WHITESTONE
solar farm

WHITESTONE SOLAR FARM

Volume 5: Reports and Statements

5.5 Policy Compliance Document (Clean)

Application Document ref. EN0110020/APP/5.5.1
Revision 02
October 2026

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

whitestonesolarfarm.co.uk

Document status					
Version	**Purpose of document**	**Authored by**	**Reviewed by**	**Approved by**	**Review date**
Rev01	DCO Submission	CH / LF	HC	SP	June 2026
Rev02	Procedural Deadline A	CH / LF	LF	SP	October 2026

Approval for issue		
Whitestone Net Zero Ltd	[redacted]	October 2026

Prepared by:

DWD LTD

Prepared for:

Whitestone Net Zero Limited

Contents

TABLE 1: NATIONAL POLICY STATEMENT EN-1 (DECEMBER 2025) – TABLE OF COMPLIANCE 1

TABLE 2: NATIONAL POLICY STATEMENT EN-3 (DECEMBER 2025) – TABLE OF COMPLIANCE 85

TABLE 3: NATIONAL POLICY STATEMENT EN-5 (DECEMBER 2025) – TABLE OF COMPLIANCE 118

TABLE 4: NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (SUPERSEDED) – TABLE OF COMPLIANCE 125

TABLE 5: NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (AUGUST 2026) – TABLE OF COMPLIANCE 139

TABLE 6: ROTHERHAM METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN – TABLE OF COMPLIANCE 168

TABLE 7: CITY OF DONCASTER COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN – TABLE OF COMPLIANCE 196

TABLE 8: NORTH EAST DERBYSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN – TABLE OF COMPLIANCE 214

Glossary

Term	Meaning
Agricultural Land Classification (ALC)	A system of classification of agricultural resource value of soils in England devised by Natural England, from Grade 1 (best quality) to Grade 5 (poorest quality), and based on criteria including soil characteristics (depth, structure, texture, chemistry, stoniness) as well as climate and site aspects
Aquifer	"Underground layers of water-bearing, permeable rock from which groundwater can be extracted" (British Geological Survey).
Best and Most Versatile (BMV)	Best and Most Versatile is agricultural land with an Agricultural land Classification of Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a (National Planning Policy Framework).
Long Lane 400kV Substation	The new 400 kilovolt National Grid substation proposed on land immediately east of Long Lane, Brinsworth, S60 4JJ.
Cable Corridors	Corridors within which the high voltage cables would be constructed.
Conservation Area	Conservation Areas are defined by local authorities as areas with special historic and architectural interest that are given extra protection through planning controls and considerations.
Designated Asset	A World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area designated under the relevant legislation.
Development Consent Order (DCO)	A statutory order made by the relevant Secretary of State pursuant to The Planning Act 2008 to authorise a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project which provides consent for the project and means that a range of other consents, such as planning permission and listed building consent, will not be required. A DCO can also include rights of compulsory acquisition.
Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)	A process, undertaken by the applicant, of identifying and assessing the significant effects likely to arise from a project.
Environment Statement (ES)	The Environmental Statement which presents the environmental information relating to the Proposed Development. The ES has been prepared to present information for formal consultation in accordance with current EIA regulation.
Heritage Asset	A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. It includes designated heritage

