS EN-3 states <i>"while land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of the site location applicants should, where possible, utilise suitable previously developed land, brownfield land, contaminated land and industrial land. Where the proposed use of any agricultural land has been shown to be necessary, poorer quality land should be preferred to higher quality land avoiding the use of "Best and Most Versatile" agricultural land where possible"</i>. However, this flows into paragraph 2.10.23 of EN-3 which states that <i>"It is recognised that at this scale, it is likely that applicants' developments will use some agricultural land. Applicants should explain their choice of site, noting the preference for development to be on suitable</i>	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Consultee	Feedback	Applicant Response	Design Change
		<i>brownfield, industrial and low and medium grade agricultural land”.</i> The Applicant can confirm that consideration as to whether there was sufficient brownfield land available to develop a utility scale solar development was given as part of the Site Selection Assessment. However, an assessment of brownfield land within the wider Search Area identified that there was no land of an adequate land area to facilitate a large-scale solar project either individually or in combination with other sites. It can be confirmed that while this information was not provided within the Draft Environmental Statement, consideration of brownfield sites did form part of the Site Selection Assessment and is demonstrated in greater detail within the submitted Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment of the Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4].	
Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council	We are in receipt of your consultation letter in regard to the proposed development of Whitestone Solar Farm. Please be advised that we, Stockport Council LPA have no comment to make	Noted.	No

Appendix E1.3 Feedback from s42(1)(d) consultees and Applicant Responses

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Air quality & dust			
Concerns around an increase in air pollution due to construction and traffic	2	Air quality impacts arising from construction activities and construction traffic associated with the Proposed Development have been fully assessed within ES Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]. Construction-phase air quality impacts arising from on-site activities and construction traffic have been assessed on a semi-quantitative basis in accordance with Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) guidance. The assessment considered construction activities, vehicle movements and the proximity of sensitive human and ecological receptors. Construction traffic routes have been selected to minimise potential effects and are detailed in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Embedded mitigation measures have been identified to limit any temporary construction-related effects. These measures are derived from IAQM best practice guidance and are detailed in Table 12-11 of ES Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]. With these measures in place, all construction-phase air quality impacts are predicted to be Not Significant, as set out in Sections 12.6 and 12.7 within ES Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]. The mitigation will be secured through the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.9] submitted with the Application. A detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) will be prepared and approved prior to the commencement of construction to ensure appropriate controls are implemented throughout the construction period. Construction traffic was also screened against IAQM, DEFRA and DMRB criteria. Predicted changes in pollutant concentrations fall below the relevant assessment	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		thresholds, and further detailed assessment for sensitive human and ecological receptors was therefore not required. As a result, no significant air quality effects are expected from construction traffic.	
Concern about dust	1	The potential for dust impacts arising from construction of the Proposed Development has been assessed within ES Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]. The risk of construction-related dust impacts on human receptors has been assessed as Low for earthworks, construction activities and track-out. The assessment also considered impacts on ecological receptors. Overall, construction dust effects are predicted to be Negligible, or at worst Low, for both human and ecological receptors. Whilst the total Proposed Development area exceeds 110,000 m², which could indicate a large magnitude of impact for earthworks, construction activities will not take place across the entire Site simultaneously. The phasing of works significantly reduces the likelihood of widespread dust generation at any one time. In addition, the Proposed Development includes embedded mitigation measures for dust minimisation and management during construction. These measures follow recommended industry guidance and are set out in Section 12.6 and Tables 12-11 and 12-12 of ES Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]. With the correct implementation of these measures, the magnitude of potential dust impacts associated with earthworks and track-out would be reduced to Small Magnitude. As a result, with embedded mitigation in place, all construction dust effects are predicted to be Not Significant. Dust control measures will be secured through the CEMP and implemented throughout the construction period, ensuring that any potential dust impacts are appropriately managed and minimised.	No
Alternatives & site selection			

