WHITESTONE SOLAR FARM

Volume 5: Reports and Statements

5.1 Consultation Report Appendix E Statutory Consultation Feedback Part Two

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 E2 FEEDBACK FROM S47 CONSULTEES 2
Appendix E2.1 Feedback from s47 consultees by questionnaire and Applicant Responses 2
Appendix E2.2 Feedback from s47 consultees by email and Applicant Responses 149
Appendix E2.3 Feedback from s47 consultees by petition and Applicant Responses 245

APPENDIX E2 FEEDBACK FROM S47 CONSULTEES

Appendix E2 considers the feedback received from s47 consultees, via questionnaire, email and petition, along with the Applicant Response to concerns raised. The feedback has been analysed and organised thematically to group the same topics together in order to effectively analyse and respond to all feedback.

Appendix E2.1 Feedback from s47 consultees by questionnaire and Applicant Responses

Table 2.1.1 Responses to question 1: Which site are you most interested in?

Response	Number of Responses	Percent of Total	Applicant Response	Design Change
Whitestone 1	36	6%	Noted	No
Whitestone 2	103	17%	Noted	No
Whitestone 3	53	9%	Noted	No
All of the above	410	68%	Noted	No
Total Responses	**602**	**100%**		

Table 2.1.2 Responses to question 2: Please provide your feedback on our updated masterplan.

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Air quality	**11**		
Concerns around an increase in air pollution from construction traffic	6	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 **[REF-13]**. 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 of the Air Quality chapter. 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 **[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.	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Concern about dust	5	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	**395**		
Concern about impact to agriculture and food production	135	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	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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 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.	

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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/APP/6.20]**. 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.	
Support for solar development in other locations including brownfields	40	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	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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.	
Concern about developing on the Green Belt	91	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	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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 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].**	
General opposition to solar	11	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 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 on line to replace this capacity. At the same time, demand for electricity continues to increase, due to the electrification of	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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.	
Support for other energy sources	8	National policy calls for 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. 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 **ES Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4].**	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Support for solar farms in other locations	22	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].**	No
Question about National Grid capacity at Brinsworth	2	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
Support for solar panels on rooftops	84	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]**.	No
Statements that the development should be closer to Brinsworth	1	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 of the ES [EN0110020/APP/6.4].**	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		The Applicant undertook a site selection process between November 2023 and January 2024. This site selection process used a 12 km search radius to identify potential land to include in order to minimise potential impacts from the cable route.	
Support for grazing	1	This is noted. The Applicant will continue to explore the option of sheep grazing with local farmers, if the Proposed Development is consented.	No
Biodiversity	**164**		
Concern about potential impact to badgers	2	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 **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan** (**oLEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.13],** ensures permeability of the Site and maintains established commuting routes. As a result,	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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 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 potential impact to birds	8	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 6.5-6.7 [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 grassland, enhanced hedgerows and woodland planting. Evidence demonstrates that well-managed solar developments can deliver benefits to breeding birds by increasing habitat	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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.	
Concern about potential impact to biodiversity in general	22	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. 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.	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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 and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO. 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	

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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.	
Concern about potential impact to deer	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 **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 and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO. 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	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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. 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.	
Concern about potential impact to foxes	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:**	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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 and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO. 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.	

Topic	Count	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.	
Concern about potential impact to great crested 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

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Concern about potential habitat loss	12	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 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 and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO. 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	Yes

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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.	
Concern about potential impact to hares	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 and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO. 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	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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.	
Concern about potential impact to hedgehogs	2	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 and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO.	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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.	
Concern about potential impact to hedgerows	3	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	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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 the draft DCO, 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, 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 that birds may mistake panels for water	1	There is limited evidence that birds mistake solar panels for water and that this causes fatal crashes. Impacts on birds are included in **Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6],** which finds no significant impacts. 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.	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Concern about potential impact to insects	2	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 and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO. 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	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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.	
Concern about potential impact to owls	1	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 **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.	No
Concern about potential impact to trees	1	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	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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 the draft DCO, 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, 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 potential impact to water voles	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

Topic	Count	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 and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO. 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.	

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Concern about potential impact to wildlife in general	91	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. 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 **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 and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO.	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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.	
Concern about potential impact to bats	1	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	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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 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.	
Concern about potential impact to bees	3	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

Topic	Count	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 and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO. 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.	
Climate change	**17**		

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Statements that the energy production is not enough to offset the construction	10	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]** 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 SF_6-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 Requirement 4 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 construction traffic, fuel use and waste. Measures to reduce construction impacts include low-carbon design choices, reducing the use of high-impact materials where	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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 CO_2e over the 60-year lifetime of the Proposed Development, the project is expected to deliver a clear net environmental and climate benefit.	
General statement of opposition to net zero	5	There is a clear and sustained political support within the UK Government for large-scale renewable energy projects, and this is demonstrated within the clean power targets to be met by 2030, and net zero targets that are to be met by 2050. As summarised within the **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, as a result of its commitments to the Paris Agreement, in June 2019 the UK became the first major economy to legislate for a 2050 net zero GHG emissions target through the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019. UK governmental objectives are to ensure the supply of energy to the national energy system always remains secure, reliable, affordable, and consistent with meeting legally binding Greenhouse Gas emissions including the Government's Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC). With the Climate Change Committee (CCC), a national independent advisory committee, making it clear within the 2024 report that there is urgent action needed to get on track for the UK's 2030 targets. The Proposed Development will assist the Government in meeting these targets in line with the UK's net zero legislation.	No
Statements about existing wind farms being turned off, questions about need for more renewable energy	2	National demand for electricity continues to increase and is projected to double by 2050. To meet this need in line with the legislated net zero targets, the Government is calling for a tripling of solar development by 2030. Curtailment may be related to the grid being overly congested and unable to transmit electricity to where it is needed. To mitigate this, National Grid is currently	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		proposing the Great Grid Upgrade to help upgrade infrastructure to make it easier to transmit the power across the country. Curtailment may also be related to a lack of storage capacity in the grid. The Proposed Development would include a battery energy storage system to help store the energy at time of low demand and release it back to the grid when it is needed the most. This would help balance the grid and avoid wasting electricity. More information on the BESS to be included in the design for the Proposed Development can be found within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]**.	
Community benefits	**30**		
Statements that there would be no local benefits	12	The Applicant has committed to delivering a meaningful community benefit package to ensure that local communities share in the benefits of the Proposed Development. While there is no standard, the Applicant proposes a community benefit fund of £400 per MW per year which is consistent with other UK solar developments. 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 final size and lifespan of the Proposed Development. See the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information**.**	No
Statements that the benefits are not enough	6	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
Support for local benefit	1	Noted, the Applicant has committed to their being community benefits to the Proposed Development.	Yes
Support for reduced energy prices	5	The Applicant is proposing a community benefit fund that would support local initiatives, which could include reduced energy costs. See the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	Yes
Do not believe in reduced energy costs	2	Noted.	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Requests for discounted solar panels	1	The Applicant is proposing that the community benefit fund be available to support for local initiatives. These could include solar panels or education programmes. Funding decisions would be decided by the board. See the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	Yes
Requests for skills and education programmes	1		
Comment that costs for construction could be spent in local community instead	1	The Applicant is a private company bringing forward the development as a business case. If the Proposed Development were not constructed, the funding would not be available.	No
Requests for direct compensation	1	The Applicant is not proposing any direct compensation as part of the community benefit package. The Applicant has sought to develop the Proposed Development in a way to minimise impacts on local properties, including noise, visual impact, glint and glare, dust, and other factors. Please see the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7**], as well as **Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7], Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12], Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14] and the Glint and Glare assessment in Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16].**	No
Construction	**6**		
Concern about general construction disruption	5	The impacts of the Proposed Development during the construction phase are assessed in each of the **ES Chapters [EN0110020/APP/6.5-16].** While there are some impacts during construction, the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/7.2]** includes appropriate to mitigation to minimise disruption.	No
Concern about nighttime working lights	1	Construction lighting will be minimised and restricted to active work areas, with the majority of works undertaken during standard daytime hours (0700–1900 Monday to Friday and 0700–1300 on Saturdays, unless otherwise justified). Where required, temporary security lighting will be low-impact, directional and motion-activated. Lighting will be controlled to avoid illumination during crepuscular and nocturnal periods where practicable and will be designed in accordance with relevant bat and lighting guidance. See further information in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/7.2].** Detailed lighting controls will be secured through the CEMP.	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Consultation	**82**		
Concern about digital access to documents	1	The Applicant provided both digital and paper documents for the consultation. Paper copies of materials were available at the public information events and by request. See the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	No
Concern about paying for the draft ES	2	The draft ES is a very large, technical document. The Applicant provided access to this document for free through the website, by USB, or in paper copy at the public events. The Applicant did not provide additional paper copies for free in order to discourage waste and excess cost. See **the Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	No
Concerns that feedback will not be considered	3	All feedback from the consultation has been reviewed and considered in the Consultation Report **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** and this Appendix.	No
Concerns that the Applicant could not answer questions	2	As set out in the Gunning Principles, consultation should occur at an early stage of development so that the feedback has the ability to result in changes to the Proposed Development. This means that the Applicant was unable to answer certain questions because those decisions had not yet been finalised. See **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	No
Concerns that specific individuals were not consulted	1	The Applicant consulted the list of prescribed consultees as well as community groups, identified in consultation with the local authorities on the development of the statement of community consultation, See **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information. The Applicant identified a consultation zone, roughly 1km from the Order Limits for individuals to receive direct notification through posted leaflet and other letters, however, anyone with an interest in the Proposed Development could submit their feedback.	No
Statements that the information events were held at bad times	4	As described in the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1],** the Applicant developed a programme of 8 public events, at different times of day and days of the week, in locations that were roughly 15m from properties within the consultation zone. The Applicant also adjusted the timings of events so if an individual could not attend the event closest to them, the next nearest event was a completely different time of day.	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
General concern that the consultation was not adequate	7	The Applicant developed a comprehensive consultation and ongoing engagement strategy that more than met the requirements for consultation that are set by the PA2008 and associated regulations and guidance, to allow for meaningful engagement that has resulted in significant changes to the Proposed Development. See Adequacy of Consultation Milestone in **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	No
Statements that the consultation leaflets appeared to be 'Junk mail' and were disregarded	2	The Applicant posted leaflets to the consultation zone to notify the upcoming consultation. If anyone did not open this leaflet, there were a variety of other ways they could have been notified of the consultation, including notices in newspapers, advertisements on social media, site notices, and emails to community groups and elected officials. See **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	No
Concern that the masterplan was out of date around Harthill and did not include a new housing development	5	The Applicant has updated the base OS layer in the **Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7]** to be the most current version, which shows the new housing development.	Yes
Statements that materials difficult to read	4	All consultation materials were drafted in non-technical language for the general public. Alternative formats were available upon reasonable request. See **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	No
Concerns that the events were drop in sessions rather than presentations	2	The Applicant developed a programme of drop-in events scheduled to be at different days of the week and times of day to accommodate various work/life schedules. Presentations that have a strict start time can be less convenient for individuals that the option to arrive within the event window. Please see the Consultation Report **[EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	No
Statements that there were not enough events	8	As described in the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1],** the Applicant developed a programme of 8 public events, at different times of day and days of the week, in locations that were roughly 15m from properties within the consultation zone. The Applicant also adjusted the timings of events so if an individual could not attend the event closest to them, the next nearest event was a completely different	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		time of day. It would not be proportionate to have an event in every village within the consultation zone, and many villages do not have appropriate venues for public events.	
Statements that there was not enough information	10	The Applicant provided a variety of materials for the consultation, at varying levels of detail for different audiences. The Consultation Booklet, See **Appendix D, Consultation Materials Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1],** was the main consultation document for the public and contained enough information to respond to the consultation. The Applicant also produced a non-technical summary of the draft ES as well as the full draft ES for anyone who wanted to view it.	No
Statements that there was not enough notice	6	The Applicant provided notice of the upcoming consultation 1 week prior to the start. As the consultation was 6 weeks long, this meant that consultees had 7 weeks to prepare to submit their feedback. The Applicant also provided further advance notice of the intent to hold the statutory consultation at the non-statutory consultation and through other community updates, as described in the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1].**	No
Concern that the materials did not show final locations for substations, BESS and cables	11	As set out in the Gunning Principles, consultation should occur at an early stage of development so that the feedback has the ability to result in changes to the Proposed Development. During the statutory consultation, the Applicant showed the potential locations for the substations, batteries and cable routes for consultation so that they final locations could be determined in response to feedback. See **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] and Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4].**	No
Concern that the Applicant did not respond enough to feedback from non-statutory consultation	1	After the non-statutory consultation, the Applicant reduced the solar areas by around a quarter. The Applicant made further reductions following the statutory consultation, resulting in a developable area that is 37% less than the original proposals. See **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1] and Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7].**	No
Statements that the consultation was not long enough	2	The consultation was six-weeks long, which is more than the 28-day requirement set by the Planning Act 2008. See Adequacy of Consultation Milestone in **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Support for staff at events	1	Noted.	No
Concern about materials using the word 'potential' or 'indicative'	2	All consultation materials throughout the pre-application period were drafted in the subjunctive tense, using words like 'would' and 'could' and 'potential', due to the fact that the Proposed Development has not yet been consented, and decisions could change in response to feedback. See Appendix D Consultation Materials **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	No
Requests to consult British Horse Society	1	The British Horse Society was consulted, and their feedback is included in these tables.	No
Support for consultation	1	Noted.	No
Concern about the DCO process and local influence	3	The Planning Act 2008 establishes that the Proposed Development is considered a nationally significant infrastructure project, which would require a DCO. However, consultation is an important part of the development process to ensure local voices are heard. See **Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]** for further information.	No
Concern that consultation not early enough in development process	1	The Applicant held two consultations on the Proposed Development as described in the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1].** The non-statutory consultation was held on the initial masterplan and early proposals for the Proposed Development. In response to feedback from this consultation, the Applicant made significant changes to the solar areas, including a reduction of around one quarter of these areas. The Applicant then held a statutory consultation on the updated proposals, including the options for where other key infrastructure could be located. In response to the statutory consultation, the Applicant made further reductions to the solar areas, resulting in a 37% reduction compared to the initial proposals, and decided the final locations of substations, batteries and cable routes. At each stage, the Applicant consulted at a time when the feedback could result in changes to the design.	No
Requests for more visualisations	2	Further visualisations are included in **Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7].**	Yes
Cumulative impacts	**36**		

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Concern about the cumulative impact of the BESS on Hard Lane	1	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**, 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.	No
Concern about housing developments	10	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**, 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 key nearby housing schemes.	No
Concern about the cumulative impact of developments around Killamarsh	1	The Proposed Development has the potential to cause inter-project effects (cumulative effects from the impact of multiple developments in addition to the Proposed Development) and intra-project effects (cumulative effects from multiple impacts affecting one receptor).	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Inter-project effects are considered within each individual technical chapter (**ES Volume 2, Chapters 6 – 16 [EN0110020/APP/6.6 – 6.16]**), and the long list of developments to be considered is provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 17.2: Long List of Developments for Cumulative Effects Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20].** A qualitative intra-project effects assessment has been completed to determine where multiple identified environmental impacts may affect the same receptor and therefore result in a larger overall impact to that receptor. Due to the embedded mitigation measures within the Proposed Development, no significant intra-project effects have been identified.	
Concern about the cumulative impact of Exagen project	6	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**, 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 key nearby schemes such as Thurcroft Energy Park / Morthen Lane, Morthen (RB2025/0714).	No
Concern about general cumulative impacts	7	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	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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**). • **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	

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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 LCAs, the cumulative change is **not of sufficient magnitude** to redefine LCAs/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)	

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		• 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. **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 ZoI. 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 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.	

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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 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	

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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 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 PRoWs/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. • **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	

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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**.	
Concern about the cumulative impact of projects on Moat Lane	1	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**, 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.	No
Concern about the cumulative impact of National Grid and other projects	1	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**, 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.	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Concern about the cumulative impact of National Grid substation	7	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**, 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.	No
Concern about the cumulative impact of projects on Piper Lane	2	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**, 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.	No
Decommissioning	**16**		
Concern about whether panels are recyclable	11	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].**	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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 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/7.4]** 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.	
Concern the land will not be returned to agriculture	5	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**). Decommissioning would be a legal requirement of the DCO. 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 **Requirement**	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		16 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.	
Developer details	**26**		
Concern around foreign investors	2	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. Green Nation is based in Somerset and has developments across the UK. The project team that has been brought on board to support the Applicant and the development process is based across the UK, but have travelled to the Site on many occasions to conduct environmental assessments or consult with local communities and stakeholders to gain local knowledge. See **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1].**	No
Concern that the developer is making a profit	21	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 cost effectiveness	1	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	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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. Solar farms like the Proposed Development do not receive any government subsidy and must be funded entirely through private sources. The 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].**	
Concern around the use of government subsidies	2	Whitestone Solar Farm is being brought forward by Whitestone Net Zero Ltd, with the overall project management provided by Green Nation. Solar farms like the Proposed Development do not receive any government subsidy and must be funded entirely through private sources. The 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].**	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
EIA General	**12**		
Concern that assessments are incomplete	8	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
Concern about general environmental impact	3	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
Concern that management plans not provided	1	Outline Management plans are included as part of the DCO application, including management plans such as the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9], oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13], Outline PRoW Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** and the **Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (OBSMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.15]**.	No
Flood risk, hydrology and drainage	**29**		
Concern about flooding on River Ryton	1	Impacts on local water resources, including the River Ryton, are assessed in **Chapter 10 Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10].** No significant effects are predicted from the construction, operational or decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. 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	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		flood risk management measures, 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.	
Concern about flooding around Bramley	1	Impacts on local water resources are assessed in **Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10].** No significant effects are predicted from the construction, operational or decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development.	No
Concern about flooding around Kearsley brook	2	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, 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 flooding around Treeton	6	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, 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 flooding near Conisbrough	2	Impacts on Kearsley Brook and Conisbrough are assessed in **Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10].**	

Topic	Count	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, 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.	
Concern about impact to surface water	1	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, 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 increased flooding	10	Impacts on local water resources are assessed in **Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10].** No significant effects are predicted from the construction, operational or decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development.	No
Concern about water contamination	1	Impacts on local water resources, including the River Ryton, are assessed in **Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10].** No significant effects are predicted from the construction, operational or decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. Construction of the Proposed Development will also generate wastewater from welfare facilities through for example vehicle cleaning. Disposal of wastewater has the potential to affect surface water quality if not managed appropriately. Inadequate containment, storage, or disposal will result in accidental releases of untreated foul water, leading to localised contamination, increased nutrient and organic loading, and deterioration of downstream water quality. Embedded Mitigation set out in Section 10.6.50 commits to a Water Consumption Plan being developed prior to the commencement of construction. The plan	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		will identify the appropriate sources of water and volume of water that can be abstracted, as well as the need to obtain the appropriate approvals and permits for water abstraction during construction (and operation). This will ensure water demand is appropriately managed and there are no reductions in water quantity for other hydrological receptors / no adverse effects to surface water features and water resources. Secured through the **outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**; foul water from welfare facilities will not be discharged onsite and will be removed by a licensed carrier. Wash water from cleaning activities will either be removed by a licensed carrier or discharged to vegetated areas where the water quality meets EA standards. With embedded mitigation in place, the magnitude of impact on surface water features (waterbodies, watercourses, reservoirs, canals), surface water resources, and hydrologically connected designated sites all of high sensitivity, is assessed as Negligible. Therefore, the effect on these receptors is **Negligible (Not Significant)**.	
Concern about flood Zones 2 and 3	4	Impacts on local water resources are assessed in **Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10].** No significant effects are predicted from the construction, operational or decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. 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. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** has identified where solar panels need to be raised so that they remain operational without increasing flood risk elsewhere under a 1 in 100-year plus climate change event. The design principles for the Proposed Development are detailed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5].**	Yes

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Concern about impacts to Ulley Brook	1	Impacts on local water resources are assessed in **Chapter 10 Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10].** No significant effects are predicted from the construction, operational or decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. Small areas along the Ulley Brook, Anston Brook, and Broad Bridge Dyke are within Flood Zone 2 and 3. Whilst the Proposed Development will not increase flood risk, proposed mitigation for the potential flooding of Ulley Brook is to raise the solar panels in these areas, which is detailed in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20].**	Yes
General	**153**		
General objection to the proposals	36	Noted.	No
General support for the proposals	19	Noted.	No
No response	98	Noted.	No
Health	**66**		
Concern about general health and safety	4	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 **Outline PRoW Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.14])**. As a result, no adverse effects on human health from access to physical activity are anticipated.	No

Topic	Count	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 safety impacts for equestrians	3	Potential effects on PRoWs and other NMUs would be managed through a Public Rights of Way Management Plan (PRoWMP). An **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPROWMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** is submitted with the Application. This plan establishes the framework for managing temporary diversions, maintaining safe access and minimising disruption to equestrians during construction. With the implementation of the mitigation measures, the assessment concludes that construction-phase traffic and transport effects would be **Not Significant**	No
Concern about impact on recreation	25	Impacts on recreation are assessed in **ES Chapter 15: Socioeconomics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15].** Section 15.7 includes assessment of effects on PRoWs and other recreational routes. Potential effects on PRoWs and other NMUs would be managed through a Public Rights of Way Management Plan (PRoWMP). An **oPROWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** is submitted with the Application. Any diversions or management measures for PRoW within the Order Limits would be short-term, temporary, and mitigated by measures set out in the Outline PRoW Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.14]; There will be no Significant effects on amenity for NMUs using local roads; Visual impacts on users of PRoW and	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		recreational routes would be short-term and temporary; and There would be no Significant noise effects from construction. This results in a Minor Adverse (Not Significant) effect, as per the EIA Regulations.	
Concern about impact to mental health	34	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	**17**		
Concern about impact to Conisbrough Castle	1	Impacts to Conisbrough Castle are assessed in **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, 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]**).	Yes

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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.	
Concern about impact to Conisbrough Parks	1	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
Concern about impact to cultural heritage	3	Impacts on cultural heritage is assessed in **Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** which finds no significant impacts.	No
Concern about impact to historic villages	5	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

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant removed the fields south of Brampton en le Morthen from the Order Limits to reduce potential impacts to these homes and the Brampton en le Morthen Conservation Area.	
Concern about impact to the Roman Villa	3	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
Concern about impact to buried heritage and archaeology	3	Impacts on buried heritage is assessed in **Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** which finds no significant impacts as per the EIA Regulations.	No
Concern about general impact to heritage	1	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 Chapter 8, no significant direct effects are predicted at construction, operation and maintenance or decommissioning.	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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. Minor Adverse effects to two Grade II Listed Buildings have also been predicted to: • 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.	
Land & soils	**16**		
Concern about the use of ALC	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 [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	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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/APP/6.20]**. 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.	

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Further information can be found in **ES Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.19]**.	
Concern around soil degradation	8	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, 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/APP/6.20]**. 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	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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]**.	
Concern about temperature change under the panels	1	The Applicant notes this concern, but there is currently no evidence to support the claim that the temperature of the land underneath the solar panels will change as a result of the Proposed Development.	No
Concern about impact of former coal mines and ground stability	1	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 that the Applicant has not considered carbon sink in the soil	3	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	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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]**.	
Concern about soil compaction	1	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 soil erosion during construction	1	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	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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]**.	
Land agreements & CPO	**2**		
Concern that the landowners would benefit	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
Landscape & visual impacts	**233**		
Concern about general visual impact	102	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	Yes

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		national energy goals. A full Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is included in **Chapter 7 [EN0110020/APP/6.7**].	
Concern about general impacts to countryside	63	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 impacts to Spa Farm	10	The Applicant assessed residential receptors for Spa House and for recreational users of Treeton Footpath No.4, and concluded that impacts would be Not Significant. A full Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is included in **Chapter 7 [EN0110020/APP/6.7**]. 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 impact to Brampton-en-le-Morthen	9	After the non-statutory consultation, the Applicant removed solar areas south of Brampton en le Morthen beyond the crest of a hill and existing hedgerows to minimise potential visual impacts. The Applicant also removed proposed solar panels on land south west of the village to preserve a sense of arrival to the village from the west, and removed proposed panels on land at Brampton Common to	Yes

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		retain open land between the Proposed Development and other solar developments. See the **Consultation Report** [**EN0110020/APP/5.1] and Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** for further information**.**	
Concern about impact to Treeton	9	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 impact to Wickersley and Winthrop Gardens	7	After the statutory consultation, the Applicant removed proposed solar panels from around Kings Pond. There would be views from properties along the southern edge of Wickersley along Sandy Lane and Wood Lane as illustrated by Viewpoint 17, with Wickersley Woods screening views from properties in the west of Wickersley. There would be views from properties along Cutlers Walk with open views to the east. The views would be partially filtered by existing vegetation. Further information can be found in **Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7].**	Yes
Concern about impacts to landscape character	6	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

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Concern about impact to Ulley	6	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 views would be mitigated with vegetation, there would be visual impacts through gaps would be as illustrated by Viewpoints 41 and 39.	Yes
Concern about visual impact from villages	4	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	Yes

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		national energy goals. A full Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is included in **Chapter 7 [EN0110020/APP/6.7**].	
Concern about impact to Woodall	4	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 to local homes	3	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
Requests to consider impact from upper floors of homes	4	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	Yes

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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**].	
Concern about visual impact from roads	1	Potential visual impacts to road routes are detailed in **Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7].** The chapter assesses the A and B class roads in the area, including the A57, A618, A630, A631 and the B6094, B6376, B6060, B6059 and the B6463. The assessments show these roads have visibility of the Proposed Development at multiple points, however, due to the speed of those travelling along the roads, there would be fleeting transient views of the Proposed Development. Glint and glare is assessed in **Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16].** This find that there are some potential impacts to local roads, which can be mitigated through landscaping. Additional areas for these plantings have been included in the Order Limits.	Yes
Requests to consider Kiveton Community Woodland as viewpoint	1	**Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]** assesses the visual impacts at Kiveton Community Woodland and residential views in Wales and finds the impacts to be not significant.	Yes
Concern that plantings take time to grow in	2	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 residual visual impacts at year 1 and year 15 after landscaping has had time to grown in.	Yes

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Concern about impact to Whiston	1	In response to feedback from the statutory consultation, the Applicant included a 220m offset across land south of Upper Whiston to minimise impact on setting. Further information can be found in **Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7].**	Yes
Concern about impact to Harthill Reservoir	1	After the statutory consultation, the Applicant reduced the solar area to the northwest of Harthill Reservoir to minimise potential visual impacts for individuals using the PRoW. 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 Harthill Reservoir and finds the impacts to be not significant.	Yes
Masterplanning	**152**		
Objection to the size & scale of the proposals	92	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
Concern about impacts to PRoWs and permissive paths	21	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 via a Public Rights of Way Management Plan (PRoWMP). An **outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/7.7]** has been submitted with the Application.	Yes

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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].**	
Concern that the change is not enough	14	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
Concern about proximity to villages	4	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 proximity to homes	3	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	Yes

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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**].	
Concern about impact to bridleways	5	The design has incorporated at least a 15m buffer for PRoWs, including bridleways, 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 via a Public Rights of Way Management Plan (PRoWMP). An **outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/7.7]** 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].**	Yes
Concern about access to Slacks Farm/Slacks Lane/fishing ponds	6	The Applicant has included a permissive path around the fishing ponds near Wickersley. New additional permissive paths are presented in **Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7].**	Yes
Concern about solar in the area by the A57	1	The A57 runs horizontal through the Proposed Development in the southern extents of W2. The assessment shows it has visibility of the Proposed Development at multiple points, however, due to the speed of those travelling along the A road, there would be fleeting transient views of the Proposed Development. More information can be found in **Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact**	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]. Views from the A57 are illustrated by Viewpoints 22 and 23.	
Request for a permissive path to Kings Pond	1	The Applicant has included a permissive path around the fishing ponds near Wickersley. New additional permissive paths are presented in **Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7].**	No
Concern that permissive paths are not included	1	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].**	Yes
Request for more permissive paths	1	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].**	Yes
Support for the changes made to the proposals	1	Noted.	No
Support for landscaped areas	1	Noted.	No
Support for offsets from houses	1	Noted.	No
Noise & vibration	**33**		
General concerns about noise	14	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
Concern about construction noise	3	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	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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.	
Concern about operational noise	15	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 noise affecting animals	1	**ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** considers impacts to animals during the construction, operational and decommissioning phases, including impacts related to noise. No significant impacts caused by noise during these phases were identified in these assessments.	No
Other	**6**		
Concern about impact of glint and glare	4	Glint and glare is assessed in **Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16].** This find that there are some potential impacts to local roads, which can be mitigated through landscaping. Additional areas for these plantings have been included in the Order Limits.	Yes

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Concern about impact to amateur radio	1	There is no evidence that solar panels impact amateur radio.	No
Theories about weather manipulation	1	There is no evidence that any organisation is manipulating weather.	No
Safety & security	**26**		
Concern around fire risk from BESS	11	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. 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.	No
Concern around battery safety	2	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.	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		The **OBSMP [EN0110020/APP/5.15]** identifies the fire safety risks for the BESS installation and the mitigation measures. 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.	
Concern about fencing	10	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
Concern about theft	1	Security measures, such as fencing and CCTV, are included to prevent theft, as specified in the **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.14].**	No
General concern about safety	2	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.	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		The **OBSMP [EN0110020/APP/5.15]** identifies the fire safety risks for the BESS installation and the mitigation measures 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.	
Socioeconomics	**55**		
Concern about impacts to property values	31	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 the **Design Approach Document [Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/5.7].**	
Concern about reduction in tourism	2	The potential effects of the Proposed Development on tourism are assessed in **Chapter 15: Socio-Economics 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.	

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		The construction impact on tourism is expected to result in a Minor Adverse (Not Significant) effect overall.	
Concern about impact on tenant farmers	19	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. 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 impact to Winthrop Gardens	2	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. 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 impact to local businesses	1	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. 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).	