Term	Meaning
	assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).
Historic Environment Records	HERs are information services maintained and managed by local authorities. They contain details on local archaeological sites and finds, historic buildings and historic landscapes and are regularly updated. This information is usually held in a database with a digital mapping system (Geographic Information System).
Listed Building	Designated assets being buildings or structures of special architectural and historic interest protected by legislation. There are three grades of listing, which are; • grade I (these are of exceptional interest); • grade II* (these are particularly important); and • grade II (these are of special interest).
Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP)	Nationally significant infrastructure projects are large scale major development projects in England or Wales which require permission under the Planning Act 2008. They can be projects such as: • power generating stations, offshore wind farms, electricity lines • new roads, railway lines, airports • hazardous waste facilities • waste-water treatment plants • reservoirs Projects are only defined as nationally significant if they meet the relevant threshold set out in the Planning Act 2008Planning Act 2008 and from 31 December 2025 The Infrastructure Planning (Onshore Wind and Solar Generation) Order 2025 onshore wind and solar projects
Non-designated Heritage Asset	A building, monument, site, place, area, or landscape identified by a local authority as having heritage significance that merits consideration in planning decisions, but which is not formally listed at a national level.
Non-statutory Consultation	The first round of consultation held from 18 November 2024 to 31 January 2025.
Order Limits	Maximum extent of the Proposed Development comprising the Site and Cable Corridors.
Registered Park and Garden (RPG)	A park and/or garden of special historic interest placed on a non-statutory Register. There are three grades of registration:

Term	Meaning
	• Grade I – these are of exceptional interest; • Grade II* - these are particularly important; and • Grade II – these are of special interest.
Rochdale Envelope Approach	An approach often used to accommodate flexibility in design for large scale infrastructure projects. This allows the assessments to address uncertainties for details which may not yet be known.
Scheduled Monument	A nationally important archaeological site and designated asset covered within the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Act, 1979.
Scoping Opinion	The opinion in response from the relevant consenting authority to an EIA Scoping Report adopted by the Secretary of State on 3 June 2025 which sets out the aspects to be assessed within an EIA. Informed by consultation with the relevant statutory bodies.
Setting	The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.
Study Area	The spatial extent within which environmental receptors may experience likely significant effects from the Proposed Development.
The Applicant	Whitestone Net Zero Ltd
The Application	The Application submitted to the Secretary of State for a Development Consent Order.
The Proposed Development	The proposed Whitestone Solar Farm.
The Site	The land planned to be used for solar PV array and associated infrastructure, BESS, substations, and landscaping and habitat enhancement. The Site is split into W1, W2, and W3.
Whitestone 1 (W1)	The northern parcels of the Whitestone Solar Farm.
Whitestone 2 (W2)	The middle parcels of the Whitestone Solar Farm.
Whitestone 3 (W3)	The southern parcels of the Whitestone Solar Farm.

Acronyms

Acronym	Meaning
ALC	Agricultural Land Classification
AQMA	Air Quality Management Area
ATC	Automatic Traffic Counts
BESS	Battery Energy Storage System
BMV	Best and Most Versatile

Acronym	Meaning
BNG	Biodiversity Net Gain
BSMP	Battery Safety Management Plan
CCTV	Closed-Circuit Television Systems
CDC	City of Doncaster Council
CEA	Cumulative Effects Assessment
CEH	Centre for Ecology and Hydrology
CEMP	Construction Environmental Management Plan
CIEEM	Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management
CIRIA	Construction Industry Research and Information Association
CNP	Critical National Priority
COMAH	Control of Major Accident Hazards
CTMP	Construction Traffic Management Plan
DCC	Derbyshire County Council
DCO	Development Consent Order
DEFRA	Department for Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs
DEMP	Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan
DESNZ	The Department for Energy Security and Net Zero
DfT	Department for Transport
DMP	Dust Management Plan
DWD	DWD Property and Planning Limited
EA	Environment Agency
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EMF	Electromagnetic Field
ES	Environmental Statement
FRA	Flood Risk Assessment
GCD	Global Climate Database
GLVIA3	Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, third edition
GVA	Gross Value Added
HE	Historic England
HER	Historic Environment Records
HGV	Heavy Goods Vehicles
HSE	Health and Safety Executive
IAQM	Institute for Air Quality Management
LCA	Landscape Character Area