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Concern about location of the Proposed Development in the Green Belt	20	National policy requires a mix of renewable energy technologies, delivered at a range of scales, to meet future energy demand and decarbonisation targets. While rooftop and small-scale solar installations make an important contribution, they cannot alone deliver the level of generation required. Large-scale solar developments are therefore necessary, as explained in the Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]. The starting point for site selection was the availability of grid connection capacity at Brinsworth substation, as new energy projects can only connect where capacity exists. Following the securing of a grid connection, land in the surrounding area was assessed for suitability, having regard to environmental constraints, proximity to sensitive receptors and agricultural land quality. Details about site selection are provided in ES Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]. The Applicant recognises that the Site is on the Green Belt and has sought to develop the Proposed Development in a manner that supports many of the same goals as the Green Belt. This includes providing opportunities for ongoing agriculture under the panels through grazing, as well as continued recreational access through current public rights of way and new permissive paths across the site. As a solar farm, the Proposed Development will create habitats to support local wildlife and increase biodiversity, while letting the soil rest and recover. At the end of the lifetime of the Proposed Development, the solar panels will be removed, and agriculture could restart. See the Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7], Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6] and Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]. The Proposed Development is located on grey belt land and meets the tests for being not inappropriate within the Green Belt. Should the Secretary of State disagree with the position on grey belt, the Proposed Development is CNP Infrastructure, and as such, the starting point for decision making is that the test of very special circumstances in Green Belt policy is satisfied. A summary of reasons why the	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Proposed Development would, in any case demonstrate very special circumstances concludes that the significant need for low carbon electricity generation infrastructure to meet the government's decarbonisation objectives, and wider environmental benefits of the proposal, including the significant increase in BNG and creation of new permissive paths locally, would outweigh any harm identified to the Green Belt, which is considered to be limited for the reasons set out in this assessment. A review and assessment of the Green Belt land within which the Proposed Development is located can be found in Planning Statement, Appendix 2 – Green Belt Assessment [EN0110020/APP/5.4] .	
Concern about the loss of agricultural land	19	National policy requires a mix of renewable energy technologies, delivered at a range of scales, to meet future energy demand and decarbonisation targets. While rooftop and small-scale solar installations make an important contribution, they cannot alone deliver the level of generation required. Large-scale solar developments are therefore necessary, as explained in the Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]. The starting point for site selection was the availability of grid connection capacity at Brinsworth substation, as new energy projects can only connect where capacity exists. Following the securing of a grid connection, land in the surrounding area was assessed for suitability, having regard to environmental constraints, proximity to sensitive receptors and agricultural land quality. Details about site selection are provided in ES Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]. The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding the loss of agricultural land and has sought to avoid and minimise the use of best and most versatile (BMV) land where possible. The majority of the Site comprises non-BMV Subgrade 3b land (78.86%). ES Volume 6, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9], and ES Volume 6, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20] confirms that only a small proportion of the Site comprises BMV land, and this is largely not subject to permanent	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		infrastructure, with the exception of approximately 0.4 ha associated with a substation compound. The ALC across the Order Limits (excluding the Cable Corridors) is as follows: • 0.94% of Grade 1 Agricultural Land; • 7.06% of Grade 2 Agricultural Land; • 11.16% of Subgrade 3a Agricultural Land; • 78.86% of Subgrade 3b Agricultural Land; • 0.32% of Grade 4 Agricultural Land; • 0.67% of Urban Land; • 0.13% of Non-Agricultural Land; and • 0.85% of Not Surveyed Land. In summary, of the area surveyed, 19% is comprised of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land, although in the majority of instances better quality grades show high spatial variability within larger areas of ALC subgrade 3b. BMV classification data for W1, W2 and W3, based on Site surveys and sampling, and for the Cable Corridors, based on a desk-based review, is provided in section 9.5 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9], including tabulated areas. The ALC survey is detailed in ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP6.20]. Agricultural use will not be permanently lost across the Site, with the exception of the 0.4ha. The Proposed Development enables continued sheep grazing within solar	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		areas, and following consultation, solar and mitigation areas have been reduced where possible to maximise land retained in agricultural use. Whilst also seeking to minimise the use of BMV land, the Applicant notes meeting national energy targets would only require 0.4% of the UK's land. The largest threat to agriculture is climate change, which is already having impacts on crop production in the UK and around the world.	
General objection to the location of the proposed solar farm	11	National policy requires a mix of renewable energy technologies, delivered at a range of scales, to meet future energy demand and decarbonisation targets. While rooftop and small-scale solar installations make an important contribution, they cannot alone deliver the level of generation required. Large-scale solar developments are therefore necessary, as explained in the Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]. The starting point for site selection was the availability of grid connection capacity at Brinsworth substation, as new energy projects can only connect where capacity exists. Following the securing of a grid connection, land in the surrounding area was assessed for suitability, having regard to environmental constraints, proximity to sensitive receptors and agricultural land quality. Details about site selection are provided in ES Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]. During the non-statutory consultation, the Applicant presented the land that had been identified for the Proposed Development for feedback. In response to this feedback, the Applicant reduced the solar areas by around one quarter. In the statutory consultation, the Applicant presented the updated masterplan for further feedback. In response to this consultation feedback, the Applicant removed further solar areas, resulting in a total reduction of 37% of the solar areas while the total project size reduced by 18% compared to the initial proposals. See the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] and Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7].	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Request to build on rooftops or brownfields instead of ground-mounted	11	National policy requires a mix of renewable energy technologies, delivered at a range of scales, to meet future energy demand and decarbonisation targets. While rooftop and small-scale solar installations make an important contribution, they cannot alone deliver the level of generation required. Large-scale solar developments are therefore necessary, as explained in the Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]. The starting point for site selection was the availability of grid connection capacity at Brinsworth substation, as new energy projects can only connect where capacity exists. Once a grid connection had been secured, the Applicant then looked for land that would be suitable for solar. This includes avoiding environmental constraints, proximity to sensitive receptors and avoiding areas with the highest quality agricultural land. Details about site selection are provided in ES Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]. During the site selection process, the Applicant undertook a brownfield site review, and this is set out in Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment of the Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]. Brownfield sites were discounted for reasons including size constraints, environmental designations, topography, proximity to settlements and landowner availability.	No
Concern about the impact to food security	5	Agricultural use will not be permanently lost across the Site, with the exception of the 0.4ha. The Proposed Development enables continued sheep grazing within solar areas, and following consultation, solar and mitigation areas have been reduced where possible to maximise land retained in agricultural use. Whilst also seeking to minimise the use of BMV land, the Applicant notes meeting national energy targets would only require 0.4% of the UK's land. The largest threat to agriculture is climate change, which is already having impacts on crop production in the UK and around the world.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Concern about use of BMV land	4	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding the loss of agricultural land and has sought to avoid and minimise the use of best and most versatile (BMV) land where possible. The majority of the Site comprises non-BMV Subgrade 3b land (78.86%). ES Volume 6, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9], and ES Volume 6, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20] confirms that only a small proportion of the Site comprises BMV land, and this is largely not subject to permanent infrastructure, with the exception of approximately 0.4 ha associated with a substation compound. The ALC across the Order Limits (excluding the Cable Corridors) is as follows: • 0.94% of Grade 1 Agricultural Land; • 7.06% of Grade 2 Agricultural Land; • 11.16% of Subgrade 3a Agricultural Land; • 78.86% of Subgrade 3b Agricultural Land; • 0.32% of Grade 4 Agricultural Land; • 0.67% of Urban Land; • 0.13% of Non-Agricultural Land; and • 0.85% of Not Surveyed Land. In summary, of the area surveyed, 19% is comprised of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land, although in the majority of instances better quality grades show high spatial variability within larger areas of ALC subgrade 3b. BMV classification data for W1, W2 and W3, based on Site surveys and sampling, and for the Cable Corridors,	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		based on a desk-based review, is provided in section 9.5 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9], including tabulated areas. The ALC survey is detailed in ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP6.20]. Agricultural use will not be permanently lost across the Site, with the exception of the 0.4ha. The Proposed Development enables continued sheep grazing within solar areas, and following consultation, solar and mitigation areas have been reduced where possible to maximise land retained in agricultural use. Whilst also seeking to minimise the use of BMV land, the Applicant notes meeting national energy targets would only require 0.4% of the UK's land. The largest threat to agriculture is climate change, which is already having impacts on crop production in the UK and around the world.	
Objection to the needs case for solar	2	The UK has made a legally-binding target to achieve net-zero carbon emissions by 2050. This is an international effort to transition away from fossil fuels to renewable energy sources in order to combat climate change, which is already causing significant impacts around the world. The net-zero targets also aim to develop more renewable energy sources in the UK to support energy security and reduce reliance on foreign energy supplies. Recent	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		global events have highlighted this issue, causing a spike in energy prices when foreign oil supplies were cut off. As coal power stations in the UK have now all been turned off, there is an urgent need for new energy sources to come online to replace this capacity. At the same time, demand for electricity continues to increase, due to the electrification of sectors such as transport and home heating, and the rise in data centres. Solar farms can be built relatively quickly to fill this need for home-grown, renewable energy. National policy requires a mix of renewable energy technologies, delivered at a range of scales, to meet future energy demand and decarbonisation targets. While rooftop and small-scale solar installations make an important contribution, they cannot alone deliver the level of generation required. Large-scale solar developments are therefore necessary, as explained in the Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]. Alternative generation technologies were also considered. The current national policy calls for a mix of renewable energy sources in order to meet future energy demands. While parts of the Site have been identified by the local authority as suitable for wind development, generating an equivalent output would require in excess of 150 large-scale wind turbines, which would result in greater environmental impacts. Solar generation was therefore identified as the most appropriate technology for the Site.	
Objection to net zero policy	1	The UK has made a legally-binding target to achieve net-zero carbon emissions by 2050. This is an international effort to transition away from fossil fuels to renewable energy sources in order to combat climate change, which is already causing significant impacts around the world. The net-zero targets also aim to develop more renewable energy sources in the UK to support energy security and reduce reliance on foreign energy supplies. Recent	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		global events have highlighted this issue, causing a spike in energy prices when foreign oil supplies were cut off. As coal power stations in the UK have now all been turned off, there is an urgent need for new energy sources to come online to replace this capacity. At the same time, demand for electricity continues to increase, due to the electrification of sectors such as transport and home heating, and the rise in data centres. Solar farms can be built relatively quickly to fill this need for home-grown, renewable energy. National policy requires a mix of renewable energy technologies, delivered at a range of scales, to meet future energy demand and decarbonisation targets. While rooftop and small-scale solar installations make an important contribution, they cannot alone deliver the level of generation required. Large-scale solar developments are therefore necessary, as explained in the Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8].	
Biodiversity			
Concern about impact to birds	13	The Applicant recognises concerns regarding potential effects on birds and has undertaken a comprehensive programme of ornithological surveys to inform the Proposed Development. Breeding Bird Surveys, Wintering Bird Surveys and targeted species surveys were completed across the Order Limits and surrounding Study Areas between 2024 and 2025, with results reported in ES Volume 3, Appendices 6.5, 6.6 and 6.7 [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Baseline surveys identified a breeding bird assemblage typical of the predominantly arable landscape, including species of conservation importance such as lapwing, skylark, grey partridge and yellow wagtail. Wintering surveys recorded regular use of the Site by farmland birds and waders, particularly in winter stubble, pasture and cereal fields. While some displacement of breeding birds may occur within areas developed for solar infrastructure, the assessment confirms that impacts are	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		appropriately mitigated through habitat retention, enhancement and, where necessary, compensation. The Proposed Development will replace intensive agricultural management with a more diverse mosaic of habitats, including species-rich grassland, enhanced hedgerows and woodland planting. Evidence demonstrates that well-managed solar developments can deliver benefits to breeding birds by increasing habitat heterogeneity and reducing fertiliser and insecticide use. These measures are secured through the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] and are expected to deliver long-term benefits for the wider bird assemblage. Species-specific measures are included where required. Open habitats suitable for breeding skylark are retained where possible, including south of Kiveton, with off-site skylark plots provided where retention is not feasible. Lapwing breeding recorded in WS3 will be compensated through off-site habitat creation, with restoration of wet grassland west of Long Road further benefiting breeding waders. Barn owl is expected to benefit from habitat creation, supplemented by additional nesting boxes within the Order Limits. Temporary works to the Cable Corridors will result in short-term, reversible effects only. Nesting birds are protected through embedded mitigation secured via the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9], including pre-construction checks, seasonal controls and protection of active nests.	