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Supply chain	**9**		
Concern around supply chain	9	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
Transport & access	**91**		
Concern about impact to A57	6	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 the **Consultation Report** [**EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information. 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 imposed upon the DCO. 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].**	No

Topic	Count	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.	
Concern about impact to A630	2	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 impact to Flash Lane	1	Traffic and transport impacts are considered in **ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]**. Potential effects at Flash Lane (ATC 19) are assessed in Section 13.7. As indicated by Table 13.18, 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	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		• 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 **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.	
Concern about the impact on local roads	54	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]** for further information. The updated Transport Statement includes trip generation, routeing and calculations **[EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]**. The assessment uses the trip generation detail provided in **Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and 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**.	Yes
Concern about impact on pedestrian safety	1	**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].** 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

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Concern about impact to Slacks Lane	2	Traffic and transport impacts are considered in **ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]**. Potential effects at Slacks Lane (ATC 72) are assessed in Section 13.7. As indicated by Table 13.18, the relevant thresholds for percentage increases in traffic flows have been exceeded at ATC 72, meaning it was therefore subject to additional assessment as part of the EIA process. Effects of major significance are predicted at ATC 72 for Severance, Non-Motorised User Amenity, and Non-Motorised User Delay. 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 mitigation measures are presented in Section 4 and Section 5 of the oCTMP.	No
Concern about impact to traffic around Clifton	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
Concern about impact to traffic around Firsby	1	Traffic and transport impacts are considered in **ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]**. Construction traffic for W1 will access the site via the A630, with no HGV traffic to be routed through Firsby. See **Figure 13.2 - Proposed HGV Routing - Whitestone 1 [EN0110020/APP/6.19].**	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Concern about impact to traffic around Harthill	1	Traffic and transport impacts are considered in **ES 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 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 **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.	No
Concern about impact to traffic around Kiveton Park	1	The percentage increase in HGV traffic around Hard Lane near Kiveton Park 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	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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. 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 mitigation measures are presented in Section 4 and Section 5 of the oCTMP.	
Concern about impact to traffic around Moat Lane	1	Traffic and transport impacts are considered in **ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]**. 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
Concern about impact to traffic around North Anston	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]** for further information. 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 imposed upon the DCO.	Yes

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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].**	
Concern about impact to traffic around Ravenfield	1	Traffic and transport impacts are considered in **ES 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 14: B6093, located south of Ravenfield • ATC 18: Moor Lane South, connecting Ravenfield and Bramley As indicated in Table 13.18, no additional HGVs are predicted to use these roads when comparing the baseline to the peak month of construction. Total vehicle increase will not exceed 0.1% for either location.	No
Concern about impact to traffic around Todwick	2	Traffic and transport impacts are considered in **ES 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	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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 **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.	
Concern about impact to traffic around Treeton	9	Traffic and transport impacts are considered in **ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]**. In response to feedback from the statutory consultation, the Applicant included a second access route to W2 to alleviate traffic pressure on Long Lane. Sensitive receptors were identified at the following locations near Treeton, which were subject to Automatic Traffic Counts and assessed as part of the EIA process: • ATC 24: Long Lane, located south of the A631 towards Treeton • ATC24*: Treeton Lane 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 mitigation measures are presented in Section 4 and Section 5 of the oCTMP	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Concern about impact to traffic around Woodall	2	Traffic and transport impacts are considered in **ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]**. Sensitive receptors were identified at the following locations near Woodall, which were subject to Automatic Traffic Counts and assessed as part of the EIA process: • ATC 62: Woodall Lane, located between Woodall and Harthill • ATC 68: Loverose Way: Located between A618 and Woodall Services • ATC 78: Killamarsh Lane, located between A618 and village of Woodall Of these, only ATC 68 (Loverose Way) is predicted to experience a daily traffic impact which exceeds the threshold for further examination. No effects of major significance are predicted. However, construction-related non-HGV traffic is anticipated at ATC 68 given it is a single-track road. Some driver and passenger delay is therefore expected. 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 mitigation measures are presented in Section 4 and Section 5 of the oCTMP	No
Concern about impact to Conisbrough Cemetery	1	Traffic and transport impacts are considered in **ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]**.	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Sensitive receptors were identified at the following locations near Conisbrough Cemetery, which were subject to Automatic Traffic Counts and assessed as part of the EIA process: • ATC 16: A630 Sheffield Road, located between Holywell Lane and Conisbrough Cemetery • ATC 69: A630, located between Conisbrough Cemetery and Old Road No effects of Major significance in EIA terms are predicted at either of these locations. 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 proposed embedded mitigation measures are presented in Section 4 and Section 5 of the oCTMP	
Concern about impact to Morthen Lane	1	Traffic and transport impacts are considered in **ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]**. Sensitive receptors were identified at Morthen Lane (ATC 73) meaning it was subject to Automatic Traffic Counts and assessed as part of the EIA process. As traffic counts at ATC 73 will be low (with a peak of three two-way vehicle movements per day), it was not subjected to further detailed assessment.	No
Concern that a traffic management plan not available	1	The Applicant has submitted an **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** with the Application.	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		This document will form the basis of the CTMP which will be provided prior to the commencement of construction works. Full details of proposed embedded mitigation measures are presented in Section 4 and Section 5 of the oCTMP.	

Table 2.1.3 Responses to question 3: Do you have feedback about the proposed permissive paths? Are there other paths you would like to see?

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design change
General	**429**		
General opposition to the Proposed Development	177	Noted.	No
No response	250	Noted.	No
General support for the Proposed Development	2	Noted.	No
Current and new proposed paths	**82**		
Concern about walking in fenced corridors	19	The Applicant has included a 10m offset between the paths and the fencing, and an additional 5m between the fencing and solar panels for 15m between the panels and path, or 30m total. Wherever possible, the Applicant has left one side of the path completely open to maintain a feeling of openness. See **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7].**	Yes
Concern about other impacts of walking near a solar farm	15	Potential EMF risk from walking near the solar farm and underground cables is assessed in **Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16]** and finds no significant impacts due to the timing an individual would spend in close proximity to a high voltage cable.	No
Concern about being limited to the permissive paths and public rights of way instead of open access to fields	12	The Applicant has consulted with landowners to identify existing permissive paths and included them in the **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7]** where possible. The solar areas would be fenced for safety and security, but the public rights of way would remain open subject to the **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/7.7].**	Yes
Requests for larger offsets	12	The Applicant has included a 10m offset between the paths and the fencing, and an additional 5m between the fencing and solar panels for 15m between the panels and path, or 30m total. Wherever possible, the Applicant has left one side of the path completely open to maintain a feeling of openness. See **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7].**	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design change
Concern about maintenance	10	The public rights of way and permissive paths would be maintained as described in the **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/7.7].**	No
Requests for signage, advertising, and other improvements	9	The public rights of way and permissive paths would be maintained as described in the **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/7.7].** Signage or other improvements could be provided through the community benefit fund, described in the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1].**	No
Concern about wildlife	5	Wildlife is assessed in **Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6],** which finds no significant impacts due to the permissive paths.	No
Impact on existing paths	**69**		
Request to leave existing paths unchanged	38	All existing public rights of way will remain open, other than temporary closures that may be needed during the construction period for safety reasons. They will be maintained as described in the **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/7.7].**	No
Concern about visual impact to existing paths	25	The Applicant has included a 10m offset between the paths and the fencing, and an additional 5m between the fencing and solar panels for 15m between the panels and path, or 30m total. Wherever possible, the Applicant has left one side of the path completely open to maintain a feeling of openness. **Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]** assesses the visual impact from the public rights of way at both year 1 (just after construction) and at year 15 (after landscaping has had time to grow. Some significant impacts are found at Footpath 16 (Conisbrough Parks), Bridleway 4 (Ulley), and Footpath 8B (Wickersley). See **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7].**	Yes
Concern about temporary closures	6	All existing public rights of way will remain open, other than temporary closures that may be needed during the construction period for safety reasons. They will be maintained as described in the **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/7.7].**	No
New proposed permissive paths	**177**		

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design change
Statements that the consultee would not want a new path through or with views of a solar farm	55	The Applicant has included a 10m offset between the paths and the fencing, and an additional 5m between the fencing and solar panels for 15m between the panels and path, or 30m total. See **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7].**	No
Concerns about how the proposed paths are displayed on the masterplan	26	The Applicant has updated the masterplan to more clearly show the permissive paths, which is included in the **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7].**	No
General opposition to the proposed permissive paths	22	Noted.	No
Statement that the new paths are not enough to offset the impacts of the project in general	18	The proposed permissive paths are one of the benefits of the Proposed Development, in addition to the renewable energy it would produce, local jobs and skills it could support, as well as the community benefit fund.	No
Concern that permissive paths are not legally binding and need to be secured	15	The permissive paths are part of the Proposed Development that the Applicant intends to bring forward.	No
Request to include equestrians	14	Equestrians would be welcome users of the permissive paths.	No
Support for proposed paths	9	Noted.	No
Request for permissive paths to include cyclists	1	Cyclists would be welcome users of the permissive paths	No
Request for permissive paths in specific locations	**16**		
Request for permissive path near Slacks Lane	5	This is included in the **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7].**	Yes

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design change
Request for permissive path from to Kings Pond	1	This is included in the **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7].**	Yes
Request for permissive path between Harthill and Woodall	1	This is included in the **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7].**	Yes
Request for permissive path from Brampton to Todwick	1	This is included where possible, connecting Brampton to Anston and to existing PROWS that connect to Todwick, as shown in the **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7].**	Yes
Request for permissive path to Kiveton Woodland	1	Existing PROWs connect to Kiveton Woodland, no new ones are proposed in this area as shown in the **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7].**	No
Request for permissive paths connect existing PRoWs and amenities	1	The Applicant has included 14.5 km of new permissive paths to create new circular routes and connect key locations and existing PROWs across the site, as shown in the **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7].**	Yes
Request for permissive paths around Treeton	1	The portion of the Proposed Development that is near Treeton includes two new permissive paths to expand access in this area, however, the Proposed Development cannot include new permissive paths outside of the Order Limits, as shown in the in the **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7].**	Yes
Request for permissive path between Anston and surrounding villages	1	A new permissive path is included to connect Anston to Brampton to the north as shown in the in the **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7].**	Yes
Request for permissive path between Stocket Lane and Ulley Reservoir	1	This is included as part of a new circular permissive path around Ulley, as shown in the **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7].**	Yes
Request for permissive path from Common Lane to Hawkhill Lane	1	A new permissive path is included along Hawkhill Lane to Common Lane	Yes

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design change
Request for permissive path between Whiston, Ulley and Guilthwaite Common	1	This is included, as shown in the **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7].**	Yes
Request for permissive path between Todwick and South Anston to Common Road	1	This is included, as shown in the **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7].**	Yes

Table 2.1.4 Responses to question 4: Please provide any feedback you have on the potential locations for the substations and batteries.

Topic	Count	Applicant response	Design Change
General/No response			
General opposition to the Proposed Development	221	Noted.	No
General support for the Proposed Development	7	Noted.	No
No response	255	Noted.	No
Concern that cannot see substation on the masterplans	10	The potential locations for the substations were shown on the masterplan in purple and the potential locations for the substations with batteries were shown in dark blue. There were no substations proposed in Whitestone 3. See the **Consultation Report, Appendix D [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	No
Concern about other developments in the area including Brinsworth B Substation, and the Hard Lane BESS	19	Cumulative impacts with these developments are considered in **Chapter 17: Cumulative Impacts [EN0110020/APP/6.17]** which finds no significant impacts.	No
General concerns about substations			
Concern about proximity to houses/villages	31	The potential substation locations were selected because they are at least 300m from homes to minimise potential noise impacts, specified in the **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.14]**. For Whitestone 1, the final location was selected to be the option in the centre of the area, rather than the option closer to Clifton to reduce impacts. For Whitestone 2, the primary substation was selected to be closer to the grid connection point to minimise impacts, though this is near the settlement of Upper Whiston. See the **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7].**	Yes
General concern about batteries and fire risk	25	The Applicant has consulted with South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue on the developing masterplan through ongoing engagement and consultation, as described in the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1].** The battery location	Yes

Topic	Count	Applicant response	Design Change
		has been selected and designed around guidance for fire risk safety, including having two access points to the location. The Applicant has produced an **oBSMP [EN0110020/APP/7.8]** through consultation with South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue. The Applicant has also produced a **BESS Plume Assessment [EN0110020/APP/7.12].**	
General concern about noise impacts of substations	18	The substations do make a buzzing sound, so their locations have been selected to be at least 300m from any home, as specified in the **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.14].** The Applicant has also committed to increasing nighttime noise by no more than 5db above baseline levels at homes, to minimise impacts. See **Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14].**	Yes
General concern about visual impact of substations	11	The Applicant identified the potential substation locations based primarily on technical feasibility, with consideration of flood risk, topography, and proximity to homes. The Applicant did not select the proposed location near Clifton, which would have been visible from the heritage village. The locations which were selected, in Whitestone 1 in the centre of the parcel, and in Whitestone 2 near Upper Whiston and Hardwick have been selected because they reduce other potential impacts. To reduce the visual impacts in these locations, the Applicant has included landscaping, as shown in the **mitigation plan [EN0110020/APP/2.9]** and managed by the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/7.6].** The remaining visual impact of these substations is assessed in **Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/7.6]**. The Applicant has developed Zones of Theoretical Visibility of the substations **Figures 7.9 and 7.10: ZTVs [EN0110020/APP/6.19]**, which show that there would be small patches of visibility in Conisbrough, Bramley and Thrybergh, as well as Whiston and Brinsworth, but that these would be minimal.	Yes
General concern about impacts to traffic	9	The Applicant has removed the proposed location near Clifton, in part due to concerns about construction traffic to access this location. See the **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7].** The remaining substation options that have been selected have been assessed in **Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13**], with no significant impacts identified.	Yes

Topic	Count	Applicant response	Design Change
General concern about flood risk	4	The original substation locations were selected to be in locations with low flood risk. **Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** includes the full assessment and finds no significant impacts.	No
Concern about impact to wildlife	16	The final substation locations will be selected with appropriate offsets for key habitats within the **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.14**]. This includes the following offsets: 5m from hedgerows, 10m from watercourses, 15m from trees, 25m from woodland, and no works within the root protection areas of veteran trees. **Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** includes the full assessment of the development on wildlife and finds no significant impact.	No
Specific feedback about proposed locations	26		
W1: Concern about location near Clifton	5	The Applicant did not select this option was in response to feedback about concerns at this location. The updated **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7]** shows that this option is no longer included.	Yes
W1: Concern about any locations near Conisbrough	1	A substation is needed for Whitestone 1 to collect the energy from the solar panels and increase the voltage before transferring it through underground cables to the primary substation. While is it not technically possible to remove all of the substation options in Whitestone 1, the Applicant has selected the option in the centre of the parcel, furthest from settlements, as shown in the **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7]**.	No
W1: Concern about locations on Park Lane	1	The Applicant selected the locations in the centre of Whitestone 1 as the final option because they are further away from settlements and homes. While the **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7]** shows the whole field being available for the substation, the substation would only need a smaller area as described in the **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.14]** and would be placed as far from Park Lane as possible, pending further environmental assessments.	Yes
W1: Support for locations in the centre of the site	1	This is what was selected, as shown in the **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7].**	Yes

Topic	Count	Applicant response	Design Change
W2: Concern about location near Upper Whiston	13	This was the option selected by the Applicant because it is closest to the grid connection point. To reduce potential visual impacts to Upper Whiston, landscaping is included for mitigation as shown on the **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7]**	Yes
W2: Support for location near Brinsworth and Whiston	2	This was the selected option to help reduce potential impacts.	Yes
W2: Concern about locations near Brampton	2	The masterplan during consultation showed 5 potential locations for substations in Whitestone 2, none of which are in Brampton. The options that were selected are the primary substation near Upper Whiston and the M1, and the secondary substation near Hardwick, as shown in the **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7]**.	No
W2: Concern about location near Wickersley	1	There was no option for a substation near Wickersley. The nearest option was the proposed location near Upper Whiston, which was selected because of its proximity to the grid connection. The Applicant has considered the BESS developments near Wickersley in the Cumulative Impact assessment in **Chapter 17 [EN0110020/APP/6.17].**	No

Table 2.1.5 Responses to question 5: Please provide any feedback on the potential cable route options.

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
General	**479**		
No response	327	Noted.	No
General opposition to the Proposed Development	146	Noted.	No
General support for the Proposed Development	6	Noted.	No
No response/Cannot see cable routes on masterplan	11	The cable routes were included in the Consultation Booklet and the Construction Masterplan, see the **Consultation Report Appendix D - Statutory Consultation Materials [EN0110020/APP/5.1].**	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
General concerns about cabling	**105**		
Concern about general disruption during construction	47	The impacts during construction are assessed in all of the ES chapters for various topics, **[EN0110020/APP/6.6-6.18]** and would be managed by the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/7.2]** to minimise impacts. No significant impacts are anticipated due to noise, traffic or air quality during construction.	No
Concern about potential impacts to wildlife	21	**Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** assesses impacts of the Proposed Development and finds that there would be significant impacts during construction on native hedgerows and wet woodlands, but this is not specific to the cable routes.	No
Concern about traffic impacts on local roads during construction	18	Construction traffic is assessed in **Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** which finds no significant impacts.	No
Concern about visual impacts and support for underground cable	7	All cables would be underground and not visible after construction. See **Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]** for further information.	No
Concern about health and safety impacts from high voltage cables	6	EMF is considered in **Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16]** which finds no significant impact on health and safety from the cable routes.	No
Concern that the cable route is too wide	2	The cable route will be narrowed through detailed design, subject to further investigations.	No
Concern about impacts to public rights of way	2	All public rights of way will remain open, other than temporary closures which may be needed for safety reasons during construction. They will be managed according to the **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/7.7]** to minimise impacts.	No
Concern about impacts to watercourses	1	The Applicant would likely use trenchless crossings to minimise impacts to watercourses, which are assessed in **Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** which finds no significant impacts.	No

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Concerns about decommissioning and leaving cables in place	1	The Applicant has committed to removing cables less than 1m below the surface as part of the **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) [EN0110020/APP/7.4].** Impacts on soil quality are assessed in **Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9],** which finds no significant impacts.	No
Concerns about impacts to landowners	**7**		
Concern about displaced livestock	5	Construction on the cable route would be temporary, and normal agricultural activities could resume after construction is complete. These would be managed by the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [EN0110020/APP/7.2]** to minimise impacts at specific locations.	No
Concern about use of Compulsory Acquisition	2	The Applicant aims to come to voluntary agreements with landowners wherever possible. The status of these negotiations is included in the **Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker [EN0110020/APP/4.4].**	No
Specific feedback about cable route options	**28**		
Whitestone 1			
Concern about impact on disused railway	1	The Applicant has engaged with the landowner to minimise impacts to the disused railway and cross at the least impactful location. See the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	Yes
Concern about impact on Bramley	1	The Applicant has selected the cable route option nearer Bramley instead of the option closer to Hellaby to reduce impacts. See the **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7] and Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]**	No
Concern about impact on Hellaby and Maltby	3	The Applicant has not selected the cable route option near Hellaby or Maltby to reduce impacts. See the **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7] and Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]**	Yes

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Concern about impact on Wickersley	1	The Applicant has selected the cable route options that are closer to Wickersley to reduce impacts. See the **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7] and Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]**	No
Concern about impact on Bridleways and Equestrians near Ravenfield	1	The Applicant has expanded the cable option in this location after the statutory consultation, in response to removing the proposed substation and panels near Clifton and to reduce impacts. See the **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7] and Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]**. Impacts to public rights of way would be managed by the **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/7.7]** to minimise impacts.	No
Whitestone 2			
Concern about impact on Spa Farm	12	Construction on the cable route would be temporary, and normal agricultural activities could resume after construction is complete. These would be managed by the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/7.2]** to minimise impacts at specific locations.	No
Support for 2b over 2a	1	This was not selected to avoid impacts to other proposed developments and impacts. See the **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7]** and **Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]** for further information.	No
Concern about impact on Whiston	1	The **masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7]** includes optionality to connect into the National Grid substation. There is a cable route option near Whiston, as well as another option to connect south of the M1. See **Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]** for further information.	Yes
Support for cabling along the M1	3	The Applicant has included cable options along the motorway wherever possible to minimise impacts. See the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** and **Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]** for further information.	Yes
Whitestone 3			
Concern about impact to the A57	1	Through the targeted consultation, the Applicant added a cable route option to avoid cabling near the A57. See the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** and **Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]** for further information.	Yes
Concern about impact to wildlife near Todwick	1	**Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** assesses impacts of the Proposed Development and finds that there would be	no

Topic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		significant impacts during construction on native hedgerows and wet woodlands, but this is not specific to the cable routes or Todwick.	
Concern about impact on field between Harthill and Woodall	2	No further changes to the cable route between the northern and southern sections of Whitestone 3 have been included at this time, however, through detailed design the Applicant will refine this corridor to minimise impacts.	No

Table 2.1.6 Responses to question 6: What would you like to see in the community benefit package? Are there other ideas that you think should be included or considered?

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Non response to the question	**477**		
General opposition to the Proposed Development	203	Noted.	No
No answer	232	Noted.	No
General opposition to community benefits	42	Noted.	No
Statements that the proposed amount is not enough	**48**		
Concern that the fund is not enough to compensate for the potential impacts	40	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]**. The Applicant has also sought to minimise impacts through the design process, as described in the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7].**	No
Request that the fund should be a higher amount per MW produced	8	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
Feedback about allocation and governance	**35**		
Request for local decision making	9	The Applicant has proposed that the community benefit fund be administered by a nominated fund manager, with a board to make funding decisions. See the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	Yes
Statement that it would not be enough when	8	The Applicant notes that the local community around the Proposed Development is large, with approximately 50,000 properties within 1km for the consultation zone, as	Yes

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
splitting between communities or individuals		described in the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]**. Therefore the Applicant does not propose to evenly distribute the fund to all individuals within this area, but to focus on key priorities that would make a difference.	
Concern about lack of commitment or details at this time	8	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, with a board to make funding decisions to support local initiatives. The Applicant will continue to engage with local stakeholders to further refine this proposal as the Proposed Development continues through the development process. See the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	No
Concern about fair allocation between communities	4	The Applicant is not proposing a formulaic approach to distribute the funding. Allocating evenly between all host parish councils would mean that smaller parishes benefit disproportionately, while parishes that are closer to the Proposed Development might receive less than they should. To mitigate this, the Applicant proposes that groups must apply for the funding rather than receive it directly. A board would decide how to approve funding based on local priorities. The Applicant will continue to engage with local stakeholders to further refine this proposal as the Proposed Development continues through the development process. See the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	Yes
Concern about having to apply for funds	3	The Applicant appreciates that there would be an administrative burden to apply for funds, however, this may be the best way to ensure that funds go to the highest priorities in the local area. The Applicant will continue to engage with local stakeholders to further refine this proposal as the Proposed Development continues through the development process. See the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	No

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Request to give funds directly to parish councils	1	The Applicant does not feel that this is the best way to ensure that funds go to the highest priorities. Instead, the Applicant proposes that groups, including parish councils, could apply for the funds and the funding decisions would be decided by the board. See the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	No
Request to not give funds directly to parish councils	1	As described above, the Applicant agrees that this is not the most effective approach.	Yes
Request to not give funds directly to local authority	1	As described above, the Applicant agrees that this is not the most effective approach.	Yes
Specific feedback	**86**		
Request for reduced energy bills	34	The fund would be available to support local initiatives, which could include reduced energy bills. See the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	Yes
Request for direct compensation to local properties	7	The Applicant is not proposing any direct compensation as part of the community benefit package. The Applicant has sought to develop the Proposed Development in a way to minimise impacts on local properties, including noise, visual impact, glint and glare, dust, and other factors. Please see the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7**], as well as **Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7], Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12], Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]** and the **Glint and Glare assessment in Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16].**	No
Request for solar panels for local homes, businesses, schools and hospitals	7	The Applicant is proposing that the community benefit fund be available to support local initiatives. These could include all of the options described in feedback here. Funding decisions on specific proposals would be decided by the board to allocate funding to specific proposals. See the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	Yes
Request to create and support green spaces	6		

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Request for improvements for local facilities	5		
Request for education programmes	4		
Request for improvements to street safety	4		
Request to support local charities	3		
Request to support Chesterfield Canal	3		
Request to support youth programmes and facilities	2		
Request for support for health care facilities and programmes	2		
Request for campaign against fly tipping	1		
Request to provide energy efficient grants	1		
Request to support art	1		
Request for support in Conisbrough generally	1		
Request for use of local employment	4	Separate to the Community Benefit Fund, the Applicant intends to use local labour whenever possible. This is described further in the **Outline Skills and Supply Chain Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/7.11].**	Yes
Request to provide funds before construction	1	This is not currently envisioned by the Applicant because the Proposed Development will not begin to generate revenue until construction is complete, and it becomes operational.	No

Table 2.1.7 Responses to question 7: Do you have any comments on the environmental topics and the mitigation proposed?

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
General non response	**360**		
No response	283	Noted.	No
General opposition to the Proposed Development	72	Noted.	No
Support for the development	5	Noted.	No
General statements about the EIA	**94**		
General concern about environmental impacts	32	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
Statement that the mitigation is not enough	28	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.	Yes

Subtopic	Count	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 and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO.	
Concern that assessments were incomplete	11	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
Request for independent monitoring	7	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
Concern about trusting the assessments	7	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

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Statement that mitigation is not clear	3	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 showed the proposed areas for mitigation and enhancement in the statutory consultation materials. 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 and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO.	Yes
Concern about maintenance	3	Technical chapters of the **ES Volume 1, Chapters 6-17 [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** to **[EN0110020/APP/6.17]** provide a description of the environmental baseline, sensitive receptors and assessment of the likely significant effects from construction, operation (and maintenance), and decommissioning where this lies within the scope of the EIA.	No
Request for enhancement not mitigation	2	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.	Yes

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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 and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO.	
Statement about there being an inadequate survey period	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
Air quality	**4**		
General concern about air pollution	3	Air quality effects associated with the Proposed Development have been assessed within **ES Chapter 12: Air Quality** [**EN0110020/APP/6.12],** covering construction, operation and decommissioning. Construction-phase air quality impacts arising from on-site activities and construction traffic were assessed on a semi-quantitative basis in accordance with	No

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		IAQM guidance **[REF-13]**. 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 **[REF-13]** 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 of the **ES Chapter 12: Air Quality** [**EN0110020/APP/6.12]**. The mitigation will be secured through the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** submitted with the Application. A detailed CEMP will be prepared and approved prior to the commencement of construction to ensure appropriate controls are implemented.	
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	No

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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.	
Biodiversity and ecology	**123**		
General concern about impacts to wildlife	67	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. 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 **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**, which together are intended to deliver a substantial uplift in	No

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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 and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO. 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.	

Subtopic	Count	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.	
General concern about habitat loss	20	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 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 and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO. 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	No

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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.	
Concern about binding and measurable BNG commitment	19	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 and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO. 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	No

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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.	
Concern about deer	9	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 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**	No

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Delivery and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO. 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]**.	
Concern about creating wildlife corridors and the ability for wildlife to move across the Site	7	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 10% requirement. The approach to BNG, including detailed enhancement proposals and a commitment to a minimum 30-year management period, is presented in **ES**	No

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Delivery and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO. 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.	
Concern about impacts to ponds	1	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 aquatic habitats 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 are anticipated.	No

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Climate change	**10**		
Concern that the footprint of the development is not offset by the production of renewable energy	7	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]** 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 SF_6-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 **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and associated Soil Management Plan, in accordance with Requirement 4 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 construction traffic, fuel use and waste. Measures to reduce construction impacts include low-carbon design choices, reducing the use of high-impact materials where	No

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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 CO_2e over the 60-year lifetime of the Proposed Development, the project is expected to deliver a clear net environmental and climate benefit.	
Specific concern that the panels would be shipped from China	3	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]** 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 SF_6-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 gCO_2e/kWh, substantially lower than gas-fired generation. Over its 60-year lifetime, the Proposed Development is expected to avoid approximately 18 million tonnes of CO_2e, delivering a clear net climate benefit and supporting regional and national net zero ambitions.	No

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Consultation	**12**		
Statement that consultation was not sufficient	3	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 the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** for further information.	No
Concern about ambiguity in materials, the use of 'potential' and 'could'	3	Throughout the pre-application period, the Applicant presented documents that were marked 'draft', 'indicative' or 'potential', and all descriptive text was written in the subjunctive tense, including 'would' or 'could'. This represents the fact that the Proposed Development has not yet been consented or constructed, and that many of the items were being presented for consultation and would therefore be subject to change. See the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** and **Appendix D Statutory Consultation Materials [EN0110020/APP/5.1].**	No
Statement that materials were difficult to understand	3	Consultation materials were written in plain, non-technical language for general audiences. In addition to the consultation booklet **Appendix D Statutory Consultation Materials [EN0110020/APP/5.1],** the Applicant also provided a non-technical summary of the draft ES, and the full draft ES for interested parties. The Applicant notes that the draft ES is a technical document that is written for technical audiences, it was made available for anyone who wanted to view it, but not necessary to respond to the consultation. See the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	No
Concern about sufficient consultation with technical consultees	2	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 technical bodies. The	No

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Applicant continues to engage with these organisations through the **Potential Main Issues for Examination [EN0110020/APP/5.10]** and statements of common ground.	
Statement that there was not enough information	1	The Applicant provided sufficient information to respond to the consultation. As detailed in the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** and **Appendix D Statutory Consultation Materials [EN0110020/APP/5.1].** Guidance for good consultation set in the Gunning Principles establishes that consultation should take place at a point early enough in the project's development that changes can still be made. To meet this requirement, the Applicant presented the initial environmental assessments and the proposed masterplan which still included some optionality in several cases. The Applicant explained how the final locations of key infrastructure would be determined.	No
Flood Risk	**17**		
General concern that the proposed development would increase existing flooding issues	17	Impacts on water resources and flood risk are assessed in **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
Health	**10**		
Concern about impacts to mental health and wellbeing	8	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.	No

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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.	
General health concerns	2	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 **Outline PRoW Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.14])**. As a result, no adverse effects on human health from access to physical activity are anticipated. 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].**	No
Heritage	**12**		
Concern about heritage in general	2	Impacts on heritage assets are assessed in **Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8**]. With the implementation of embedded	No

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		mitigation measures, as outlined within Section 8.6 of Chapter 8, no significant direct effects are predicted 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. Minor Adverse effects to two Grade II Listed Buildings have also been predicted to: • 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.	
Specific concern about Conisbrough Castle	4	Impacts to Conisbrough Castle are assessed in **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	No

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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.	
Specific concern about the Conisbrough Deer Park	2	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
Specific concern about the Roman Villa	4	Impacts on heritage assets are assessed in **Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8**].	Yes

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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.	
Landscape and visual impact	**34**		
General concern about visual impacts	28	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	Yes

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		national energy goals. A full Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is included in **Chapter 7 [EN0110020/APP/6.7**].	
Concern that landscaping takes time to grow	5	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 residual visual impacts at year 1 and year 15 after landscaping has had time to grown in.	No
Concern about the visual impact of the PCS units	1	The components of the PCS would be housed together in a single enclosure, designed in muted colours to blend in with the surrounding landscape. The enclosure will be limited to 3.5m in height. See **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]** for further information.	No
Masterplan	**19**		
Concern about ambiguity of the location of some components, including substations and cable routes	3	The consultation materials for the statutory consultation showed potential locations for these components for the purposes of consultation. In response to feedback, and environmental and technical assessments, the Applicant was able to select the final locations for these components as presented in the updated **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7].**	No
Concern about impacts to Kiveton	1	**Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]** assesses the visual impacts at Kiveton Community Woodland and residential views in Wales and finds the impacts to be not significant.	No
Concern about impact to 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]** and **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** for further information.	Yes
Concern about using agricultural land for mitigation	1	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	No

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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 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.	

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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/APP/6.20]**. 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.	
Concerns about impacts to Public Rights of Way and recreation	10	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 via a Public Rights of Way Management Plan (PRoWMP). An **outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/7.7]** 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].**	Yes

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Concern about temporary closures to PRoWs during construction	1	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 via a Public Rights of Way Management Plan (PRoWMP). An **outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/7.7]** 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].**	Yes
Concerns about impacts to bridleways	1	The design has incorporated at least a 15m buffer for PRoWs, including bridleways, 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 via a Public Rights of Way Management Plan (PRoWMP). An **outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/7.7]** 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].**	Yes
Concern about impacts to PRoWs around Brampton	1	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]**.	Yes

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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/7.7]** 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].**	
Noise	**5**		
General concern about noise	3	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
Concern about operational noise	2	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.	Yes

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Operational noise impacts for all receptors are either Negligible or Minor, which would be Not Significant in EIA Regulation terms.	
Safety	**4**		
Concern about potential fires from the battery units	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. 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.	No
Socio-economics	**2**		
Concern about impacts to local farmers	1	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.	

