WHITESTONE SOLAR FARM — EN0110020

PROCEDURAL DEADLINE A — PERSONAL REQUEST FOR ACCOMPANIED SITE INSPECTIONS

Submitted by: Nicholas Eastwood, [redacted]
Date: 26 October 2026
Interested Party reference: [redacted]

1. Purpose and scope of this request

1.1 I ask the Examining Authority (ExA) to undertake accompanied inspections of [redacted], Firsby, the connected Conisbrough Parks bridleways and selected viewpoints in the wider Whitestone 1 (W1) landscape. I support the separate site-inspection submission made by Firsby Residents Association (FRA), including its proposed locations and coordinates. This personal request supplements, rather than duplicates, that collective submission.

1.2 This request is made for Procedural Deadline A. I am asking the ExA to decide where first-hand inspection would assist its examination; it is not intended to be a full written representation on the merits of the DCO.

1.3 I have documented photographic evidence of the locations and viewpoints identified below, including images showing different positions along the same route. I can provide labelled photographs, location information and comparison tables for each viewpoint if required by the ExA, or submit them at a subsequent examination deadline as directed. My preference would be for direct engagement and accompanied inspection so the ExA can experience the topography, changing views and practical route conditions in person.

2. Priority inspections and reasons

Location / priority	Why an accompanied inspection is requested
1 — [redacted] and Firsby residential outlooks	[redacted] outlook and equestrian use differ from the selected representative Viewpoint 11. Firsby's residential properties have different orientations and relationships with W1. Request a visit to [redacted] by prior arrangement and, where occupiers consent, other Firsby properties.
2 — Conisbrough Parks Bridleway 13	Inspect a continuous section, including the vicinity of the former Applicant Viewpoint 12. Its reported omission because of vegetation at one position needs testing against the open and changing views elsewhere on the route.
3 — Conisbrough Parks Bridleways 2, 4 and 14	Inspect the linked network around Firsby, its elevation changes, riding experience and proposed construction crossings; examine the relationship with Firsby Lane, Park Lane and W1 infrastructure. Distinguish these Conisbrough Parks routes from Ravenfield Bridleway 4.
4 — Firsby Lane and Bridleway 2 crossing	Inspect the only lawful vehicular access to Firsby residential properties as reported by residents, and the practical implications of any construction controls for residents, emergency access, horseboxes and

	mounted riders. Request independent confirmation of the legal access position.
5 — Ravenfield Footpath 10 and Footpaths 2/6	Compare the Applicant's Viewpoint 9 with higher and sequential positions along Footpath 10, including views towards Conisbrough Castle; inspect Footpaths 2 and 6 for the wider landscape and St James' Church setting.
6 — Conisbrough Cemetery and Spring Bank Lane — Applicant Viewpoint 1	Inspect the cemetery itself, including ground-level visitor positions and its elevated outlook, separately from Spring Bank Lane. The viewpoint labelled or associated with 'Conisbrough Cemetery' does not, in my assessment, give a true depiction of the experience from within the cemetery. Its exact position, title and representativeness must be verified against the Applicant's current plans.
7 — A630 Single Access Location (W1)	Inspect the proposed principal access, traffic conditions and suitability for HGVs, including local observations of damaged street furniture alongside formal collision evidence.

3.4 Former Viewpoint 12 — Conisbrough Parks Bridleway 13. My understanding from the Applicant's viewpoint-selection material is that this viewpoint was removed on the basis of vegetation screening and predicted lack of visibility. I dispute whether that explanation addresses the wider route. Photographs I have taken from Bridleway 13 show expansive views across the rolling Conisbrough Parks landscape from other positions, including towards the W1 area. The photographs and their positions can be supplied for examination.

3.5 The ExA is asked to walk a representative length of Bridleway 13, including positions between Hooton Cliff RIGS (R8) and ancient woodland towards Firsby Hamlet approach. The Applicant should explain why Viewpoint 12 was excluded, what consultation took place over its removal, whether alternative viewpoints along the route were considered, and how the continuous experience of walkers and mounted riders was assessed. A screened position does not establish that the whole bridleway is screened. This was requested during non-statutory and statutory consultation.

3.6 Viewpoint 7 — Conisbrough Grange Farm / Park Lane / Conisbrough Parks Bridleway 4. From positions in this area I can see Conisbrough Castle and St Peter's Church with the naked eye, and I hold photographs showing them within the wider landscape. I have not identified an adequate discussion of these landmarks in the material accompanying Viewpoint 7. I ask the Applicant to identify where these visible heritage features within the historic landscape, their setting and the experience of riders and users on Bridleway 4 have been considered.

3.7 I request inspection from the Applicant's precise Viewpoint 7 position and other accessible positions along Park Lane / Bridleway 4. The ExA should consider whether the camera's position, field of view, foreground vegetation and direction capture the relationship between the proposed development and the historic landscape, including the visible Castle and church. Their visibility in a photograph does not by itself establish heritage harm; it warrants a clear assessment of their setting and the contribution made by this landscape.

3.8 These three challenges are complementary to FRA's route-wide request and a separate residential concern from my wife. My request is that the ExA tests the viewpoints on the ground and requires a documented explanation of viewpoint selection, omissions and heritage / landscape visibility before relying on the Applicant's conclusions.