General concern about loss of wildlife	12	In general, solar farms are very beneficial for local wildlife. After construction, there is little activity needed for maintenance and minimal noise. Unlike traditional agriculture, the fields will not require regular application of chemical fertilisers or pesticides, and the soil will be left to rest. This creates an ecosystem where local wildlife can thrive, and biodiversity will increase.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Solar areas will be fenced for safety, however, mammal gates will be included to ensure that wildlife can traverse the Site. See Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.14]. In addition to the solar areas, the Applicant has included 458 hectares for mitigation land, which would not have any above ground infrastructure. These areas would be planted with a mix of wildflowers and native grasses to support wildlife and increase biodiversity. The Applicant recognises concerns regarding the potential loss of wildlife and has designed the Proposed Development to avoid, minimise and compensate for ecological effects in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy. The scheme incorporates an Indicative Landscape Masterplan and an Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.13], which together are intended to deliver a substantial uplift in biodiversity and wider landscape benefits over the lifetime of the Proposed Development. The design has been informed by extensive baseline field surveys and ecological assessment, enabling a targeted approach to habitat retention, creation, enhancement and long-term management. As set out in ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6], the Proposed Development will deliver Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) well in excess of the statutory 10% requirement. The approach to BNG, including detailed enhancement proposals and a commitment to a minimum 30-year management period, is presented in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Delivery of BNG will be secured through the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. The oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] provides prescriptive detail on habitat creation, enhancement and management across the Site, with a particular emphasis on improving ecological connectivity at both site and landscape scales. Proposed measures include new woodland planting, enhancement of grassland and hedgerow	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		habitats, and the creation of habitat corridors and rides to maintain connectivity for mammals and other wildlife. Deer fencing is proposed where necessary to protect newly created habitats, with proportionate management of woodland areas during construction and operation. Sensitive, priority and irreplaceable habitats have been avoided wherever practicable. Ancient woodland and veteran trees are protected in line with current government guidance, including appropriate buffer zones. For cable corridors, trenchless construction techniques are predominantly proposed where sensitive habitats are present. Open trenching is limited to non-priority habitats such as arable fields, with all temporarily affected areas reinstated following construction in accordance with the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] and embedded mitigation measures. A commitment to complete surveys is provided in embedded mitigation and the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] with the results informing post consent activities and details within CEMP secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	
Concern about habitat loss	11	The Applicant recognises concerns regarding the potential loss of wildlife and has designed the Proposed Development to avoid, minimise and compensate for ecological effects in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy. The scheme incorporates an Indicative Landscape Masterplan and an oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13], which together are intended to deliver a substantial uplift in biodiversity and wider landscape benefits over the lifetime of the Proposed Development. The design has been informed by extensive baseline field surveys and ecological assessment, enabling a targeted approach to habitat retention, creation, enhancement and long-term management. As set out in Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation of the ES [EN0110020/APP/6.6], the Proposed Development will deliver Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) well in excess of the statutory	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		10% requirement. The approach to BNG, including detailed enhancement proposals and a commitment to a minimum 30-year management period, is presented in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Delivery of BNG will be secured through the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. The oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] provides prescriptive detail on habitat creation, enhancement and management across the Site, with a particular emphasis on improving ecological connectivity at both site and landscape scales. Proposed measures include new woodland planting, enhancement of grassland and hedgerow habitats, and the creation of habitat corridors and rides to maintain connectivity for mammals and other wildlife. Deer fencing is proposed where necessary to protect newly created habitats, with proportionate management of woodland areas during construction and operation. Sensitive, priority and irreplaceable habitats have been avoided wherever practicable. Ancient woodland and veteran trees are protected in line with current government guidance, including appropriate buffer zones. For cable corridors, trenchless construction techniques are predominantly proposed where sensitive habitats are present. Open trenching is limited to non-priority habitats such as arable fields, with all temporarily affected areas reinstated following construction in accordance with the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] and embedded mitigation measures. A commitment to complete surveys is provided in embedded mitigation and the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] with the results informing post consent activities and details within CEMP secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	
Concern that assessments are incomplete	9	The Applicant recognises concerns regarding the potential loss of wildlife and has designed the Proposed Development to avoid, minimise and compensate for ecological effects in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy. The scheme incorporates an Indicative Landscape Masterplan and an oLEMP	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		[EN0110020/APP/5.13], which together are intended to deliver a substantial uplift in biodiversity and wider landscape benefits over the lifetime of the Proposed Development. The design has been informed by extensive baseline field surveys and ecological assessment, enabling a targeted approach to habitat retention, creation, enhancement and long-term management. As set out in ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6], the Proposed Development will deliver Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) well in excess of the statutory 10% requirement. The approach to BNG, including detailed enhancement proposals and a commitment to a minimum 30-year management period, is presented in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Delivery of BNG will be secured through the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. The oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] provides prescriptive detail on habitat creation, enhancement and management across the Site, with a particular emphasis on improving ecological connectivity at both site and landscape scales. Proposed measures include new woodland planting, enhancement of grassland and hedgerow habitats, and the creation of habitat corridors and rides to maintain connectivity for mammals and other wildlife. Deer fencing is proposed where necessary to protect newly created habitats, with proportionate management of woodland areas during construction and operation. Sensitive, priority and irreplaceable habitats have been avoided wherever practicable. Ancient woodland and veteran trees are protected in line with current government guidance, including appropriate buffer zones. For cable corridors, trenchless construction techniques are predominantly proposed where sensitive habitats are present. Open trenching is limited to non-priority habitats such as arable fields, with all temporarily affected areas reinstated following construction in accordance with the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] and embedded mitigation measures.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		A commitment to complete surveys is provided in embedded mitigation and the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] with the results informing post consent activities and details within CEMP secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] .	
Concern about loss of hedgerows and trees	6	The Applicant recognises concerns regarding the potential loss of hedgerows and trees and has designed the Proposed Development to prioritise their retention and protection wherever possible. ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6] includes a detailed assessment of potential effects on trees, woodlands, hedgerows, ancient woodland, veteran trees and other irreplaceable habitats, with avoidance forming a key part of the embedded mitigation strategy. Avoidance of trees and hedgerows has informed the overall design, including the selection and alignment of Cable Corridors, with trenchless crossings proposed where practicable to avoid woodland and tree impacts. Most woodland within the Order Limits will be retained in full. Where individual trees are unavoidably affected, this is limited to non-TPO woodland and only where no satisfactory alternative exists. All ancient woodland and veteran trees will be avoided in accordance with current government guidance and the Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]. An arboricultural survey and Tree Constraints Plan (TCP) have been prepared in ES Appendix 6.14 [EN0110020/APP/6.14], with further surveys to be undertaken prior to construction. Protective measures will be implemented through the CEMP, secured via a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. To ensure compliance with BS5837:2012 during construction, operation and decommissioning. Hedgerows will be retained wherever possible, with existing field gateways used to minimise removals. Where tree or hedgerow loss is unavoidable, Biodiversity Net Gain losses will be minimised, and compensation provided through extensive native tree planting,	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		including the use of standard trees and hedgerow reinforcement across the Site. These measures are designed to deliver a significant net gain for tree and hedgerow habitats and long-term landscape connectivity.	
Concern about impact to badgers	4	The Applicant recognises concerns regarding potential effects of the Proposed Development on badgers and has undertaken detailed survey work to ensure their presence, movement and legal protection requirements are fully considered. Badger walkover surveys were carried out in accordance with current guidance across the Site and within 30 metres of the Order Limits, focusing on all habitats identified as having high suitability for badgers. Surveys were completed during August and December 2024 and between March and November 2025, with accessible areas of the Cable Corridors surveyed in November 2025. The findings are reported in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.3: Confidential Badger Survey Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20], with sensitive location data appropriately anonymised. Badgers are a mobile species and that the absence of field signs at the time of survey does not indicate absence. Where land access was not available, professional judgement was applied using aerial imagery, desk study information and off-site observations to characterise likely badger use. The confidential survey information enables appropriate mitigation and, if required, licensing to be identified, ensuring compliance with legal protections for badger setts. Potential effects during construction and operation have been carefully considered. Perimeter fencing has the potential to restrict movement; however, the provision of mammal gates within fencing, as detailed in the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13], ensures permeability of the Site and maintains established commuting routes. As a result, effects associated with habitat fragmentation are reduced to neutral and not significant in the long term. Badgers are predominantly nocturnal and may be sensitive to lighting disturbance. Perimeter fence lighting will therefore be avoided, with infra-red security systems used instead. Where security lighting is required within BESS and substation areas, it	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		will be designed to avoid light spill into surrounding habitats in accordance with the Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]. The creation and maturation of grassland, hedgerows and woodland habitats will provide long-term benefits for foraging, commuting and shelter, resulting in a beneficial, not significant effect for badgers at a local scale.	
Concern about impact to bats	4	The Applicant recognises concerns regarding potential effects of the Proposed Development on bats and has undertaken a detailed programme of baseline surveys and assessment to inform the design and mitigation strategy. Interpretation of updated bat survey data is included within the Environmental Statement, with full details provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.10: Bat Survey Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Ground Level Tree Assessments (GLTA) were completed for approximately 83% of trees within the Site where access was available, together with accessible areas of the Cable Corridors. Of the trees surveyed, the majority were assessed as having low or negligible bat roost potential, with a proportion identified as containing Potential Roost Features (PRFs), enabling appropriate mitigation to be identified. Bat activity surveys, including walked transects, remote monitoring and call analysis, were undertaken between April and September 2025. These confirmed a diverse assemblage of bat species using the Site for commuting and foraging, dominated by common and soprano pipistrelles, with additional records of noctule, Myotis species, brown long-eared bat, Nathusius' pipistrelle and serotine bat. No Annex II species were recorded. Potential effects associated with lighting were carefully considered given the nocturnal and light-sensitive ecology of bats. Perimeter fencing lighting will be avoided, with infra-red security systems used instead. Where lighting is required within BESS and substation areas, it will be designed and controlled in line with Bat Conservation Trust best practice and the Outline Design Parameters	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		[EN0110020/APP/7.3]. Residual effects from lighting are therefore assessed as very low adverse and not significant. The Proposed Development includes extensive habitat creation and enhancement through the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13], including new grassland, hedgerows and woodland planting. As these habitats mature, they will strengthen commuting and foraging corridors and may provide future roost features. The installation of 75 bat boxes on suitable retained trees will further enhance roosting opportunities. Collectively, these measures are expected to result in long-term beneficial and potentially significant effects for bats at a district scale.	
Requests for mitigation	4	The Applicant recognises concerns regarding the potential loss of wildlife and has designed the Proposed Development to avoid, minimise and compensate for ecological effects in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy. The scheme incorporates an Indicative Landscape Masterplan and an oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13], which together are intended to deliver a substantial uplift in biodiversity and wider landscape benefits over the lifetime of the Proposed Development. The design has been informed by extensive baseline field surveys and ecological assessment, enabling a targeted approach to habitat retention, creation, enhancement and long-term management. As set out in ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6], the Proposed Development will deliver Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) well in excess of the statutory 10% requirement. The approach to BNG, including detailed enhancement proposals and a commitment to a minimum 30-year management period, is presented in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Delivery of BNG will be secured through the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. The oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] provides prescriptive detail on habitat creation, enhancement and management across the Site, with a particular emphasis on improving ecological connectivity at both site and landscape scales. Proposed	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		measures include new woodland planting, enhancement of grassland and hedgerow habitats, and the creation of habitat corridors and rides to maintain connectivity for mammals and other wildlife. Deer fencing is proposed where necessary to protect newly created habitats, with proportionate management of woodland areas during construction and operation. Sensitive, priority and irreplaceable habitats have been avoided wherever practicable. Ancient woodland and veteran trees are protected in line with current government guidance, including appropriate buffer zones. For cable corridors, trenchless construction techniques are predominantly proposed where sensitive habitats are present. Open trenching is limited to non-priority habitats such as arable fields, with all temporarily affected areas reinstated following construction in accordance with the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] and embedded mitigation measures. A commitment to complete surveys is provided in embedded mitigation and the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] with the results informing post consent activities and details within CEMP secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]	
Concern about impact to deer	3	The Applicant recognises concerns regarding the potential loss of wildlife, including deer, and has designed the Proposed Development to avoid, minimise and compensate for ecological effects in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy. The scheme incorporates an Indicative Landscape Masterplan and an oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13], which together are intended to deliver a substantial uplift in biodiversity and wider landscape benefits over the lifetime of the Proposed Development. The design has been informed by extensive baseline field surveys and ecological assessment, enabling a targeted approach to habitat retention, creation, enhancement and long-term management. As set out in ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6], the Proposed Development will	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		deliver Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) well in excess of the statutory 10% requirement. The approach to BNG, including detailed enhancement proposals and a commitment to a minimum 30-year management period, is presented in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Delivery of BNG will be secured through the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. The oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] provides prescriptive detail on habitat creation, enhancement and management across the Site, with a particular emphasis on improving ecological connectivity at both site and landscape scales. Proposed measures include new woodland planting, enhancement of grassland and hedgerow habitats, and the creation of habitat corridors and rides to maintain connectivity for mammals and other wildlife. Deer fencing is proposed where necessary to protect newly created habitats, with proportionate management of woodland areas during construction and operation. Management of the Site in relation to mammal fencing and movement is noted, however in addition to mammal gates, habitat corridors and rides are proposed between fenced areas within the Proposed Development to ensure wildlife corridors are maintained for mammals. Further information is found in the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]. Sensitive, priority and irreplaceable habitats have been avoided wherever practicable. Ancient woodland and veteran trees are protected in line with current government guidance, including appropriate buffer zones. For cable corridors, trenchless construction techniques are predominantly proposed where sensitive habitats are present. Open trenching is limited to non-priority habitats such as arable fields, with all temporarily affected areas reinstated following construction in accordance with the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] and embedded mitigation measures.	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		A commitment to complete surveys is provided in embedded mitigation and the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] with the results informing post consent activities and details within CEMP secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]	