Subtopic	Count	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 local housing values	1	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]** for further information.	
Soils	**6**		
Concern about soil degradation	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;	No

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		• 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/APP/6.20]**. 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]**.	
Concern about soil contamination	1	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

Subtopic	Count	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 sterilisation	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 [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.	No

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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/APP/6.20]**. 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]**.	
Traffic	**15**		
General concerns about increased traffic on local roads	10	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 the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information. The updated Transport Statement includes trip generation, routeing and calculations **[EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]**.	Yes

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		The assessment uses the trip generation detail provided in **Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and 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**.	
Concern about traffic around Whiston	1	Traffic and transport impacts are considered in **ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]**. Potential effects in locations near Whiston are assessed in Section 13.17. Of these, only Pleasley Road (ATC 82) required further assessment due to surpassing the threshold for the percentage increase in daily HGV traffic during the peak month of the construction period. No effects of either moderate or major significance are predicted at this location.	No
Concern about traffic on the A630	1	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.	Yes
Concern about traffic on Slacks Lane near the Bramley Cemetery	1	Traffic and transport impacts are considered in **ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]**. Potential effects at Slacks Lane (ATC 72) are assessed in Section 13.7 of Chapter 13. The relevant thresholds for percentage increases in traffic flows have been exceeded at ATC 72, meaning it was therefore subject to additional assessment as part of the EIA process. Effects of major significance are predicted at ATC 72 for Severance, Non-Motorised User Amenity, and Non-Motorised User Delay.	No

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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 mitigation measures are presented in Section 4 and Section 5 of the **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12].**	
Concern about traffic around Kiveton	1	The percentage increase in HGV traffic around Hard Lane near Kiveton Park 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. 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 mitigation measures are presented in Section 4 and Section 5 of the **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12].**	No
Concern about traffic and health impacts	1	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

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
Other topics	**17**		
General concern about cumulative impacts with other developments	15	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 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**). • **Intra-project effects** on ecological receptors are considered within the biodiversity assessment. **Biodiversity and Nature Conservation**	Yes

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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 LCAs, the cumulative change is **not of sufficient magnitude** to redefine LCAs/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**	

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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. **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 ZoI. 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**	

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Inter-project effects are not considered relevant to the Climate Change Risk Assessment (CCRA) in line with guidance. The In-Combination Climate 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 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.	

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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 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 PRoWs/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.	

Subtopic	Count	Applicant Response	Design Change
		• **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. • **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**.	
Concern about glint and glare	1	Glint and glare is assessed in **Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16].** This find that there are some potential impacts to local roads, which can be mitigated through landscaping. Additional areas for these plantings have been included in the Order Limits.	Yes
Concern about panels creating microclimates	1	The Applicant notes this concern, but there is currently no evidence to support the claim that the temperature of the land underneath the solar panels will change as a result of the Proposed Development.	No

Responses to question 8: Do you have any other comments you would like us to consider?

The responses from question 8 were included in Table 2.1.1 for analysis.

Appendix E2.2 Feedback from s47 consultees by email 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	25	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 **[REF-13]**. 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 **[REF-13]** 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 **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** submitted with the Application. A detailed 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	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		ecological receptors was therefore not required. As a result, no significant air quality effects are expected from construction traffic.	
General concern about the negative impact on air quality	21	Air quality effects associated with the Proposed Development have been assessed within **ES Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12],** covering construction, operation and decommissioning. Construction-phase air quality impacts arising from on-site activities and construction traffic were assessed on a semi-quantitative basis in accordance with IAQM guidance **[REF-13]**. 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 **[REF-13]** 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 of the **ES Chapter 12: Air Quality** [**EN0110020/APP/6.12]**. The mitigation will be secured through the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** submitted with the Application. A detailed 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.	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		During the operational phase, traffic associated with the Proposed Development will be limited to infrequent inspection, monitoring and maintenance activities. These are anticipated to comprise van-sized vehicle visits occurring approximately once per week on average to any one area of the Site. This level of traffic is negligible and below IAQM **[REF-13]** screening thresholds, and no significant operational air quality effects are predicted. At decommissioning, traffic movements are expected to be similar to, or lower than, those associated with construction, and air quality effects are therefore anticipated to be non-significant. As baseline traffic conditions cannot be reliably predicted several decades in advance, a traffic assessment will be undertaken prior to decommissioning, and appropriate mitigation measures will be agreed with the relevant authorities at that time. A Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP), including a Decommissioning Traffic Management Plan, will be prepared and secured by a requirement of the DCO to ensure potential air quality impacts are appropriately managed.	
Concern about increasing existing air pollution problems due to the M1 and M18	7	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 quality conditions in the area, including the influence of major roads such as the M1 and M18. 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**	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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 M1 or M18.	
Concern about worsening air pollution near Conisbrough	3	Air quality effects associated with the Proposed Development, including those affecting Conisbrough, have been assessed in **ES Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12],** with construction traffic data informed by **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13].** Construction traffic flows for both light-duty vehicles (LDVs) and heavy-duty vehicles (HDVs) have been assessed using the IAQM screening methodology **[REF-13]**. As a result of this screening, nine road links screened in for further consideration under the IAQM criteria **[REF-13]**, eight of which are located in or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). These include Doncaster AQMA No. 2 and AQMA No. 5, which can be viewed in **ES Volume 3, Figure 12.1: Air Quality Study Area [EN0110020/APP/6.19]** and which encompass roads such as the A630 through Conisbrough and Warmsworth, where construction traffic accessing the northern part of the Site would travel. The assessment recognises that parts of the road network near Conisbrough are within an existing AQMA due to elevated nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) concentrations, and this context has been fully accounted for in the assessment. **ES Chapter 12: Air Quality** [**EN0110020/APP/6.12]** considers a large number of nearby human receptors, which includes receptors within Conisbrough, ensuring that potential effects on local residents have been appropriately assessed. While the overall construction period is expected to last between 24 and 36 months, construction is anticipated to be phased, and activities will not occur across all	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		areas simultaneously, which further limits the potential for sustained impacts on local air quality. Construction-phase air quality impacts from activities and traffic have been assessed on a semi-quantitative basis in accordance with IAQM guidance **[REF-13]**. Embedded mitigation measures are set out in Section 12.6 of **ES Chapter 12: Air Quality** [**EN0110020/APP/6.12]**, with all construction-phase air quality impacts predicted to be **Not Significant** following mitigation. These measures will be secured through the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and implemented throughout construction, ensuring that any potential effects on air quality near Conisbrough are appropriately managed.	
Concern about dust	2	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.	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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.	

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Alternatives & Site Selection			
Concern about the loss of or impact to agricultural land	371	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 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:	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		• 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/APP/6.20]**. 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	

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		to agriculture is climate change, which is already having impacts on crop production in the UK and around the world.	
Concern about loss of the Green Belt	283	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	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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].**	
Support for solar on rooftops or brownfields instead of agricultural fields	214	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

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
General objection to the location of the proposed solar farm	202	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 of the ES [EN0110020/APP/6.4].** The Applicant undertook a site selection process between November 2023 and January 2024. This site selection process used a 12 km search radius to identify potential land to include in order to minimise potential impacts from the cable route.	No
Concern about the impact to food security	68	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	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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, 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]**,	

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		including tabulated areas. The ALC survey is detailed in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. 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.	
Concern about use of BMV land	40	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 undertook a site selection process between November 2023 and January 2024**.** During this 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	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		were discounted for reasons including size constraints, environmental designations, topography, proximity to settlements and landowner availability. 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.	

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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/APP/6.20]**. Agricultural use will not be permanently lost across the Site. 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.	
Statements of support for other forms of energy generation	40	National policy calls for 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. 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 **ES Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4].**	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Objection to net zero policy	33	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 national energy targets also aim to develop more renewable energy sources in the UK to support energy security and reduce reliance on foreign energy supplies. Recent 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 decommissioned, 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]**.	No
Objection to the need for solar	24	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

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.	
Concern that the grid connection is far away from the solar area	1	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 of the ES [EN0110020/APP/6.4].**	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		The Applicant undertook a site selection process between November 2023 and January 2024. This site selection process used a 12 km search radius to identify potential land to include in order to minimise potential impacts from the cable route.	

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Biodiversity			
General concern about loss of wildlife	280	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. Solar areas will be fenced for safety, however, mammal gates will be included to ensure that wildlife can traverse the Site. See the **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.14]** for further information. 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	Yes

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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 and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO. 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.	
Concern about impact to birds	86	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]**.	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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 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.	

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Concern about impact to deer	66	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 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 and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO. 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	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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. 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.	
Concern about habitat loss	64	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 10% requirement. The approach to BNG, including detailed enhancement proposals and a commitment to a minimum 30-year management period, is presented in **ES**	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]. Delivery and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO. 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.	
Concern about impact to badgers	37	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	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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 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	29	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	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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 [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.	

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Concern about impact to great crested newts	16	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
Concern that mitigation will not make a difference	21	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	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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 and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO. 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	

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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.	
Concern about impact to owls	18	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 **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.	No
Concern about loss of hedgerows and trees	19	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	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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 the draft DCO, 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, 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.	
Impact to Firsby Nature Reserve and Ravenfield Ponds	12	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	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		and noise. As a result, no significant adverse effects to the aquatic habitats or species within Firsby Reservoir LNR are anticipated.	
Requests for mitigation	7	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 and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO. 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	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		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.	
Impact to Firsby Nature Reserve and Ravenfield Ponds	6	Impacts on Firsby Nature Reserve and Ravenfield Ponds are assessed in **Chapter 10 Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10].** 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
Concern about impact to bees	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.	No

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 and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO. 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.	

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Impact to Brampton Local Wildlife Site	1	Brampton Common Local Wildlife Site (LWS) is partially located within the Order Limits and will therefore be directly affected by the Proposed Development. Of the 145 ha LWS, approximately 81 ha lies within the Site, with only around 25% proposed for solar infrastructure. The remainder will be retained as green infrastructure, providing opportunities for habitat protection and enhancement. The LWS is designated for its native species-rich hedgerows and skylark population. Survey results indicate that skylark density within the LWS is currently low due to sub-optimal habitat management. The **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** includes targeted measures to enhance skylark habitat, native hedgerows and grassland management, alongside the creation of wet grassland and scrapes to support wading birds. These measures are expected to improve the condition of the designated features over time. Some short-term, localised adverse effects will occur during construction, including limited permanent loss of a small section of Important Hedgerow to facilitate safe access. However, hedgerow losses will be minimised, protected through the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, and compensated through enhancement and restoration proposals. Collectively, the proposals are expected to deliver a long-term beneficial outcome for Brampton Common LWS, supported by ongoing engagement with RMBC, YWT and other stakeholders.	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Climate change			
Environmental concerns about panel supply chain	41	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]** 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 SF_6-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 gCO_2e/kWh, substantially lower than gas-fired generation. Over its 60-year lifetime, the Proposed Development is expected to avoid approximately 18 million tonnes of CO_2e, delivering a clear net climate benefit and supporting regional and national net zero ambitions.	No
Environmental impact of importing food because of food security issues	14	To meet national energy targets for solar development would require only 0.4% of UK land, which is a minimal impact on agricultural production. The Applicant is also exploring opportunities to continue agricultural production through sheep grazing under the panels. Therefore no impact due to increased importing of food is anticipated. **ES Chapter 15: Socioeconomics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15]** assesses the impacts of the Proposed Development	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		on food security. Following the end of the project lifespan, the land could be returned to agricultural production, resulting in no significant impacts on food security.	
Environmental impact of construction	3	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]** 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 SF_6-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 Requirement 4 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.	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
		The primary source of construction-phase GHG emissions relates to the embodied carbon of equipment and raw materials, with relatively small emissions arising from 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 CO_2e over the 60-year lifetime of the Proposed Development, the project is expected to deliver a clear net environmental and climate benefit.	

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Community benefits			
Concern about lack of community benefits	136	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. While there is no standard, the Applicant proposes a community benefit fund of £400 per MW per year, which is consistent with other UK solar developments. 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 final size and lifespan of the Proposed Development. The Applicant remains committed to continuing to develop the fund in partnership with the local community. See the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	No
Request for reduced energy bills	28	The fund would support local initiatives, which could include reduced energy bills. The structure and approach to the community benefit package will continue to evolve in response to further engagement with local stakeholders and communities. See the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	Yes
Concern about how the community benefit fund would be managed	3	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. The Applicant remains committed to continuing to develop the fund in partnership with the local community. See the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	No
Request for funding	2	The Applicant proposes that the fund would be open for applications, and specific funding decisions would be determined by the board, to support local initiatives. See the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	No
Request for compensation	1	The Applicant is not proposing direct compensation as part of the community benefit package. Through the design process, the Applicant has sought to minimise	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Community benefits			
		impacts on local properties including visual impacts, noise, dust and glint and glare. Please see the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7],** as well as the **EIA Chapters for Landscape and Visual Impact [EN0110020/APP/6.7], Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12], Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]** and **Glint and Glare [EN0110020/APP/6.16].**	

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Consultation			
Concern about there being inadequate consultation	234	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	148	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
Frustrations around the planning process	61	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
Issues with the feedback methods	2	The Applicant provided multiple methods for consultees to submit their feedback, as described in the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** This included both	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Consultation			
		traditional and digital methods for submitting feedback using the questionnaire either online or in printed version, as well as submitting open responses by email or freepost. The Applicant received a significant number of responses through all methods, which were functional throughout the consultation period.	
Concern about the dates and times of information events	2	The Applicant developed a programme of events at various days of week and time of day to accommodate different work/life schedules. 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.	No
Request for further consultation	1	The Applicant held two rounds of consultation as well as two targeted consultations in this pre-application period, as described in the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1].** While no further consultation is required, the Applicant does envision ongoing engagement with communities and local stakeholders if the Proposed Development is consented, through the post-consent and construction and operation stages.	No
Comment that consultation documentation was clear	1	Noted.	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Cumulative impacts			
Concern about other developments in the area	93	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 the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** for further information. 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**). • **Intra-project effects** on ecological receptors are considered within the biodiversity assessment.	Yes

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Cumulative impacts			
		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 LCAs, the cumulative change is not of sufficient magnitude to redefine LCAs/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	

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Cumulative impacts			
		• **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) • 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.	

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Cumulative impacts			
		Water Resources and Flood Risk 22 cumulative developments were identified within the relevant ZoI. 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 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**	

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Cumulative impacts			
		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 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 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.	

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Cumulative impacts			
		For PRoWs/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. • **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.	

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Decommissioning			
Concern that the land will not be returned to its original state	32	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**). Decommissioning would be a legal requirement of the DCO. 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 **Requirement 16 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
Concern about length of lifespan of the project	30	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.	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Decommissioning			
		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).** 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 **Requirement 16 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].** An **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/7.4]** has been submitted with the Application**.**	
Concern about panels not being recycled	19	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	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Decommissioning			
		through 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/7.4]** 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.	
Concern that insufficient information was provided about decommissioning	12	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. 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	

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Decommissioning			
		Requirement 16 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]. An **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/7.4]** has been submitted with the Application, ensuring a clear and regulated framework for future site restoration.	

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Developer details			
Concern that the developers are making a profit	68	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 **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]**, **ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6], Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** and the **Outline PRoW Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.14])**.	No
Concerns about the cost of the project	17	Whitestone Solar Farm is being brought forward by Whitestone Net Zero Ltd, with the overall project management provided by Green Nation. Solar farms like the Proposed Development do not receive any government subsidy and must be funded entirely through private sources. The 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	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Developer details			
		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].**	
Concern about where the developer is based	15	Whitestone is being brought forward by Whitestone Net Zero Ltd, with Green Nation acting as overall project manager. Green Nation is based in Somerset but has developments across the UK. The project team that has been brought on board to support the Applicant and the development process is based across the UK, but have travelled to the Site on many occasions to conduct environmental assessments or consult with local communities and stakeholders to gain local knowledge. See the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	No
Concern about Whitestone being the largest project by the developer	9	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. See the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Flood risk			
Concern about increasing flood risk	108	Impacts on water resources and flood risk are assessed in **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
Concern about impacts to drainage	32	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. 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, 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. It includes initial hydraulic calculations, proposed SuDS features, and maintenance plans. This will be developed further throughout the detailed design phase.	No
Concern about worsening existing flooding of Kearsley Brook and Conisbrough	26	Impacts on Kearsley Brook and Conisbrough are assessed in **Chapter 10 Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10].**	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Flood risk			
		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, 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.	
Concern about water contamination	16	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 worsening existing flooding at Treeton	10	Impacts on Treeton are assessed in **Chapter 10 Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10].**	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Flood risk			
		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, 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.	
Concern about worsening existing flooding at Whiston	5	Impacts on Whiston in relation to the flooding of Ulley Brook are assessed in **Chapter 10 Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10].** Small areas along the Ulley Brook, Anston Brook, and Broad Bridge Dyke are within Flood Zone 2 and 3. Whilst the Proposed Development will not increase flood risk, proposed mitigation for the potential flooding of Ulley Brook is to raise the solar panels in these areas, which is detailed in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20].**	Yes
Concern about impact to Harthill Reservoir	4	Impacts on Harthill Reservoir are assessed in **Chapter 10 Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10].** The reservoir is located to the east of W3, and the Proposed Development has the potential to directly impact these CRT assets through cabling/ access track works which could cause structural damage, but also through impacts to water quantity/quality. However, such effects would be temporary and controlled through standard pollution prevention measures and compliance with CRT requirements.	Yes
Concern about flooding near Hard Lane	4	Impacts on Hard Lane 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	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Flood risk			
		control and flood risk management measures, 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.	

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Health			
Concern about impact to mental health	108	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 **Outline PRoW Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.14]**). As a result, no adverse effects on human health from access to physical activity are anticipated.	No
Concern about impact to physical health	72	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 **Outline**	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Health			
		PRoW Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.14]). As a result, no adverse effects on human health from access to physical activity are anticipated. 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 of EMFs	7	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 that assessments are incomplete	2	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. 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];**	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Health			
		• **ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]; and** • **ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14].**	

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Heritage			
Impact to the Roman Villa	63	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
Impact to Conisbrough Castle	45	Impacts to Conisbrough Castle are assessed in **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, though this effect is considered to be Not Significant in terms of the EIA Regulations.	Yes

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Heritage			
		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.	
General concern about impact to heritage	68	Impacts on heritage assets are assessed in **Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8**]. With the implementation of embedded mitigation measures, 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.	Yes

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Heritage			
		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. Minor Adverse effects to two Grade II Listed Buildings have also been predicted to: • 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.	
Impact to the Conisbrough Deer Park	32	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	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Heritage			
		many changes. Therefore, whilst the deer park is acknowledged, it is assessed as part of the Conisbrough Castle Setting assessment.	
Impact to Clifton conservation village	12	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
Concern that assessments are incomplete	3	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
Impact to heritage of Brampton en le Morthen	2	Impacts on heritage assets are assessed in **Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8**]. Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant removed the fields south of Brampton en le Morthen from the Order Limits to reduce potential impacts to these homes and the Brampton en le Morthen Conservation Area.	Yes

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Land & soils			
Concern about land contamination	18	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. 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]**.	No
Concern about soil disturbance	16	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.	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Land & soils			
		Further information can be found in **ES Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.19]**.	
Concerns around a potential risk of subsidence due to historic mining	13	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 the reduction in the quality of the land	8	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.	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Land & soils			
		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/APP/6.20]**.	

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Land & soils			
		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]**.	
Concern that mitigation will not make a difference	1	Extensive assessments have been undertaken as part of the ES, which can be found in **ES Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.19]**.	No
Concern about dual land use	1	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]**.	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Land agreements & CPO			
Concern about landowners making a profit from the proposals	9	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	2	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]** for further information.	Yes

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Landscape & visual impact			
General concern about impacts to countryside views	321	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
Concerns around impacts to the area's rural character	70	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 rural in nature. 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

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Landscape & visual impact			
Concern about visual impact to Conisbrough Parks	57	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
Concern about visual impact from PRoWs	55	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**]. 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.	Yes

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Landscape & visual impact			
Concern about visual impact from Harthill and Woodall	37	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 that mitigation will not make a difference	35	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 and glare	26	A Glint and Glare Assessment is included in **Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16]** and the **Glint and Glare**	Yes

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Landscape & visual impact			
		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.	
Concern about visual impact from Ulley	19	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 views would be mitigated with vegetation, there would be visual impacts through gaps would be as illustrated by Viewpoints 41 and 39.	Yes
Concern about visual impact from Clifton	15	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 Clifton. Through consultation feedback	Yes

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Landscape & visual impact			
		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 to the proposals near Clifton include the removal of the area west of Clifton from the Order Limits and the removal of the proposed substation from south of Clifton off Beacon Lane. **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 Clifton. These are considered to be moderate to major adverse (significant) after the plantings have had sufficient time to grown in. There would be filtered views through trees from properties on the western edge of Clifton and from Beacon Hill as illustrated by Viewpoint 4.	
Concern about visual impact from Kiveton Park and Wales	15	**Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]** assesses the visual impacts at Kiveton Community Woodland and residential views in Wales and finds the impacts to be not significant.	Yes
Concern about visual impact from Treeton	10	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 Brampton en le Morthen	13	After the non-statutory consultation, the Applicant removed solar areas south of Brampton en le Morthen beyond the crest of a hill and existing hedgerows to minimise potential visual impacts. The Applicant also removed proposed	Yes

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Landscape & visual impact			
		solar panels on land south west of the village to preserve a sense of arrival to the village from the west, and removed proposed panels on land at Brampton Common to retain open land between the Proposed Development and other solar developments. See the **Consultation Report** [**EN0110020/APP/5.1]** and the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** for further information**.**	
Concern that assessments are incomplete	10	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
Requests for screening and mitigation	5	The **Illustrative Mitigation Plan [EN0110020/APP/2.9]** and the **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 residual visual impacts at year 1 and year 15 after landscaping has had time to grown in.	Yes
Concern about visual impact from Firsby	2	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
Concern about impact to Harthill Reservoir	1	After the statutory consultation, the Applicant reduced the solar area to the northwest of Harthill Reservoir to minimise potential visual impacts for	Yes

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Landscape & visual impact			
		individuals using the PRoW. 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 Harthill Reservoir and finds the impacts to be not significant.	

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Masterplanning			
Objection to the size & scale of the proposals	152	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
Concern about impacts to PRoWs and permissive paths	137	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 the **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 via a Public Rights of Way Management Plan (PRoWMP). An **outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/7.7]** 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].**	Yes
Objection to cable routes	43	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	Yes

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Masterplanning			
		options. This was narrowed down based on feedback and environmental assessments to the design submitted as part of the DCO. 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]**.	
Objection to locations of substations	28	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	Yes

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Masterplanning			
		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.	
Objection to locations of BESS	15	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. 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/7.12].**	Yes
Request for screening and mitigation	12	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.	Yes

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Masterplanning			
		Details of the mitigation planting is provided in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** submitted with the Application and secured by requirement 7 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]**.	
Request for reduction in panels near Harthill	4	The Applicant has reduced solar areas near Harthill. 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. See the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** and the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	Yes

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change?
Noise & vibration			
Concern about construction noise	111	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	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change?
Noise & vibration			
		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.	
Concern about operational noise	106	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
General concern about increased noise and vibration	28	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
Concern about impact of noise from the BESS	31	Operational noise effects in connection with the BESS system are assessed in **Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]**.	Yes

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change?
Noise & vibration			
		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 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	4	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 more than 100m away from residential properties where practicable **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.14]**.	Yes
Concern about noise being heard from footpaths	3	Noise impacts have been assessed in **ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14].** The power conversion stations would be located at least 50m from public rights of way, where practicable, as shown in the **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.14]**.	No
Concern that mitigation will not make a difference	1	Embedded mitigation measures in connection with the Proposed Development are assessed in **Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]**.	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change?
Noise & vibration			
		The **outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [EN0110020/APP/7.2**] defines the key construction activity principles that will be adhered to and developed during construction activities, including recommendations that represent good practice specific to the noise and vibration assessment, based on the assumed construction plant list and working methodologies. Operational mitigation measures are summarised in Section 14.16 of Chapter 14. Following mitigation, no significant adverse noise or vibration effects are expected in connection with the Proposed Development.	

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Safety & security			
Concern about BESS fire and safety	68	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. 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.	No
General concern about safety risks	12	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.	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Safety & security			
		The **Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (OBSMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.15]** identifies the fire safety risks for the BESS installation and the mitigation measures 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.	
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

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Socio-economics			
Concern about impacts to property values	159	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],** the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** and the **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** for further information.	Yes
Concern about impact on local economy	70	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. 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).	No
Concern about lack of employment opportunities	27	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 (FTE)s 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	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Socio-economics			
		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).	
Concern about reduction in tourism	9	The potential effects of the Proposed Development on tourism are assessed in **Chapter 15: Socio-Economics 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.	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Transport & access			
Concerns about disruption and increase in traffic due to construction	266	The impacts of construction traffic have been assessed, and details can be found in the **Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. When accounting for traffic it is assumed that each vehicle is making a 2-way trip, both to and from the Site. This includes HGVs and Light Vehicles. When selecting access routes, priority was given to major road networks over smaller local roads and roads with restrictions where possible. Where public rights of way interact with the Site, these areas will be managed to ensure safe passage for both pedestrians and vehicles. In addition, an **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** has been produced, with a commitment to provide a detailed version as the design develops. 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]** for further information. The updated **Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** includes trip generation, routeing and calculations. The assessment uses the trip generation detail provided in **Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the	Yes

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Transport & access			
		mitigation measures outlined in the **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]**, which is secured by a requirement in the **draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1**.	
Concern about road safety for pedestrians and equestrians	65	**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
Concern about using Doncaster Road (A630) for access	28	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.	Yes
Concern about access off the A57	24	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	Yes

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Transport & access			
		highway safety standards. See the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information. 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 imposed upon the DCO. 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].**	
Concern about use of Long Lane for access	13	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. See the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information. The **Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** provides estimates of vehicle volumes considered at these locations.	Yes

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Transport & access			
		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. 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	10	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.	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Transport & access			
		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]**.	
Concern about safety on Ruddle Lane and Beacon Lane	8	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]** for further information.	Yes
Concern that assessments are incomplete	5	Full assessments can be found in **ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** and the **Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20].**	No
Concern that mitigation will not make a difference	1	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]** for further information. The updated **Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** includes trip generation, routeing and calculations. The assessment uses the trip generation detail provided in **Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and 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**.	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Other			
Concern about lack of grid capacity	22	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
General concern about EIA assessments	22	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
Concern that EIA assessments are incomplete	40	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
Ethical concerns about panel manufacturing	13	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**	No

Feedback subtopic	Count of subtopic	Applicant Response	Design Change
Other			
		Chapter 15: Socioeconomics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15].	

Appendix E2.3 Feedback from s47 consultees by petition and Applicant Responses

The Applicant received 22 different templates of petitions. The number of each petition received is provided in the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]**. The below provides the full copy of each petition, with the Applicant Response.

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
Petition 1: Biodiversity		
I am responding to your statutory consultation regarding the proposed Whitestone One Solar Farm. Having reviewed your Draft Environmental Statement and Non-Technical Summary, I must object to both the inadequate consultation process and the severe environmental impacts this development will cause across multiple communities. FLAWED CONSULTATION ON ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS Your consultation process has fundamental failures: • Inadequate Survey Period: Environmental surveys appear insufficient for a development affecting such a large area and multiple communities • Limited Seasonal Data: Key species surveys lack sufficient seasonal coverage to assess year-round wildlife impacts around	Survey work has continued since Statutory Consultation and reported in appendices to **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6].** Surveys are undertaken in line with relevant guidance, and any limitations clearly stated in the reports and chapter for transparency with decision makers. 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 the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** for further information. In order to make the consultation as accessible as possible, the Applicant created three separate consultation booklets for W1, W2 and W3 which explained the proposals and environmental	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
Conisbrough, Ravenfield, Micklebring, Clifton, and Firsby • Community Knowledge Ignored: Local residents with decades of wildlife observation have not been properly consulted • Non-Technical Summary Deficiencies: Fails to explain complex ecological interactions in accessible language	information in non-technical language. During the statutory consultation, the draft ES was available for the public to view, which had a Non-Technical Summary included as an accessible summarised version of the document. This was available to download on the Applicant's website, view at public information events, take hard copies at events, and the Applicant sent out the printed copies of the Non-Technical Summary in the post on request.	
SEVERE BIODIVERSITY IMPACTS Habitat Destruction and Wildlife Corridor Disruption Chapter 6 (Biodiversity and Nature Conservation) underestimates devastating impacts across this ecologically connected landscape. The development will create a massive industrial barrier severing traditional wildlife movement routes between: • River Don valley habitats and countryside toward Tickhill • Ancient woodland around Old Denaby and agricultural areas near Ravenfield • Wetland habitats and upland areas serving migrating species • Conisbrough area and countryside toward Maltby Community-Specific Impacts:	**Loss of biodiversity** An assessment of potential impacts to ecological receptors is presented in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]**. 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. Solar areas will be fenced for safety, however, mammal gates will be included to ensure that wildlife can traverse the Site. See the **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.14]** for further information. 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	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
• Conisbrough: Loss of established bird territories and bat foraging areas • Ravenfield: Destruction of traditional nesting sites and ancient hedgerows • Micklebring: Elimination of farmland bird habitat and small mammal populations • Clifton/Firsby: Loss of quiet rural environment crucial for sensitive species	with a mix of wildflowers and native grasses to support wildlife and increase biodiversity. This includes mitigation land south of the A630, and northeast of Firsby. 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. **Ancient woodland and hedgerow loss** **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. 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 the	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	draft DCO, 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, 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. **Wetland habitats** Enhancement proposals to aquatic, grassland, and hedgerow habitats within the Solar Array area have been presented in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and Development Design, with BNG measures recorded in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and referenced in this ES. Minimum buffer distances from retained sensitive habitat features within the Order Limits and adjacent are provided in the **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]** to avoid impacts. **Bird and bat territories** The Applicant recognises concerns regarding potential effects on birds and has undertaken a comprehensive programme of ornithological surveys to inform the Proposed Development.	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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 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	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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. 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	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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 enhance roosting opportunities. Collectively, these measures are expected to result in long-term beneficial and potentially significant effects for bats at a district scale. **Noise impacts on animals** Habitat management and monitoring are included in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**, buffer distances of the Proposed Development from habitats are specified within the **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]**, with light	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	and noise pollution addressed in the embedded mitigation Section 6.6 and the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**.	
Water Environment and Aquatic Ecology The Non-Technical Summary inadequately addresses impacts on water-dependent wildlife: • Wetland Disruption: Construction will affect seasonal flooding areas, pond systems supporting great crested newts, and mining subsidence pools now valuable wildlife habitat • Water Quality Impact: Industrial activities will cause sedimentation affecting aquatic invertebrates, chemical contamination, altered water temperatures, and disruption of natural cycles wildlife has adapted to over centuries	An assessment of potential impacts to ecological receptors is presented in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]**. **Wetland habitats** Enhancement proposals to aquatic, grassland, and hedgerow habitats within the Solar Array area have been presented in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and Development Design, with BNG measures recorded in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and referenced in this ES. Minimum buffer distances from retained sensitive habitat features within the Order Limits and adjacent are provided in the **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]** to avoid impacts. **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].**	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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. **Water quality**	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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.	
Protected and Notable Species Despite identifying significant wildlife populations, proposed protection is inadequate: • Bats: Multiple species use hedgerow networks connecting all communities. • Industrial lighting and 24/7 operations will disrupt established flight paths. Heat island effects will alter insect abundance, reducing food availability	**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]**.	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
• Great Crested Newts: Construction will disrupt terrestrial habitat and prevent genetic exchange between populations, potentially causing local extinctions • Birds of Prey: Eliminates hunting grounds for kestrels, buzzards, and barn owls while creating collision risks • Ground-Nesting Birds: Skylarks and lapwings will lose remaining habitat with no adequate compensation	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 [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	

Comment	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. **Lighting** Habitat management and monitoring are included in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**, buffer distances of the Proposed Development from habitats are specified within the **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]**, with light and noise pollution addressed in the embedded mitigation and the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**. **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 negative results for GCN in all ponds sampled, with no confirmed presence identified within	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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. **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	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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 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	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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.	
Microclimate and Construction Impacts Solar installations will create heat island effects (panels reaching 149°F), humidity changes, air current disruption, and soil moisture redistribution. Chapter 14 confirms construction will cause ground vibration, noise pollution, light pollution, and dust affecting wildlife across multiple communities during sensitive breeding seasons.	Construction would be managed by a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP). The **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** includes mitigation measures during construction. Habitat management and monitoring are included in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**, buffer distances of the Proposed Development from habitats are specified within the **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]**, with light and noise pollution addressed in the embedded mitigation Section 6.6 and the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**.	No
WATER CYCLE AND CLIMATE DISRUPTION The development will affect natural drainage patterns developed over millennia, groundwater recharge essential for wetland habitats, seasonal flooding cycles, and stream flow patterns. While claiming climate benefits, it will cause: a. Loss of carbon storage in agricultural soils b. Reduced vegetation cover affecting carbon sequestration	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