3. Particular concern — Applicant Viewpoint 1 and Conisbrough Cemetery

3.1 I particularly request that the ExA does not treat Applicant Viewpoint 1 as an adequate depiction of Conisbrough Cemetery without inspecting the cemetery. My accompanying viewpoint review identifies the Applicant's selected position as Spring Bank Lane, separate from the cemetery itself, and documents materially different elevated and ground-level views from within the cemetery. I have applied to Historic England in relation to this building and wider landscape for noting being listed as a grade II building currently under consideration.

3.2 The cemetery is a place where visitors attend graves, funerals and remembrances. The visual and acoustic experience of visitors at these locations is not necessarily represented by a photograph from an adjacent road or a different elevation. I ask for inspection from at least three accessible positions within the cemetery, subject to permission and respect for visitors, and separate consideration of the journey along Spring Bank Lane.

3.3 This is a challenge to viewpoint representativeness, not an assertion that the Applicant has deliberately mislabelled or manipulated a photograph. The ExA should require the exact coordinates, official title, camera orientation, baseline photographs and rationale for selecting Viewpoint 1, and ask whether a separate cemetery receptor assessment is needed or required.

4. [redacted] and Firsby — complementary residential evidence

4.1 [redacted] is both our home and a property with equestrian-related use. The impact cannot be understood solely from a public-path photograph: residential outlook, garden and everyday outdoor use, access arrangements, the relationship with nearby riding routes and the surrounding historic landscape need to be seen together.

4.2 As detailed in the separate personal submission from my wife, we repeatedly requested a property visit. Whitestone offered an appointment on 29 October 2025 for 31 October, giving only two days' notice and acknowledging the property's different aspect. Alternative dates were requested but a mutually convenient visit was not completed. I support the request for the ExA to inspect and establish where this distinctive residential outlook has been assessed.

4.3 Concerns about W1 have been raised through non-statutory and statutory consultation. I am not attaching those responses to this procedural request and reserve detailed consideration of the Applicant's responses for the substantive examination deadlines.

4.4 [redacted] property/blight material to be submitted identifies potential residential, access and equestrian effects relevant to the value of an inspection. This can be supplied upon request to assist the ExA. This request does not ask the ExA to determine compensation or blight entitlement at Procedural Deadline A.

5. Questions for the ExA to put to the Applicant

5.1 Where exactly is Applicant Viewpoint 1 located, and what evidence establishes that it represents views experienced by visitors within Conisbrough Cemetery rather than a separate Spring Bank Lane position?

5.2 Will the Applicant identify and assess representative views from within Conisbrough Cemetery at different elevations, and explain whether those views would change its assessment conclusions?

5.3 Why was Viewpoint 12 on Bridleway 13 excluded, who was consulted, and why was it not replaced with a position reflecting the open, expansive views elsewhere along the route?

5.4 For Viewpoint 7 at Conisbrough Grange Farm / Park Lane / Bridleway 4, where does the Applicant assess the visible Conisbrough Castle and St Peter's Church and their relationship with the W1 landscape?

5.5 How has the Applicant assessed sequential views and the experience of mounted riders on Conisbrough Parks Bridleways 2, 4, 13 and 14, rather than relying on isolated camera positions?

5.6 Where is the property-specific assessment for [redacted], and what evidence demonstrates that Viewpoint 11 represents its different outlook?

5.7 Will the Applicant supply verified coordinates, photographic dates, directions and the original viewpoint-selection and consultation records for Viewpoints 1, 7, 11 and former 12?

6. Evidence available and request for engagement

6.1 I have prepared viewpoint location and photographic documents covering Ravenfield Footpaths 2 and 10, Ravenfield Bridleway 4, Conisbrough Parks Bridleways 13 and 14 and Conisbrough Cemetery. I also hold images from the Viewpoint 7 / Park Lane area showing Conisbrough Castle and St Peter's Church. I can provide a labelled photographic schedule and location comparisons at the ExA's request or a later directed deadline; I would welcome direct engagement and accompanied inspections in preference to relying on photographs alone.

6.2 If it would assist the ExA, I am willing to arrange a structured accompanied visit and explain the precise positions from which photographs were taken. Any photographs subsequently lodged can be organised in a table identifying location, direction, date where known, source and the Applicant viewpoint being tested.

6.3 I respectfully ask that my request for engagement and inspection be recorded even if the ExA is unable to visit every proposed location. I support FRA's request for the wider network and its priority around Firsby.

7. Conclusion

7.1 For Procedural Deadline A, I request priority for [redacted] and Firsby, Bridleways 2, 4, 13 and 14, and direct testing of Viewpoint 1 at Conisbrough Cemetery, Viewpoint 7 at Park Lane and former Viewpoint 12 on Bridleway 13. Ravenfield Footpath 10 and the A630 / Common Lane access should also be considered, consistently with FRA's submission.

7.2 My substantive position remains that W1 should be removed from the proposal because of its combined potential residential, landscape, heritage, recreational, access and equestrian effects. I will address the evidence and planning balance at the appropriate examination deadlines.

Nicholas Eastwood
[redacted]