Impact to Firsby Nature Reserve and Ravenfield Ponds	2	Firsby Reservoir Local Nature Reserve lies approximately 240 m from the Order Limits. Potential construction effects such as dust, lighting, noise and vibration have been assessed within ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6] . The assessment concludes that effects on Firsby Reservoir LNR would be short-term, of negligible magnitude and not significant. Air quality and dust impacts are assessed as not significant, and additional controls within the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] will further manage dust, pollution pathways, lighting and noise. As a result, no significant adverse effects to the aquatic habitats or species within Firsby Reservoir LNR are anticipated.	No
Impact to Anston Stones	1	Impact of the Proposed Development on the Anston Stones SSSI is assessed in Chapter 6 - Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6] . Anston Stones SSSI has a hydrological link to the Site; however, the features for which it has been designated are terrestrial and not aquatic. With the pollution prevention measures detailed in the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] in place, there is not a pathway to affect these designation features (whether terrestrial or aquatic), with the duration of effect being short term, of negligible magnitude and Not Significant to IEFs of the SSSI.	No
Concern that mitigation will not make a difference	1	The Applicant recognises concerns regarding the potential loss of wildlife and has designed the Proposed Development to avoid, minimise and compensate for ecological effects in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy. The scheme incorporates an Indicative Landscape Masterplan and an oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] , which together are intended to deliver a substantial uplift in biodiversity and wider landscape benefits over the lifetime of the Proposed Development.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		The design has been informed by extensive baseline field surveys and ecological assessment, enabling a targeted approach to habitat retention, creation, enhancement and long-term management. As set out in ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6], the Proposed Development will deliver Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) well in excess of the statutory 10% requirement. The approach to BNG, including detailed enhancement proposals and a commitment to a minimum 30-year management period, is presented in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Delivery of BNG will be secured through the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. The oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] provides prescriptive detail on habitat creation, enhancement and management across the Site, with a particular emphasis on improving ecological connectivity at both site and landscape scales. Proposed measures include new woodland planting, enhancement of grassland and hedgerow habitats, and the creation of habitat corridors and rides to maintain connectivity for mammals and other wildlife. Deer fencing is proposed where necessary to protect newly created habitats, with proportionate management of woodland areas during construction and operation. Sensitive, priority and irreplaceable habitats have been avoided wherever practicable. Ancient woodland and veteran trees are protected in line with current government guidance, including appropriate buffer zones. For cable corridors, trenchless construction techniques are predominantly proposed where sensitive habitats are present. Open trenching is limited to non-priority habitats such as arable fields, with all temporarily affected areas reinstated following construction in accordance with the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] and embedded mitigation measures. A commitment to complete surveys is provided in embedded mitigation and the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] with the results informing post consent activities and	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		details within CEMP secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1] .	
Concern about impact to newts	1	The Applicant recognises concerns regarding potential effects of the Proposed Development on great crested newts (GCN) and has undertaken proportionate survey and assessment in line with current guidance. Detailed information is provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.8: Great Crested Newt Survey Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20], with survey coverage illustrated on Figures 6.8.1–6.8.4 [EN0110020/APP/6.19]. Habitat Suitability Index (HSI) assessments were completed for ponds within the Site and surrounding Study Area where access permitted. While a small number of ponds recorded 'Good' or 'Excellent' suitability, environmental DNA (eDNA) surveys undertaken in 2024 and 2025 confirmed negative results for GCN in all ponds sampled, with no confirmed presence identified within the Order Limits or within 250 metres of them. Two ponds returned inconclusive eDNA results; however, no desk study records or biological records indicate the presence of GCN within the Study Area. As such, the presence of a connected GCN metapopulation is considered unlikely. Where pond access was not possible, precautionary measures were applied using desk study data, aerial imagery and avoidance through design, including cable micro-siting. Four ponds lie within 250 metres of the Cable Corridors; however, potential effects on core terrestrial and aquatic habitat can be avoided through careful routing and construction practices. Given the absence of confirmed GCN presence, District Level Licensing has not been progressed. Embedded mitigation measures will be implemented during construction to avoid harm to amphibians, where required, through the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]. Overall, the Proposed Development is not expected to result in significant effects on Great Crested Newts.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Concern about impact to bees	1	The Applicant recognises concerns regarding the potential loss of wildlife and has designed the Proposed Development to avoid, minimise and compensate for ecological effects in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy. The scheme incorporates an Indicative Landscape Masterplan and an oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13], which together are intended to deliver a substantial uplift in biodiversity and wider landscape benefits over the lifetime of the Proposed Development. The design has been informed by extensive baseline field surveys and ecological assessment, enabling a targeted approach to habitat retention, creation, enhancement and long-term management. As set out in ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6], the Proposed Development will deliver Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) well in excess of the statutory 10% requirement. The approach to BNG, including detailed enhancement proposals and a commitment to a minimum 30-year management period, is presented in ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Delivery of BNG will be secured through the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. The oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] provides prescriptive detail on habitat creation, enhancement and management across the Site, with a particular emphasis on improving ecological connectivity at both site and landscape scales. Proposed measures include new woodland planting, enhancement of grassland and hedgerow habitats, and the creation of habitat corridors and rides to maintain connectivity for mammals and other wildlife. Deer fencing is proposed where necessary to protect newly created habitats, with proportionate management of woodland areas during construction and operation. Sensitive, priority and irreplaceable habitats have been avoided wherever practicable. Ancient woodland and veteran trees are protected in line with current government guidance, including appropriate buffer zones. For cable corridors, trenchless construction techniques are predominantly proposed where sensitive	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		habitats are present. Open trenching is limited to non-priority habitats such as arable fields, with all temporarily affected areas reinstated following construction in accordance with the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] and embedded mitigation measures. A commitment to complete surveys is provided in embedded mitigation and the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] with the results informing post consent activities and details within CEMP secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].	
Climate change			
Environmental concerns about panel supply chain	4	As part of the procurement and contractor selection process, potential contractors will be assessed against multiple criteria, including their sourcing of materials and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions performance. The design of the Proposed Development retains a degree of flexibility to reflect ongoing advances in renewable technologies, including improvements in solar PV module efficiency, manufacturing processes and associated infrastructure, as detailed in ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]. The Proposed Development incorporates embedded mitigation measures to minimise GHG emissions across construction, operation, maintenance and decommissioning. These measures will be secured through the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] which is secured in a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. Commitments include engineering design choices to reduce embodied carbon, the use of lower GHG-emitting technologies where practicable, minimisation of high-impact equipment such as SF₆-containing components, and the reuse and local recycling of materials and waste. While embodied emissions from equipment and raw materials represent the largest source of emissions, the GHG intensity of the Proposed Development is estimated at approximately 23 gCO₂e/kWh, substantially lower than gas-fired generation. Over its	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		60-year lifetime, the Proposed Development is expected to avoid approximately 18 million tonnes of CO ₂ e, delivering a clear net climate benefit and supporting regional and national net zero ambitions.	
Environmental impact of construction	1	The environmental impacts arising from construction of the Proposed Development have been comprehensively assessed within ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change [EN0110020/APP/6.11]. The Proposed Development incorporates embedded mitigation measures to minimise GHG emissions across construction, operation, maintenance and decommissioning. These measures will be secured through the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] which is secured via a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. Commitments include engineering design choices to reduce embodied carbon, the use of lower GHG-emitting technologies where practicable, minimisation of high-impact equipment such as SF₆-containing components, and the reuse and local recycling of materials and waste. Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with construction activities, including fuel use, materials, and waste generation, have been fully accounted for within the GHG Assessment. Waste impacts are addressed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16], and GHG emissions associated with waste across all phases of the Proposed Development have been included. Construction works may result in temporary effects such as soil compaction, loss of soil function, contamination risks and potential groundwater disturbance. These impacts will be mitigated through best practice construction measures secured by the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and associated Soil Management Plan, in accordance with a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. Embedded mitigation measures are designed to protect soil structure, maintain infiltration and preserve carbon storage potential. The primary source of construction-phase GHG emissions relates to the embodied carbon of equipment and raw materials, with relatively small emissions arising from	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		construction traffic, fuel use and waste. Measures to reduce construction impacts include low-carbon design choices, reducing the use of high-impact materials where practicable, utilising lower-emission construction technologies, local recycling of wastes and reuse of excavated materials. The GHG Assessment concludes that construction-related impacts are 'Negligible' and 'Not Significant'. When considered alongside the estimated avoidance of approximately 18 million tonnes of CO₂e over the 60-year lifetime of the Proposed Development, the project is expected to deliver a clear net environmental and climate benefit.	
Community benefit			
Concern about lack of community benefits	13	The Applicant has committed to delivering a meaningful community benefit package to ensure that local communities share in the benefits of the Proposed Development. This package has been shaped through consultation feedback and ongoing engagement with elected representatives and local stakeholders. The Applicant proposes a community benefit fund of £400 per MW per year. Based on the project's 750MW grid connection, this would equate to approximately £300,000 per year. Over the project's anticipated operational lifetime of up to 60 years, this would amount to around £18 million in total, with the final value dependent on the consented capacity, operational output and project lifespan. While there is no standard for community benefit funds, the Applicant has proposed a community benefit fund of £400 per MW per year, which is consistent with other solar developments in the UK, as described in the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1].	No
Concern about how the community benefit	1	The Applicant recognises the importance of transparency, fairness and local relevance in administering the fund. It is therefore proposed that the fund is managed by nominated fund manager, with input from parish councils, local councillors and other local representatives to help guide funding allocations. This approach reflects	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
fund would be managed		feedback received during consultation and a dedicated workshop with elected representatives as described in the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] .	
Consultation			
Concern about there being inadequate consultation	42	The PA2008 and associated regulations and guidance set out the requirements for consultation for NSIPs. As detailed in the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] , the Applicant has developed and implemented a consultation and engagement strategy that goes beyond these requirements to provide opportunities for meaningful engagement with local communities, stakeholders, and technical bodies. The feedback from the two consultation periods and ongoing engagement has led to significant changes to the Proposed Development, resulting in a reduction of solar areas by 37% and the total size of the project by 18% as compared to the initial proposals. See Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7] .	No
Concern about lack of information at consultation	9	The Gunning Principles establish that consultation should occur early in the project's development process, so that the design is still flexible and can be altered in response to feedback. For EIA developments, there is a requirement to consult on preliminary environmental information, so that the consultation feedback can be incorporated as the assessments are finalised. This means that information presented at each of the consultation periods was by definition indicative and included optionality in many cases. The Applicant through consultation materials explained the development process, to explain how final environmental results or final decisions on the locations of key components would be made, and how consultation feedback would be considered. See Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] .	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Frustrations around the planning process	5	The Proposed Development is considered a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project because it meets the threshold set in the Planning Act 2008 for energy generating stations. The Applicant has followed the pre-application procedures for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects in preparing the DCO Application. This has included extensive pre-application consultation as set out in the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] .	No
S42(1)(d) consultee not consulted directly	1	The Applicant is aware of the individual that believes they were not contacted directly as an s42(1)(d) entity. The Applicant has conducted due diligence to identify land interests, as described in the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] . This individual is not listed on the Land Registry, and is therefore not considered a land interest. However, the Applicant notes that another individual at the same property did receive the required notices, and they have submitted feedback which is included in this table.	No
Forwarding address provided for s42(1)(d) contact	1	Noted and an additional letter was sent to the Duchy of Lancaster who are represented by Farrer & Co. via email at bvenquiries@farrer.co.uk and letter at 66 Lincoln's Inn Fields, London WC2A 3LF . No response was received.	Yes
Cumulative Effects			
Concern about cumulative impacts alongside other developments in the area	23	The Applicant has considered other developments in the local area and potential cumulative impacts. This has led to the reduction of solar areas around Common Farm, a solar farm under construction near Whitestone 2. The Applicant also altered the access point on the A630 to minimise potential traffic impacts due to the housing development that has been recently consented in this location. See the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] and Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]. Cumulative effects have been assessed within ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects, supported by ES Volume 3 Figures 17.1–17.3 (long list and Zones of Influence within 1km and 10km) and ES Volume 3 Appendices 17.1–17.2 (policy/guidance and the long list of developments). The list of cumulative schemes	No