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
c. Heat island effects increasing local temperatures d. Altered precipitation patterns	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]**.	
INADEQUATE MITIGATION AND CUMULATIVE IMPACTS Proposed environmental measures are completely inadequate: • Wildlife corridors too narrow for ecological connectivity • Replacement habitats not secured before construction • Monitoring periods too short for long-term assessment • No compensation for decades of habitat loss	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. 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.	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
Chapter 17 (Cumulative Effects) fails to assess how this development, combined with other projects and climate change, will create ecological disaster across South Yorkshire. Multiple communities will simultaneously lose wildlife heritage when climate resilience requires stronger ecosystems. This development will cause irreversible ecological damage across multiple rural communities. The consultation has failed to engage meaningfully with residents understanding local wildlife patterns, and environmental information is inadequate. Climate action should enhance biodiversity, not destroy it. This application must be refused to protect remaining wildlife heritage and water environments that sustain it.	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 **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. Mitigation in relation to biodiversity is proposed in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** Cumulative effects have been assessed at the end of each technical chapter in relation to interactions with other projects.	
Petition 2: Consultation		
OBJECTION I am writing to formally object to your Development Consent Order application for the Whitestone One Solar Farm, specifically regarding the fundamentally flawed and inadequate consultation process that has failed to meet the legal requirements for meaningful community engagement under the Planning Act 2008. SYSTEMATIC EXCLUSION OF AFFECTED COMMUNITIES	To maintain the core value of accessibility, the Applicant produced a variety of consultation materials in various formats and accepted written feedback through a variety of methods. The Applicant produced a variety of documents at various levels of detail for different audiences. Short, plain language summaries were available through newsletters, leaflets and consultation booklets. These materials were available for the general public and written in plain language for general audiences to comprehend. For those individuals that wanted more information, the non-technical summary of the draft Environmental Statement provided more information on the Environmental Assessments	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
Digital Divide and Financial Barriers Your consultation systematically excludes the residents most affected by this development: • Prohibitive costs: Your Non-Technical Summary states hard copies of the full Environmental Statement cost "up to £750" - creating an unacceptable financial barrier to accessing essential information. • Over-reliance on digital platforms: Despite acknowledging the need to reach "people without internet access," your process relies heavily on online materials, excluding elderly residents in communities like Conisbrough, Ravenfield, Hooton Roberts, Micklebring, Clifton, and Firsby • Technical complexity barrier: The Environmental Statement uses impenetrable technical jargon that your own Non-Technical Summary fails to adequately translate for ordinary residents	written in slightly more technical language, while the draft ES provided the full detail for those audiences that wanted the technical information. To take part in the consultation, the consultation booklets provided enough information to understand the Proposed Development and provide informed feedback, while the other documents were provided for those individuals that wanted more information, but were not essential to respond to the consultation. Consultation materials were all provided digitally through the project website, whitestonesolarfarm.co.uk for download free of charge. These materials all remained available for reference throughout the preapplication period and continue to be accessible. To ensure that individuals who did not have digital access could also view the consultation materials, the Applicant also provided printed copies of these materials. The consultation booklet, questionnaire, masterplans, SoCC, and Non-Technical Summary of the Draft ES were all available at the public information events or by request. Many individuals did request paper copies of these materials, which the Applicant then printed and posted to them upon request. A total of roughly 1,000 copies of these materials were printed and made available to consultees at no charge. A copy of the draft ES was available to view at the public events and was also available at no charge via USB by request. There were several requests for this material by USB. The Applicant stipulated that print copies of the draft ES would be available upon request for £750. The total print cost of the full ES, which is	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	over 8,000 pages long was estimated at £10,000. Therefore, the £750 charge would be a heavily subsidised cost to help discourage excessive printing of this very large, technical document. After the last consultation event, the Applicant left the printed copy in the Ulley Village Hall so that it would be available for those individuals that wanted to read it. In order to make the consultation as accessible as possible, the Applicant created three separate consultation booklets for W1, W2 and W3 which explained the proposals and environmental information in non-technical language. During the statutory consultation, the draft ES was available for the public to view, which had a Non-Technical Summary included for an accessible summarised version of the document. This was available to download on the Applicant's website, view at public information events, take hard copies at events, and the Applicant sent out the printed copies of the Non-Technical Summary in the post on request. More information can be found in the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1].**	
Inadequate Consultation Programme Your Statement of Community Consultation reveals systematic shortcomings: • Insufficient public events: Only 7 public events for a development affecting multiple communities across nearly 2,000 hectares • Poor geographic coverage: Smaller communities like Clifton, Firsby, and Hooton	A common concern was raised about the location and number of consultation events with requests for more events located in more villages. The public information events are only one component of the consultation and engagement programme, but an important part of the process. These in-person events allow individuals to view	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
Roberts poorly served, forcing residents to travel significant distances • Rushed timeline: 6 weeks is fundamentally inadequate for communities to understand hundreds of pages of technical documentation • Limited accessibility: Events poorly timed for working families, insufficient weekend options	consultation materials and converse with the project team to understand more about the Proposed Development. It is not possible to host public events in every village or hamlet near the Proposed Development. In many cases, there are not venues that would meet accessibility or size requirements to host large events. It would also not be proportionate to host this many events. Therefore, the Applicant developed a programme of events located at venues across the local area such that no one would need to travel more than roughly 15 minutes to access an event. The locations of the events were informed by consultation and engagement throughout the development process. For the non-statutory consultation, the events were informed by initial conversations with the local authorities, as well as desk-based research to identify appropriate venues that would be near the solar site. In response to feedback from MP John Healey, the Applicant added an additional venue in Conisbrough. Based on the attendance at the first round of events, the Applicant identified new venues for the second round of consultation, which were discussed in the SoCC consultation with local authorities. MP Jake Richards requested an event in Todwick, which the Applicant included in the second round of consultation. During the course of the statutory consultation, MP Sarah Champion requested the addition of another event in Treeton, which the Applicant added. The locations of events in the second round of consultation included some of the previous locations used in the first round, as well as new locations that had been identified through engagement with stakeholders.	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	The Applicant developed a programme of events at various days of week and time of day to accommodate different work/life schedules. 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. More information can be found in the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1].**	
CONSULTATION ON OUTDATED AND INCOMPLETE INFORMATION Heritage Assessment Rendered Obsolete Your heritage assessment is now fundamentally flawed: • New Roman villa designation: Historic England recently designated the Roman Villa at Conisbrough Parks as a Scheduled Monument after your heritage assessment was completed • Underestimated significance: Your assessment fails to account for this "undoubtedly one of the best surviving and most important sites in the region"	Assessment of the Roman Villa as a Scheduled Monument is presented in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]**. 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.	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
• Inadequate reassessment: This designation should have triggered complete consultation restart, not cosmetic updates	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.	
FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCESSIBLE INFORMATION Non-Technical Summary Inadequacies Your Non-Technical Summary fails its basic purpose of making information accessible: • Downplays significant impacts: Describes "Moderate to Major Adverse (Significant)" effects in technical language that obscures serious harm • Minimises community concerns: Fails to explain in plain English how residents' daily lives will be affected • Incomplete impact assessment: Missing key information about heritage impacts due to Roman villa designation	In order to make the consultation as accessible as possible, the Applicant created three separate consultation booklets for W1, W2 and W3 which explained the proposals and environmental information in non-technical language. During the statutory consultation, the draft ES was available for the public to view, which had a Non-Technical Summary included for an accessible summarised version of the document. This was available to download on the Applicant's website, view at public information events, take hard copies at events, and the Applicant sent out the printed copies of the Non-Technical Summary in the post on request at no charge. More information can be found in the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1].**	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
Technical Document Complexity The Environmental Statement chapters are impenetrable to ordinary residents: • Expert-level language: Technical assessments use specialist terminology without adequate explanation • Volume and complexity: Hundreds of pages requiring professional expertise to understand • Cross-referencing difficulties: Information scattered across multiple volumes and appendices		
DISMISSAL OF COMMUNITY EXPERTISE Previous Consultation Feedback Ignored Despite receiving 940 responses in your first consultation: • Substantive concerns dismissed: Community objections about fundamental site unsuitability treated as minor design issues • Cosmetic changes only: Claimed design changes fail to address core problems raised by residents • No genuine dialogue: Technical responses that fail to engage with community concerns	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]** for further information.	No
Section 47 Planning Act 2008 Failures	The PA2008 and associated regulations and guidance set out the requirements for consultation for NSIPs. As detailed in the	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
Your consultation fails to meet statutory requirements for meaningful community engagement: 1. Accessibility failure: Systematic exclusion through digital bias, cost barriers, and technical complexity 2. Inadequate opportunity: Insufficient public meetings and rushed timelines prevent meaningful participation 3. Information failure: Technical documents and incomplete surveys prevent informed community input 4. Geographic bias: Poor coverage of smaller communities most affected by the development Procedural Inadequacies • Premature consultation: Consulting on incomplete surveys and outdated heritage assessments • Information barriers: Financial and technical obstacles preventing community access to essential information • Timeline inadequacy: Insufficient time for communities to coordinate responses to complex development	**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].** To maintain the core value of accessibility, the Applicant produced a variety of consultation materials in various formats and accepted written feedback through a variety of methods. The Applicant produced a variety of documents at various levels of detail for different audiences. Short, plain language summaries were available through newsletters, leaflets and consultation booklets. These materials were available for the general public and written in plain language for general audiences to comprehend. For those individuals that wanted more information, the non-technical summary of the draft Environmental Statement provided more information on the Environmental Assessments written in slightly more technical language, while the draft ES provided the full detail for those audiences that wanted the technical information. To take part in the consultation, the consultation booklets provided enough information to understand the Proposed Development and provide informed feedback, while the other documents were provided for those individuals that	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	wanted more information, but were not essential to respond to the consultation. Consultation materials were all provided digitally through the project website, whitestonesolarfarm.co.uk for download free of charge. These materials all remained available for reference throughout the preapplication period and continue to be accessible. To ensure that individuals who did not have digital access could also view the consultation materials, the Applicant also provided printed copies of these materials. The consultation booklet, questionnaire, masterplans, SoCC, and Non-Technical Summary of the Draft ES were all available at the public information events or by request. Many individuals did request paper copies of these materials, which the Applicant then printed and posted to them upon request. A total of roughly 1,000 copies of these materials were printed and made available to consultees at no charge. A copy of the draft ES was available to view at the public events and was also available at no charge via USB by request. There were several requests for this material by USB. The Applicant stipulated that print copies of the draft ES would be available upon request for £750. The total print cost of the full ES, which is over 8,000 pages long was estimated at £10,000. Therefore, the £750 charge would be a heavily subsidised cost to help discourage excessive printing of this very large, technical document. After the last consultation event, the Applicant left the printed copy in the Ulley Village Hall so that it would be available for those individuals that wanted to read it.	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	In order to make the consultation as accessible as possible, the Applicant created three separate consultation booklets for W1, W2 and W3 which explained the proposals and environmental information in non-technical language. During the statutory consultation, the draft ES was available for the public to view, which had a Non-Technical Summary included for an accessible summarised version of the document. This was available to download on the Applicant's website, view at public information events, take hard copies at events, and the Applicant sent out the printed copies of the Non-Technical Summary in the post on request. The Applicant developed a programme of events at various days of week and time of day to accommodate different work/life schedules. 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. ore information can be found in the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1].**	
IMPACT ON DEMOCRATIC DECISION-MAKING These consultation failures undermine the entire planning process:	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	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
• Compromised community input: Affected residents cannot provide informed responses due to accessibility barriers • Flawed evidence base: Decision-makers lack comprehensive information needed for balanced evaluation • Democratic deficit: Systematic exclusion of communities violates principles of participatory planning This consultation represents a fundamental failure to engage meaningfully with affected communities as required by law. The systematic exclusion of residents through cost barriers, technical complexity, incomplete information, and rushed timelines violates both the letter and spirit of democratic participation in planning decisions. A development of this scale affecting multiple historic communities and heritage assets deserves proper consultation that genuinely includes and engages with those whose lives will be permanently affected.	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]** for further information. To maintain the core value of accessibility, the Applicant produced a variety of consultation materials in various formats and accepted written feedback through a variety of methods. The Applicant produced a variety of documents at various levels of detail for different audiences. Short, plain language summaries were available through newsletters, leaflets and consultation booklets. These materials were available for the general public and written in plain language for general audiences to comprehend. For those individuals that wanted more information, the non-technical summary of the draft Environmental Statement provided more information on the Environmental Assessments written in slightly more technical language, while the draft ES provided the full detail for those audiences that wanted the technical information. To take part in the consultation, the consultation booklets provided enough information to understand the Proposed Development and provide informed feedback, while the other documents were provided for those individuals that wanted more information, but were not essential to respond to the consultation.	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	Consultation materials were all provided digitally through the project website, whitestonesolarfarm.co.uk for download free of charge. These materials all remained available for reference throughout the preapplication period and continue to be accessible. To ensure that individuals who did not have digital access could also view the consultation materials, the Applicant also provided printed copies of these materials. The consultation booklet, questionnaire, masterplans, SoCC, and Non-Technical Summary of the Draft ES were all available at the public information events or by request. Many individuals did request paper copies of these materials, which the Applicant then printed and posted to them upon request. A total of roughly 1,000 copies of these materials were printed and made available to consultees at no charge. A copy of the draft ES was available to view at the public events and was also available at no charge via USB by request. There were several requests for this material by USB. The Applicant stipulated that print copies of the draft ES would be available upon request for £750. The total print cost of the full ES, which is over 8,000 pages long was estimated at £10,000. Therefore, the £750 charge would be a heavily subsidised cost to help discourage excessive printing of this very large, technical document. After the last consultation event, the Applicant left the printed copy in the Ulley Village Hall so that it would be available for those individuals that wanted to read it. In order to make the consultation as accessible as possible, the Applicant created three separate consultation booklets for W1,	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	W2 and W3 which explained the proposals and environmental information in non-technical language. During the statutory consultation, the draft ES was available for the public to view, which had a Non-Technical Summary included for an accessible summarised version of the document. This was available to download on the Applicant's website, view at public information events, take hard copies at events, and the Applicant sent out the printed copies of the Non-Technical Summary in the post on request. The Applicant developed a programme of events at various days of week and time of day to accommodate different work/life schedules. 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. More information can be found in the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1].**	
Petition 3: Flooding		
I am responding to the public consultation for Whitestone One solar development to register my strong objection to this proposal. As a local resident, I have serious concerns about flood risk,	Impacts relating to water resources and flood risk are assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]**.	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
environmental impact, and the adequacy of the assessment provided. The Environment Agency has specifically highlighted flood risk concerns for Whitestone One, yet the consultation documents don't adequately address these warnings. As someone who lives in this area, flood risk isn't just a technical issue - it affects our homes, our safety, and our community. The documents acknowledge that parts of Whitestone One will be located in Flood Zones 2 and 3. These are areas already known to flood, and with climate change making extreme weather more frequent, I'm deeply worried about making the situation worse. What concerns me most is that the developers seem to be dismissing expert advice. When the Environment Agency raises specific concerns about flood risk in Whitestone One, shouldn't that be a red flag? Instead, the response appears to downplay these warnings without properly addressing them. The "sequential test" - which should prove this is the best location from a flood risk perspective - seems inadequate. Why can't this development go somewhere safer? Our community shouldn't bear	Supporting technical information is provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. Measures for managing environmental impacts are outlined in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and the **outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**. With these mitigation measures, effects are Negligible. 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. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** has identified where solar panels need to be raised so that they remain operational without increasing flood risk elsewhere under a 1 in 100-year plus climate change event. The design principles for the Proposed Development are detailed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5].**	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
increased flood risk so developers can use cheaper land.		
Water Quality and Local Environment Our local streams and rivers are already in poor condition, and Whitestone One could make things worse. The consultation documents admit that watercourses in the area have "failed" chemical status and poor ecological conditions, yet there's no detailed plan for how construction and operation will avoid further damage. Multiple watercourses flow through or near the Whitestone One site. During construction, there will be soil disturbance, machinery, and potentially hazardous materials that could pollute our waterways. The mitigation measures proposed are too vague to give me confidence that proper protection will be in place.	Impacts relating to water resources and flood risk are assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]**. Measures for managing environmental impacts are outlined in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and the **outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**. With these mitigation measures, effects are Negligible. 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 **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

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
Incomplete Assessment and Missing Information It's concerning that key information is still missing from this consultation. The documents state that "targeted walkover surveys will be completed to inform the assessment" - but shouldn't these surveys be finished before asking for our views? How can we properly comment on the proposal when the developers themselves don't have complete information about: • Groundwater springs in the area (specifically mentioned by the Environment Agency) • Private water supplies that local residents depend on • Detailed understanding of local water flow patterns This feels like being asked to approve something before all the facts are known. Vague Promises and Weak Commitments The proposed mitigation measures for Whitestone One are disappointingly non-committal. Key phrases like "where appropriate," "if required," and "may include" appear throughout the documents.	Impacts relating to water resources and flood risk are assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]**. Measures presented in outline management plans such as the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** will be developed into detailed management plans in agreement with the relevant authorities.	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
These aren't firm promises - they're ways to avoid taking responsibility later. For example: • The approach to surface water monitoring will be "agreed with the Environment Agency prior to construction" - why isn't this detailed now? • The 10-meter buffer zones around watercourses have multiple exceptions that could make them meaningless • Construction water management measures are described as "potential" rather than definitive Once construction starts, it will be too late to implement proper protections if these vague measures prove inadequate.		
Environment Agency Concerns Not Properly Addressed The Environment Agency has raised specific concerns about Whitestone One, including: • Flood risk issues that need urgent attention	Impacts relating to water resources and flood risk are assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]**. Supporting technical information is provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. Measures for managing environmental impacts are outlined in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and the **outline Operational Environmental Management Plan**	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
• The location of battery storage systems without considering water environment sensitivity • Requirements for watercourse crossings and environmental permitting The consultation response to these concerns appears inadequate. When statutory consultees with environmental expertise raise red flags, these should be taken seriously and addressed comprehensively, not dismissed with vague assurances. The consultation feels premature - key surveys are incomplete, expert concerns are inadequately addressed, and mitigation measures are too vague to provide confidence. Our community deserves better than incomplete information and weak promises.	**(oOEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**. With these mitigation measures, effects are Negligible. 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. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** has identified where solar panels need to be raised so that they remain operational without increasing flood risk elsewhere under a 1 in 100-year plus climate change event. The design principles for the Proposed Development are detailed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5].**	
Petition 4: Heritage		
I am writing in response to your public consultation under the Planning Act 2008 regarding the Whitestone One Solar Farm proposal. I must strongly object to this damaging development and your inadequate consultation process that has failed to engage meaningfully with affected communities.	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 **Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8**], no significant direct effects are predicted at construction, operation and maintenance or decommissioning.	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
DEVASTATING HERITAGE IMPACTS Newly Scheduled Roman Villa - National Significance The most serious concern is Historic England's recent designation of the Roman Villa at Conisbrough Parks as a Scheduled Monument, described as "undoubtedly one of the best surviving and most important sites in the region dating to this period" and representing one of only a handful of Roman villas ever identified in Yorkshire. This designation reflects the site's exceptional national importance as a rare surviving example of Roman rural settlement in northern England. Critical Assessment Gap: Chapter 8 (Cultural Heritage and Archaeology) was compiled before this designation and therefore fundamentally underestimates the heritage significance of this area. The Non-Technical Summary fails entirely to address this crucial new development, rendering the heritage assessment obsolete and inadequate for proper decision-making. Archaeological Landscape Context: The field systems around both the Roman villa and medieval Conisbrough Castle reflect nearly 2,000 years of continuous agricultural development. This represents an irreplaceable archaeological landscape where the villa's relationship with its	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.	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
agricultural hinterland can still be understood - a connection that will be permanently severed by industrial development. Severe Impact on Scheduled Monument: The Whitestone One development will cause irreversible harm through: • Industrial intrusion into the historic landscape setting that has remained agricultural for nearly 2,000 years, destroying the ability to understand how Roman communities lived and worked. • Construction disturbance potentially affecting buried archaeological remains extending beyond the scheduled area boundaries. • Permanent landscape change severing the villa's connection to its agricultural context, making it impossible for future generations to understand this nationally significant site. • Heavy construction traffic causing vibration damage to fragile archaeological deposits that have survived since Roman times. This significant new designation should trigger complete reassessment of the project's viability and demonstrates why this heritage-sensitive location is fundamentally unsuitable for industrial development.		

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
Conisbrough Castle - Medieval Heritage at Risk Chapter 8 severely underestimates harm to one of England's finest Norman castles, representing nearly 900 years of continuous history. Conisbrough Castle is a world-class monument whose eastern approach has remained agricultural for centuries, enabling visitors to understand how the medieval community lived and worked. Heritage Tourism Economy: The castle attracts thousands of heritage tourists annually, supporting local businesses across Conisbrough and surrounding villages. Industrial development will reduce visitor numbers and economic benefits to the entire area, destroying both heritage value and economic sustainability. Historical Context Destruction: The eastern approach to the castle, which has maintained its agricultural character for centuries, will be industrialised with solar panels, security fencing, and substations. This destroys the historical context that allows modern visitors to understand the relationship between the medieval castle and its surrounding landscape, effectively severing a connection that has existed for nearly a millennium. Historic Village Character Destruction	Impacts to Conisbrough Castle are assessed in **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, 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	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
Ravenfield: Historic village approaches dominated by industrial infrastructure; traditional field boundaries removed; rural agricultural identity permanently altered. Micklebring: Small historic village surrounded by industrial development; traditional farmland connections severed; community character overwhelmed. Clifton and Firsby: Historic settlement patterns disrupted; traditional rural settings industrialized; heritage tourism potential damaged.	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**].	
INADEQUATE ASSESSMENT AND ALTERNATIVES Your heritage assessment process has been fundamentally flawed: • Pre-designation assessment now obsolete due to Roman villa scheduling, requiring complete reassessment. • Limited archaeological survey inadequate for such a vast area of demonstrated historical significance spanning from Roman to medieval periods. • No assessment of community heritage value beyond designated assets, ignoring how these villages function as a connected historic landscape. • Failure to understand cumulative heritage impact - the network of historic villages	**Heritage Assessment** 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 **Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8**], no significant direct effects are predicted at construction, operation and maintenance or decommissioning. **Roman Villa** 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	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
connected by traditional countryside represents a heritage resource that has survived for nearly two millennia. Alternatives Not Explored: Chapter 4 fails to demonstrate why heritage-sensitive locations must be sacrificed when industrial areas, brownfield sites, and commercial rooftops remain available across South Yorkshire. The unique heritage significance of this area, now including a scheduled Roman villa, makes it fundamentally unsuitable for industrial development. This application represents an unacceptable attack on multiple rural communities and our shared heritage spanning nearly 2,000 years of continuous history. The recent designation of the Roman villa as a scheduled monument demonstrates the exceptional heritage value of this landscape and should trigger immediate project reassessment. Your consultation process has failed to engage meaningfully with affected residents and has dismissed legitimate community concerns. The Non-Technical Summary provides inadequate information about serious heritage impacts and community effects.	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. **Alternatives** 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].** **Consultation** 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	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
Cumulative Heritage Destruction: This development will destroy the rural character of an entire area of South Yorkshire. The network of historic villages connected by traditional countryside - from Roman villa through medieval castle to historic settlements - will be replaced by an industrial landscape, eliminating a heritage resource that represents one of the finest examples of continuous landscape history in northern England. The heritage of Conisbrough, Ravenfield, Micklebring, Clifton, Hooton Roberts and Firsby belongs to the nation and future generations. It cannot be replaced once destroyed for short-term industrial gain.	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 the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** for further information. **Cumulative heritage impacts** 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. 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:	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	• 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.	
Petition 5: Landscape and Visual		
I am writing as a local resident to formally object to the proposed Whitestone One solar farm development. While I support renewable energy in principle, this particular site is entirely inappropriate for such a large-scale industrial development. Green Belt Protection The Whitestone One site lies completely within the South and West Yorkshire Green Belt, whose fundamental purpose is to keep land permanently open. The developer's own assessment admits the project will cause "Moderate Adverse (Significant) Effects" on the landscape and acknowledges "loss of openness" as a primary impact. The 3.8-metre high solar panels will fundamentally destroy the	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].**	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
open character that Green Belt policy exists to protect. This directly contradicts Green Belt policy, and the developer has even deferred proper Green Belt impact assessment to a separate report - suggesting they know this is a weak point in their application.	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 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	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	Planning Statement, Appendix 2 – Green Belt Assessment [EN0110020/APP/5.4].	
Historic Landscape Destruction The proposed site encompasses Conisbrough Parks and former royal hunting grounds - a landscape with centuries of historical significance. This area falls within the Area of Special Landscape Value designation, recognising its exceptional landscape quality. The development would industrialise this heritage landscape, disrupting historic field patterns and ancient woodland boundaries that have existed for hundreds of years. Severe Visual Impact on Local Communities The assessment identifies significant visual harm to multiple nearby communities, but fails to properly address the cumulative damage to our quality of life: • Conisbrough: Direct views from just 0.2km away • Clifton: Significant visual effects from 0.5km distance • Ravenfield: Visible despite screening attempts at 1km	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**]. 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	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
• Micklebring: Direct views from the western edge • These aren't just technical "viewpoints" - these are our homes, where we live and work every day. Agricultural Heritage Lost This development will destroy the essential character of our working agricultural landscape, converting large irregular arable fields bounded by mature hedgerows into an industrial solar farm. The relationship between historic field patterns and hedgerow boundaries - developed over centuries - will be lost forever.	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 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;	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	• 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/APP/6.20]**. 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.	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
Destruction of Public Rights of Way Our local footpath and bridleway network will be severely damaged. Multiple Conisbrough Parks footpaths and Bridleway No.4 cross directly through the site. The assessment shows "Moderate to Major Adverse (Significant) effects" on several routes. These paths are vital for our community's recreation, health, and connection to the countryside - they will be transformed from peaceful rural walks into industrial corridors.	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 the **Design Approach Document** [**EN0110020/APP/5.7]** for further information. 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.	No
Ancient Woodland Threat The development will severely compromise irreplaceable ancient woodlands, including Hooton Cliff ancient woodland adjacent to the western boundary. The proposed 10-metre offset is completely inadequate to protect these precious habitats from the visual intrusion of an industrial solar installation. Inadequate Mitigation The proposed mitigation is wholly insufficient: • New hedgerows planted at just 0.3-0.6m height provide no immediate screening	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. Visual impacts are assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]** in line with relevant guidance, this includes an assessment of effects at year 1 and year 15.	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
• Planting will take over 15 years to provide meaningful screening • Even after 15 years, the assessment admits "Moderate Adverse (Significant) effects" will remain • The rolling open landscape severely limits the effectiveness of any screening Industrial Infrastructure The development includes three substation options up to 13.5 meters high - equivalent to a 4-story building. These industrial structures will be visible across considerable distances due to the topography, with no adequate screening proposed. Seasonal Impact The assessment acknowledges that existing vegetation provides "minimum levels of screening" in winter when deciduous trees are leafless. This means severe visual impacts for approximately half the year - something completely unacceptable for a permanent development. Elevated Viewpoints	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**].	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
From Beacon Hill (146m), a key local landmark, the assessment shows "Moderate to Major Adverse (Significant) visual effects." The flat, open character of surrounding land means this development will be prominently visible across wide areas. Conclusion This proposal represents the wrong development in the wrong place. The developer's own assessment proves this site will cause significant and lasting harm to: • Green Belt openness and policy • Historic landscape heritage • Multiple community viewpoints • Public rights of way network • Ancient woodland settings Agricultural landscape character Even with 15 years of mitigation growth, significant adverse effects will persist. This development will cause extensive and permanent harm to our valued landscape. This is not acceptable for our community or our environment.		
Petition 6: Green Belt Objection		

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
I am writing in response to your statutory consultation under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 regarding the proposed Whitestone One Solar Farm development. Having reviewed the Draft Environmental Statement and consultation materials, I formally object to this application. OBJECTIONS TO THE DEVELOPMENT Green Belt Destruction Chapters 1 and 4 fail to justify massive Green Belt consumption protecting multiple historic communities: • Conisbrough: Green Belt maintains the historic market town's rural setting and castle approaches • Hooton Roberts: Surrounding farmland maintains village identity and prevents urban sprawl • Ravenfield: Agricultural land preserves rural character and prevents coalescence with Micklebring • Micklebring: Surrounding farmland maintains village identity and prevents urban sprawl	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].**	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
• Clifton and Firsby: Green Belt protects these small communities from development pressure Your consultation fails to demonstrate Very Special Circumstances required by the NPPF and effectively assess the harm to the green belt purposes. Additionally, your assessment fails to demonstrate why industrial rooftops, brownfield sites, and already developed land across South Yorkshire cannot accommodate this development without destroying protected countryside.	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].**	
Agricultural Land Loss and Food Security Chapter 9 reveals Whitestone One will consume hundreds of acres of productive agricultural land supporting: • Cereal production serving local and regional food supply chains • Livestock grazing around Ravenfield and Micklebring	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