Acronym	Meaning
LNR	Local Nature Reserves
LNRS	Local Nature Recovery Strategy
LPA	Local Planning Authority
LRN	Local Road Network
LSE	Likely significant effects
LVIA	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
LWS	Local Wildlife Site
MHCLG	Ministry of Housing Communities & Local Government
NE	Natural England
NEDDC	North East Derbyshire District Council
NH	National Highways
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPS	National Policy Statement
NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
oBSMP	Outline Battery Safety Management Plan
oCEMP	Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan
oCTMP	Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan
oDEMP	Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan
OEMP	Operational Environmental Management Plan
oLEMP	Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan
ONS	Office for National Statistics
oOEMP	Outline Operation Environmental Management Plan
oSMP	Outline Soil Management Plan
oSWDS	Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy
PPG	Planning Practice Guidance
PRoW	Public Rights of Way
PRoWMP	Public Right of Way Management Plan
PV	Photovoltaic
RMBC	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
RPG	Registered Park and Garden
SM	Scheduled Monument
SoS	Secretary of State
SPZ	Source Protection Zone
SSSI	Sites of Special Scientific Interest
SuDS	Sustainable Drainage Systems
SWDS	Surface Water Drainage Strategy

Acronym	Meaning
SWMP	Site Waste Management Plan
W1	Whitestone 1
W2	Whitestone 2
W3	Whitestone 3

Document Updates

This document has been updated at Procedural Deadline A in response to the National Planning Policy Framework being updated in August 2026 post the acceptance of the Whitestone Solar Farm DCO Application. The document references have not been updated from the original submission. Please refer to the **Guide to the Application [EN0110020/APP/1.3.2]** for the list of current versions of documents.

TABLE 1: NATIONAL POLICY STATEMENT EN-1 (DECEMBER 2025) – TABLE OF COMPLIANCE

Policy	Policy Text	Assessment
3.1 Introduction	3.1.1 This Part of the NPS explains why the government sees a need for significant amounts of new large-scale energy infrastructure to meet its energy objectives and why the government considers that the need for such infrastructure is urgent.	The Proposed Development would make a significant contribution to the achievement of both the national renewable energy targets and to the UK's contribution to global efforts to reduce the effects of climate change. The **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** and the **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** set out that the Proposed Development will deliver a significant amount of low-carbon, low-cost and UK-located solar electricity generation capacity connecting to the National Electricity Transmission System, anticipated to be from 2029. In addition to meeting the urgent national need for secure and affordable low-carbon energy infrastructure and its associated environmental and societal benefits, the Proposed Development delivers wider benefits to the environment and the local community. Given the Proposed Development comprises EIA development as defined by the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, an EIA has been undertaken to assess the environmental impacts of the Proposed Development, with the findings presented in the **Environmental Statement (ES) [EN0110020/APP/6.1 - 6.5].** The mitigation hierarchy has been appropriately applied to avoid, reduce and mitigate wherever practicable any likely significant adverse effects of the Proposed Development. In the case of the Proposed Development, a small number of localised and short-term residual significant adverse effects remain and are limited to effects on landscape and visual. Given the substantial benefits the Proposed Development will provide, it is considered that these residual effects are outweighed. It is considered that these residual impacts do not meet the "exceptional circumstances" test (as set out in paragraph 4.1.7 of NPS EN-1) and therefore do not warrant refusal of the application for development consent on the basis that the Proposed Development qualifies as Critical National Priority (CNP) . In addition, Section 3.3 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** sets out that there are a significant number of additional benefits that would be achieved by the Proposed Development, which must be weighed against any residual effects.
	3.1.2 However, it will not be possible to develop the necessary amounts of such infrastructure without some significant residual adverse impacts. These effects will be minimised by the application of policy set out in Parts 4 and 5 of this NPS. See also Part 2 of each technology specific NPS.	
3.2 Secretary of State decision making	3.2.1 The government's objectives for the energy system are to decarbonise power generation to meet the Clean Power 2030 Mission, ensuring our supply of energy always remains secure, reliable, affordable, and consistent with net zero emissions in 2050 for a wide range of future scenarios, including delivery of our carbon budgets and Nationally Determined Contributions.	The **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** and **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** set out that the Proposed Development will deliver a significant amount of low-carbon, low-cost and UK-located solar electricity generation capacity connecting to the National Electricity Transmission System, anticipated to be operational from 2029. The Proposed Development would contribute towards the UK Government meeting the overarching key national policy aims of: • Achieving Net Zero by 2050 • Increasing the security of energy supply