Consultation Report Appendix E Statutory Consultation Feedback Part 1

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		has been continually reviewed and updated using Local Planning Authority planning registers, Landstack, and GIS mapping, and was finalised with input from CDC, RMBC and NEDDC. With embedded mitigation and topic-specific controls, the ES concludes that significant adverse inter-project cumulative effects are not anticipated, including in relation to the key nearby schemes such as Carr Lane, Ulley (RB2025/0029), Thurcroft Energy Park / Morthen Lane, Morthen (RB2025/0714), Common Farm Solar Farm (RB2022/1203) and Piper Lane Solar Farm (RB2025/0029).	
Concern that assessments are incomplete	2	The Applicant presented the preliminary environmental assessments for the statutory consultation, which is a requirement of EIA regulations to present the results at an early stage of development. These assessments have since been completed, in consideration of the consultation feedback and further stakeholder engagement in accordance with EIA guidance and standards. This includes potential cumulative effects, which are presented in ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN0110020/APP/6.17].	No
Decommissioning			
Concern about length of lifespan of the project	3	The proposed 60-year operational lifespan of the project is consistent with similar projects around the country and is in line with standard norms for renewable energy generation developments. Decommissioning of the Proposed Development has been assessed within the Environmental Statement, which assumes a 60-year operational life followed by full decommissioning (ES Volume 1 and ES Volume 2, Chapters 6–17) [EN0110020/APP/6.1-6.21]. Decommissioning is anticipated to involve the dismantling and recycling of the solar PV panels, with vehicle movements broadly comparable to, or less than, those during construction. Some components, such as mitigation planting, site access tracks and cabling ducts buried below plough-depth, may be retained subject to landowner	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		agreement. These elements would not prevent future land use and would be managed in accordance with industry best practice, with no adverse environmental effects anticipated. The Environmental Statement explains that the precise decommissioning methods cannot be fully defined at this stage, as engineering practices will continue to evolve over the lifetime of the project. A precautionary, reasonable worst-case approach has therefore been adopted, with decommissioning effects assumed to be similar to, or of a lesser magnitude than, construction effects. A detailed Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) will be prepared and approved by the relevant Local Planning Authority prior to decommissioning, as secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. An outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/7.4] has been submitted with the Application.	
Concern that insufficient information was provided about decommissioning	2	Decommissioning of the Proposed Development has been assessed within the Environmental Statement, which assumes a 60-year operational life followed by full decommissioning (ES Volume 1 and ES Volume 2, Chapters 6–17) [EN0110020/APP/6.1-6.21]. Decommissioning is anticipated to involve the dismantling and recycling of the solar PV panels, with vehicle movements broadly comparable to, or less than, those during construction. Some components, such as mitigation planting, site access tracks and cabling ducts buried below plough-depth, may be retained subject to landowner agreement. These elements would not prevent future land use and would be managed in accordance with industry best practice, with no adverse environmental effects anticipated. The Environmental Statement explains that the precise decommissioning methods cannot be fully defined at this stage, as engineering practices will continue to evolve over the lifetime of the project. A precautionary, reasonable worst-case approach has	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		therefore been adopted, with decommissioning effects assumed to be similar to, or of a lesser magnitude than, construction effects. A detailed DEMP will be prepared and approved by the relevant Local Planning Authority prior to decommissioning, as secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. An oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/7.4] has been submitted with the Application.	
Concern that the land will not be returned to its original state	1	The Proposed Development would have a maximum lifespan of 60 years, after which it would be fully decommissioned, as assessed within the Environmental Statement (ES Volume 2, Chapters 6–17) [EN0110020/APP/6.1-6.21]. A detailed DEMP will be prepared and approved by the relevant planning authority prior to decommissioning, as secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. An oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/7.4] has been submitted with the Application. Decommissioning is anticipated to involve the dismantling and recycling of the solar PV arrays, with associated vehicle movements broadly similar to, or less than, those experienced during construction. The ES concludes that decommissioning effects on ground conditions and land quality would be temporary and of equal or lesser magnitude than construction impacts, with no lasting adverse effects following completion of this phase. Where agreed with the landowner, elements such as mitigation planting, site access tracks and cabling ducts buried below plough-depth may be retained, as these would not prevent future agricultural use and may provide ongoing environmental benefits. Decommissioning activities would be governed by a DEMP, to be approved by the relevant Local Planning Authority prior to works commencing, as secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. An oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/7.4] has been submitted with the Application, ensuring appropriate restoration and environmental protection in line with legislation and best practice.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Developer details			
Concern that the Applicant will make a profit from the Proposed Development	3	Whitestone is a privately funded renewable energy project brought forward by Whitestone Net Zero Ltd, owned by Net Zero One Ltd, with Green Nation acting as overall project manager. As with other nationally significant infrastructure projects, private investment is essential to fund the design, environmental assessment, construction, operation and eventual decommissioning of a project of this scale. Any revenue generated from the sale of electricity enables the long-term operation and maintenance of the site, supports grid connection costs, and ensures that funding is available to responsibly decommission the project at the end of its anticipated 60-year operational life. Net Zero One Ltd was established specifically to ensure sufficient funding is in place to build, operate and decommission Whitestone and similar projects. The Applicant also recognises that supporting the local community is important. In addition to contributing to national energy security and net-zero targets, the project includes proposals for a community benefit fund, biodiversity enhancements, continued agricultural use, and recreational access, detailed in the ES.	No
Concern about Whitestone being the largest development brought forward by the Applicant	3	Whitestone is being brought forward by Whitestone Net Zero Ltd, with Green Nation acting as overall project manager. While Whitestone represents a larger scheme than individual projects previously managed by Green Nation, it builds directly on the company's extensive track record in renewable energy delivery. Green Nation currently manages 75 operational solar farms and over 700 rooftop solar installations across the UK, with a portfolio exceeding 200MW of electricity-generating capacity. It is also important to note that the scale of Whitestone means it is being progressed as a NSIP under the Planning Act 2008. This requires a DCO, which is a robust and transparent process involving extensive technical assessment, statutory consultation, independent examination by the Planning Inspectorate and a final decision by the Secretary of State.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Flood risk			
Concern about increasing flood risk	9	Impacts on water resources and flood risk are assessed in ES Appendix 10.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20] and Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]. The assessment considered potential impacts on surface water features (watercourses, waterbodies, canals, and reservoirs), flood risk, and designated sites. Following the implementation of embedded mitigation as set out in the ES Chapter, the significance of any adverse effects during construction, operational and decommissioning phases are all assessed as being negligible, or not significant in EIA terms, and would therefore lead to no significant increase in flood risk.	No
Concern about worsening existing flooding at Treeton	5	Impacts on Treeton are assessed in Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]. As set out in the outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy [EN0110020/APP/5.17], the Site's access roads will not lead to a substantive increase in impermeable area. Surface water falling on the access roads will runoff to the adjacent ground. However, with implementation of suitable runoff control and flood risk management measures outlined in Section 10.6.38 - 10.6.43, the magnitude of change is assessed as negligible to surface water features of high sensitivity and flood risk of medium sensitivity which is Negligible (Not Significant) in accordance with EIA Regulations.	No
Concern about worsening existing flooding of Kearsley Brook and Conisbrough	4	Impacts on Kearsley Brook and Conisbrough are assessed in Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]. As set out in the outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy [EN0110020/APP/5.17], the Site's access roads will not lead to a substantive increase in impermeable area. Surface water falling on the access roads will runoff to the adjacent ground. However, with implementation of suitable runoff control and flood risk management measures outlined in Section 10.6.38 - 10.6.43, the magnitude of change is assessed	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		as negligible to surface water features of high sensitivity and flood risk of medium sensitivity which is Negligible (Not Significant) in accordance with EIA Regulations.	
Concern about water contamination	4	Impacts on water contamination are assessed in Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]. There are six licenced abstractions (A1 – A6) within the Study Area: four groundwater and two surface water. There is also one groundwater fed PWS (P1) located within Cable Corridor CRG-1. One SPZ (SPZ 3) is also present, as detailed in Section 10.5.72. An assessment of the impacts to surface water quality and quantity has been provided in Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10] and concluded there will be negligible (not significant) effects with the implementation of embedded mitigation. Impacts to groundwater quality and quantity are assessed in detail in Section 9.7 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]. This also concluded no significant effects on groundwater.	No
Concern about impacts to drainage	3	Impacts on drainage are assessed in Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]. An outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy [EN0110020/APP/5.17] is submitted with the Application. It includes initial hydraulic calculations, proposed SuDS features, and maintenance plans. This will be developed further throughout the detailed design phase.	No
Impact to Firsby Nature Reserve and Ravenfield Ponds	2	Impacts on Firsby Nature Reserve and Ravenfield Ponds are assessed in Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10] .	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		As set out in the outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy [EN0110020/APP/5.17] , the Site's access roads will not lead to a substantive increase in impermeable area. Surface water falling on the access roads will runoff to the adjacent ground. However, with implementation of suitable runoff control and flood risk management measures outlined in Section 10.6.38 - 10.6.43, the magnitude of change is assessed as negligible to surface water features of high sensitivity and flood risk of medium sensitivity which is Negligible (Not Significant) in accordance with EIA Regulations.	
Health			
Concern about impact of EMFs	4	Electromagnetic Fields (EMF) are considered within ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16] and the assessment concluded that no significant effects from EMF are likely. Electrical infrastructure would be installed in accordance with relevant guidance; predicted magnetic field strengths remain below ICNIRP reference levels and cumulative effects are Not Significant. There are therefore no anticipated human health impacts from EMF. Where appropriate, the potential effects of EMFs on ecological receptors have been assessed in ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6] .	No
Concern about impact to physical health	3	The technical assessments have concluded that due to the appropriate mitigation measures being in place, and best practice construction methods being used, individually there would be no impact on human health from each environmental effect. Access to PRowS supports mental and physical health. The Proposed Development has been designed to retain PRowS with continued access to the wider countryside along at least one side of the route or through appropriately sized corridors, as secured in the Works Plans [EN0110020/APP/2.3]. PRowS will remain open during construction, with only temporary closures or minor diversions where necessary (as set out in oPRowMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]). As a result, no adverse effects on human health from access to physical activity are anticipated.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Human health receptors are considered in the following chapters of ES: • ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]; • ES Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]; • ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]; and • ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14].	
Concern about impact to mental health	2	Effects on mental health and wellbeing of the general population as result of landscape and visual impacts are considered in the intra – projects effects section in ES Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.17]. Extensive consultation has been held with local residents to discuss key concerns regarding the Proposed Development, and their feedback has been taken into account to ensure impacts to communities are mitigated as much as possible. Access to PRowS supports mental and physical health. The Proposed Development has been designed to retain PRowS with continued access to the wider countryside along at least one side of the route or through appropriately sized corridors, as secured in the Works Plans [EN0110020/APP/2.3]. PRowS will remain open during construction, with only temporary closures or minor diversions where necessary (as set out in oPRowMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]). As a result, no adverse effects on human health from access to physical activity are anticipated.	No
Heritage			
Impact to Conisbrough Castle	7	Impacts to Conisbrough Castle are assessed in Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]. A moderate adverse effect is predicted to the	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		setting of the castle, though this effect is considered to be Not Significant in terms of the EIA Regulations. The Proposed Development (W1) would be visible in views south-west from the upper levels of the castle's keep, with the panels of W1 visible in views beyond the town when looking along the length of the A630 Sheffield Road. The Proposed Development would not be visible from the lower, ground floor levels of the castle (see Statutory and Non-Statutory Historic Assets [EN01100020/APP/2.7]). In relation to its modern setting, only views south-west would be altered. These views, which take in some of the rural periphery of the town and lands associated with the Medieval Estate, would be changed, with the Proposed Development bringing additional infrastructure into views and resulting in further change to the character of the town's periphery. The Proposed Development would only be visible from the upper levels of the Keep, with views unchanged for visitors to the castle at ground level. Any contribution to significance in views south-west lies with the Castle's association with the former Medieval Deer Park, which is located within the Site at W1.	
Impact to the Conisbrough Deer Park	6	Impacts on heritage assets are assessed in Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]. Conisbrough Park (02958/01) is currently designated as a non-designated asset in terms of significance. Its description in the HER record acknowledges that its existence is known primarily through documentary sources and also acknowledges its changing use and form through economic and social changes. Whilst a recently found small ditch supports its historic use as a deer park, its current value as a deer park is low, due to its physical form having undergone many changes. Therefore, whilst the deer park is acknowledged, it is assessed as part of the Conisbrough Castle Setting assessment.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Impact to the Roman Villa	6	Impacts on heritage assets are assessed in Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]. Scheduled Monument 1491751 Conisbrough Parks Romano-British Villa is located in the vicinity of the Proposed Development. There is no large-scale electrical infrastructure in the immediate landscape around the asset. The Proposed Development (W1) would place infrastructure, in the form of solar panels in fields to the south, albeit some 260m removed from the villa site. Solar panels would also be located in fields 80m west of the villa site. Infrastructure will avoid physical disturbance of the asset thus preserving core aspects of its historic and archaeological interest. A Small magnitude of impact is predicted to the Scheduled Monument, resulting in a Moderate Adverse effect. In the context of this monument, this is considered Not Significant. Core aspects of significance, namely the surviving subsurface remains would be unaffected. Setting Impacts would not be of sufficient magnitude to alter the legibility of the monument or introduce a significant adverse effect. Following feedback received during statutory consultation, the villa has been removed from the Order Limits.	Yes
General concern about impact to heritage	5	Impacts on heritage assets are assessed in Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]. With the implementation of embedded mitigation measures, as outlined within Section 8.6 of this Chapter, no significant direct effects are predicted at construction, operation and maintenance or decommissioning. No Significant Adverse effects are predicted at construction, operation and maintenance or decommissioning. However, Moderate Adverse effects to two Scheduled Monuments are predicted:	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		1010828 Conisbrough Castle 1491751 Conisbrough Parks Romano-British Villa. These effects are considered to be Not Significant in terms of EIA regulations. Moderate Adverse effects have been predicted to Barlborough Registered Park and Garden and Barlborough Conservation Area. These effects are considered as Not Significant in the context of EIA regulations. Minor Adverse effects have been identified at Ulley Conservation Area. Minor Adverse effects to two Grade II Listed Buildings have also been predicted; 1314636 Hardwick Hall 1151523 Manor House. As they are Minor Adverse effects they are, therefore, considered as Not Significant in the context of EIA regulations.	
Concern that assessments are incomplete	4	Comments regarding incompleteness of the environmental assessments were made following review of the PEIR during statutory consultation. By its nature PEIR is an early-stage document which does not aim for completeness in the same way as a full Environmental Statement. Impacts on heritage assets are assessed in Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8].	No
Concern about impact to Ulley Conservation Area	3	Impacts on heritage assets are assessed in Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8].	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		With the implementation of embedded mitigation measures, as outlined within Section 8.6 of this Chapter, no significant direct effects are predicted at construction, operation and maintenance or decommissioning. Minor Adverse effects have been identified at Ulley Conservation Area. As they are Minor Adverse effects they are, therefore, considered as Not Significant in the context of EIA regulations.	
Impact to heritage of Harthill	2	Impacts on heritage assets are assessed in Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]. Following consultation, parcels to the west of Harthill Conservation Area have been removed to be more in line with the current bridleway which cuts across the field, after concerns were raised over its proximity and setting. With the implementation of embedded mitigation measures, as outlined within Section 8.6 of the Chapter, no significant direct effects are predicted at construction, operation and maintenance or decommissioning.	Yes
Impact to St James Church, Ravenfield	1	Impacts on heritage assets are assessed in Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]. Following submission of the Draft ES in September 2025, the Order Limit boundary was pulled back from the Ravenfield Conservation Area. With the implementation of embedded mitigation measures, as outlined within Section 8.6 of the Chapter, no significant direct effects are predicted at construction, operation and maintenance or decommissioning.	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		No adverse impacts are predicted on either the Ravenfield Conservation Area or the Church of St James.	
Impact to Clifton conservation village	1	Impacts on heritage assets are assessed in Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]. Following submission of the Draft ES in September 2025, the Applicant removed proposed solar areas and substation to the south of the Clifton Conservation Area after concerns were raised over its proximity and setting. Parcels to the west of the Conservation Area have also been reduced.	Yes
Land & soils			
Concerns around a potential risk of subsidence due to historic mining	5	A detailed data review has been undertaken in ES Volume 3 Appendix 9.10-9.12: Phase 1 Coal Mining Risk Assessments [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. These have identified areas of the Proposed Development with increased risk of unstable land due to historic coal mining activity, as well as other potential risks to development, including mine entries and areas with higher potential for mine gas. Substations and the BESS have been located away from all of the areas with potential for deleterious ground conditions described above, although solar arrays, low-voltage and high-voltage Cable Corridors and access tracks do overlap with relatively small areas with the potential hazards described above. However, with the proposed embedded mitigation the likelihood of occurrence of this effect is considered to be 'low'. Further information can be found in ES Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.19].	No
Concern about land contamination	2	Preliminary risk assessments in relation to land contamination have been undertaken in the Phase 1 CLRs. Phase 2 Ground Investigations will identify any existing contamination in these areas and help establish the requirement for remediation strategies, if deemed appropriate, prior to construction.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		The design of the Proposed Development has been refined such that the most significant potential sources of contamination are now avoided, including the Maltby Brickworks and Kiveton Park Landfills. The methodology for treatment of the water removed from excavations, alongside surface water runoff from construction areas, is presented in the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] to reduce sediment load and contamination, if present, prior to discharge via an appropriate, approved route. Further information can be found in ES Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.19].	
Concern about soil disturbance	2	Appropriate management of managing vehicle and machinery movements and soil disturbance activities, including undertaken works only when soils are in a suitably dry condition, restriction of traffic to designated construction routes (see ES Volume 3, Figures 13.2 to 13.6: Proposed HGV Routing [EN0110020/APP/6.19]) use of machinery with tracks or low ground pressure tyres where possible to spread the weight and minimise soil compaction. Less than 5 ha of land is proposed to be subject to permanent ground disturbance. Although a greater area will be subject to temporary disturbance, temporary soil disturbance is classified as 'low' magnitude of impact. Similarly, sensitivity of the soils is classified as 'medium' (80% of Site) to High' (20%) of Site, based on the presence and extent of BMV soils. Further information can be found in ES Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.19].	No
Concern about the reduction in the quality of the land	1	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding the loss of agricultural land and has sought to avoid and minimise the use of best and most versatile (BMV) land where possible. The majority of the Site comprises non-BMV Subgrade 3b land (78.86%). ES Volume 6, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		[EN0110020/APP/6.9], and ES Volume 6, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20] confirms that only a small proportion of the Site comprises BMV land, and this is largely not subject to permanent infrastructure, with the exception of approximately 0.4 ha associated with a substation compound. The ALC across the Order Limits (excluding the Cable Corridors) is as follows: • 0.94% of Grade 1 Agricultural Land; • 7.06% of Grade 2 Agricultural Land; • 11.16% of Subgrade 3a Agricultural Land; • 78.86% of Subgrade 3b Agricultural Land; • 0.32% of Grade 4 Agricultural Land; • 0.67% of Urban Land; • 0.13% of Non-Agricultural Land; and • 0.85% of Not Surveyed Land. In summary, of the area surveyed, 19% is comprised of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land, although in the majority of instances better quality grades show high spatial variability within larger areas of ALC subgrade 3b. BMV classification data for W1, W2 and W3, based on Site surveys and sampling, and for the Cable Corridors, based on a desk-based review, is provided in section 9.5 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9], including	