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
• Traditional farming systems sustaining these communities for centuries • Soil systems storing carbon and supporting biodiversity Construction traffic will cause irreversible soil compaction, while foundations and access roads permanently remove land from production. Claims about returning to agriculture after 40 years ignore soil structure damage and climate change impacts.	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; • 0.32% of Grade 4 Agricultural Land;	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	• 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/APP/6.20]**. 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.	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
Traffic and Air Quality Impact Chapter 13 confirms construction will devastate the local transport network: Construction Traffic: • Conisbrough: Heavy vehicles via A630 will create bottlenecks, damage historic streets, and create safety risks near schools • Ravenfield/Micklebring: Village streets not designed for industrial traffic will suffer structural damage • Clifton/Firsby: Increased traffic on single-track roads will displace agricultural vehicles and compromise emergency access The Environmental Statement underestimates the impacts from diesel dust generation, soil-carried pathogens, and heat island effects from solar arrays	Impacts to the local road network have been assessed and can be found in the **Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20].** An **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/7.2]** is being provided for review, as well as outline access design of the A630, and other points. The Transport Statement also outlines that there are no HGVs routed through Micklebring or Clifton in the strategy. Air quality effects associated with the Proposed Development, including those affecting Conisbrough, have been assessed in **ES Chapter 12: Air Quality** [**EN0110020/APP/6.12],** with construction traffic data informed by **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13].** Construction traffic flows for both light-duty vehicles (LDVs) and heavy-duty vehicles (HDVs) have been assessed using the IAQM screening methodology **[REF-13]**. As a result of this screening, nine road links screened in for further consideration under the IAQM criteria **[REF-13]**, eight of which are located in or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). These include Doncaster AQMA No. 2 and AQMA No. 5, which can be viewed in **ES Volume 3, Figure 12.1: Air Quality Study Area [EN0110020/APP/6.19]** and which encompass roads such as the A630 through Conisbrough and Warmsworth, where construction traffic accessing the northern part of the Site would travel. The assessment recognises that parts of the road network near Conisbrough are within an existing AQMA due to elevated nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) concentrations, and this context has been fully accounted for in the assessment.	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	ES Chapter 12: Air Quality [**EN0110020/APP/6.12]** considers a large number of nearby human receptors, which includes receptors within Conisbrough, ensuring that potential effects on local residents have been appropriately assessed. While the overall construction period is expected to last between 24 and 36 months, construction is anticipated to be phased, and activities will not occur across all areas simultaneously, which further limits the potential for sustained impacts on local air quality. Construction-phase air quality impacts from activities and traffic have been assessed on a semi-quantitative basis in accordance with IAQM guidance **[REF-13]**. Embedded mitigation measures are set out in Section 12.6 of **ES Chapter 12: Air Quality** [**EN0110020/APP/6.12]**, with all construction-phase air quality impacts predicted to be **Not Significant** following mitigation. These measures will be secured through the oCEMP **[EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and implemented throughout construction, ensuring that any potential effects on air quality near Conisbrough are appropriately managed.	
Water Resources and Flood Risk Construction will alter drainage patterns across hundreds of acres, potentially causing: • Increased surface runoff affecting surrounding communities • Erosion and sedimentation of watercourses • Flooding risk from changed water flow patterns	Impacts relating to water resources and flood risk are assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]**. Measures for managing environmental impacts are outlined in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and the **outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**. With these mitigation measures, effects are Negligible.	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
• Water contamination from chemical spills and construction waste • Disruption of groundwater affecting private wells	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 **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.	
Ground Conditions Chapter 9 inadequately assesses: • Mining legacy issues and ground instability from historical coal mining • Permanent soil compaction from construction traffic • Long-term degradation preventing natural soil processes for decades	Impacts relating to ground conditions and land quality are assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]**. 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.	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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'. 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]**.	
COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC IMPACTS • Conisbrough: Loss of historic setting, tourism impact, traffic congestion, air quality degradation • Ravenfield: Village approaches industrialised, through-traffic, flood risk	The potential effects of the Proposed Development on tourism are assessed in **Chapter 15: Socio-Economics 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	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
• Micklebring: Community overwhelmed by development, infrastructure strain • Clifton: Rural tranquillity destroyed, access road damage, water contamination risk • Firsby: Historic character compromised, and community swamped by development This application represents an unacceptable sacrifice of multiple rural communities for industrial development that could be located on brownfield sites. The consultation process has failed to adequately engage affected communities, and the Non-Technical Summary provides inadequate information about serious environmental impacts. The cumulative impact of air quality degradation, water contamination risk, flood concerns, agricultural land loss, and traffic chaos across multiple communities is unacceptable when alternatives exist. I urge you to withdraw this application and pursue alternatives that do not require destruction of our Green Belt heritage and rural communities.	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. 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 includes trip generation, routeing and calculations **[EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]**. The assessment uses the trip generation detail provided in **Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and 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**. 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].**	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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 **[REF-13]**. 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].**	
Petition 7: Micklebring		
I am writing to you as a resident of Micklebring. The village has direct views from the western edge of Whitestone 1, (0.5 km) and to date has not had any targeted consultation. As a result, current scoping documents inadequately address the cumulative harm this will have to our residential amenity. I strongly object to the proposed siting of a large substation and compound off Ruddle Lane and the closure of 'Common Lane', Clifton.	The Applicant has removed the option of the substation on Ruddle Lane from the Proposed Development. While Common Lane was never proposed to be closed, this access point is no longer needed and has been removed from the Proposed Development. See the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1**] and **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5/7]** for further information.	Yes
I list the following objections to the project: 1. Significant harm to Greenbelt Landscape Character The sites of Whitestone 1 lie entirely within South Yorkshire Greenbelt. The Greenbelt planning policy is to fundamentally keep Greenbelt open and to stop Urban spread. Your assessments acknowledge "loss of openness" as a primary impact, which directly contradicts Green Belt Policy	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

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
within Doncaster City Council's Local Development Plan.	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 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	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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].**	
2. Landscape and Visual Impact Not enough emphasis has been given attention to the Coalfield Farmlands Landscape Character Area and the Area of Special Landscape Value designation.	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

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
3. Three separate NSIP applications rather than one The Whitestone scheme comprises three distinct land parcels, each with its own substation, access arrangements and cable corridors. It is arguable that these do not form a single, functional integrated generating station but amount to three separate solar farms. If that is correct, they should be the subject of separate applications, rather than being aggregated into one DCO. The one project approach also has an impact on cumulative effects.	Due to the size of the Proposed Development, it is considered a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project according to the Planning Act 2008. The Planning Act establishes the planning process for projects of this size, which will be decided at the national level by the Secretary of State for Net Zero and Energy Security. There is a meaningful role for local authorities in the development process, through consultation in the pre-application stage, and ongoing engagement throughout examination and post-consent.	No
4. Cultural Heritage The area falls within the Area of Special Landscape Value and the Archeological Map within the Doncaster City Council Local Development Plan. I give specific reference to Conisbrough Castle, the nationally scheduled Roman Villa, and associated historic landscape.	Impacts to Conisbrough Castle are assessed in **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, 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	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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.	
5. Ecology and Flood Risk/Hydrology There is evidence of red-list species across the area of Conisbrough Parks and an abundance of protected Flora and Fauna, all of which is evidenced by local enthusiasts and experts. There have been inadequate assessments made by Green Nation. Given the site's proximity to the River Don and evidence of recurrent flooding at Low Road, Conisbrough and Hooton Roberts, Green Nation has not demonstrated any alternative that exists in lower risk areas.	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. 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 **oLEMP**	No

Comment	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 and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO. 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	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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. Impacts relating to water resources and flood risk are assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]**. Measures for managing environmental impacts are outlined in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and the **outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**. With these mitigation measures, effects are Negligible.	
Petition 8: Treeton		
I object to the proposed Whitestone Solar Farm for the following reasons: - The size of the development is totally unacceptable and there has been a total failure to evaluate any aspects of the impact the hundreds of thousands of	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	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
solar panels spread over 3,500 acres of land will have on the local environment. There is no other solar farm of equivalent size in Europe and yet you believe it acceptable to do this in South Yorkshire. The farm will last for 60 years so will impact the lifetime of current residents and their children.	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.	
Whitestone has sought to avoid any meaningful consultation with local people and both the informal and now the formal consultation has been kept to an absolute minimum including the time the public has to respond. There have been no presentations, only limited drop-in sessions taking place mostly during the working day when many people are not free to attend to ask reasonable questions or raise local concerns. Whitestone has sent fliers to households which many residents have taken to be junk mail. Treeton, despite being a Parish likely to be surrounded by panels, was not offered a meeting at all and even the involvement of our MP asking for us to have our own meeting has been ignored. This is a disgrace to a village which continues to recover from years of heavy coal mining activity. We finally have flourishing wildlife again which will be hugely impacted and we have seen no evidence of any kind of meaningful environmental impact assessments. There has also been no visible engagement with Rotherham Borough Council. Whitestone consider consultation to be a "requirement" so "valuable local knowledge is built	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].** To maintain the core value of accessibility, the Applicant produced a variety of consultation materials in various formats and accepted written feedback through a variety of methods. The Applicant produced a variety of documents at various levels of detail for different audiences. Short, plain language summaries were available through newsletters, leaflets and consultation booklets. These materials were available for the general public and written in plain language for general audiences to comprehend. For those individuals that wanted more information, the non-technical summary of the draft Environmental Statement	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
into the design" but the lack of meaningful consultation suggests this is a myth and that the project is 'a done deal' already due to it having Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project status which overrides the local planning authority. The Secretary of State has the ability to override all local opinion and even local MPs who represent us have indicated the farm will, in all probability, be approved whatever local people say. They share our concern about the economic cost of this development and the loss of 3500 acres of largely food producing land at a time of massive population increase and both the rising carbon footprint of importing necessary food and the loss of food security within our own country.	provided more information on the Environmental Assessments written in slightly more technical language, while the draft ES provided the full detail for those audiences that wanted the technical information. To take part in the consultation, the consultation booklets provided enough information to understand the Proposed Development and provide informed feedback, while the other documents were provided for those individuals that wanted more information, but were not essential to respond to the consultation. Consultation materials were all provided digitally through the project website, whitestonesolarfarm.co.uk for download free of charge. These materials all remained available for reference throughout the preapplication period and continue to be accessible. To ensure that individuals who did not have digital access could also view the consultation materials, the Applicant also provided printed copies of these materials. The consultation booklet, questionnaire, masterplans, SoCC, and Non-Technical Summary of the Draft ES were all available at the public information events or by request. Many individuals did request paper copies of these materials, which the Applicant then printed and posted to them upon request. A total of roughly 1,000 copies of these materials were printed and made available to consultees at no charge. A copy of the draft ES was available to view at the public events and was also available at no charge via USB by request. There were several requests for this material by USB. The Applicant stipulated that print copies of the draft ES would be available	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	upon request for £750. The total print cost of the full ES, which is over 8,000 pages long was estimated at £10,000. Therefore, the £750 charge would be a heavily subsidised cost to help discourage excessive printing of this very large, technical document. After the last consultation event, the Applicant left the printed copy in the Ulley Village Hall so that it would be available for those individuals that wanted to read it. In order to make the consultation as accessible as possible, the Applicant created three separate consultation booklets for W1, W2 and W3 which explained the proposals and environmental information in non-technical language. During the statutory consultation, the draft ES was available for the public to view, which had a Non-Technical Summary included for an accessible summarised version of the document. This was available to download on the Applicant's website, view at public information events, take hard copies at events, and the Applicant sent out the printed copies of the Non-Technical Summary in the post on request. The Applicant developed a programme of events at various days of week and time of day to accommodate different work/life schedules. 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.	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	More information can be found in the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1].**	
No public recognition has been given to the construction of the proposed National Grid Sub Station on Long Lane which will consume another 18 acres of land around Treeton or the impact of this on the village alone during its construction. Whitestone have stated that in addition to all of this they will have over 630 construction vehicles, including over 200 HGVs doing twelve hour daily rounds at the peak of construction. A small village will drown in heavy traffic on totally unsuitable roads and local people will find it impossible to enter and leave the village to go about their daily lives. The 'Community Benefits' referred to during consultation are derisory and insulting.	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**). • **Intra-project effects** on ecological receptors are considered within the biodiversity assessment. **Traffic and Transport**	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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 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. 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. While there is no standard, the Applicant proposes a community benefit fund of £400 per MW per year which is consistent with other UK solar developments. 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 final size and lifespan of the Proposed Development. The Applicant remains committed to continuing to develop the fund in partnership with the local community. See the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
There has been no disclosure as to where battery storage, cable corridors and primary and secondary sub stations will be sited which will only be disclosed either during or perhaps after the consultation period. This is totally unacceptable.	The potential locations for the substations were shown on the masterplan in purple and the potential locations for the substations with batteries were shown in dark blue. There were no substations proposed in Whitestone 3. See the **Consultation Report, Appendix D [EN0110020/APP/5.1]**. The potential substation locations were selected because they are at least 300m from homes to minimise potential noise impacts, specified in the **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.14]**. For Whitestone 1, the final location was selected to be the option in the centre of the area, rather than the option closer to Clifton to reduce impacts. For Whitestone 2, the primary substation was selected to be closer to the grid connection point to minimise impacts, though this is near the settlement of Upper Whiston. See the **Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7].**	Yes
The solar panels are produced by slaves in China and have a huge carbon footprint in their own right because they require mostly coal powered energy and a significant amount of water to produce and are then not recyclable. They also have to be transported from China to South Yorkshire.	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	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	will be 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 SF_6-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 gCO_2e/kWh, substantially lower than gas-fired generation. Over its 60-year lifetime, the Proposed Development is expected to avoid approximately 18 million tonnes of CO_2e, delivering a clear net climate benefit and supporting regional and national net zero ambitions.	
This area has seen and continues to see a massive increase in the building of huge industrial units which can, but rarely do, host solar panels. This is allowed whilst green belt is consumed by panels. Why? There are no restrictions in place to limit 'solar sprawl' by other green energy companies which have already submitted planning applications which will consume even more hundreds or thousands of acres of green belt. These nearby schemes have excluded Whitestone Solar Farm from their environmental impact assessments 'due to its early and uncertain status'. Local planning authorities	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	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
should not allow this and should fully assess the holistic impact.	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. 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].**	
The only people to benefit from this development are Whitestone and landowners, paid generously to	Whitestone is a privately funded renewable energy project brought forward by Whitestone Net Zero Ltd, owned by Net Zero One Ltd,	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
surrender their land. The costs for this project, which is widely opposed by the majority of the public here in South Yorkshire, are likely to be passed on to the public in the form of ever higher energy bills. This solar panel farm should not be approved for the reasons stated.	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.	
Petition 9: Harthill		
I am writing to formally object to the above proposal, incorporating widespread solar panels and associated infrastructure. I object to the scale, location, and approach of this proposal, which I believe to be deeply flawed and fundamentally at odds with the principles of good	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**	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
planning, environmental stewardship, and community wellbeing.	**Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** describes the feedback received and how the master plan was updated in response.	
Additionally, I feel that the consultation process falls short of what I would have expected for a project of this size. I have historically experienced a far better standard of communication for projects of a much smaller nature. Many of my friends and neighbours have advised that they were unaware of consultation dates until late in the process, there has been no direct communication. I understand that there was no event in Kiveton at all, a place with over 7000 residents. At the consultation event people asked questions that could not be answered, with portions of the data still unavailable or matters still undecided. The Draft Environmental Statement has missing information, and it appears that decisions on cable routes have not yet been made or fully disclosed. Furthermore, much of the literature provided is misleading with areas of solar panels illustrated in green and areas shown for use as mitigation which are not guaranteed to be taken up by Whitestone. Why is such a short deadline being given for comments when the information is not readily available? Map inaccuracies-including the complete omission of a housing estate that borders one of the fields identified for development on the outskirts of Harthill Village-give me no confidence in a company	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 the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** for further information. 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. The Applicant developed a programme of events at various days of week and time of day to accommodate different work/life	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
that has, to date, never managed a project of this scale.	schedules. 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.	
From the information that I have seen my other concerns are: Loss of productive agricultural land. The total development site spans approximately 4,700 acres of good quality farmland. Locally, in Harthill and Woodall, the land now proposed for Solar Panels has for decades been actively used for growing food crops, hay, and silage. Based on conservative estimates, the development site could yield up to 75,000 tonnes of potatoes per year-equivalent to 150 million portions of chips. Such figures illustrate the enormous value this land holds in supporting domestic food production. This land will be lost to food production for 60 years. Pictures of sheep grazing under panels are misleading as sites are now removing sheep due to	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**	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
the damage they can cause-this is merely greenwashing. In the current climate of global uncertainty, climate change, and increasing reliance on imported produce, the importance of national food security cannot be overstated. Government and environmental policy alike encourage us to buy local and reduce emissions associated with long-distance food transport. Removing this scale of productive farmland directly contradicts these aims and undermines long-term food sustainability for residents in Rotherham and beyond. It is unacceptable to sacrifice such vast tracts of fertile, arable land for infrastructure when alternative sites-such as brownfield, industrial, and rooftop locations-remain underutilised across the UK. NSIPs should not come at the cost of local food systems.	**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	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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/APP/6.20]**. 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.	
Construction and Transport As a local resident, I am deeply concerned about the significant disruption the two-year construction phase will bring to our communities. The proposed working hours-7 am to 7 pm on weekdays and 7 am to noon on Saturdays-mean prolonged noise, dust, and mud will affect daily life and local air quality for an extended period.	The impacts of construction traffic have been assessed, and details can be found in the **Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. When accounting for traffic it is assumed that each vehicle is making a 2-way trip, both to and from the Site. This includes HGVs and Light Vehicles. When selecting access routes, priority was given to major road networks over smaller local roads and roads with restrictions where possible.	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
The suggested access routes through Todwick, Harthill, and Kiveton are unsuitable for the heavy construction traffic expected. These narrow village roads pass directly in-front of primary schools and are often congested by parked cars, raising serious safety concerns for pedestrians, especially children. I worry that the volume and size of vehicles will cause dangerous congestion and threaten community wellbeing. Moreover, the vehicle movement estimates in the Environmental Report appear to be flawed, assuming each vehicle only makes a single daily trip and failing to account for subcontractor additional movements and visitor traffic. This likely underestimates the true impact on our roads. Of particular concern is the planned crossing over Broadbridge Dyke, a vital wildlife habitat supporting protected species. Construction activity here risks damaging local biodiversity as well as that of the Chesterfield Canal immediately downstream. Finally, the proposed site access from Hard Lane would use a popular public footpath regularly used by residents, including school children en-route to Wales Comprehensive School. Closing or diverting this footpath during construction poses an unacceptable safety risk and would remove an important community asset.	Where public rights of way interact with the Site, these areas will be managed to ensure safe passage for both pedestrians and vehicles. In addition, an **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** has been produced, with a commitment to provide a detailed version as the design develops.	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
Cumulative Impact The Whitestone proposal should not be considered in isolation. Local to our Parish there is already a significant concentration of energy infrastructure projects underway or proposed. These include Exagen's Thurcroft Interchange Solar Farm, OnPath Energy's Battery Energy Storage System (BESS), and Harmony Energy's BESS, which is located in the field immediately adjacent to the proposed Whitestone 3 site-just behind the substation on Hard Lane. Additionally, the cumulative impact of the nearby Clowne Garden Village development and the approved Common Farm Solar Farm should be taken into account. From the perspective of local residents, particularly those in Harthill and Woodall, these developments collectively pose a significant burden on the landscape, local infrastructure, and residential amenity. Considering the density and scale of these projects, it is imperative that a broader, cumulative assessment is conducted, rather than evaluating Whitestone in isolation. Importantly, Rotherham appears to be shouldering a disproportionate share of greenbelt loss compared to other areas nationally.	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 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**).	Yes