	• Lowering the cost and increasing the affordability of generate electricity; and • Contributing to sustainable development and economic opportunities. This would help the UK diversify its energy supply, increase energy resilience, and support local and national carbon emission reduction targets. It would provide a reliable supply of electricity that seeks to help address the needs of the UK power market. The Proposed Development would also help the UK to meet carbon reduction commitments by significantly increasing the proportion of electricity supplied by renewable sources, which is reported as a significant beneficial effect in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [APP/6.11]**.
3.2.2 We need a range of different types of energy infrastructure to deliver these objectives. This includes the infrastructure described within this NPS but also more nascent technologies, data, and innovative infrastructure projects consistent with these objectives.	The Proposed Development would help the UK diversify its energy supply, increase energy resilience and help support local and national carbon emission reduction targets. The **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** and **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** set out that the Proposed Development will deliver a significant amount of low-carbon, low-cost and UK-located solar electricity generation capacity connection to the National Electricity Transmission System from 2029. As noted in National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1 paragraph 3.2.4, planning policy does not set limits on different technologies proposed, with the exception of new coal or large-scale oil-fired electricity generation. Therefore, the presence of additional low carbon technologies in the area, or the growing competition in the energy sector should not affect the need for the Proposed Development.
3.2.3 The Clean Power 2030 Action Plan sets out a DESNZ ‘Clean Power Capacity range’ which is a range of possible installed capacities for each technology in 2030. The range reflects that there is no singular path to achieving clean power, but instead, that there are a range of scenarios that could get us there.	
3.2.4 It is not the role of the planning system to deliver specific amounts or limit any form of infrastructure covered by this NPS. It is for industry to propose new energy infrastructure projects that they assess to be viable within the strategic framework set by government. This is the nature of a market-based energy system. With the exception of new coal or large-scale oil-fired electricity generation23, the government does not consider it appropriate for planning policy to set limits on different technologies but planning policy can be used to support the government’s ambitions in energy policy and other policy areas.	
3.2.5 The government’s strategic framework includes the Clean Power 2030 Action Plan and the pathways to 2030, the Strategic Spatial Energy Plan, and the Centralised Strategic Network Plan. These should be considered by applicants, together with other relevant considerations, and used to inform developments of new energy infrastructure projects.	The **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** sets out the evidence in support of ground mounted solar electricity generation generally, and the Proposed Development specifically, in relation to the benefit brought towards meeting the UK’s critical strategic needs, including those set out in the Clean Power 2030 Action Plan, the Strategic Spatial Energy Plan, and the Centralised Strategic Network Plan.
3.2.8 The Secretary of State should assess all applications for development consent for the types of infrastructure covered by this NPS on the basis that the government has demonstrated that there is a need for those types of infrastructure which is urgent, as described for each of them in this Part.	Section 3.3 of the NPS EN-1 identifies an urgent need for new nationally significant electricity infrastructure. The Proposed Development addresses this need by delivering a significant amount of low-carbon, low-cost, and UK-located solar electricity generation capacity connected to the National Electricity Transmission System, anticipated to be operational from 2029. The **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** concludes, in support of the settled position in Paragraphs 3.2.8 – 3.2.10 of NPS EN-1, that the decarbonisation, security of supply and affordability benefits delivered by the Proposed Development to the national urgent need for low-carbon generation should be accorded substantial weight in the planning balance.
3.2.9 In addition, the Secretary of State has determined that substantial weight should be given to this need when considering applications for development consent under the Planning Act 2008.	
3.2.10 The Secretary of State is not required to consider separately the specific contribution of any individual project to satisfying the need established in this NPS.	