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		tabulated areas. The ALC survey is detailed in ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP6.20]. Due to the presence of PV arrays and restricted access during the operational phase, the land will become grassland suitable for grazing rather than for arable purposes for the duration of the Proposed Development. It is anticipated that removal of this land from arable use for the duration of the Proposed Development will lead to improved soil structure, carbon content and fertility, supporting improved biodiversity, as the land will be rested from intensive farming practices such as ploughing, harvesting or chemical inputs, allowing natural recovery processes to take place. Therefore, there is no permanent loss of soil function over the great majority of the Proposed Development. Further information can be found in ES Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.19].	
Land agreements & CPO			
Opposition from landowners on proposed cable corridors	4	The Applicant is seeking to reach voluntary agreements with all landowners. The Applicant has already negotiated and completed property agreements with the freehold owners of the land comprising the Site, which represents the significant majority of the Order Land. The Applicant is in negotiations to enter into voluntary agreements with the remaining freehold owners of the land comprising the Order limits where voluntary agreements are considered necessary. The Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker [EN0110020/APP/4.4] provides more information on the status of these negotiations. Compulsory acquisition powers are included in the DCO Application in case it is not possible to secure voluntary agreements with all landowners, and, thus, to ensure deliverability of the Proposed Development.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Feedback from land interests has led to design changes, including the decisions to reduce optionality in the cable corridors and other changes to the Order Limits. See the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] .	
Concern about landowners making a profit from the proposals	2	In the site selection process, the Applicant sought land that would be suitable for solar and landowners who wanted to be part of the Proposed Development. The Applicant has entered into commercial agreements with these landowners to lease their land for use in the Proposed Development, though the details of those agreements are private. Farming can be a difficult financial venture. In many cases, solar farms can help farmers to diversify their finances in order to support ongoing agriculture in other locations.	No
Concerns about people being served CPOs	1	The Applicant is seeking to reach voluntary agreements with all landowners. The Applicant has already negotiated and completed property agreements with the freehold owners of the land comprising the Site, which represents the significant majority of the Order Land. The Applicant is in negotiations to enter into voluntary agreements with the remaining freehold owners of the land comprising the Order limits where voluntary agreements are considered necessary. The Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker [EN0110020/APP/4.4] provides more information on the status of these negotiations. Compulsory acquisition powers are included in the DCO Application in case it is not possible to secure voluntary agreements with all landowners, and, thus, to ensure deliverability of the Proposed Development. Feedback from land interests has led to design changes, including the decisions to reduce optionality in the cable corridors and other changes to the Order Limits. See the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1].	No
Landscape & visual impact			