Comment	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 LCAs, the cumulative change is not of sufficient magnitude to redefine LCAs/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:	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	• **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) • 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	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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 ZoI. 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 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	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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 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**	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	During construction, cumulative employment and GVA could increase where programmes overlap, but this is not expected to change overall 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 PRoWs/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. • **Major Accidents and Disasters (MADs)**: Interactions between accidental events across sites are limited; road accident inter-project effects are unlikely due to limited	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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.	
Inappropriate Development in Greenbelt and Negative Visual Impact Solar panels up to 3.8m high will dominate the rural landscape for 60 years. The draft ES acknowledges "some significant impacts" on landscape character and visual amenity, particularly immediately after construction. Natural screening through hedgerows and trees will take 10-15 years to provide any meaningful mitigation. The report is erroneous as the "visualisations" provided are selective, missing some key viewpoints in our Parish such as the Kiveton Community Woodland, Harthill Wildflower Meadow, Hard Lane and the public footpaths around Harthill Reservoir. The applicant appears to present best-case scenarios while failing to adequately assess worst-case impacts. In particular, there is no proper consideration of how seasonal variation affects tree density, meaning that claims of visual mitigation through planting are	**Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]** assesses the visual impacts at Kiveton Community Woodland and residential views in Wales and finds the impacts to be not significant. 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	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
misleading and ineffective for significant parts of the year. Furthermore, the proposal represents a permanent and irreversible industrialisation of rural countryside, with effects lasting for the full 60-year operational period and beyond. The proposed development, with a combined capacity of 750 MW across three sites, constitutes a clear industrialisation of the countryside. It represents inappropriate development within the Green Belt, contrary to its fundamental aims of: preventing urban sprawl, safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, and maintaining the distinct identity of separate settlements. The stretch of land to the east of Hard Lane for example, currently serves as a vital green buffer between the villages of Kiveton, Harthill, Wales and Woodall – four communities that differ significantly in size, character, and appearance. This open swathe of primarily agricultural land is designated as Green Belt specifically to preserve that separation. The scale and visual impact of the proposed development would significantly erode this gap, undermining the openness of the Green Belt and accelerating the perceived merging of the four villages. In both size and extent, the scheme would contribute to the creeping urbanization of this rural area.	with national energy goals. A full Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is included in **Chapter 7 [EN0110020/APP/6.7**]. 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**	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
The developer's own assessment admits the project will cause "Moderate Adverse (Significant) Effects" on the landscape and acknowledges "loss of openness" as a primary impact. The 3.8-metre-high solar panels will fundamentally destroy the open character that Green Belt policy exists to protect.	**[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 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].**	
Character and Community Impact Harthill and Woodall are attractive, well-cared-for villages with a strong sense of local identity and community pride. They have received recognition for their presentation and appearance, thanks to the continued efforts of residents and volunteers who maintain public spaces, plant flower beds, and keep	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].** The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment includes viewpoints from Harthill, and finds that there would be some moderate impacts during construction, but not during operation at the Year	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
the villages clean and welcoming. The area is rich in accessible green space, including local ponds, a well-used network of footpaths, and popular walking routes, all of which contribute significantly to the mental and physical wellbeing of residents and visitors alike. Many people have chosen to live in these villages precisely because of their rural character, scenic views, and strong community atmosphere, including regular events and volunteer-led initiatives. The introduction of large-scale solar infrastructure on nearby greenbelt land would dramatically undermine the rural character of the area. Its industrial appearance and visual dominance would permanently alter the landscape, disrupting the setting and atmosphere that make Harthill and Woodall such desirable places to live. This impact cannot be adequately mitigated and represents a direct threat to the local quality of life and sense of place.	1 or Year 15 time points. For further information see **Chapter 7 [EN0110020/APP/6.7]**.	
Environmental Despite claims of "biodiversity gain," the reality is that the project would transform open, historic countryside into an industrial landscape of glass, metal, and fencing. Residents and visitors would lose uninterrupted views, heritage character, and natural habitats that currently support deer, birds of prey, badgers, foxes, and numerous farmland species.	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. 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]**.	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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 and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO. The **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** provides prescriptive detail on habitat creation, enhancement and management across the	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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.	
Degradation of Public Rights of Way Our local footpath and bridleway network will be severely damaged. Multiple footpaths and bridleway cross directly through the proposed site. The assessment shows "Moderate to Major Adverse	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]**.	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
(Significant) effects" on several routes. These paths are vital for our community's recreation, health, and connection to the countryside-they will be transformed from peaceful rural walks into industrial corridors.	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/7.7]** 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].**	
Historic Landscape Destruction Harthill was recorded as a settlement in the Doomsday book in 1086, however archaeological finds around the village and the Harthill Reservoir area date back to the bronze age (3000 BC). The Whitestone 3 development would industrialise the surrounding landscape, disrupting historic field patterns and ancient woodland boundaries that have existed for hundreds of years.	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.	No
Proposed Community Benefit The community benefit proposed as part of the Whitestone development is extremely limited, particularly when considered in light of the wide	The Applicant has committed to delivering a meaningful community benefit package to ensure that local communities share in the benefits of the Proposed Development. While there is no standard, the Applicant proposes a community benefit fund of £400 per MW per year which is consistent with	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
geographic footprint and the number of both parished and non-parished communities affected. It will not compensate for the damage to the local environment. This development will have lasting impacts across multiple settlements, yet the benefit is not scaled appropriately to reflect the number or size of those communities. Moreover, the proposed benefit is not index-linked, meaning its real-world value will diminish significantly over time, especially given the long operational lifespan of such infrastructure. Taken together, the financial contribution on offer does not come close to offsetting the harm caused by the loss of greenbelt land, the likely reduction in nearby property values, the degradation of visual amenity, and the negative effects on both mental and physical wellbeing. A truly fair and future-proofed community benefit package should be proportionate, equitably distributed, and inflation-proofed-none of which are achieved in the current proposal.	other UK solar developments. 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 final size and lifespan of the Proposed Development. See the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	
Conclusion This project is inconsistent with both Local and National planning policy. It does not preserve our Greenbelt, agricultural land, heritage assets, or visual amenity. Nor does it promote brownfield development first and safeguard best and most versatile 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	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
The Draft Environmental Statement contains minimal information relating to any genuine exploration of Brownfield sites. In contrast other nations, including France, have successfully installed solar infrastructure over existing built environments such as car parks and logistics roofs rather than destroying the countryside. The Whitestone Solar Farm represents an ill-conceived, industrial-scale intrusion into the heart of South Yorkshire's rural landscape. It undermines food security, disregards community voice, and exposes the region to lasting environmental and safety risks-all while offering limited and poorly evidenced public benefit. Of further concern is the lack of safeguard around long term management and decommissioning. Of particular concern is what would happen in the event that the operator was to go into liquidation before the site is fully decommissioned. The project should also be considered in light of the further disruption to the area when the panels have to be replaced after 25 years, a subject which seems to have been completely ignored in the Draft Environmental Statement. I therefore formally object to the proposal in its current form and call for:	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]** for further information.	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
1. A full independent review of the consultation process. 2. Reassessment of alternative non-agricultural locations. 3. Transparent publication of all environmental and traffic impact data. 4. Suspension of the current proposal pending a democratic, evidence-based consultation.		
Petition 10: Roman Villa		
I am writing to object to the Whitestone One Solar Farm on heritage and landscape grounds. This development will cause unacceptable and irreversible harm to a landscape of exceptional significance spanning nearly 2,000 years of continuous history. The heritage resource being destroyed belongs to the nation and future generations. THE NEWLY SCHEDULED ROMAN VILLA Historic England recently designated the Roman Villa at Conisbrough Parks as a Scheduled Monument, describing it as “undoubtedly one of the best surviving and most important sites in the region dating to this period.” This represents one of only a handful of Roman villas ever identified in Yorkshire.	Assessment of potential impacts to the Roman Villa is presented in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8].** 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.	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
This is not a local heritage asset – it's a monument of exceptional national importance. Roman villas in northern England are extremely rare. This site provides unique evidence of Roman rural settlement patterns where such remains are scarce. The villa and its surrounding landscape preserve information about Roman agricultural systems and daily life that cannot be found elsewhere in Yorkshire. Your Chapter 8 (Cultural Heritage and Archaeology) was compiled before the scheduling designation. It's obsolete. The Non-Technical Summary doesn't even mention it. This isn't a minor oversight – it goes to whether this site is appropriate for industrial development at all. The field systems around both the villa and Conisbrough Castle reflect nearly 2,000 years of continuous agricultural history. This isn't just about individual monuments. It's about an entire landscape where the relationship between settlements, agriculture, and rural life can still be understood. Your development will industrialize landscape that's been agricultural for two millennia. The villa existed because of its agricultural landscape – that's why it was built there. Industrial	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.	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
development will permanently sever the villa's connection with its archaeological landscape. Investigation isn't just about what we know now – it's what future generations with better techniques might discover. You'll prevent that understanding forever.		
CONISBROUGH CASTLE – 900 YEARS OF HISTORY THREATENED Conisbrough Castle is one of England's finest Norman castles, representing nearly 900 years of continuous history. The cylindrical keep is unique in England for its date and demonstrates sophisticated late 12th-century military architecture. The eastern approach to the castle has remained agricultural for centuries. This isn't incidental – it enables modern visitors to understand the relationship between the medieval castle, the market town it protected, and the agricultural lands that sustained both. From the battlements, the agricultural landscape to the east demonstrates how the medieval community organized production and why the castle was positioned where it stands. The castle attracts thousands of heritage tourists annually, supporting local businesses across Conisbrough and surrounding villages. Your development will industrialize the eastern approach	Impacts to Conisbrough Castle are assessed in **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, 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	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
with solar panels, security fencing, and substations up to 13.5 meters high. Visitors will no longer understand the relationship between castle and landscape or how the medieval community functioned. This severs a connection existing for nearly a millennium. Heritage tourism will be damaged. Industrial development visible from the castle will reduce visitor experience and numbers, harming local businesses dependent on heritage tourism. You've provided no economic assessment or compensation.	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.	
HISTORIC VILLAGES – CONNECTED LANDSCAPE Ravenfield's historic character depends on its agricultural setting. The village developed as a farming community, and its identity remains tied to surrounding countryside. Traditional field boundaries and hedgerows – some ancient – will be removed. Future generations won't comprehend why this village developed where it did or how it functioned historically. Micklebring represents a traditional small rural settlement pattern. The surrounding solar farm will overwhelm this small community. The development	Assessment of potential impacts to the heritage setting is presented 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. Following submission of the Draft ES in September 2025, the Applicant removed proposed solar areas and substation to the	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
scale is completely inappropriate to the village's historic character and will destroy the relationship between settlement and landscape existing for centuries. Clifton and Firsby represent historic settlement patterns where small communities developed in relation to agricultural land. Their existence and character depend on rural settings. The development will industrialize traditional settings, disrupt settlement patterns, and destroy the relationship between village and countryside.	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.	
INADEQUATE HERITAGE ASSESSMENT Your assessment suffers multiple failures. It predates scheduled monument designation and is now obsolete. Archaeological survey coverage appears limited for such a vast development affecting demonstrably significant archaeology. The area contains a Roman villa with potential for related features, medieval archaeology associated with castle and villages, and historic landscape features. The assessment lacks analysis of whether harm constitutes "substantial harm" under NPPF Paragraph 201 or "less than substantial harm" under Paragraph 202. Public benefits haven't been	Assessment of potential impacts to the Roman Villa is presented in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8].** 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.	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
properly balanced against heritage harm. All alternatives haven't been properly explored. LOSS THAT CANNOT BE REPLACED The 2,000-year story this landscape tells – from Roman villa through Norman castle to living villages – is too precious to sacrifice when alternatives exist.	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.	
Petition 11: National Highways		
I am responding to your statutory consultation regarding the proposed Whitestone One Solar Farm. Having reviewed the Draft Environmental Statement, I must object on the basis that serious concerns raised by statutory consultees remain unresolved, demonstrating this application is premature and inadequate. NATIONAL HIGHWAYS: CRITICAL TRANSPORT CONCERNS IGNORED National Highways has identified major deficiencies that go to the heart of whether this development is safe and practical. They require understanding of the "likely traffic impact" on the M1 and M18 motorways, yet your assessment provides nothing. The Strategic Road Network carries thousands of	The impacts of construction traffic have been assessed, and details can be found in the **Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20].** When accounting for traffic it is assumed that each vehicle is making a 2-way trip, both to and from the Site. When selecting access routes, priority was given to major road networks over smaller local roads and roads with restrictions where possible. In addition, an **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** has been produced, with a commitment to provide a detailed version as the design develops. 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	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
vehicles daily - how can you proceed without knowing the impact? Your own documents admit "construction access will be confirmed as the Proposed Development's design progresses" and "highway works will be included within the ES." This isn't acceptable. An NSIP application should have these details confirmed, not deferred. You're asking us to comment on incomplete information while National Highways waits for the basic transport assessment they've requested. The road safety baseline is alarming: 370 collisions in five years including 18 fatal accidents, with 2019 seeing 85 collisions and 6 fatalities. Multiple schools sit along your proposed routes with 20mph zones. Yet there's no assessment of peak hour impacts, no analysis of junction geometry and visibility, no collision data for SRN access points. National Highways demands a "first principles approach" - you haven't provided one. Cable crossings of the motorways haven't been assessed. Abnormal loads require EDSAL approval but routes aren't confirmed. Twenty-five or more access points needed across three sites affecting communities from Conisbrough to Micklebring, yet the routing remains undefined. This is backwards -	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]** for further information. The updated **Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** includes trip generation, routeing and calculations. The assessment uses the trip generation detail provided in **Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and 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**. **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].** The assessments conclude that the construction of the Proposed Development will result in a Negligible magnitude of impact on road user and pedestrian safety.	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
confirm the routes, then consult, not the other way around.		
ENVIRONMENT AGENCY: FLOOD RISK AND WATER THREATS DISMISSED The Environment Agency specifically highlighted concerns about Whitestone One, yet your response appears to dismiss rather than address them. Parts of your site lie in Flood Zones 2 and 3 - areas that already flood. With climate change making extreme weather more frequent, why are you building here? The sequential test should prove this is the best location from a flood risk perspective. It doesn't. Why can't this development go somewhere safer? Our communities shouldn't bear increased flood risk so you can use cheaper land in the Green Belt. The EA notes groundwater springs in the area that you haven't surveyed. Private water supplies haven't been assessed. Your documents admit "targeted walkover surveys will be completed to inform the assessment" - but shouldn't surveys be finished before consultation? How can we comment when you don't have complete information about water resources our communities depend on? Multiple watercourses near the site have "failed" chemical status and poor ecological conditions.	Impacts relating to water resources and flood risk are assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]**. Supporting technical information is provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. Measures for managing environmental impacts are outlined in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and the **outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**. With these mitigation measures, effects are Negligible. 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. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** has identified where solar panels need to be raised so that they remain operational without increasing flood risk elsewhere under a 1 in 100-year plus climate change event. The design principles for the Proposed Development are detailed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5].**	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
Your mitigation is vague: "where appropriate," "if required," "may include." The surface water monitoring approach will be "agreed with the Environment Agency prior to construction" - why isn't it detailed now? Once construction starts, it's too late. The 10-meter buffer zones around watercourses contain so many exceptions they could be meaningless. Construction activities will cause sedimentation, chemical contamination, altered water temperatures, and disruption of natural cycles. The EA raised these concerns specifically about Whitestone One. They should be comprehensively addressed before this application proceeds, not brushed aside with promises to work it out later.		
ROTHERHAM MBC: PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY CONFLICTS UNRESOLVED Sixty-two public rights of way are affected by this development. Two DMMO claims for upgrading routes to Byway Open to All Traffic status are pending within your site boundaries. These aren't minor administrative matters - they go to whether these routes can legally accommodate the uses you're proposing.	The **Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7]** includes an offset of 10m from the paths to the fences, and then an additional 5m between the fences and the solar panels, for a total offset of 15m in either direction. The siting of the inverters will be finalised within the detailed design period, subject to the **outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.14]**. These parameters specify that that the inverters or power conversion stations will be placed at least 50m from public rights of way where practicable.	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
RMBC specifically states construction traffic routes should "avoid passing along or across equestrian routes." Have you confirmed your routes do this? The Council requires 5-meter widths between fences for bridleways and byways. Is this incorporated in your design? They note inverter housing should be "sited away from bridleways and byways" for noise reasons. Have you done this? The Planning Inspectorate raised concerns that your "Scoping Report does not explain how the baseline use of these PRoWs will be established." You've done desktop reviews but no user surveys. How do you know the impact on people who actually use these paths daily - walkers, horse riders, cyclists? These paths connect our communities to countryside, provide health and recreation benefits, and in many cases follow historic routes used for centuries. The assessment shows "Moderate to Major Adverse (Significant) effects" on several routes. You propose temporary closures, but these require Secretary of State approval beyond 18 months. Have you considered the disruption?	The impacts of construction traffic have been assessed, and details can be found in the **Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20].** When selecting access routes, priority was given to major road networks over smaller local roads and roads with restrictions where possible. In addition, an **outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** and **Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** have been produced, with a commitment to provide detailed versions as the design develops.	
HISTORIC ENGLAND: SCHEDULED MONUMENT REQUIRES REASSESSMENT	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 **Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and**	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
This is perhaps the most serious issue. Historic England recently designated the Roman Villa at Conisbrough Parks as a Scheduled Monument, describing it as "undoubtedly one of the best surviving and most important sites in the region" - one of only a handful of Roman villas identified in Yorkshire. This is heritage of national significance. Your Chapter 8 (Cultural Heritage) was compiled before this designation. It's now obsolete. The Non-Technical Summary doesn't even mention it. This nationally significant scheduled monument requires complete reassessment. How can we comment on heritage impacts when your assessment doesn't reflect current designations? The field systems around both the Roman villa and Conisbrough Castle reflect 2,000 years of continuous agricultural history. This isn't just about individual monuments - it's an archaeological landscape where you can still understand how Roman and medieval communities lived and worked. Your development will industrialize landscape that's been agricultural for nearly two millennia, permanently severing this connection. Conisbrough Castle, one of England's finest Norman structures, will see its eastern approach - agricultural for 900 years - transformed into industrial infrastructure. This destroys the historical	**Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]**, no significant direct effects are predicted at construction, operation and maintenance or decommissioning. 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. Impacts to Conisbrough Castle are assessed in **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	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
context that allows visitors to understand the castle's relationship with its landscape. The heritage tourism economy supporting local businesses across Conisbrough and surrounding villages will be damaged, yet you've provided no assessment or compensation.	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.	
INCOMPLETE ASSESSMENT AND MISSING DOCUMENTS Beyond statutory consultee concerns, core documents are missing. The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan will be "provided later with the ES." The detailed Transport Assessment is deferred. The PROW Management Plan isn't	These documents have been submitted as part of the DCO application and can be found at the following document references: • **Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** • **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.14]**	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
provided. Green Belt impact assessment is separate. How is this adequate for consultation? You acknowledge watercourses with "failed" chemical status but provide no detailed plan for avoiding further damage during construction. The approach to issues like surface water monitoring and construction water management is described as "potential" or to be "agreed" later rather than definitive commitments.	Measures to manage impacts during construction are set out in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**. 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 **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.	
CONSULTATION INADEQUACY This consultation process has fundamental failures. Limited accessibility excludes many residents in Micklebring, Clifton, Hooton Roberts, Firsby, Ravenfield, and Conisbrough who cannot easily access online materials. Technical complexity prevents ordinary residents from understanding	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	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
impacts. Insufficient notice and limited public meetings mean affected communities haven't had proper opportunity to engage. Most seriously, you're consulting on incomplete information. When your own documents say surveys "will be completed," design details "will be confirmed as the development progresses," and key documents "will be provided later," this isn't adequate consultation - it's premature.	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].** A common concern was raised about the location and number of consultation events with requests for more events located in more villages. The public information events are only one component of the consultation and engagement programme, but an important part of the process. These in-person events allow individuals to view consultation materials and converse with the project team to understand more about the Proposed Development. It is not possible to host public events in every village or hamlet near the Proposed Development. In many cases, there are not venues that would meet accessibility or size requirements to host large events. It would also not be proportionate to host this many events. Therefore, the Applicant developed a programme of events located at venues across the local area such that no one would need to travel more than roughly 15 minutes to access an event. The locations of the events were informed by consultation and engagement throughout the development process. For the non-statutory consultation, the events were informed by initial conversations with the local authorities, as well as desk-based research to identify appropriate venues that would be near the solar site. In response to feedback from MP John Healey, the Applicant added an additional venue in Conisbrough. Based on	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	the attendance at the first round of events, the Applicant identified new venues for the second round of consultation, which were discussed in the SoCC consultation with local authorities. MP Jake Richards requested an event in Todwick, which the Applicant included in the second round of consultation. During the course of the statutory consultation, MP Sarah Champion requested the addition of another event in Treeton, which the Applicant added. The locations of events in the second round of consultation included some of the previous locations used in the first round, as well as new locations that had been identified through engagement with stakeholders. The Applicant developed a programme of events at various days of week and time of day to accommodate different work/life schedules. 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. More information can be found in the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1].** 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	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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].**	
Petition 12: Environment Agency		
I am objecting to the Whitestone One Solar Farm on environmental grounds. While climate action is essential, this development will cause severe and irreversible damage to biodiversity, water environment, and ecological systems. Climate action must enhance nature, not destroy it. ENVIRONMENT AGENCY WARNINGS IGNORED The Environment Agency specifically highlighted concerns about Whitestone One regarding flood risk and water environment impacts. These aren't minor technical issues - they affect our homes, our safety, and the wildlife habitats we observe daily. Parts of your site lie in Flood Zones 2 and 3 - areas already known to flood. With climate change making extreme weather more frequent, you're proposing	Impacts relating to water resources and flood risk are assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]**. Supporting technical information is provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. Measures for managing environmental impacts are outlined in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and the **outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**. With these mitigation measures, effects are Negligible. 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. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** has identified where solar panels need to be raised so that they remain operational without increasing flood risk	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
development in flood-prone areas. Your sequential test doesn't justify why this must go here when safer alternatives exist. Our communities shouldn't bear increased flood risk so you can use cheaper land. The EA notes groundwater springs in the area that you haven't surveyed. Private water supplies haven't been assessed. You admit "targeted walkover surveys will be completed to inform the assessment" - but shouldn't surveys be finished before consultation? Multiple watercourses in the area have "failed" chemical status and poor ecological conditions. Yet there's no detailed plan for how construction will avoid further damage. Your mitigation throughout uses vague language: "where appropriate," "if required," "may include." The surface water monitoring approach will be "agreed with Environment Agency prior to construction" - why isn't it defined now? The 10-meter buffer zones around watercourses contain so many exceptions they could be meaningless. Once construction starts, it's too late if these vague measures prove inadequate.	elsewhere under a 1 in 100-year plus climate change event. The design principles for the Proposed Development are detailed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5].**	
WILDLIFE CORRIDORS SEVERED Living here, we see the wildlife your technical documents reduce to survey data. The bats	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	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
following hedgerows at dusk. The skylarks nesting in fields each spring. The buzzards hunting over farmland. The great crested newts in our ponds. This isn't abstract ecology - it's the natural heritage defining our countryside. Your Chapter 6 fundamentally underestimates impacts across this ecologically connected landscape. The development will create a massive industrial barrier severing traditional wildlife movement routes functioning for centuries. Corridors between River Don valley and Tickhill countryside will be blocked. Ancient woodland at Old Denaby will be isolated from Ravenfield agricultural areas. Wetlands will be disconnected from uplands serving migrating species. Conisbrough countryside will be separated from Maltby. These aren't just lines on a map. Wildlife doesn't recognize site boundaries. When you fragment habitat, you fragment populations. Small, isolated populations face higher extinction risk. Genetic exchange between populations is prevented. The connected landscape that has sustained wildlife for centuries becomes an industrial wasteland. MITIGATION INADEQUACY	the soil will be left to rest. This creates an ecosystem where local wildlife can thrive, and biodiversity will increase. 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 **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**	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
Proposed environmental mitigation is completely inadequate. Wildlife corridors are too narrow for ecological connectivity. Replacement habitats aren't secured before construction.	**3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20].** Delivery and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO. 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.	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
PROTECTED SPECIES INADEQUATELY PROTECTED Multiple bat species use hedgerow networks connecting all affected communities. Industrial lighting and 24/7 operations will disrupt flight paths used nightly for decades. Heat from panels reaching 149ºF will alter insect populations - the primary food source for bats. Hundreds of acres of foraging habitat will be eliminated. Your assessment acknowledges these impacts but provides no adequate mitigation. New hedgerows at 0.3-0.6m height provide no immediate connectivity. Fifteen years are needed before functional flight corridors reestablish - many bats won't survive fragmentation that long. Replacement habitat isn't secured before construction begins. Birds of prey - kestrels, buzzards, barn owls we regularly observe - will lose hunting grounds covering hundreds of acres. Collision risk with panels and infrastructure isn't properly assessed. Ground-nesting skylarks and lapwings already in severe national decline will lose remaining habitat. These farmland specialists evolved with traditional agriculture. Modern intensive farming has already	Potential impacts to birds and bats are assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6].** 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	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
decimated populations. Remaining suitable habitat must be protected, not destroyed. You propose compensation, but ground-nesting birds require specific conditions that cannot be created quickly. The 15+ year mitigation timeline means multiple bird generations lost. For declining species, every breeding territory counts.	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 enhance roosting opportunities. Collectively, these measures are expected to result in long-term beneficial and potentially significant effects for bats at a district scale. 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,	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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 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	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9], including pre-construction checks, seasonal controls and protection of active nests.	
ANCIENT WOODLAND THREATENED Hooton Cliff ancient woodland faces inadequate protection with only a 10-meter offset. Ancient woodland has existed since at least 1600 AD and often much longer. It contains species and ecological relationships that cannot be recreated. The setting and context of ancient woodland is part of its significance. An industrial solar installation immediately adjacent destroys the experience of this heritage landscape feature. The offset provides no protection from visual intrusion, light pollution, noise disturbance affecting breeding birds, edge effects altering wind, temperature, and humidity, altered hydrology affecting ground flora, or recreational pressure from maintenance access.	Visual impacts are assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]**. 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].**	No
WATER QUALITY DEGRADATION Construction activities threaten sedimentation from soil disturbance across hundreds of acres, chemical contamination from fuel and oils, altered water	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	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
temperatures from reduced vegetation cover and heat island effects, and disruption of natural cycles wildlife has adapted to over centuries. The watercourses already have "failed" chemical status. They support aquatic life despite current degradation. Further pollution could cause complete ecosystem collapse. Starting from a poor baseline means any additional impact is more serious.	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.	
Petition 13: Incomplete Assessments		
I am writing to object to the Whitestone One Solar Farm on the basis that the Environmental Statement contains fundamental deficiencies preventing proper assessment. The consultation is premature and should not proceed until critical gaps are addressed. ASSESSMENT IS INCOMPLETE Your own documents reveal how incomplete this assessment is. The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan will be "provided later with the ES." The detailed Transport Assessment is deferred. You state, "construction access will be confirmed as the Proposed Development's design progresses" and "highway works will be included	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]** for further information. The updated **Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** includes trip generation, routeing and calculations. The assessment uses the trip generation detail provided in **Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the mitigation measures outlined in	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
within the ES" - suggesting the current version is incomplete. Environmental surveys acknowledge "targeted walkover surveys will be completed to inform the assessment." These should be finished before consultation, not during or after. The Environment Agency specifically notes groundwater springs in the area haven't been surveyed. Private water supply assessment is incomplete. Public rights of way baseline usage methodology is undefined despite 62 PROWs being affected. How can we properly comment when you're asking us to approve something before all facts are known? This isn't minor detail - these are core elements of impact assessment. The Planning Inspectorate raised concerns about your methodology, noting the "Scoping Report does not explain how the baseline use of these PROWs will be established" and questioning study area definition and access route descriptions.	the **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]**, which is secured by a requirement in the **draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1**. 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.	
HERITAGE ASSESSMENT IS OBSOLETE The most serious issue is that your heritage assessment is obsolete before you've even submitted the application. Historic England recently designated the Roman Villa at Conisbrough Parks as a Scheduled Monument, describing it as "undoubtedly one of the best surviving and most	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	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
important sites in the region" - one of only a handful of Roman villas in Yorkshire. Your Chapter 8 (Cultural Heritage and Archaeology) was compiled before this designation. It fundamentally underestimates the heritage significance. The Non-Technical Summary doesn't even mention the scheduling. This isn't a minor update - it's a nationally significant heritage asset that requires complete reassessment.	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.	
WATER ENVIRONMENT INADEQUATELY ASSESSED The Environment Agency specifically highlighted Whitestone One with concerns about flood risk and water environment impacts. Parts of your site lie in Flood Zones 2 and 3. Your sequential test doesn't justify why development must go in flood-prone areas when alternatives exist. Once construction starts, it's too late to implement proper protections if vague measures prove inadequate. The mitigation throughout uses escape clause language: "where appropriate," "if required," "may include." These aren't binding commitments.	Impacts relating to water resources and flood risk are assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]**. Supporting technical information is provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. Measures for managing environmental impacts are outlined in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and the **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**. With these mitigation measures, effects are Negligible. 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. **ES Volume 3,**	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	Appendix 10.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20] has identified where solar panels need to be raised so that they remain operational without increasing flood risk elsewhere under a 1 in 100-year plus climate change event. The design principles for the Proposed Development are detailed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5].**	
BIODIVERSITY ASSESSMENT INSUFFICIENT The biodiversity assessment suffers from inadequate survey coverage for such a large development affecting multiple communities. Limited seasonal data means year-round impacts can't be properly assessed. MITIGATION IS INADEQUATE Proposed mitigation throughout the assessment is disappointingly non-committal. Replacement habitats aren't secured before construction begins.	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 and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO.	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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.	
Petition 14: Communities Under Threat		
I am writing as a resident of one of the communities directly affected by Whitestone One Solar Farm to register my strong objection. This development will	Impacts on heritage assets are assessed in **Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8**].	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
destroy the rural character and heritage of multiple historic communities that have coexisted with this agricultural landscape for centuries. OUR COMMUNITIES UNDER THREAT Living in this area, we see daily what your technical documents reduce to statistics. The skylarks that nest in the fields each spring. The bats following hedgerows at dusk. The footpaths we've walked for generations. The views from Conisbrough Castle that have remained agricultural for 900 years. This isn't just "landscape impact" - it's our home, our heritage, our way of life. Conisbrough will see its historic setting destroyed. The Roman villa recently designated as a Scheduled Monument - one of only a handful in Yorkshire - sits in fields your development will industrialize. This villa and the agricultural landscape around it preserve 2,000 years of history. Once destroyed, that connection is gone forever. The castle attracts thousands of heritage tourists supporting local businesses. Industrial solar arrays visible from the battlements will damage both the visitor experience and our tourism economy. HERITAGE THAT BELONGS TO THE NATION Historic England recently designated the Roman Villa at Conisbrough Parks as a Scheduled	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. 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.	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
Monument of national importance. Your heritage assessment was compiled before this designation - it's obsolete. The Non-Technical Summary doesn't even mention it. How can we comment on heritage impacts when your assessment doesn't reflect current designations? The field systems around both the villa and Conisbrough Castle reflect nearly 2,000 years of continuous history. From Roman agriculture through medieval farming to today's fields, this landscape tells the story of how communities have lived and worked here. Your development will industrialize what's been agricultural fortwo millennia, permanently destroying this connection. Conisbrough Castle's eastern approach has remained agricultural for 900 years, enabling visitors to understand the relationship between the medieval fortress and the landscape it protected. Solar panels, security fencing, and substations up to 13.5 meters high will sever that understanding. The heritage tourism supporting our local economy will be damaged, yet you've provided no assessment or compensation. Ancient woodland at Hooton Cliff faces visual intrusion from an industrial installation. Your 10-meter offset is completely inadequate. Ancient woodland has existed since at least 1600 AD and	Following feedback received during statutory consultation, the villa has been removed from the Order Limits. Impacts to Conisbrough Castle are assessed in **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, 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	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
often much longer. It's irreplaceable. The setting matters as much as the trees themselves.	Castle's association with the former Medieval Deer Park, which is located within the Site at W1. **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. All ancient woodland and veteran trees will be avoided in accordance with current government guidance and the **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3].**	
The traditional field boundaries and ancient hedgerows - some centuries old - will be ripped out for access roads. Narrow village streets never designed for industrial traffic will suffer years of heavy vehicle damage. The flood risk from altered drainage patterns hasn't been properly assessed, yet our homes could be affected. Our villages risks being completely overwhelmed. Surrounded by solar arrays and industrial infrastructure, future generations won't understand why they exists or how it functioned as an agricultural community. The farmland bird habitat and small mammal populations we observe daily will be eliminated. Our traditional farming connections, maintained for centuries, will be severed. We will lose the rural tranquility that defines these historic villages. Single-track roads will be overrun with construction traffic. The Green Belt designation	**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. 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 the draft DCO, 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.	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
exists specifically to protect small communities like ours from being overwhelmed - this development directly contradicts that purpose. TRAFFIC CHAOS AFFECTING EVERYONE The construction impact will be brutal: 24 to 36 months starting in 2027, with peak traffic in 2028. Your documents show 370 collisions in five years including 18 fatal accidents in our area. Multiple schools sit along your proposed routes with 20mph zones. Yet you haven't confirmed construction access routes or assessed how 25+ access points across three sites will affect our daily lives. Weight restrictions, single-track roads, and bridge constraints mean many routes can't handle your traffic. But more fundamentally, you're asking communities to endure years of disruption when you haven't even confirmed which routes you'll use. How can we comment when you don't know your own plan? Your assessment admits "Moderate to Major Adverse (Significant) effects" on several paths. Peaceful rural walks will become industrial corridors for fifteen years until mitigation planting matures - if it ever does.	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. The impacts of construction traffic have been assessed, and details can be found in the **Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. When selecting access routes, priority was given to major road networks over smaller local roads and roads with restrictions where possible. Access tracks through hedges and field boundaries seek to use existing paths where possible and cross with as little disruption as possible. In addition, an **outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** and **outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** have been produced, with a commitment to provide detailed versions as the design develops.	
GREEN BELT DESTRUCTION	National policy requires a mix of renewable energy technologies, delivered at a range of scales, to meet future energy demand and	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
The entire site lies within South and West Yorkshire Green Belt, whose fundamental purpose is to keep land permanently open. Your own assessment admits "Moderate Adverse (Significant) Effects" on landscape and "loss of openness." The 3.8-meter solar panels will destroy the open character Green Belt policy exists to protect. You've deferred proper Green Belt assessment to a separate report, suggesting you know this is your weakest point. The assessment fails to demonstrate why industrial rooftops, brownfield sites, and already developed land across South Yorkshire can't accommodate this project without destroying Green Belt that's protected our communities' settings for decades. VISUAL IMPACT ON OUR DAILY LIVES Your assessment identifies significant visual harm, but these aren't just "viewpoints" - they're our homes and the places we live every day. Conisbrough faces direct views from 0.2km away. Clifton experiences significant effects from 0.5km. Ravenfield and Micklebring will see industrial infrastructure dominating approaches to our villages. From Beacon Hill, a local landmark, the assessment shows "Moderate to Major Adverse (Significant)	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].**	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
visual effects." The substations up to 13.5 meters high - equivalent to four-story buildings - will be visible across considerable distances due to the rolling topography. Your proposed mitigation is inadequate. New hedgerows planted at 0.3-0.6m height provide no screening. Fifteen years are needed before meaningful screening develops - a generation will experience severe impacts. Even after fifteen years, your assessment admits "Moderate Adverse (Significant) effects" will remain. Deciduous screening provides minimal protection in winter, meaning severe impacts for approximately half of every year.	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].**	
AGRICULTURAL LAND AND SOIL DESTRUCTION Hundreds of acres of productive agricultural land will be permanently lost. This land currently supports cereal production, livestock grazing, and traditional farming systems that have sustained our communities for centuries. Your claims about returning to agriculture after 40 years ignore the reality of irreversible soil compaction from construction traffic and permanent removal of land by concrete foundations.	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	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
With climate change threatening food security, why are we sacrificing productive farmland when alternatives exist on already degraded land? ALTERNATIVES NOT EXPLORED Your Chapter 4 fails to demonstrate why this heritage-sensitive location affecting multiple historic communities must be sacrificed. Industrial rooftops across South Yorkshire, brownfield sites, already developed land not in Green Belt - why can't these accommodate your project without destroying countryside protected for good reason? Cost appears to drive your site selection rather than minimizing harm. Our communities shouldn't bear permanent environmental and heritage damage so you can use cheaper land. This development represents an unacceptable sacrifice of multiple rural communities for industrial development that could go elsewhere. The cumulative impact of heritage destruction, Green Belt loss, environmental damage, traffic chaos, and visual harm across Conisbrough, Hooton Roberts, Ravenfield, Micklebring, Clifton, and Firsby is unacceptable when alternatives exist.	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; • 0.32% of Grade 4 Agricultural Land;	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	• 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/APP/6.20]**. 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.	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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, 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]**.	
Petition 15: Ulley		
I object to the proposed Whitestone Development and especially Whitestone 2 in Ulley for the following reasons: - The size of the development is totally unacceptable and there has been a total failure to fully evaluate the aspects of the impact this development will have on the local environment. The farm will last for 60	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**	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
years so will impact the lifetime of current residents and their children.	**[EN0110020/APP/5.1]** describes the feedback received and how the master plan was updated in response.	
Whitestone's consultations have not engaged with local people and have been kept to an absolute minimum. The public notice of the formal consultation was fastened to a field gate outside the village. This is not acceptable when the village notice board should have been considered along with a local press release. At the event, representatives could not adequately respond to many detailed questions, such as exactly where the access roads for Whitestone 2 would be, nor traffic mitigation plans. Ulley is a small village accessed by rural roads not fit for mass construction traffic and local people may find it impossible to enter and leave the village to go about their daily lives. The consultation documentation (Environmental Impact statement) provided by Whitestone is extremely complex and is not presented to be readily informative and was also incomplete and contained errors - clearly highlighted. The consultation meeting in Ulley was held on Oct 14th and yet we only have until 28th October to respond. This is unfair and the deadline should be	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]** for further information. The public information events are only one component of the consultation and engagement programme, but an important part of the process. These in-person events allow individuals to view consultation materials and converse with the project team to understand more about the Proposed Development. The Applicant developed a programme of events at various days of week and time of day to accommodate different work/life schedules. 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	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
extended or given the lack of information should be rescheduled completely. There has also been no visible engagement with Rotherham Borough Council. There appears no recognition of all the other planned solar and energy parks that are going through local planning procedures. The impact of these plus Whitestone must be considered and assessed together to protect our communities. Some statutory consultees do not seem to have been involved.	them due to scheduling, the next closest event would be more convenient. Due to the size of the Proposed Development, it is considered a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project according to the Planning Act 2008. The Planning Act establishes the planning process for projects of this size, which will be decided at the national level by the Secretary of State for Net Zero and Energy Security. There is a meaningful role for local authorities in the development process, through consultation in the pre-application stage, and ongoing engagement throughout examination and post-consent. More information can be found in the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1].**	
There is no final agreement where battery storage, cable corridors and sub stations will be sited. The current proposal shows battery store at the top of the hill in Upper Whiston. This huge structure will be seen, and heard, for miles around. This is totally unacceptable. Although we heard that the areas planned for the siting of solar panels have been pushed back, the proposed siting of the panels on hills surrounding the village and close to our rural roadsides continues to be unacceptable. Solar panels should not be placed on hills, as it's impossible to mitigate or disguise their impact. I do not want to drive	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 **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
through an industrial landscape to access the village.	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].**	
Ulley enjoys a wide and diverse wildlife population including many species of flora and fauna, including Birds of Prey, Deer, Hares and a wide variety of other animals. The impact of this proposal on this wildlife has not been adequately addressed, rather fenced out. The hunting areas needed to sustain this wildlife have not been adequately protected.	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. 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,	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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 and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO. 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.	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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.	
The Village is surrounded by Public Footpaths and Bridle ways. These must be protected, without fencing them in. What if our dogs get into fenced off areas and cannot recall. The joy of walking and riding in the countryside is the outlook, the feeling of space and the distant views. These are paramount to our rural community.	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 via a Public Rights of Way Management Plan (PRoWMP). An **outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/7.7]** has been submitted with the Application.	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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].**	
The proposed community benefits package is woefully inadequate and does not reach the individual households impacted. Our house prices will fall and there is no commitment that local residents' electricity costs will be lowered, there is just no compensation offered. This project is opposed by the residents of Ulley and its surrounding villages in South Yorkshire.	The Applicant has committed to delivering a meaningful community benefit package to ensure that local communities share in the benefits of the Proposed Development. While there is no standard, the Applicant proposes a community benefit fund of £400 per MW per year which is consistent with other UK solar developments. 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 final size and lifespan of the Proposed Development. See the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information**.**	No
Petition 16: OnPath Energy		
I am writing as a resident of Rotherham, regarding the proposed Whitestone Solar Farm development. Having reviewed your consultation materials and the accompanying draft Environmental Statement, I wish to formally register my objection to this proposal on the following grounds: 1. Inappropriate Green Belt Development The proposal contradicts national Green Belt policy. Industrial-scale energy infrastructure—featuring substations up to 13.5m high, 2.2m	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	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
fencing, CCTV, and BESS compounds—cannot be considered compatible with the openness or rural character the Green Belt is designed to protect. For these reasons, I urge OnPath Energy and your project partners to withdraw or substantially redesign the Whitestone proposal and to explore alternative, less intrusive renewable solutions such as rooftop, brownfield, or smaller distributed installations. This project, in its current form, would irreversibly damage our Green Belt, erode our rural heritage, compromise community wellbeing for generations and ruin access to green spaces for everyone in Rotherham and the surrounding area.	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 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,	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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].**	
2. Visual Impact and Landscape Character Even after the claimed 25% reduction, the proposed 3.8m-high solar panels will dominate the local landscape for up to 60 years. All villages in the area where the Solar Farms are proposed to be constructed will lose their rural views permanently, with screening taking decades to mature.	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
3. Excessive Scale and Cumulative Impact At 750 MW across three sites, this is one of the UK's largest solar projects, turning vast areas of open countryside into an industrial energy zone. The cumulative effects alongside other regional developments are wholly disproportionate.	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	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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**]. 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 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.	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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).	
4. Construction Disruption and Traffic Impact The projected 833 vehicle movements per day (including over 200 HGVs) for a two-year construction period will overwhelm rural lanes, create air quality issues, and severely disrupt daily life. The statement that routes will 'avoid villages where possible' is insufficient and unenforceable.	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]** for further information. The updated **Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** includes trip generation, routeing and calculations. The assessment uses the trip generation detail provided in **Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and 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**.	Yes
5. Noise and Disturbance Substations, BESS units, and conversion stations will operate 24/7, introducing constant low-frequency noise into what are currently tranquil rural	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	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
environments. The consultation provides no binding limits, monitoring, or penalties.	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.	
6. Loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land Over 20% of the affected area comprises high-grade farmland (Grades 1, 2 and 3a). Removing this from food production for 60 years is unjustifiable given current food security concerns. Grazing beneath panels is not equivalent to active agricultural use.	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].**	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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.	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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/APP/6.20]**. 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.	
7. Inadequate Community Benefit The proposed £400 per MW per year fund is wholly inadequate and below national norms. It fails to reflect the scale, duration, and impact on local communities, property values, and amenity.	The Applicant has committed to delivering a meaningful community benefit package to ensure that local communities share in the benefits of the Proposed Development. While there is no standard, the Applicant proposes a community benefit fund of £400 per MW per year which is consistent with other UK solar developments. Based on the project's 750MW grid connection, this would equate to approximately £300,000 per year. Over the	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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 final size and lifespan of the Proposed Development. See the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information**.**	
8. Flood Risk and Environmental Damage Portions of the site lie in Flood Zones 2 and 3. Large impermeable structures and access tracks will inevitably alter drainage patterns and increase flood risk to downstream communities.	Impacts relating to water resources and flood risk are assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]**. Supporting technical information is provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. Measures for managing environmental impacts are outlined in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and the **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**. With these mitigation measures, effects are Negligible.	No
9. Biodiversity and Habitat Harm Claims of biodiversity gain are unsubstantiated and rely on incomplete surveys. Industrial fencing, lighting, and long-term disturbance will damage established habitats for protected species such as badgers, newts, bats, and water voles.	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. 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	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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 management period, is presented in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20].** Delivery and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO. 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	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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.	
10. Battery Energy Storage Safety Risks Large-scale battery systems pose fire and explosion hazards. Local emergency services lack the specialist equipment required to manage such incidents safely, placing residents at risk.	As part of the DCO application an **oBSMP [EN0110020/APP/5.15**] has been produced in consultation with the local fire service to control design and actions in case of emergency.	No
11. Inadequate Consultation and Uncertain Details Critical information—including confirmed cable routes, traffic access points, and drainage plans—remains undecided, leaving communities unable to make fully informed responses. Six weeks is an	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	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
insufficient consultation period for a development of this scale.	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]** for further information. 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 **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	
Petition 17: Access and Routes		
This report presents a detailed evaluation of why the access arrangements for the Whitestone 1 (W1) development in Conisbrough Parks are problematic and at great risk to the wellbeing of residents in Doncaster, specifically heavily populated areas such as Warmsworth, Edlington, Conisbrough and surrounding villages. The report focuses on the	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 **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
proposed routes and access points, limited to only 2 points from the A630 and B6376 both from the A1- to cater for the entirety of W1. The report highlights how the wider impacts across Doncaster and Rotherham, with lack of alternatives and options to mitigate the limitations. Key concerns addressed include road safety and accident history, traffic congestion, air quality, local opposition, disruptions due to flooding, route feasibility, misalignment to both Doncaster and Rotherham Plans and recommended mitigation measures. **1. Road Safety and Accident History** The A630 is a principal route proposed for access to W1, 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 fatally killed in November 2014, and in 2011 3 teenagers were fatally killed in a collision on part of the A630 where Doncaster Road tums into Sheffield Road in Conisbrough. This is 8 Deaths too many. Historic accident data reveals multiple recorded collisions along this stretch,	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. **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].** The assessments conclude that the construction of the Proposed Development will result in a Negligible magnitude of impact on road user and pedestrian safety.	