	3.2.11 This NPS, along with any technology specific energy NPSs, sets out policy for nationally significant energy infrastructure covered by sections 15-21 of the Planning Act 2008.	The Proposed Development is an onshore generating station in England (which does not generate electricity from wind) with a generating capacity exceeding 50 MW. It is therefore classed as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) under sections 14(1)(a), 15(1) and 15(2) of the PA 2008. The PA 2008 requires a Development Consent Order (DCO) to be obtained for the development of NSIPs. The Applicant acknowledges this policy and confirms that a policy review of all relevant NPSs for Energy has been undertaken.
3.3 The need for electricity generating capacity	3.3.59 All the generating technologies mentioned above are urgently needed to meet the government's energy objectives by: • providing security of supply (by reducing reliance on imported oil and gas, avoiding concentration risk and not relying on one fuel or generation type) • providing an affordable, reliable system (through the deployment of technologies with complementary characteristics) • ensuring the system is net zero consistent (by remaining in line with our carbon budgets and maintaining the options required to deliver for a wide range of demand, decarbonisation and technology scenarios, including where there are difficulties with delivering any technology)	As discussed in the above responses to NPS EN-1 Paragraphs 3.2.1 and 3.2.2, the Proposed Development is urgently needed in order to meet the Government's energy objectives. The **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** consistently concludes with NPS EN-1 that the decarbonisation, security of supply, and affordability benefits delivered by the Proposed Development to the national urgent need for low-carbon generation should be accorded substantial weight in the planning balance. The Proposed Development meets the definition of CNP Infrastructure because it is for the development of greater than 50MW capacity of a low carbon source of energy. As CNP infrastructure, the urgent need for the Proposed Development to assist in achieving the UK's energy objectives, together with the national security, economic, commercial, and net-zero benefits, will, in general, outweigh any other residual impacts that cannot be addressed by applying the mitigation hierarchy.
	3.3.63 Subject to any legal requirements, the urgent need for CNP infrastructure to achieving our energy objectives, together with the national security, economic, commercial, and net zero benefits, means that it is likely the need case will outweigh any other residual impacts not capable of being addressed by application of the mitigation hierarchy, in all but the most exceptional circumstances. Government strongly supports the delivery of CNP infrastructure and it should be progressed as quickly as possible.	Urgent and unprecedented actions are required on a global scale to halt climate change. A rapid increase in the supply of low-carbon electricity is needed for the UK to meet its legally binding climate change targets. Solar generation is a critical part of the UK's strategy to achieve net zero by 2050, a key step towards the government's national mission for 'Clean Power by 2030'. However, the need for new clean power does not stop at 2030. The continued delivery of low-carbon generation facilities beyond 2030 is necessary to meet future electricity demand growth outlined in the **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** and achieve essential wider societal carbon savings. It is also important to continue to bring forward Proposed Developments in case 'Clean Power by 2030' is not achieved.
3.3 The need for new electricity networks	3.3.84 Government has committed to reduce GHG emissions by 78 per cent by 2035 under CB6. According to the Net Zero Strategy46 this means that by 2035, all our electricity will need to come from low carbon sources, subject to security of supply, whilst meeting a 40-60 per cent increase in demand.	The NPSs do not set out any maximum targets for low-carbon infrastructure development (see Paragraph 3.2.3 of NPS EN-1). The UK should be developing as much low-carbon infrastructure as possible and as quickly as possible to meet the urgent need to reduce carbon emissions while ensuring a reliable, secure, and affordable supply.
	3.3.85 Given the urgent need for new electricity infrastructure and the time it takes for electricity NSIPs to move from design conception to operation, there is an urgent need for new (and particularly low carbon) electricity NSIPs to be brought forward as soon as possible, given the crucial role of electricity as the UK decarbonises its economy.	Section 6 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** considers the legal and regulatory requirements (Habitats Regulation Assessment, Water Framework Directive (WFD), the Infrastructure Planning (Application: Prescribed Forms and Procedures) Regulations 2009 and the EIA Regulations) and concludes that along with demonstrating compliance with the energy NPSs and application of the mitigation hierarchy, the CNP presumption applies to the Proposed Development.
4.1 Weighing impacts and benefits	4.1.5 In considering any proposed development, in particular when weighing its adverse impacts against its benefits, the Secretary of State should take into account: • Its potential benefits including its contribution to meeting the need for the Clean Power 2030 Mission and net zero, energy infrastructure, job creation, reduction	The **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** outlines, in section 9, the planning balance for the Proposed Development, bringing together the beneficial effects of the Proposed Development and the likely significant residual adverse effects. The Proposed Development is set to provide the following benefits:

	of geographical disparities, environmental enhancements, and any long-term or wider benefits; • Its potential adverse impacts, including on the environment, and including any long-term and cumulative adverse impacts, as well as any measures to avoid, reduce, mitigate or compensate for any adverse impacts, following the mitigation hierarchy.	• Existing hedgerows, woodland, ditches, ponds and field margins will be retained within the Order Limits, with the exception of small breaks and/or crossings required for new access tracks, security fencing, cable routes and new access junctions. • Substantial positive contribution to meeting the urgent need for renewable electricity generation in line with meeting net zero by 2050 targets. • The provision of battery energy storage which will maximise efficiency of the land and grid capacity, as encourages by NPS EN-3. • Ecological enhancement measures that will result in a secured commitment to deliver a minimum of 10% in Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), with the following proposed unit breakdown: o Habitat Units = 28% o Hedgerow Units = 30% o Watercourse Units = 10% • Creation of 14.58km of permissive paths throughout the Order Limits to provide new connections to extend options and routes for pedestrians, equestrians and cyclists. • Creation of jobs during all three phases of the Proposed Development, including construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning. • Soil maturing – due to the limited application of agricultural practices there is a proposed beneficial effect on the land and soils. The following management plans set out all mitigation measures which are outlined in all of the ES chapters. In the case of the Proposed Development, the residual significant adverse effects during the operational and maintenance phase are limited to effects on landscape and visual, as confirmed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 18: Summary of Significant Effects [EN0110020/APP/6.18]**. The management plans include: • **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** • **Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.10]** • **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** • **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** • **Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**
	4.1.6 In this context, the Secretary of State should take into account environmental, social and economic benefits and adverse impacts, at national, regional and local levels. These may be identified in this NPS, the relevant technology specific NPS, in the application or elsewhere (including in local impact reports, marine plans, and other material considerations as outlined in Section 1.1).	
	4.1.7 Where this NPS or the relevant technology specific NPSs require an applicant to mitigate a particular impact as far as possible, but the Secretary of State considers that there would still be residual adverse effects after the implementation of such mitigation measures, the Secretary of State should weigh those residual effects against the benefits of the proposed development. For projects which qualify as CNP Infrastructure, it is likely that the need case will outweigh the residual effects not capable of being addressed by application of the mitigation hierarchy, in all but the most exceptional cases. This presumption, however, does not apply to residual impacts which present an unacceptable risk to, or interference with, human health and public safety, defence, or irreplaceable habitats. Further, the same exception applies to this presumption for residual impacts which present an unacceptable risk to, or unacceptable interference offshore to navigation, or onshore to flood and coastal erosion risk. See paragraph 4.2.28 of this NPS for further detail.	