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
General concern about impacts to countryside views	14	The site selection process described in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4] describe how the Applicant identified the land to include in the Proposed Development, which is in the countryside. The design process, described further in the Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7] describes the design principles that the Applicant used in order to develop the project in a way that is sensitive to the local environment and communities. Through consultation feedback and ongoing engagement, the Applicant has reduced the solar areas by 37% as compared to the original proposals, to avoid potential visual and other impacts (see the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] . Key changes were made around homes, villages, and public rights of way to preserve views and minimise visual impacts wherever possible, while also balancing the need to produce renewable energy in line with national energy goals. A full Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is included in Chapter 7 [EN0110020/APP/6.7] .	Yes
Concern about visual impact to Conisbrough Parks	10	The site selection process described in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4] describe how the Applicant identified the land to include in the Proposed Development, which includes parts of Conisbrough Parks. The design process, described further in the Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7] describes the design principles that the Applicant used in order to develop the project in a way that is sensitive to the local environment and communities. Through consultation feedback and ongoing engagement, the Applicant has reduced the solar areas by 37% as compared to the original proposals, to avoid potential visual and other impacts (see the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] . Key changes around Conisbrough include the removal of a solar field along the A630, removal of fields south of Conisbrough to isolated dwellings, removal of solar and proposed substations near Clifton, and removal of fields around Firsby. Key changes were made around homes, villages, and public rights of way to preserve views and minimise visual impacts wherever possible, while also balancing the need to produce renewable energy in line with national energy goals. A full Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is included in Chapter 7 [EN0110020/APP/6.7] .	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Concern that mitigation will not make a difference	5	The Applicant has implemented the mitigation hierarchy in the design of the Proposed Development. Through two rounds of consultation, the Applicant sought feedback about potential visual impacts around homes, public rights of way and other sensitive receptors. The Applicant then developed bespoke offsets at each location, which, when combined, amounted to a total reduction of 37% of the solar areas, as described further in the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] and Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7] . The Illustrative Mitigation Plan [EN0110020/APP/2.9] and oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/7.6] provide more information about proposed landscaping that would be used to create a visual barrier to reduce visual impacts. Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7] assesses the remaining visual impacts and finds that there are some remaining significant impacts after the plantings have had sufficient time to grown in. While it is not possible to develop a solar farm that would be completely invisible, the Applicant has sought to minimise visual impacts and assessed them in line with EIA regulations.	Yes
Concern about impact of glint & glare	5	A Glint and Glare Assessment is included in Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16] and the Glint and Glare Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20] . The Report found potential impacts to road receptors, which are mitigated through landscaping included in the Illustrative Mitigation Plan [EN0110020/APP/2.9] and oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/7.6] . No significant impacts are found for users of PRowS or nearby aerodromes. There are some remaining significant impacts to residences.	Yes
Concern about visual impact from PRowS	5	The Applicant has reduced potential visual impacts through the pre-application period by ensuring a 10m offset between the paths and fencing, and another 5m between the fencing and the solar panels, for a 15m offset to either side of the paths. In many cases, the Applicant removed solar panels from one field to the side of paths to maintain a sense of openness. See Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7] .	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Visual impacts to the PRoWs are considered in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7] which finds that there are some significant impacts.	
Concern about visual impact from Harthill and Woodall	2	The Applicant has reduced the solar areas and Order Limits around Harthill and Woodall, in response to consultation feedback as described in the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] and Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7] . Key changes include solar panels being moved further away from Harthill Reservoir, an increased offset from Woodall to site the solar beyond landform, the removal of proposed solar on land between Woodall and Harthill to maintain openness between the villages, and the removal of solar from north of Harthill. Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7] includes viewpoints from Harthill, and finds that there would be some moderate impacts during construction, but not during operation at the Year 1 or Year 15 time points.	Yes
Concern about visual impact from Ulley	2	The Applicant has implemented the mitigation hierarchy in the design of the Proposed Development. Through two rounds of consultation, the Applicant sought feedback about potential visual impacts around homes, public rights of way and other sensitive receptors in Ulley. Through consultation feedback and ongoing engagement, the Applicant has reduced the solar areas by 37% as compared to the original proposals, to avoid potential visual and other impacts (see the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]). Based on feedback, the Applicant removed land north of Ulley entirely from the Order Limits, included mitigation land to the south of Ulley and removed proposed solar panels south of Ulley on at least one side of the PRoW connecting to Aston to retain a sense of openness. The Illustrative Mitigation Plan [EN0110020/APP/2.9] and oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/7.6] provide more information about proposed landscaping that would be used to create a visual barrier to reduce visual impacts. Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7] assesses the remaining visual impacts and finds that there are some remaining significant impacts to viewpoints in Ulley after the plantings have had sufficient time to grown in. These remaining visual impacts would be to views from properties on the north, east and southern edge of Ulley. Whilst	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		views would be mitigated with vegetation, there would be visual impacts through gaps would be as illustrated by Viewpoints 41 and 39.	
Concern that assessments are incomplete	1	The Applicant presented the preliminary environmental assessments for the statutory consultation, which is a requirement of EIA regulations to present the results at an early stage of development. These assessments have since been completed, in consideration of the consultation feedback and further stakeholder engagement in accordance with EIA guidance and standards. Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7] includes a full assessment of visual impacts.	No
Concern about visual impact from Treeton	1	After the statutory consultation, the Applicant reduced the solar areas around Treeton to push the panels back along the crest of the hill to minimise potential visual impacts. Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7] assesses the visual impacts at Treeton and finds the impacts to be not significant. See the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] , Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7] for further information.	Yes
Concern about visual impact from Firsby	1	After the statutory consultation, the Applicant reduced the solar areas around Firsby to remove the remaining solar field to the north, east and west of the hamlet with an offset ranging between 250 – 500m to minimise potential visual impacts. See the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] and Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7] for further information. Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7] assesses the visual impacts at Firsby and along Firsby Lane and finds the impacts to be not significant.	Yes
Masterplanning			
Impacts to PRowS and permissive paths	17	The design has incorporated at least a 15m buffer for PRowS, with the aim of reducing any potential impacts to sensitive receptors where practicable. This is set out in Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/5.8APP/7.3]. The Applicant has committed to retaining existing PRowS. During construction, there may be a requirement to temporarily close some PRowS, with temporary diversions provided for safety reasons. These closures and diversions would be managed	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		via a Public Rights of Way Management Plan (PRoWMP). An oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14] has been submitted with the Application. The Applicant is proposing new additional permissive paths to enhance connectivity across the site. This includes 14.5km of new paths to create circular routes and connect key locations, presented in Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7].	
Objection to the size & scale of the proposals	15	The Applicant has developed design principles to balance the need to maximise renewable energy production whilst also minimising potential impacts to the local community and environment. See the Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7] for more information. In response to consultation feedback, the Applicant has significantly reduced the Proposed Development. Compared to the original masterplan, the final developable area has been reduced by 37%, while the total project has been reduced by 18%. The Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] describes the feedback received and how the master plan was updated in response.	Yes
Objection to cable routes	6	Underground cables are needed to connect the solar areas together and into the National Grid, to power homes and businesses across the UK. During the statutory consultation, the Applicant consulted on various Cable Corridor options. This was narrowed down based on feedback and environmental assessments to the design submitted as part of the DCO Application. The exact route of these underground cables is unknown, so corridors have therefore been identified within which the cables would run. These corridors serve as boundaries for further investigations, which will inform the ultimate routing of the cables. The Cable Corridors detailed in this ES are therefore wider than would be required for the laying of the cables. Some routes have options (D1/D2, G1/G2, I1/I2, and K1/K2) which are being considered in the Proposed Development, and a worst case is assessed in this ES. A description of the Cable Corridors is given in ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: The Site and Surrounding Area [EN0110020/APP/6.3].	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Objection to locations of substations	4	The location of the primary substation is shown in the Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7] and the Works Plan [EN0110020/APP/2.3] as sub area 4-2A in W2. It would be located at least 300m from residential properties. The primary substation would be designed to ensure a night-time noise level no greater than 5dB(A) above baseline conditions. The primary substation would have a maximum footprint of 170m by 100m, and a maximum height of 13.5m, subject to Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.14]. The Proposed Development would also require two satellite substations: one in W1 and one in W2. These are shown on the Works Plan [EN0110020/APP/2.3] as sub-area 4-1A and sub-area 4-2B. The maximum footprint for satellite substation compounds would be 130m by 90m, and the maximum height would be 13.5m. During the statutory consultation, the Applicant consulted on the proposed options for the locations of the substations. In response to feedback and technical assessments, the Applicant selected the option in the centre of Whitestone 1 and towards the southeast in Whitestone 2 to minimise impacts. See Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] for further information.	Yes
Requests for greater levels of screening and mitigation	4	The Illustrative Mitigation Plan [EN0110020/APP/2.9] and oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/7.6] provide information about proposed landscaping that would be used to create a visual barrier to reduce visual impacts. Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7] assesses the residual visual impacts at year 1 and year 15 after landscaping has had time to grown in. As part of the design process through to the final LVIA and ES, residential properties in proximity to the Proposed Development have been identified within ES Volume 3, Figures 7.4.4 to 7.4.6 [EN0110020/APP/6.19]. As part of the embedded mitigation for the Proposed Development a minimum 250m offset to the BESS and substations has been included from the outer edge of the property boundary. The solar arrays have also been set back from residential properties as part of the iterative design	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		process. The setback distance to properties varies and is based on an evaluation of the likely changes to views and the need for a suitable separation so as not to result in an overbearing effect on the views and visual amenity experienced from a property during both the construction and decommissioning phases, noting that at decommissioning visual effects would be further reduced by the maturation of the mitigation planting. Details of the mitigation planting is provided in the oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13] submitted with the Application and secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1], which guides the management of existing vegetation and establishment of the proposed new planting to provide mitigation. The design principles for the Proposed Development are detailed in ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4].	
Objection to locations of BESS	1	During the statutory consultation, the Applicant consulted on the proposed options for the location of the BESS. In response to feedback and technical assessments, the Applicant selected the location closest to the National Grid substation and near the M1 to minimise potential impacts. See Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]. The BESS is proposed to be located adjacent to the M1. Engagement with National Highways is ongoing regarding the BESS. An oBSMP [EN0110020/APP/7.8] has been produced, shared and discussed with South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue and further details can be found here as well as the BESS Plume Assessment [EN0110020/APP/7.2].	Yes
Noise & vibration			
General concern about increased noise and vibration	5	The potential effects of noise and vibration connected to the Proposed Development are considered in Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]. Assessments were carried out for impacts during the construction, operational and decommissioning stages of the Proposed Development. No significant adverse noise or vibration effects are predicted in connection to the Proposed Development.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Concern about operational noise	3	The components of the solar farm that make noise are the power conversion stations, the batteries, and the substations. The batteries and substations have been selection in locations to minimise noise impacts and would be at least 300m from homes. The power conversion stations would be located at least 100m from homes and 50m from public rights of way, where practicable as defined in the Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.14]. Operational noise effects are assessed in Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]. No assessment locations are expected to rating levels which exceed +5 dB above background, and therefore not triggering the potential for adverse impacts which could result in significant effects. Operational noise impacts for all receptors are either Negligible or Minor, which would be Not Significant in EIA Regulation terms.	Yes
Concern about construction noise	2	The potential effects of construction noise connected to the Proposed Development are considered in Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]. Construction noise impacts are generally predicted to be negligible or minor, though a small number of moderate or major impacts may result for some assessment locations, for instance during the installation of Cable Route B, highways alterations, and construction of other cable corridors. Any major impacts would be very brief in nature, and no moderate impacts would occur more frequently than advised by best practice application of BS 5228-1. Therefore, the assessment considers that construction noise impacts to be Not Significant in EIA Regulation terms.	No
Concern about impact of noise from the BESS	2	Operational noise effects in connection with the BESS system are assessed in Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]. BESS units or substations would be located at least 300m away from any residential properties, as defined in the Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.14]. The design principles (ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]) for the Proposed Development have been	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		established to prioritise locating potential sources of noise as far as reasonably practicable from noise sensitive receptors. No assessment locations are expected to rating levels which exceed +5 dB above background, and therefore not triggering the potential for adverse impacts which could result in significant effects.	
Concern about impact of noise from inverters	1	There will be no more than a 5db increase in nighttime noise above base levels, therefore there is no significant impact. Operational noise effects in connection with the container inverters are assessed in Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]. The design principles (ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]) for the Proposed Development have been established to prioritise locating potential sources of noise as far as reasonably practicable from noise sensitive receptors. Power conversion stations would be located less than 100m away from residential properties where practicable Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.14].	Yes
Safety & security			
Concern about risk of fire at the BESS	4	To ensure the safety of the overall system, various levels of fire detection and suppression mechanisms have been incorporated. These mechanisms have been designed to promptly identify and mitigate any potential risk of thermal runaway and the conditions that may lead up to it. In the unlikely event that a fire does occur, the spacing and location of the units have been carefully considered to eliminate any possibility of fire spreading between units, ensuring the situation does not escalate. BESS units shall be selected that are designed to self-contain fire risks. The Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (OBSMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.15] identifies the fire safety risks for the BESS installation and the mitigation measures.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Separate to the OBSMP, the Emergency Response Plan (ERP) will provide information that supports operators and the Fire and Rescue Service in effectively responding to an incident at the BESS Site. The proposed shall be based on proven battery technology and adheres to the latest available safety guidance and relevant standards.	
General concern about safety risks	4	Safety is considered at several points in the DCO Application. The Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (OBSMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.15] identifies the fire safety risks for the BESS installation and mitigation measures. To ensure the safety of the overall system, various levels of fire detection and suppression mechanisms have been incorporated. These mechanisms have been designed to promptly identify and mitigate any potential risk of thermal runaway and the conditions that may lead up to it. In the unlikely event that a fire does occur, the spacing and location of the units have been carefully considered to eliminate any possibility of fire spreading between units, ensuring the situation does not escalate. BESS units shall be selected that are designed to self-contain fire risks. Separate to the OBSMP, the Emergency Response Plan (ERP) will provide information that supports operators and the Fire and Rescue Service in effectively responding to an incident at the BESS Site. The proposed shall be based on proven battery technology and adheres to the latest available safety guidance and relevant standards. The effects of increased traffic on road user and pedestrian safety are considered in ES Chapter 13: Traffic [EN0110020/APP/6.13]. No significant effects on road user and pedestrian safety are identified. The effects of the Proposed Development on human health receptors are considered in the following chapters of ES:	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		• ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]; • ES Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]; • ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]; and • ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]. No significant effects on human health receptors are identified.	
Concerns around the safety of fencing	1	Details of the proposed fencing around the Solar PV arrays, Power Conversion Station (PCS) and substations are provided in the Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]. They are also described in ES Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]. Fencing around the solar PV areas will comprise wooden post and wire or wooden post with galvanised welded wire up to 2.2m above ground level. A double fence, separated by approximately 2m, may be installed. Mammal gates will be incorporated. Fencing around PCS enclosures will be up to 3.5m above ground level and comprise galvanised welded wire with metal posts.	No
Socio-economics			
Concern about impact on local economy	6	The potential economic effects of the Proposed Development are assessed in Chapter 15: Socio-Economics and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15]. During the Construction phase, the Proposed Development is predicted to have a £74.2 million GVA impact to the local economy, as part of a £222.6 million impact overall. This Negligible Beneficial (Not Significant) effect.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		During operation, the Proposed Development is estimated to generate £0.4m of direct local GVA annually. While this would be a benefit to the local economy, the effect is estimated as Negligible Beneficial (Not Significant).	
Concern about impacts to property values	3	The potential economic effects of the Proposed Development are assessed in Chapter 15: Socio-Economics and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15]. Potential impacts on residential or commercial property values were scoped out of the EIA assessment as these matters are beyond the scope of EIA regulations and difficult to attribute to the Proposed Development. However, the Applicant has made significant changes in response to consultation feedback to remove solar panels and create bespoke offsets around homes and villages to reduce potential visual impacts, See the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] and Design Approach Document [Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/5.7].	No
Concern about lack of employment opportunities	1	The potential employment effects of the Proposed Development are assessed in Chapter 15: Socio-Economics and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15]. The construction phase of the Proposed Development would create or safeguard 1,616 full-time equivalent jobs (FTEs) per annum over the two-year construction period, including direct, indirect and induced FTEs. Indirect employment refers to jobs created as a result of linked purchases within the supply chain, and induced employment refers to those created by local spend by direct and indirect workers. While this is a beneficial effect, due to being temporary in nature, and the number of jobs created being proportionally small compared with the overall workforce of Rotherham and Doncaster, it is assessed as being Minor Beneficial (Not Significant) overall. The operation and maintenance phase would create 39 FTEs, 15 of which would be local. While long-term operational employment, both direct and through the supply chain, would contribute positively to the local economy, the overall effect is assessed as Negligible Beneficial (Not Significant).	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Concern about reduction in tourism	1	The potential effects of the Proposed Development on tourism are assessed in Chapter 15: Socio-Economics and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15] . No significant effects are identified during construction or operations for tourism receptors.	No
Transport & access			
Concerns about disruption and increase in traffic due to construction	26	Traffic and transport impacts are considered in ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]. The chapter considers the potential traffic and transport effects associated with the construction of the Proposed Development on the surrounding public road network and sensitive receptors. The additional traffic due to the construction of the Proposed Development would result in temporary increases of traffic flows, including HGVs, on the surrounding highway network. A full assessment of the potential environmental effects concludes that the significance of impacts relating to the effect of severance, NMU amenity and delay, fear and intimidation, road user and pedestrian safety, road vehicle driver and passenger delay, and hazardous and large loads are all Negligible or Minor. As such, based on the significance criteria outlined in Section 13.4 the effects of the temporary traffic generated by the construction of the Proposed Development on all road links and junctions are considered to be Not Significant. Cumulative impacts with nearby developments are also considered Not Significant in terms of EIA Regulations.	No
Concern about road safety for pedestrians and equestrians	9	ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13] details the baseline collision data in the Study Area. Further details are set out in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20] including locations of the collisions for key junctions along the routes within the Study Area. The full result of the assessment is shown in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.4: Road User and pedestrian Safety Data [EN0110020/APP/6.20] .	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		The assessments conclude that the construction of the Proposed Development will result in a Negligible magnitude of impact on road user and pedestrian safety.	
Concern about using Doncaster Road (A630) for access	5	In response to feedback from the statutory consultation and ongoing engagement with local highways, the Applicant has moved the W1 access point further along the A630 to minimise potential cumulative impacts with the housing development at this location. See the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]. The Applicant notes the importance of maintaining safety on the A630 and has engaged with the LHA on the proposed concept access design. The Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20] provides estimates of vehicle volumes considered, and known crash data.	Yes
Concern about use of Long Lane for access	3	In the statutory consultation, the Applicant received feedback about the proposed access point on Long Lane. In response, the Applicant added an additional access point to the south of this solar area, to reduce the construction traffic at the access point on Long Lane. See the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]. The Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20] provides estimates of vehicle volumes considered at these locations. The percentage increase in HGV traffic on this link is primarily due to the low baseline flows (11 HGVs per day), whilst the magnitude of the predicted increase is low in absolute terms (an additional 6 HGVs per day over the baseline). The increases in HGV traffic would only occur during the peak month of construction with no construction related HGVs associated with the Cable Corridor of the Proposed Development using this route. The change in HGV traffic is temporary, fully reversible and would only occur during peak month of construction. The proposed HGV routing along Long Lane indicates that HGVs will only be travelling along the north section of the road and will not travel through the settlement of Treeton.	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		To effectively minimise any potential adverse effect on severance at this location, a number of measures are proposed as part of the oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12] .	
Concern about using Hard Lane for access	2	The percentage increase in HGV traffic around Hard Lane is primarily due to the low baseline flows (between 18 and 62 HGVs per day), whilst the magnitude of the predicted increase is relatively low in absolute terms ranging from approximately 44 to 71 additional HGVs per day above baseline levels. It should be noted that the increases in HGV traffic would only occur during the peak month of construction. The majority of construction related HGVs that will travel along this route will be associated with the Cable Corridor of the Proposed Development, it is unlikely that the peak periods of the Site and Cable Corridors of the Proposed Development will coincide. Therefore, the change in HGV traffic is temporary, fully reversible and would only occur during peak month of construction. That notwithstanding to effectively minimise any potential adverse effect a number of mitigation measures are proposed as part of the oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12].	No
Concern about access off the A57	1	After the statutory consultation, the Applicant presented proposed changes to the Order Limits in a targeted consultation. This included Change 20, which provides for more road safety works at the access point on the A57 to ensure highway safety standards. See Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]. Preliminary vehicle tracking and visibility splay assessments in accordance with the relevant design guidance have been undertaken to inform the development of the proposed access strategy and to confirm that the accesses are capable of accommodating the anticipated construction vehicles. Detailed access proposals will be developed and be supported, where appropriate, by Road Safety Audits undertaken at the detailed design stage following consent via a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. When the proposed routings of each PV Site and Cable Corridor are combined, a maximum of 215 daily two-way HGVs are expected on a single road within the Study	Yes