<table>
<tr><th>Comment</th><th>Applicant Response</th><th>Design Change</th></tr>
<tr><td>amplified by high traffic volumes and complex junctions. Press reports have called the area an accident black spot and STILL one of area's most dangerous roads. This is supported by several videos circulated on Social regarding anti-social use of the road.

These risks are heightened by increased construction and operational traffic linked to the proposed development within the documents released by Whitestone which are frightening.

Source Whitestone Transport-Statement Section 1.1.93
Table 2-3 Collisions within the Whitestone 1 Study Area (2019-2023)
<table>
<tr><th>Road Name</th><th>Slight</th><th>Serious</th><th>Fatal</th><th>Total</th></tr>
<tr><td>A630 Conisbrough to Warmsworth</td><td>15</td><td>6</td><td>1</td><td>22</td></tr>
<tr><td>B6376 Edington Lane</td><td>19</td><td>9</td><td>1</td><td>29</td></tr>
<tr><td>A630 Hooton Roberts to Conisbrough (Clifton Hill Junction)</td><td>7</td><td>7</td><td>0</td><td>14</td></tr>
</table>
</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Comment					Applicant Response	Design Change
(3.86km distance along road)						
Ruddle Lane	3	1	0	4		

The table above, prepared by Whitestone, indicates the need for serious 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 further fatal collision occurred on B6376 Edington Lane April 12th, 2025. 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 missed within the Data provided by Whitestone seek to downplay the significance of the increase of traffic. Casting doubt on the figures and further concern as sensitive receptors such as schools and pedestrian crossings are on this route.

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
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 longe 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 amour 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.	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 [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** provides estimates of vehicle volumes considered, and known crash data.	Yes
3. Air Quality and Pollution Air pollution along the A630 and A6023 crossroads	Air quality effects associated with the Proposed Development, including those affecting Conisbrough, have been assessed in **ES Chapter 12: Air Quality** [**EN0110020/APP/6.12],** with	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
outside Conisbrough Castle is a significant concern and the A630 Sheffield Road have been 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 Draft-ES-Volume-2-Figure-12.1-Air-Quality-Study-Area does not show any local NO2 Monitoring points or local PM2.5 Monitoring points within W1, as they show as being shown at Brinsworth. Further key analysis is required due to the recent information that Conisbrough, specifically the A630 due to recent report highlighted above.	construction traffic data informed by **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13].** Construction traffic flows for both light-duty vehicles (LDVs) and heavy-duty vehicles (HDVs) have been assessed using the IAQM screening methodology **[REF-13]**. As a result of this screening, nine road links screened in for further consideration under the IAQM criteria **[REF-13]**, eight of which are located in or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). These include Doncaster AQMA No. 2 and AQMA No. 5, which can be viewed in **ES Volume 3, Figure 12.1: Air Quality Study Area [EN0110020/APP/6.19]** and which encompass roads such as the A630 through Conisbrough and Warmsworth, where construction traffic accessing the northern part of the Site would travel. The assessment recognises that parts of the road network near Conisbrough are within an existing AQMA due to elevated nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) concentrations, and this context has been fully accounted for in the assessment. **ES Chapter 12: Air Quality** [**EN0110020/APP/6.12]** considers a large number of nearby human receptors, which includes receptors within Conisbrough, ensuring that potential effects on local residents have been appropriately assessed. While the overall construction period is expected to last between 24 and 36 months, construction is anticipated to be phased, and activities will not occur across all areas simultaneously, which further limits the potential for sustained impacts on local air quality. Construction-phase air quality impacts from activities and traffic have been assessed on a semi-quantitative basis in accordance	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
12.8.12 states the construction traffic is potentially above the screening thresholds in AQMAs. Locations where traffic may pass through an AQMA include traffic accessing W1 on the A630 through Conisbrough and Warmsworth, and along the B6058. Further analysis will be undertaken in the ES using more refined traffic data to assess the potential for road traffic to contribute to screening. This does not suggest that significant impacts are occurring, but rather that a more detailed assessment is needed. The above highlighted statement is further evidence of the applicant underplaying the significance of the impact of the suggested routes, Open source research shows that Air Quality Management Areas AQMA on the A630 is above national average and specific analysis is certainly required along this route, in order to comply with the Doncaster and Rotherham Plan to ensure the health of residents. Whitestone's Transport-Statement Section 1.1.185 suggests routes were planned to avoid environmentally sensitive zones, Due to the A630 being above the UK Limit on nitrogen dioxide (NO2), this should be a serious consideration and mitigated by the applicant and assessed as an environmentally sensitive zone within any methodology.	with IAQM guidance **[REF-13]**. Embedded mitigation measures are set out in Section 12.6 of **ES Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]**, with all construction-phase air quality impacts predicted to be Not Significant following mitigation. These measures will be secured through the oCEMP **[EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and implemented throughout construction, ensuring that any potential effects on air quality near Conisbrough are appropriately managed.	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
4. Local Opposition and Planning Context There is significant local opposition, thousands of residents attending public meetings and walks, not only opposing the developments 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 for over 200 new homes, 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. Planning application 21/03311/FULM Proposed residential development for over 200 houses in the area (Land Southeast Of Old Road Conisbrough Doncaster) gave the following review within CDS's refusal "The proposal by virtue of increased vehicle movements would result in an adverse impact on air quality, close to an area that is a declared Air Quality Management Area leading to a cumulative impact on public health. It is further considered that the submitted Travel Plan would be ineffective to mitigate those impacts. Consequently, the proposal is contrary to Policy 54 of the Doncaster Local Plan	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 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**).	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
and paragraph 186 of the National Planning Policy Framework." This application is currently submitted for Recommendation/ and or comment under 24/010404/FULM on new proposals for over 200 dwellings. Previous planning applications have been refused due to safety concerns on the A630. For example, application RB2012/1383 (stable block and hay barn on Doncaster Road, Hooton Roberts, Rotherham) was denied because it would create additional turning traffic, increasing risks on a busy, high-speed road and compromising road safety. Of note this location of RB2012/1383 is the proposed location for a separate solar farm by German company ILOS Solar Farm Planning ref RB2025/0236, which runs at the side of Firsby Lane on W 1 (North West Position) boundary. 10/03480/FUL was an application for a Dog Kennel and Cattery off Firsby Lane, Due to the dangerous highway of the A630 Conisbrough, conditions/directives were placed on the applicant to improve highway safety by agreeing to a delivery service only for the business due to the visibility at the access junction to the A630.	• **Intra-project effects** on ecological receptors are considered within the biodiversity assessment. **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 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.	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
24/02106/FULM - Change of Use for Motorcross facility - Location Field Off Green Baulk and Ruddle Lane, Clifton. Decision was refused due to harming the openness of the Doncaster Greenbelt but reason 03 The development would fail to provide safe and secure access to the site for all users and result in unacceptable harm to safety on surrounding highway network conflicting with NPPF and the Doncaster plan 13 and 14.		
5. Sensitive Receptors, Business impacts, 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.	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 **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.	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
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, with the entire lane being a sensitive receptor. (See Section 9 for further sensitive receptors such as Hill Top Primary School)		
6. Flooding Events and Traffic Disruption Conisbrough has experienced significant flooding in recent years, resulting in major well documented traffic disruptions which centre around Conisbrough Castle and A630. Due to the ongoing issues flood events have previously led to the national leaders of political parties to attend to draw further attention to the issues which are well documented. 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	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, 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

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
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. A Section 19 Flood Investigation Report 2024 by Doncaster Council into flooding during Storm Babet concludes that Conisbrough around the A630 has a history of flooding with heavy and prolonged rain causing river levels in the area to rise, namely River Don and Kearsley Brook which exceeded its banks and over walls. 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.		
7. Public Right of Ways / Bridleways	The design has incorporated at least a 15m buffer for PRoWs, with the aim of reducing any potential impacts to sensitive	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
Whitestone's Transport-Statement Section 1.1.121 outlines Walking, Cycling and Equestrian Accessibility. Whitestone have identified the following footpaths within section 1.1.126 and Bridleways within section 101.127 Conisbrough Parks Footpath No.3. Conisbrough Parks Footpath No.5. Conisbrough Parks Footpath No.8 · Conisbrough Parks Footpath No.14. Conisbrough Parks Footpath No.16 - Conisbrough Parks Bridleway No.4. Conisbrough Parks Bridleway No.14 Section 1/1/124: These routes will NOT require permanent closure as a result of the construction, operation, or decommissioning of the Proposed Development. However, some temporary diversions and user management may be required to ensure the safe and uninterrupted usage of these routes throughout construction. I am unable to locate any PROW Management Plan (PROWMP) referred to within Draft Environmental Statement Non-Technical Summary 5.9.10. Without mitigation, there are potentially hundreds of horse riders, cyclist, walkers pedestrians who include children who will not have access to Conisbrough Parks via the A630 specifically around Park Lane and Firsby Lane. This will cause serious	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 via a Public Rights of Way Management Plan (PRoWMP). An **outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/7.7]** 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].** The outline **Public Rights of Way Management plan [EN0110020/APP/7.7]** is included in the DCO and explains the proposed mitigation and management strategy. Potential safety issues related to the A630 are considered in **Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]**. The Applicant has also included new permissive paths, which are presented in the **Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/2.7]**.	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
safety issues that requires serious mitigation and analysis. Evidence can be provided of equestrian accidents on the A630 which clearly show it is unsuitable for any leisure riders.		
8. Adverse Weather conditions / Working Hours during GMT The Draft-ES-Volume-3-Appendix-13.2_Transport-Statement fails to specify any mitigations for adverse weather conditions on the 2 routes, showing any impacts to the local services. Beacon Lane and Ruddle lane are locally well known for black ice during winter months. This does not appear to have been considered alongside additional grit required from local stocks at key times. Sections from Draft-ES-Volume-3-Appendix-13.2_Transport-Statement: 1.1.151 HGV movements during the construction phase will be scheduled throughout the working day, avoiding peak traffic times (08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00). This approach is designed to minimise congestion and disruption on local roads during periods of highest demand. HGV routes and timings will be coordinated using a Delivery Management System to ensure compliance with	The impacts of construction traffic have been assessed, and details can be found in the **Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. When selecting access routes, priority was given to major road networks over smaller local roads and roads with restrictions where possible. In addition, an **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** has been produced, with a commitment to provide detailed versions as the design develops. Impacts relating to air quality are assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]**. Air quality effects associated with the Proposed Development, including those affecting Conisbrough, have been assessed in **ES Chapter 12: Air Quality** [**EN0110020/APP/6.12],** with construction traffic data informed by **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13].** Construction traffic flows for both light-duty vehicles (LDVs) and heavy-duty vehicles (HDVs) have been assessed using the IAQM screening methodology **[REF-13]**. As a result of this screening, nine road links screened in for further consideration under the	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
established protocols and to promote safe and efficient traffic flow. 13.7.3 Where practicable, deliveries will be planned outside of school opening and closing times. All delivery drivers will be informed during their induction about the presence of schools along construction delivery routes within settlements. Given sections 1.1.151 and 13.7.3, further clarification is needed regarding journeys on the B6376 Edington Lane. While it is stated that HGVs will operate between 09:00 and 17:00, this does not seem to account for school pick-up and drop-off times along routes passing the school. Please address this issue and include relevant calculations for the A630 and related air pollution impacts.	IAQM criteria **[REF-13]**, eight of which are located in or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). These include Doncaster AQMA No. 2 and AQMA No. 5, which can be viewed in **ES Volume 3, Figure 12.1: Air Quality Study Area [EN0110020/APP/6.19]** and which encompass roads such as the A630 through Conisbrough and Warmsworth, where construction traffic accessing the northern part of the Site would travel. The assessment recognises that parts of the road network near Conisbrough are within an existing AQMA due to elevated nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) concentrations, and this context has been fully accounted for in the assessment. **ES Chapter 12: Air Quality** [**EN0110020/APP/6.12]** considers a large number of nearby human receptors, which includes receptors within Conisbrough, ensuring that potential effects on local residents have been appropriately assessed. While the overall construction period is expected to last between 24 and 36 months, construction is anticipated to be phased, and activities will not occur across all areas simultaneously, which further limits the potential for sustained impacts on local air quality.	
9. Route Analysis The feasibility of using rudd 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.	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 **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**	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
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.	**[EN0110020/APP/6.20]** provides estimates of vehicle volumes considered, and known crash data.	
10. Mitigation Measures	The impacts of construction traffic have been assessed, and details can be found in the **Transport Statement**	No

<table>
<tr><th>Comment</th><th>Applicant Response</th><th>Design Change</th></tr>
<tr>
<td>
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.

Table 2-17 Concerns and Responses (excerpt) Draft Environmental Statement (Volume 3, 13.2 Transport Statement)
<table>
<tr><th>Concern / Comment</th><th>Response</th></tr>
<tr><td>Concern that A630 will be the only A road to Whitestone 1 and it is already busy</td><td>Use of the A630 is necessary due to existing access constraints. Routing has prioritised higher-capacity roads, and mitigation measures will be included in</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
<td>
[EN0110020/APP/6.20]. When selecting access routes, priority was given to major road networks over smaller local roads and roads with restrictions where possible.

In addition, an oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12] has been produced, with a commitment to provide detailed versions as the design develops.

Impacts relating to air quality are assessed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12].
</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</table>

Comment		Applicant Response	Design Change
	the oCTMP to manage traffic flow and safety.		
Request to create access route off M18 directly rather than along A630	A construction access from the M18 is not currently feasible and would not be acceptable to National Highways		
11. 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		The applicant is working with relevant parties to secure safe means of operating via the **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]**. 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 **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.	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
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 Land and Ruddle Lane. What paragraph 1.1.52 of the transport statement fails to acknowledge is 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.		

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
A630 High Road Table 2-19 2028 Average Daily Two-Way Movements (AADT Baseline) Page 48 showing that the total will be a total 27,183 Journeys (576 Daily) and increase of 12% 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. After reviewing Whitestone's data, neither proposed W1 route is suitable for a project of this scale, and no feasible alternatives have been identified.		
Petition 18: ALC		
Re: Draft Environmental Statement GROUND CONDITIONS AND LAND QUALITY 2.3.7 and 2.3.8 and Volume 1: Chapter 9 Ground Conditions and Land Quality and Volume 3: Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report The following is a list of reasons why I strongly object to Whitestone proposals to decimate 1,200 acres of productive agricultural land by covering it with thousands of solar panels and infrastructure,	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	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
turning our rural treasure into a gigantic Chinese-manufactured eco desert. 1. Whitestone have predominantly relied on desk-top research and The Natural England Provisional Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) to superficially assess the quality of the land, rather than in-depth field studies. 2. The ALC is stated by Natural England itself to be 'provisional' so should not be relied upon absolutely. 3. Whitestone admits that the information is out-of-date quote "due to the age of the data, further surveys are being undertaken". So the info they are including and basing their assumptions on, and presenting to us, is old. 4. Whitestone "assessments" have only taken place on 45% of Area 1 5. Their surveys are taken at a point in time and then extrapolated. This is not a true representation. Assessments should be over a whole year's worth of data, covering all the seasons and weather events in a 12 month period at least 6. Natural England data does not differentiate between 3a Best Most Versatile (BMV) and 3b not BMV. 7. ALC does not recognise Grade 3 land to be split into Grade 3a or 3b, but Whitestone are wrongly trying to push tranches of land into a 3b category, which would subgrade this 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; • 0.32% of Grade 4 Agricultural Land; • 0.67% of Urban Land;	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
and put it below the line of Best Most Versatile Land and therefore into a non-BMV grade, hoping it will strengthen their case to use farmland and deter proper scrutiny. 8. The ALC may not be fit for purpose when it comes to relating it to important local knowledge regarding land type and conditions and that much of the grade 3b land should be revised to 3a in terms of food security, food production and reduction of food miles 9. Defra have also considered expanding BMV land to include 3b in 2022 as supply of this grade is becoming increasingly less available. Grade 3b land is likely to be lifted into the category of BMV land and should be protected at any cost. 10. CPRE Council for Protection of Rural England state that it is essential to preserve agricultural land for farming purposes and has raised concerns. Agri-voltaics do NOT compensate for the loss potential of the land. Sheep grazing is simply a token gesture as Planning has no jurisdiction over how agricultural land is farmed. 11. NPPF guidance discourages development on BMV land unless there are exceptional circumstances, which this project is not. The NPPF states that when located in Green Belt, elements of many renewable energy projects	• 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/APP/6.20]**. 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.	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
will constitute "inappropriate development". (NPPF para 160). "3.10.14 applicants should where possible utilise previously developed, brownfield, contaminated or industrial land". As with many other sections of the Whitestone's Environmental Statement, they have started with an assumed and arrogant position that they will get a successful application passed - they know the answer they want - but they have failed miserably to carry out sufficiently, thoroughly and fairly the work and hard evidence that will get them past the post. There are gaps, omissions and assumptions in their assessments, and pursuing a generic, homogenised approach which they have no doubt used on all their other 55 solar projects/companies, all based at The Long Barn, Radstock under the Directorship of Jonathan Thompson, like a cut and paste job. Whitestone are trying to downgrade the quality of our rural assets in every aspect. This needs to be raised as serious concerns, at the highest level. Whatever desk-based research, ALC listings or other pre-prepared data they put in their reports, there is nothing to beat the knowledge and experience of our local farmers who have worked on these fields all their lives, like their fathers and forefathers before them - this is their life and		

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
livelihood. They have tilled, seeded, fertilised, watered, harvested and tended crops in rain and shine, 365 days (and nights) a year for decades, even centuries. These farmers and land workers know the soils, the terrain, the topography and contours, and all the vagaries of weather and conditions in this particular location. No-one knows the land better nor what it is capable of, than they do. And yet, Whitestone ignores all this knowledge in their pursuit of speed and greed. It is quite difficult for those of us less familiar with farming, to imagine just how large a food mountain is created from this specific area of land. The main crops grown here typically include potatoes, wheat, barley, beans, and rape seed, as well as animal fodder crops. (Clearly there would normally be crop rotation and mixed crops grown), but here is an analogy based on a single crop, to help us visualise the enormity of food that is being taken out of production here on our doorstep, and off our tables. Example 1: POTATOES All the fields in this proposed site area of 1,200 acres have a mix of soil grades (Grade 1 the best, 2, and 3), but they are ALL capable of supporting staple food crops eg potatoes. If all 1,200 acres were planted with potatoes, average yield would be 20 Tonnes per acre 20 Tonnes per acre x 1,200 acres = 24,000 Tonnes		

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
of potatoes = 24,000,000 kg At a typical portion size of 0.22kg per person THIS WOULD FEED 109,090,909 (Over 109 MILLION PEOPLE) or looking at it another way. The population of Conisbrough is 15,773 people (as officially recorded in 2021), this would feed every man, woman and child with a portion of potatoes each per day, for nearly 19 YEARS. Example 2: WHEAT If all 1,200 acres were sown with wheat, with an average yield of 3 Tonnes per acre 1,200 acres x 3 tonnes = 3,600 tonnes wheat. 1 Tonne of wheat makes approx 250,000 WEETABIX biscuits (which are 97% wheat) So 3,600 Tonnes of wheat would make approx 900 Million Weetabix biscuits At an average portion size of 2 biscuits per person for breakfast THIS WOULD FEED 450 MILLION PEOPLE This would feed every man, woman and child of Conisbrough with a BREAKFAST each per day, for OVER 78 YEARS. Example 3: RAPE SEED OIL If all 1,200 acres were sown with Rape, with an average yield of 1.5 Tonnes per acre 1,200 acres x 1.5 Tonnes per acre = 1,800 tonnes of rape seed 1.4 kg of rape seed is needed to make a 500 ml		

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
bottle of rape seed oil So 1,800 tonnes rape seed would make 1.26 MILLION bottles (500 ml) Rape Seed Oil SO you can see from the above examples how the proposed Whitestone solar farm on this one location alone, taking this amount out of our food production is CRIMINAL and completely bonkers and it is happening at lightning speed all over rural England - and yet Labour in general and Ed Miliband in particular with his frenzied obsession to net zero is slavishly devouring anything and everything in its path - and rural England will be gone forever. It will drive our country into buying-in more and more food from abroad at higher cost, poorer quality, greater food miles, eradicating our food independence and security. It would be madness - but that is what is happening. DO YOUR PART TO STOP THIS NOW!		
Petition 19: Safety for Schoolchildren		
I am writing as a local resident to formally OBJECT to the proposed massive-size solar farm development which Whitestone are proposing for Area 1 in Conisbrough Parks and surrounds. 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	The access at Beacon Lane has been removed, which should ease the amount of traffic transiting Edlington Road. 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	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
Edlington, past the immediat 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. This will bring an INCREASE IN 2-way HGV diesel lorries thundering along Edlington Lane at a rate of over 12% per day, between 7 am to 7 pm including Saturdays and some Sundays, for a period of at least 2 years during the construction period. This is lunacy and the relevant authorities should stop you right now! Apart from the Fire Station, Cemetery, pubs, social clubs, post office, garage, library, doctors and health centre, supermarket, shops and other businesses along the B6376, in addition to the	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. See the **Consultation Report** [**EN0110020/APP/5.1**] and the **Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** for further information.	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
dense population of residential homes lining the route (many just a narrow footpath away from the roadside), the most crucial of concerns are the children of the 3 schools and 1 Adult Learning Centre which are clustered at the top end of Edlington Lane, heading towards Old Edlington. There are a total of 1,718 pupils who arrive and depart from these 3 schools & 1 Adult Learning Centre every school day. Plus over 120 teachers, other support staff, caretakers, cleaners, catering staff and other delivery and supply vehicles….. Plus all the parents and carers delivering and collecting the children from the school gates, all parked legitimately in Edlington Lane along both sides of the road and all the side roads. The zebra crossing opposite the main gates enables children, mums and dads with younger children in tow and pushchairs with babies and toddlers back and forth across the B6376 Edlington Lane. Cars parked legitimately all the way along this road on both sides at school start and finish times reduce the width of this narrow road even further. Even at non-school times, the road is filled along one side anyway with residents parking their cars outside their houses, reducing the width of the road. There		

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
are bus-stops on both sides of the road at this point, too. This is an area of high pedestrian activity and high risk. HILL TOP ACADEMY, Edlington Lane. Primary School. Ages 3 to 11. 390 pupils. 17 Classroom teachers, plus support staff and catering. Main school 8:30 am to 3:20 pm. Also runs nursery sessions: 8:45 to 11:45 am and 12:30 to 3:30 pm. BUTTONS DAY NURSERY, Edlington Lane. Pre-school day care ages 0 yrs to 5 yrs 82 pupils in day care, plus teachers/supervisors (staffing statutory ratios). Open 51 weeks a year. Sessions 8 am – 1 pm and 1 pm – 6 pm. Opens 7:30. Plus Breakfast Club and catering. SIR THOMAS WHARTON ACADEMY, Tate Avenue, off Edlington Lane. Secondary school with 6th Form. 8 am to 4 pm with flexible hours. Over 1,166 students. 66 teachers, 16 teaching assistants, 39 non-teaching staff, plus cleaners, suppliers and deliveries.		

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
HELPING HANDS ADULT LEARNING & COMMUNITY CENTRE, Edlington Lane Providing many social and educational services for all members of the community, including mentally and physically disabled people, including outside social spaces and community garden café, classes and support groups to meet local needs. Individuals, staff, deliveries etc are in and out all day long. Up to 100 people per day. NB: All these 3 schools and Community Centre have outside play/recreational facilities so will be exposed to the increased levels of emissions and pollution caused from the Whitestone diesel HGV's pounding along Edlington Lane. Whitestone, in their Draft Environmental Statement, have sought again to downplay the real facts and ignore the importance of these schools and the 1,718 children and learners that attend them. OUR VULNERABLE CHILDREN. Whitestone have FAILED to recognise that there are 3 schools plus a Community Centre all in the space of 150 yards, with their front and only entrances facing onto the road in just a footpath width away from the hazardous Edlington Lane.		

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
Whitestone has merely put tape counters across Edlington Lane, as a quick measure to assess traffic frequency and look at some accident figures and think this arrogantly qualifies them to be able to state under their Existing Baseline in 5.9.3 that "This combination of data sources ensures a robust and comprehensive baseline to support the assessment of traffic and transport effects." It is nothing of the sort – neither robust nor comprehensive! Whitestone have done themselves yet again to have made giant unfounded and ill-evidenced leaps without due diligence research, again to save time and money. Under 6.9.5 it states that "No SIGNIFICANT effects were identified….." and under 6.9.12 that overall "the potential effects are minimal to be Minor, and therefore NOT significant." The lack of any hard evidence to support this will be founded, untrue statements is staggering and deeply concerning and I resent that my fear around what my children and I are already seeing is being so glibly dismissed.		
AIR QUALITY & POLLUTION The proposed increase in vehicular movements associated with Area 1 of the Whitestone development, will worsen local air quality, causing additional health impacts for residents and CHILDREN – sensitive receptors for the above schools. Any development which increases traffic on these corridor must be carefully scrutinised for	Air quality effects associated with the Proposed Development, including those affecting Conisbrough, have been assessed in **ES Chapter 12: Air Quality** [**EN0110020/APP/6.12],** with construction traffic data informed by **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13].** Construction traffic flows for both light-duty vehicles (LDVs) and heavy-duty vehicles (HDVs) have been assessed using the IAQM screening methodology **[REF-13]**. As a result of this screening, nine road links screened in for further consideration under the	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
its impact on air quality and compliance with local and national targets, specifically looking at the Doncaster Plan Policy 50 (Health) and Policy 74 (Air Quality) of the Doncaster Local Plan and paragraph 186 of the National Planning Policy Framework. This conflicts with Whitestone's Transport-Statement Section 1.1.185 where "routes were planned to avoid environmentally sensitive zones". I confirm my STRONG OBJECTION to Whitestone using the above routing option: "PROTECT OUR SCHOOL CHILDREN"	IAQM criteria **[REF-13]**, eight of which are located in or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). These include Doncaster AQMA No. 2 and AQMA No. 5, which can be viewed in **ES Volume 3, Figure 12.1: Air Quality Study Area [EN0110020/APP/6.19]** and which encompass roads such as the A630 through Conisbrough and Warmsworth, where construction traffic accessing the northern part of the Site would travel. The assessment recognises that parts of the road network near Conisbrough are within an existing AQMA due to elevated nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) concentrations, and this context has been fully accounted for in the assessment. **ES Chapter 12: Air Quality** [**EN0110020/APP/6.12]** considers a large number of nearby human receptors, which includes receptors within Conisbrough, ensuring that potential effects on local residents have been appropriately assessed. While the overall construction period is expected to last between 24 and 36 months, construction is anticipated to be phased, and activities will not occur across all areas simultaneously, which further limits the potential for sustained impacts on local air quality. Construction-phase air quality impacts from activities and traffic have been assessed on a semi-quantitative basis in accordance with IAQM guidance **[REF-13]**. Embedded mitigation measures are set out in Section 12.6 of **ES Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]**, with all construction-phase air quality impacts predicted to be **Not Significant** following mitigation. These measures will be secured through the oCEMP **[EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and implemented throughout construction,	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	ensuring that any potential effects on air quality near Conisbrough are appropriately managed.	
Petition 20: Industrial Scale		
1 The industrial scale of the proposed sites. The reality of this ginormous 'site' is quite frankly unbelievable .... Mile upon mile of black glass panels. Panels that are to been made, or already made !! , in China. How ironic that China will be using fossil fuels and slave labour to produce the very product that is meant to be used for 'green' purposes !!! Security fears have been raised after reports that 'Rogue Communication Devices' have been discovered in some solar panel inverters by U.S. experts who check for security issues. One expert quoted as saying that it is built in a way to physically destroy the grid. Not much use then are they? Who would then supply the power supposedly required for this country? Possibility of fire hazards and toxic run off from lithium-ion batteries polluting the land and water causing harm to everything that lives here. What about glare no one has mentioned this!	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
2 Solar sprawl. Regardless of it being prime farmland, this land needs to be protected, as it was once- supposedly. Our area is semi rural and we have beautiful lakes and woodlands land that is not only needed for	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]**.	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
farming but also for walking, cycling and community well being. We too are part of nature. We do not want to walk along 'permissive pathways' through fields of ugly giant glass panels and the noise emitted by them. Who would want to do this?	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/7.7]** 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].**	
3 Nature Ancient hedgerows and woodlands being ripped up for access and construction. Foxes, deer, badgers and countless other creatures as well as countless birds will loose their habitats that have been their home for generations of them. They cannot simply relocate. The use of animals grazing under the giant panels that have infested their fields that provide both food and freedom to roam, this is just a ruse to make it seem more acceptable to people. The fact is that farming will become secondary and large scale grazing will be impractical, moving sheep around a fenced off industrial site will become unviable in the long term thus becoming just, as foreseen by Whitestone, an energy facility not a	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. 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]** for further information. 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	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
farm. not only a loss of productive land but also fencing prevents free movement for wildlife. This land once industrialised may never be returned to its former beauty, we should not be totally dominating the land for our own greed. We never know when to stop thrashing it. It is no good chipping in a 'few quid' to a 'nature restoration fund' Whitestone is a c company that is grabbing land that will leave nothing but a wasteland.	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 management period, is presented in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20].** Delivery and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO. 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	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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.	
4 Alternatives Smarter planning is required if we really care about Energy security. Brownfield sites could be used for solar panels. Covering car parks, homes, business premises and huge warehouses. Just the use of common sense and some good imagination could help. Surely this is the best way to progress not destroy valuable farmland which is essential to feed the population or are we to become reliant on other	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 global events have highlighted	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
countries to purchase food from? Is it homegrown energy or food, why not both for our independence by using logical thinking, other countries have. Ie. Floating solar farms that is the use of reservoirs such as one in Hapcheon, South Korea, and being creative even making it aesthetically pleasing with the use of pleasing patterns formed into shapes. Solar trees .... are being developed for their use in parks which can provide shade and power for benches and charging stations. Other ideas are the use of motorways and railway tracks. Why do other countries think like this when this country only considers 'quick fix ' solutions. Thus enabling land grabbing companies to make themselves and their investors rich off the people who have to suffer losing their precious environment.	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 on line 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.	
Summing up	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	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
This MASSIVE solar farm that is proposed will offer no local jobs, once completed, no guaranteed reduction in local energy bills no compensation for homes that have to suffer the blight on our beautiful landscapes leaving the communities with metal, glass, electric noise and dust pollution. Our villages will become encased in huge solar panels of black glass and in some cases gigantic battery storage areas that as yet seem to be undisclosed. Will we become known as the new BLACK COUNTRY ????	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.	
Petition 21: WS1 As a Whole		
I write to register my objection to the proposed Whitestone Solar Farm, with particular concern regarding Whitestone One (W1), the northernmost component of this sprawling development. Having reviewed the Draft Environmental Statement and associated documentation, I am compelled to raise serious concerns both about this specific site and the scheme as a whole. OBJECTIONS SPECIFIC TO WHITESTONE ONE Whitestone One represents a particularly egregious element of this proposal, demanding scrutiny before we even consider the cumulative burden of the entire scheme. Heritage Under Threat - Critical Omission of Scheduled Monument Status	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	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
The most serious omission in the applicant's assessment concerns the Roman Villa in the northeast of Whitestone One, near Conisbrough Parks Farm. Since the Draft ES was prepared, Historic England has designated this site as a Scheduled Monument (List Entry 1491751) in July 2025. This is not merely an administrative update; it represents a fundamental change in the heritage significance and legal protection of this site that completely invalidates the applicant's heritage assessment. The applicant's Draft ES Chapter 8 (Cultural Heritage and Archaeology) was prepared before this scheduling occurred and therefore fundamentally underestimates the significance of impacts. A Scheduled Monument is afforded the highest level of heritage protection, and the Infrastructure Planning (Decisions) Regulations 2010, Regulation 3(3) requires the decision-maker to "have regard to the desirability of preserving the scheduled monument or its setting." The timing of this designation is particularly significant. The monument was only scheduled after the Draft ES was prepared, meaning the applicant's entire heritage impact assessment is based on outdated information. The site is now protected under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, and any works affecting it would	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.	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
require Scheduled Monument Consent from the Secretary of State. This fundamentally changes the planning balance and demonstrates that the archaeological significance of W1 was not fully understood or assessed by the developers. Beyond the Roman Villa, the Draft ES Chapter 8 identifies extensive archaeological features across W1: • Medieval pottery factory remains recorded in the southwest of W1 at Firsby Lane • Geophysical surveys revealing "a series of settlements and enclosures and multi period field systems" (Chapter 8, para 8.6.33-8.6.42) • Complex enclosure systems dating from Late Prehistoric to Romano-British periods across land parcels 29, 34, 35, and 40 • Iron Age or Romano-British rectangular enclosure and ditches at Conisbrough Parks (HER 02005/01) • Medieval or earlier earthworks at Conisbrough Parks (HER 03362/02) • Evidence of the Conisbrough Deer Park, a significant Medieval landscape feature The Draft ES acknowledges that Whitestone One contains "Areas of Heightened Archaeological Sensitivity" but then proceeds to propose mounting infrastructure that will cause permanent damage. The developers acknowledge that solar panel piling		