		• **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** • **Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.15]** • **Outline Written Proposed Development of Investigation [EN0110020/APP/5.16]** • **Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy (oSWDS) [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** • **Outline Skills and Supply Chain Management Plan (oSSCMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.18]** • **Outline Cable Construction Method Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.19]** It is considered that these residual impacts do not meet the "*exceptional circumstances*" test (as set out in paragraph 4.1.7 of NPS EN-1) and therefore do not warrant refusal of the application for development consent on the basis that the Proposed Development qualifies as CNP infrastructure . The Proposed Development does not pose an unacceptable interference with human health and public safety, defence, or irreplaceable habitats, nor does it pose an unacceptable risk to the achievement of net zero. The planning balance is firmly in favour of granting consent. Section 9.2 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** outlines that the Proposed Development would achieve a significant number of additional benefits. The Proposed Development is a well-considered and effectively designed proposal that responds to its locality and is sensitive to the local environment. It is therefore concluded that there are no significant environmental impacts arising that cannot be outweighed by the benefits outlined within the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]**. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 18: Summary of Significant Effects [EN0110020/APP/6.18]** concludes that there are residual significant effects during the operational and maintenance phase of the Proposed Development on landscape and visual, which are localised. It should be noted that there is sufficient mitigation proposed to assist in mitigating these effects as far as possible. The **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** considers the CNP presumption, in accordance with this policy. Given that the Applicant has demonstrated that the Proposed Development is in accordance with the NPSs, the mitigation hierarchy has been applied, and compliance with other legal and regulatory requirements has also been demonstrated, it can be concluded that the CNP presumption will apply to the Proposed Development and accordingly should be considered in the decision-making process. It concludes that, following application of the planning balance and CNP presumption, there is an overwhelming case in favour of granting development consent for the Proposed Development.
Other Documents	4.1.10 The policy set out in this NPS and the technology specific energy NPSs is intended to provide greater clarity around existing policy and practice of the Secretary of State in considering applications for nationally significant energy infrastructure, (or therefore the "benchmark" for what is, or is not, an acceptable nationally significant energy development).	The Proposed Development's compliance with the NPSs is considered in Tables 1-3 of this **Policy Compliance Document [EN0110020/APP/5.5]**.

	4.1.11 The energy NPSs have taken account of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Planning Practice Guidance for England, and Planning Policy Wales and Technical Advice Notes (TANs) for Wales, where appropriate	The Proposed Development's compliance with the NPPF is considered in Table 4 of this **Policy Compliance Document [EN0110020/APP/5.5]**.
	4.1.12 Other matters that the Secretary of State may consider both important and relevant to their decision-making may include Development Plan documents or other documents in the Local Development Framework.	The Proposed Development's compliance with local policies is considered in Tables 5 – 8 of this **Policy Compliance Document [EN0110020/APP/5.5]**. The Proposed Development is expected to align with the three primary duties of the SSEP: • promoting Net Zero, to enable the government to deliver on its legally binding emissions targets • efficiency and economy, promoting efficient, coordinated and economic electricity; and • security and supply, ensuring security of supply for current and future consumers of electricity and gas.
	4.1.13 Where the project conflicts with a proposal in a draft Development Plan, the Secretary of State should take account of the stage which the Development Plan document in England or Local Development Plan in Wales has reached in deciding what weight to give to the plan for the purposes of determining the planning significance of what is replaced, prevented, or precluded.	
	4.1.15 The Secretary of State should also consider spatial plans, such as the Strategic Spatial Energy Plan upon endorsement by all relevant governments.	
	4.1.16 In the event of a conflict between these documents and an NPS, the NPS prevails for the purpose of Secretary of State decision making given the national significance of the infrastructure.	The Applicant notes that in the event of a conflict between the Development Plan and the NPS, the NPS prevails for the purpose of the Secretary of State (SoS) decision making given the national significance of the Proposed Development.
Development Consent	4.1.17 The Secretary of State should only impose requirements in relation to a development consent that are necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development to be consented, enforceable, precise, and reasonable in all other respects.	The **Explanatory Memorandum [EN0110020/APP/3.2]** to the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]** explains the purpose and effect of each provision in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**, including why it is considered necessary, as required by Regulation 5(2)(c) of the APFP Regulations. It also identifies examples of precedents from other DCOs where applicable. The Proposed Development's compliance with the NPPF is considered in Table 4 of this **Policy Compliance Document [EN0110020/APP/5.5]**. The Proposed Development has been developed with consideration of relevant Planning Practice Guidance.
	4.1.18 The Secretary of State should consider the guidance in the NPPF, the PPG: Use of Planning Conditions, and TANs, or any successor documents, where appropriate.	
	4.1.19 The Secretary of State may consider any development consent obligations that an applicant agrees with local authorities. These must be relevant to planning, necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the proposed development, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development, and reasonable in all other respects.	
Early Engagement	4.1.20 Early engagement both before and at the formal pre-application stage between the applicant and key stakeholders, including public regulators, Statutory Consultees (including Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies (SNCBs)), and those likely to have an interest in a proposed energy infrastructure application, is strongly encouraged in line with the government's pre-application guidance. This means that only applications which are fully prepared and comprehensive can be accepted for examination, enabling them to be properly assessed by the Examining Authority and leading to a clear recommendation report to the Secretary of State.	A **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** has been submitted with this application, demonstrating how the Applicant has complied with the consultation requirements set out in the PA 2008, the APFP Regulations, and the EIA Regulations. The **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** also aligns with the guidance outlined in Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on the Consultation Report, and Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: 2024 Pre-Application Prospectus, where relevant. Section 3.2 of the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** details the early engagement conducted by the Applicant.
	4.1.21 This is particularly so in the case of HRA matters covered in paragraphs 5.4.26 to 5.4.32 below, which explain the onus is on the applicant to submit sufficient information to enable the Secretary of State to conduct an Appropriate Assessment if required.	The Proposed Development is not interacting with any European designated sites, and this was scoped out at Scoping Stage of the Proposed Development as confirmed in table 6.1 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6].**