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Area (A57) as a worst-case scenario (both peak periods occurring at the same time). Over a 10-hour delivery window, the worst-case construction related HGV trips would be equivalent to approximately 22 two-way movements (11 inbound and 11 outbound) per hour. Further detail on access strategy is included in ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20].	
Concern about safety on Ruddle Lane	1	The Applicant has removed the proposed substation that was located on Ruddle Lane, south of Clifton in response to concerns about traffic and safety impacts in this location. Therefore, this access point is no longer needed and has been removed from the Proposed Development. See the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] and the Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]	Yes
Other			
Ethical concerns about panel manufacturing	2	The Applicant expects suppliers and contractors to comply with applicable legislation, standards and procurement requirements, including those relating to ethical supply chains. Wider socio-economic considerations are assessed in ES Chapter 15: Socioeconomics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15].	No
Concern about lack of grid capacity	1	National Grid identified that there was existing capacity at Brinsworth Substation and offered a grid connection agreement with the Applicant for 750MW at this location. Separately, National Grid have undertaken a large-scale upgrade of infrastructure across the UK, known as the Great Grid Upgrade. As part of that development to upgrade the overhead lines, National Grid is also proposing a new substation that would be located on Long Lane. They have updated the grid connection agreement to have the Proposed Development connect into the new substation. If for any reason the new substation is not consented or constructed, National Grid would revert to the original substation to connect the Proposed Development.	No

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX E

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
General concern about EIA assessments	1	The ES details the environmental assessments that have taken place. During the statutory consultation, the draft ES was available to view, which explained the preliminary environmental assessments that had taken place. The environmental assessments have been ongoing throughout the development process, which has informed the ES submitted as part of the DCO Application. ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: EIA Methodology [EN0110020/APP/6.2] explains the process undertaken for EIA assessments, along with the relevant technical chapters.	No



WHITESTONE
solar farm

Contact

Whitestone Net Zero Ltd

info@whitestonesolarfarm.co.uk

0800 688 9936