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
"could reach up to 4 metres below ground level" (Chapter 8, para 8.5.31), directly impacting archaeological deposits. Even areas proposed for "low impact" solar arrays will experience ground disturbance from: • Piling or helical screws for solar panel mounting • Trenching for cables (up to 4m deep in places) • Construction of access tracks • Installation of substations and BESS facilities • Soil compaction from heavy construction machinery		
Landscape and Visual Impact - Industrialising Open Countryside The Draft ES Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment) confirms that Whitestone One occupies "a broad open landscape in a shallow bowl with gently rising terrain and small hills" within the Conisbrough and Denaby Coalfield Farmlands landscape character area. The developers' own assessment identifies "Moderate to Major Negative" effects on landscape character during construction (Chapter 7, Table 7.9). Critically, the LVIA acknowledges that even after 15 years of mitigation planting, "the development will remain noticeable in the landscape" (Chapter 7,	Impacts relating to landscape and visual effects are assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]**. 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	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
para 7.6.48). This is development-speak for permanent, irreversible harm to landscape character. The area's current character of open farmland with mature hedgerows will be replaced by: • Solar panels up to 3.8m high across 430 hectares • Primary substations up to 13.5m high (three options proposed for W1) • Security fencing, CCTV cameras, and inverter stations • Permanent access tracks and infrastructure The Draft ES identifies numerous viewpoints experiencing "Moderate to Major Adverse (Significant)" visual effects even after 15 years (Chapter 7, Appendix 7.4). Residential properties along Firsby Lane, Arbour Lane, Park Lane, and in the villages of Clifton and Conisbrough will have their landscape views dominated by industrial solar infrastructure. Public rights of way crossing Whitestone One, including Park Lane and Firsby Lane Bridleways, will be fundamentally altered in character from rural agricultural routes to passages through an industrial energy facility. Significantly, part of Whitestone One falls within the Doncaster Area of Special Landscape Value	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**].	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
(ASLV). This designation is in the current local plan, the Draft ES acknowledges it "serves to provide an indication of the quality and value of the landscape in this area" (Chapter 7, para 7.6.57). This designation underscores the recognised landscape quality that will be permanently compromised.		
Green Belt Assault Whitestone One lies entirely within the South and West Yorkshire Green Belt. The Draft ES acknowledges this but provides no compelling justification for why this particular site merits exceptional treatment. National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 142 establishes that Green Belt serves "to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open." The developers' stated aim to "maximise the amount of clean energy exported to the National Grid" does not constitute the special circumstances required to justify Green Belt development. The Draft ES acknowledges the Green Belt location but fails to demonstrate why renewable energy needs cannot be met through rooftop solar, genuinely local brownfield sites, or alternative locations outside Green Belt designations.	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,	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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 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].**	
Agricultural Land Degradation The Draft ES Chapter 8 acknowledges that Whitestone One contains approximately 5% Grade 2 (Best and Most Versatile) agricultural land, with	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**). Decommissioning would be a legal requirement of the DCO.	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
"areas in the north and west include Grades 1 and 2 and Subgrade 3a" (Chapter 8, para 8.6.30). The applicant admits to having surveyed only 45% of W1 (approximately 197 hectares of 430 hectares total). More troublingly, the Draft ES claims impacts on Best and Most Versatile soils represent only a "Moderate (Significant)" effect, somehow suggesting this is acceptable. Yet permanent infrastructure, substations, access tracks, and associated works will result in permanent loss of soil function through "compaction, removal of topsoil, mixing of soil layers, contamination, and erosion." Once productive agricultural land becomes compacted under heavy machinery and sealed beneath concrete foundations, it doesn't simply recover when the development ends 60 years later. The developers' promise to "restore" the land after decommissioning ignores the permanent damage to soil structure, drainage patterns, and agricultural capability.	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 **Requirement 16 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.	
Historic Mining Hazards - Inadequate Assessment Whitestone One carries the legacy of historic coal mining. The Draft ES Chapter 8 identifies two High Risk Development Areas in the northeast of W1, containing three mine entries associated with probable shallow coal mine workings. The Coal	Impacts associated with historic mining activities are assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]**. 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	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
Authority's mapping confirms these risks, yet the Draft ES states that "Phase 1 Coal Mining Risk Assessments are apparently underway" with "no concrete analysis of these risks" (Chapter 8, para 8.6.36). Building solar infrastructure over historic mine workings introduces risks of: • Ground movement and subsidence • Methane emissions • Water ingress and contamination • Collapse of shallow workings under the weight of construction machinery The developers' casual acknowledgment coupled with their promise to address these "in due course" in the final ES is wholly inadequate. These risks should have been fully evaluated before any consultation process began. Mine shafts identified on historic mapping (HM2-HM10) across W1 represent significant constraints that fundamentally question the suitability of this site for development.	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]**.	
Traffic and Transport Impacts During Construction The Draft ES Chapter 13 (Traffic and Transport) reveals the scale of construction disruption that W1 will experience. The proposed construction programme estimates 2-3 years of intensive activity (2027-2029), with:	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]**.	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
• Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) movements for delivery of thousands of solar panels, mounting structures, inverters, substations, and equipment • Construction worker traffic estimated at up to 200 workers per day during peak construction • Use of A630, B6094, Park Lane, and local rural roads as HGV routes (Chapter 13, Figure 13.2) The Draft ES acknowledges that traffic will increase on rural roads serving Whitestone One, including Park Lane, a bridleway regularly used by horses. The applicant's Transport Statement admits that construction traffic on such routes "where existing traffic levels are low ... may result in a predicted increase that would be higher than" assessment thresholds (Chapter 13, para 13.5.16). For residents of properties along these routes, including Park Farm Cottages, Conisbrough Parks Farm, and Hilltop Farm, this means years of disruption from: • HGVs negotiating narrow rural lanes • Dust and mud from construction vehicles • Road safety risks on routes used by pedestrians, cyclists, and horse riders • Damage to road surfaces and verges	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.	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
Flood Risk and Hydrological Concerns Kearsley Brook (referred to as "The Brook" in the Draft ES) runs through Whitestone One. While most of W1 lies within Flood Zone 1 (low risk), the Draft ES Chapter 10 (Water Resources and Flood Risk) acknowledges areas of higher flood risk associated with watercourses. The scheme involves substantial ground works, trenching for cables, access track construction, and the installation of impermeable solar panel surfaces across 430 hectares. Despite the Draft ES claiming effects will be "Negligible, and therefore Not Significant" (Chapter 8, para 8.6.110), the fundamental transformation of agricultural land to hardstanding and solar arrays will inevitably alter surface water runoff patterns. The Draft ES admits cable trenches will cross watercourses, with "open-cut trenching used in many locations" (Chapter 8, para 8.6.114). Any works in or near watercourses risk sedimentation, pollution, and habitat damage-particularly problematic given that Firsby Reservoir Local Nature Reserve lies immediately southwest of Whitestone One, and Thrybergh Country Park sits approximately 1km to the west.	Impacts relating to water resources and flood risk are assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]**. Supporting technical information is provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. Measures for managing environmental impacts are outlined in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and the **outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**. With these mitigation measures, effects are Negligible. 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. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** has identified where solar panels need to be raised so that they remain operational without increasing flood risk elsewhere under a 1 in 100-year plus climate change event. The design principles for the Proposed Development are detailed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5].**	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
Cumulative Impact and the Rochdale Envelope The Draft ES extensively employs the "Rochdale Envelope" approach-assessing a worst-case scenario while retaining optionality on final design. While this approach has legal validity, it creates profound uncertainty about actual impacts. For Whitestone One, the developers propose: • Three alternative locations for primary substations (up to 13.5m high) • Multiple routing options for cable corridors • Unspecified final positions for BESS and inverter stations • Variable layouts for solar arrays This "Rochdale Envelope" means the final development could involve any combination of these options, making it impossible for residents, statutory consultees, or decision-makers to understand the precise impacts. The applicant retains flexibility to choose the most economically advantageous configuration post-consent, potentially increasing impacts beyond those assessed. Moreover, the Draft ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative Effects) acknowledges the need to assess cumulative impacts with other developments but	The design has been refined since Statutory Consultation that reduces uncertainty. The Rochdale envelope is explained in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: EIA Methodology [EN0110020/APP/6.2]**. 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 **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** for further information.	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
provides limited detail at this stage. W1 does not exist in isolation-it must be considered alongside: • The remainder of the Whitestone Solar Farm (W2 and W3) • Other solar and energy infrastructure projects in South Yorkshire • Existing wind farms (Penny Hill Wind Farm visible from W1) • Proposed and consented developments identified in local planning portals		
Biodiversity and Ecological Impact Though Whitestone One itself contains no statutory ecological designations, it sits precariously close to sites of genuine natural value: • Firsby Reservoir Local Nature Reserve immediately southwest • Thrybergh Country Park approximately 1km west • Edlington Wood SSSI within 2.5km (secondary woodland of ancient origin with species-rich flora) • Sprotborough Gorge SSSI within 2.5km (limestone, marshland, open water, and ancient woodland) The Draft ES Chapter 6 (Biodiversity) airily dismisses potential effects on these SSSIs as "short term, Negligible in magnitude, and therefore Not	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. 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	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
Significant." Yet construction of 430 hectares of solar arrays, with associated traffic, dust, noise, and disturbance, spanning 2-3 years, can hardly be described as "negligible." The hedgerows and tree lines identified along "The Brook" and the dismantled Dearne Valley railway line provide crucial wildlife corridors. While the developers promise "Biodiversity Net Gain of no less than 10%," the fundamental transformation of agricultural land to industrial solar farm will fragment habitat connectivity and alter the ecological character of the area.	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 and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO. 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.	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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.	
Noise and Vibration During Construction The Draft ES Chapter 14 (Noise and Vibration) identifies sensitive receptors including residential properties at: • Hilltop Farm (Firsby Lane) • Park Farm Cottages (Park Lane) • Conisbrough Parks Farm • Properties along the southern edge of Conisbrough • Clifton village to the east • Construction activities will generate noise from:	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

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
• Piling operations for solar panel mounting (potentially reaching 4m depth) • HGV movements on construction haul routes • Concrete pouring for substation and BESS foundations • Mechanical plant and equipment • Earth moving and ground preparation The Draft ES acknowledges construction will occur 0700-1900 Monday-Friday and 0700-1300 Saturdays, with "exceptions ... required for trenchless crossings or for time sensitive construction activities such as concrete pouring" (Chapter 8, para 8.6.122). In other words, when convenient for the construction schedule, evening, night, and weekend working will occur-despite assurances otherwise. For isolated rural properties across W1, this industrialization of their immediate surroundings represents a profound loss of tranquillity and amenity lasting multiple years.		
OBJECTIONS TO THE SCHEME AS A WHOLE Beyond the specific harms posed by Whitestone One, the scheme as a whole presents challenges that exceed the sum of its parts. The Sheer Scale of Industrialisation	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	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
This is not a "solar farm" in any benign agricultural sense. This is industrial-scale energy generation infrastructure spanning 1,914 hectares across three separate sites. To put this in perspective: • Whitestone 1 alone covers approximately 430 hectares • Whitestone 2 covers approximately 1,150 hectares • Whitestone 3 covers approximately 334 hectares • Combined with cable corridors, the Proposed Order Limits exceed 2,000 hectares This represents one of the largest solar developments proposed in the United Kingdom. The scale alone should trigger the most rigorous scrutiny of its claimed benefits versus its demonstrable harms. Which brings us to what must be considered the most significant problem with the whole application.	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.	
Excessive Rochdale Envelope and Design Immaturity A fundamental flaw in the Whitestone application is the excessive and unreasonable deployment of the Rochdale Envelope principle. While the Planning Inspectorate's guidance acknowledges that some aspects of a development's design may not yet be	The design has been refined since Statutory Consultation that reduces uncertainty. The Rochdale envelope is explained in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: EIA Methodology [EN0110020/APP/6.2]**. 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	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
fixed, the scale of optionality in this application goes far beyond what is reasonable or examinable, suggesting the project is simply not ready for any meaningful consideration by consultees or for in a state of preparation consistent with the consent process. The Scale of Uncertainty The Applicant presents an extraordinary level of design flexibility across virtually every major project component. This includes four alternative locations for the primary substation (W2 P1, P2, P3, P4), two locations for the BESS, three options for the W1 satellite substation, two for the W2 satellite substation, and fifteen different cable corridor options (CR 1a through 3d). When combined with multiple options for M1 crossings, construction compound locations, and internal cable routes, the application asks us to examine not a single defined project, but rather 768 basic permutations-potentially thousands when all variables are included. Each of these configurations would have distinctly different environmental effects on visual receptors, heritage assets, ecological habitats, and construction impacts. It is impossible to meaningfully assess "the project" being consented	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]** for further information.	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
when the Applicant cannot even determine where the primary substation will be located. Comparison to Comparable Projects This level of indecision is unprecedented. Similar solar NSIP applications, such as Gate Burton and Longfield, presented one to two substation location options, not nine. If the Applicant cannot select a primary substation location after more than two years of development and two rounds of public consultation, this indicates the design lacks sufficient maturity for examination. The Problem of Artificial Bundling Critically, this excessive uncertainty is a direct consequence of the artificial bundling of three separate projects. Individually, each area's Rochdale Envelope would be manageable: W1 with three satellite substation options would be reasonable; W2 with two BESS and two satellite options would be assessable; W3 with minimal optionality would be straightforward. However, the combined envelope multiplies these uncertainties exponentially (W1 uncertainty × W2 uncertainty x W3 uncertainty x cable uncertainty), creating an examination burden that would not exist if these were properly separated applications.		

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
Post-Consent Cherry-Picking Risk Once a DCO is granted for this worst-case envelope, the Applicant gains the ability to cherry-pick from the assessed options with no guarantee the final build will reflect the examined "integrated 750 MW project." They could optimize development at W2 (the largest and most viable area, with all supporting infrastructure) while de-scoping W1 and W3. They could select the primary substation location nearest to existing grid infrastructure at Brinsworth, making connection from W1 or W3 economically unviable due to cable costs. The Secretary of State would consent to a worst-case envelope, but the Applicant would build an optimized subset bearing little resemblance to what was examined.		
Fragmentation of Green Belt and Agricultural Land The Draft ES acknowledges that all three sites lie within the South and West Yorkshire Green Belt. The cumulative impact of industrializing nearly 2,000 hectares of Green Belt agricultural land fundamentally undermines the purposes of Green Belt designation: • Preventing urban sprawl • Safeguarding the countryside from encroachment	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	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
• Preserving the setting and special character of historic towns The developers cannot credibly argue that consuming 2,000 hectares of Green Belt for solar panels constitutes "safeguarding the countryside." This is precisely the type of large-scale industrialisation that Green Belt policy was designed to prevent. Moreover, the Best and Most Versatile agricultural land assessment remains incomplete across all three sites. The Draft ES admits limited surveying has been completed, leaving substantial uncertainty about the quantum of BMV land that will be permanently lost or degraded.	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 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	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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].**	
Cumulative Heritage Impact Across Three Sites While Whitestone One contains the newly scheduled Roman Villa-the most significant heritage asset-the scheme as a whole poses risk to numerous heritage assets: • W1: Scheduled Monument (Roman Villa), medieval pottery industry, extensive prehistoric and Roman settlement evidence, historic mining landscape • W2: Roman roads, prehistoric flint finds, Iron Age and Roman settlement evidence, medieval deer park, WWII anti-aircraft battery remains • W3: Iron Age to Romano-British features, Chesterfield Canal, historic mills, proximity to Barlborough Hall Registered Park and Garden The Draft ES Chapter 8 identifies 346 non-designated assets and 132 designated assets within the 1km study area. The cumulative impact of simultaneously developing three large sites across this historically rich landscape represents an	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

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
unprecedented assault on the region's archaeological and built heritage.		
Landscape and Visual Impact - Three Sites of Harm The LVIA assesses each site separately but acknowledges cumulative effects must be considered. Residents of villages caught between or near multiple sites will experience compounded visual impacts: • Residents of Ulley and Brampton-en-le-Morthen caught between W1 and W2 • Villages along the M1 corridor (Wales, Kiveton Park, Harthill) experiencing impacts from W2 and W3 • Users of long-distance paths (Rotherham Round Walk, Cuckoo Way) experiencing sequential or combined views of multiple sites The Draft ES identifies "Moderate to Major Adverse (Significant)" effects at numerous viewpoints across all three sites, persisting even after 15 years of mitigation planting. The cumulative effect is to industrialize the landscape character of central Rotherham, replacing open countryside with three distinct concentrations of solar infrastructure visible across a wide area.	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
Traffic and Transport - Cumulative Construction Chaos	The impacts of construction traffic have been assessed, and details can be found in the **Transport Statement**	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
The Draft ES Chapter 13 contemplates construction traffic routing for all three sites, but underplays the cumulative impact of: • Construction activity potentially occurring simultaneously across W1, W2, and W3 • Multiple HGV routes converging on the Strategic Road Network (M1, M18, A1(M)) • Thousands of HGV movements over a 2-3-year construction period • Worker traffic estimated at 200+ vehicles per day at peak periods • 25+ access points requiring highway works The Study Area for traffic assessment spans from the M1 Junction 31 in the south to A630 in the north-a distance of approximately 20km. Communities throughout this corridor will experience construction traffic impacts. Rural roads never designed for intensive HGV use will become construction haul routes. National Highways has raised significant concerns about impacts on the Strategic Road Network, particularly regarding cable crossings under the M1 and M18. The Draft ES acknowledges "engagement with National Highways is ongoing" but provides no detail on the engineering solutions or traffic management required for these complex crossings.	**[EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. When accounting for traffic it is assumed that each vehicle is making a 2-way trip, both to and from the Site. When selecting access routes, priority was given to major road networks over smaller local roads and roads with restrictions where possible to avoid damage. In addition, an **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** has been produced, with a commitment to provide a detailed version as the design develops. Engagement with National Highways entails following their CD622 process to agree safe crossings of the M1/M18. These crossings are proposed to be completed with trenchless technology, requiring no road closures or traffic management while being executed.	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
Flood Risk and Hydrological Concerns Multiple watercourses run through and around the three sites: • Kearsley Brook through W1 • River Rother, Ulley Brook, Kingsforth Brook, and Anston Brook through W2 • Harthill Reservoir bordering W3 While most areas lie within Flood Zone 1 (low risk), the Draft ES acknowledges areas of Flood Zones 2 and 3 (medium to high risk) associated with these water features. The scheme involves substantial ground works, trenching for cables, access track construction, and the installation of impermeable solar panel surfaces across hundreds of hectares. The claim that surface water runoff patterns won't be affected strains credulity. More concerningly, the scheme crosses these watercourses in numerous locations. While the developers claim to favour "trenchless crossing methods," they acknowledge that open-cut trenching will be used in many locations. Any works in or near watercourses risk sedimentation, pollution, and habitat damage-particularly given the two/three-year construction programme with work occurring across multiple sites potentially simultaneously.	Impacts relating to water resources and flood risk are assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]**. Supporting technical information is provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. Measures for managing environmental impacts are outlined in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and the **outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**. With these mitigation measures, effects are Negligible. 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. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** has identified where solar panels need to be raised so that they remain operational without increasing flood risk elsewhere under a 1 in 100-year plus climate change event. The design principles for the Proposed Development are detailed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5].**	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
Climate Change: Missing the Point The developers justify this scheme through appeal to climate change mitigation, citing government targets for renewable energy. Yet the climate change chapter of the Draft ES reveals uncomfortable truths. While the operational solar farm will generate renewable energy, the construction phase will produce substantial greenhouse gas emissions through: • Manufacturing and transporting thousands of solar panels • Producing steel mounting structures and concrete foundations • Importing aggregates for access tracks • Constructing substations and BESS facilities • All associated construction traffic The Draft ES acknowledges these emissions but claims they will be offset by operational emissions savings. However, the carbon payback period-the time required for operational savings to exceed construction emissions-is not clearly stated. Given the energy and resources required to construct a 750 MW solar farm, this payback period may stretch to many years. Moreover, the scheme's claimed benefits compare poorly with alternatives. Rooftop solar, genuinely	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]** 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 SF_6-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 gCO_2e/kWh, substantially lower than gas-fired generation. Over its 60-year lifetime, the Proposed Development is expected to avoid approximately 18 million tonnes of CO_2e, delivering a clear net climate benefit and supporting regional and national net zero ambitions.	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
brownfield site development, or offshore wind would achieve renewable energy generation without sacrificing agricultural land, Green Belt, and rural landscape character. The developers acknowledge rooftop solar's role but insist "large scale solar developments are needed." This begs the question: needed where? Why must they be located on Green Belt agricultural land containing scheduled monuments rather than exhausted industrial sites or other genuinely brownfield locations?		
The 60-Year Imposition The developer proposes operating this scheme for 60 years, from 2029 to approximately 2089. This isn't a temporary intrusion into the countryside; it's a generational transformation. People living near these sites today will live with them for the rest of their lives. Children born after the development opens will grow up, raise their own families, and potentially retire while these solar farms still dominate their landscape. The promise of decommissioning "between one and two years" after 2089 provides cold comfort to current residents. Even if decommissioning occurs as planned, the Draft ES notes that "components of the Proposed Development such as mitigation planting, Site accesses and permanent substations	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).** 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.	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
(primary and satellite) and associated infrastructure (underground cabling) may be left in place.' In other words, this isn't truly reversible development. The landscape will be permanently altered by access tracks, substations, underground cables, and the dense mitigation planting installed to screen the solar farms. The developers propose to industrialise the countryside for 60 years, then partially remove that industrialisation while leaving substantial infrastructure behind permanently.	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 **Requirement 16 of the draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].** An **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/7.4]** has been submitted with the Application**.**	
CONCLUSION: A SCHEME TOO FAR Whitestone One alone represents a serious threat to heritage, agricultural land, Green Belt, and landscape character. The recent designation of the Roman Villa as a Scheduled Monument-occurring after the Draft ES was prepared-fundamentally undermines the applicant's heritage assessment and demonstrates the archaeological significance of this site was not properly evaluated. The 430 hectares of W1 would industrialise a sensitive landscape containing nationally important Scheduled Monuments and extensive archaeological features, all while producing questionable benefits that could be achieved through less harmful alternatives.	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].**	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
But Whitestone One is merely one component of a scheme whose ambitions have outstripped any reasonable planning justification. A 1,914-hectare solar mega-development spanning three sites across Green Belt agricultural land represents exactly the kind of industrialisation of the countryside that Green Belt policy was designed to prevent. The developers' confidence that they can simply acknowledge harm while pressing ahead regardless-noting significant impacts on landscape character, heritage settings, agricultural land, and visual amenity, then claiming these are somehow acceptable in pursuit of renewable energy-reveals a fundamental misunderstanding of the planning balance. Yes, renewable energy is important. Yes, we must act on climate change. But these imperatives do not create a blank cheque to industrialise the countryside wherever grid connections exist. They do not override Green Belt policy, heritage protection, or agricultural land conservation. They do not justify sacrificing rural landscape character across three sites simultaneously. And they certainly do not justify approving a development where the most significant heritage asset-a Roman Villa-was granted Scheduled Monument status after the environmental assessment was completed.	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 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	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
This scheme, and Whitestone One in particular, should be refused consent. The harm is real, substantial, and permanent. The benefits, however laudable in principle, could be achieved through genuinely sustainable locations that don't require the sacrifice of Green Belt, Best and Most Versatile agricultural land, Scheduled Monuments, and rural landscape character. I therefore object in the strongest possible terms to this Development Consent Order application.	located can be found in **Planning Statement, Appendix 2 – Green Belt Assessment [EN0110020/APP/5.4].**	
Petition 22: Area 1		
I submit my response to the statutory consultation regarding Whitestone 1 Solar Farm and I state my strong objections. 1) Consultation timescale, transparency, inclusivity, limitation of affordable key information. The consultation response time of six weeks is wholly inadequate given the volume and complexity of documents, especially compared to the eleven-week first consultation. Requests for extensions have not been answered. There is confusion regarding the freepost address layout, risking non-receipt of	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]** for further information.	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
communications, which as they will be predominantly objections to your proposed project, will skew results in your favour. The consultation has systematically excluded digitally disadvantaged and elderly residents, imposed financial barriers to accessing essential documents, and failed to restart consultation following significant new heritage designations. The absence of a consultation event in Clifton further undermines inclusivity. Key documents, such as the Draft Environmental Statement and its appendices, have not been provided to statutory consultees. Most meaningful documents were only available online, contrary to best practice for statutory consultation. The consultation materials contain inaccuracies and omissions.		
2) Project Proposed as 1 scheme Given the vast area and differing characteristics of Whitestone 1, 2, and 3, these should be considered as separate applications, not as a single project.	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**	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	[EN0110020/APP/5.1] describes the feedback received and how the master plan was updated in response.	
3) Green Belt Policy & Agricultural Land The proposal fails to demonstrate the "Very Special Circumstances" required for green belt development under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Alternative brownfield sites have been dismissed without transparent justification. Full transparent disclosure should be made available to all consultees and communities. The development would result in the irreversible loss of productive agricultural land, threatening local food security and undermining centuries-old farming systems. Only 45% of the land has been surveyed, much of it only by desktop research from ALC data which is both classed as 'provisional' and 'out-of-date' with insufficient independent published soil assessment to back up your claims with hard evidence. You have made a deliberate attempt to downgrade the local land, into a category which you believe will allow solar farms to be built on it. SUMMARY	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. 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	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
Whitestone 1 is totally unsuitable for the Conisbrough Parks area—an industrial-sized project in specified and recognized Green Belt. It is a valley enjoyed by many, little changed for centuries, and is a productive farming area vital for future food security.	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].**	
4) Biodiversity and Ecological Connectivity The development will sever established wildlife corridors and disrupt habitats for protected and notable species, including bats, great crested newts, birds of prey, and ground-nesting birds. Ecological surveys lack sufficient seasonal coverage and fail to incorporate decades of local wildlife observation. The proposed mitigation measures are inadequate, with wildlife corridors too narrow and replacement habitats not secured before construction.	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. 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	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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 management period, is presented in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20].** Delivery and long-term stewardship of BNG will be secured through the DCO. 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	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	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.	
5) Flooding and Water The Environment Agency has raised significant flood risk concerns, which have not been adequately addressed. The sequential test is insufficient, and mitigation measures are vague and non-committal. Key surveys on groundwater, private water supplies, and local water flow patterns remain incomplete. Rainwater runoff issues are not significantly addressed, especially given recent	Impacts relating to water resources and flood risk are assessed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]**. Supporting technical information is provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. Measures for managing environmental impacts are outlined in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and the **outline Operational Environmental Management Plan**	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
severe flooding in adjacent areas. Kearsley Brook is recognized as being in high-risk flood zone 3.	**(oOEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**. With these mitigation measures, effects are Negligible.	
6) Heritage & Archaeology Historic England's recent designation of the Roman Villa at Conisbrough Parks as a Scheduled Monument of national significance has not been properly considered. The heritage assessment is now obsolete and fails to address the cumulative impact on the area's archaeological landscape and heritage tourism. The development will cause irreversible harm to the historic landscape, including Conisbrough Castle and the network of historic villages, severing connections that have existed for nearly two millennia.	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
7) Landscape & Visual Impact The development will cause permanent loss of openness in the green belt and irreparable	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,	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
harm to the Area of Special Landscape Value. Proposed screening is inadequate, with new hedgerows taking over 15 years to provide meaningful cover and failing to prevent significant adverse effects. Public rights of way will be transformed from rural walks into industrial corridors, and ancient woodland settings will be compromised. Photographs in the documentation downplay the visual impact and omit key landscape features. The industrial infrastructure, including substations up to 13.5 meters high, will be visible across considerable distances, with no adequate screening proposed.	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**].	
8) Construction Impact Narrow lanes around Clifton and the wider Parish area are unsuitable for construction vehicles, many having weight restrictions. The impact on roads and transport would be unacceptable over many months. Public rights of way, used by horse riders and walkers, would be greatly affected during and after construction. Access for emergency services, utility companies, and residents must be maintained, especially for the Yorkshire Water reservoir and Beacon Hill telecommunications masts.	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]** for further information.	Yes
9) Natural Environment	Enhancement proposals to aquatic, grassland, and hedgerow habitats within the Solar Array area have been presented in	No

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
The total effect on the natural environment and habitats is of grave concern, especially regarding the adjacent designated reed bed nature reserve (Clifton Wetland) opened in 2022. The cumulative impact of this and other developments, combined with climate change, will undermine local climate resilience, reduce carbon storage, and threaten biodiversity.	the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and Development Design, with BNG measures recorded in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and referenced in this ES. Minimum buffer distances from retained sensitive habitat features within the Order Limits and adjacent are provided in the **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]** to avoid impacts. 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]**.	
10) Conservation Area Impact Clifton and its surrounding area is a designated Conservation Area and would be changed forever, not just during construction but throughout operation and after decommissioning. The landscape around Clifton is protected as an Area of Special Landscape Value, which must be retained.	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
11) Cumulative & Climate Impact The cumulative impact of this and other developments, combined with climate change, will	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	Yes

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
undermine local climate resilience, reduce carbon storage, and threaten biodiversity. Multiple communities will simultaneously lose wildlife heritage when climate resilience requires stronger ecosystems.	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]** for further information. 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**). • **Intra-project effects** on ecological receptors are considered within the biodiversity assessment. **Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases**	

Comment	Applicant Response	Design Change
	Inter-project effects are not considered relevant to the Climate Change Risk Assessment (CCRA) in line with guidance. The In-Combination Climate 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.	

WHITESTONE
solar farm

Contact

Whitestone Net Zero Ltd

info@whitestonesolarfarm.co.uk

0800 688 9936