Financial Viability	4.1.22 In deciding to bring forward a proposal for infrastructure development, the applicant will have made a judgement on the financial and technical viability of the proposed development, within the market framework and taking account of government interventions	The **Funding Statement [EN0110020/APP/4.2]** and the **Grid Connection Statement [EN0110020/APP/7.1]** are submitted alongside the DCO Application, setting out how the Proposed Development is to be funded, and that the status of the grid connection is confirmed. The Applicant has considered these policies, in this table and where they arise in NPS EN-3 and EN-5 in Tables 2 and 3 of this **Policy Compliance Document [EN0110020/APP/5.5]**, and confirms that the Proposed Development is expected to be project financed. The overall objective of the financing strategy for the Proposed Development is to provide full funding commitments prior to the commencement of construction and minimise the overall cost of funds to provide value for money on the cost of the delivered energy from this capital-intensive project. The Applicant has followed a site evaluation process that has taken into account environmental, physical, technical, social, and commercial considerations and opportunities, as well as engineering requirements. Therefore, the Applicant is confident that they have developed a sensitive and technically viable proposal at this stage. The Applicant wishes to retain flexibility regarding the design detail of certain components of the Proposed Development, as is acknowledged and allowed for in NPS EN-1 Section 4.3, Section 2.6 and Paragraph 2.10.70 of NPS EN-3. The extent of flexibility sought by the Applicant is described in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]**.
	4.1.23 Where the Secretary of State considers that the financial viability and technical feasibility of the proposal has been properly assessed by the applicant, it is unlikely to be of relevance in Secretary of State decision making (any exceptions to this principle are dealt with where they arise in this, or other energy NPSs, and the reasons why financial viability or technical feasibility is likely to be of relevance explained).	
4.2 The critical national priority for low carbon infrastructure	4.2.1 Government has committed to the Clean Power 2030 Mission, subject to security of supply, to underpin its 2050 net zero ambitions. More than half of final energy demand in 2050 could be met by electricity, as transport and heating in particular shift from fossil fuel to electrical technology.	The Proposed Development would make a significant contribution to the achievement of both the national renewable energy targets and to the UK's contribution to global efforts to reduce the effects of climate change. The **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** and the **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** set out that the Proposed Development will deliver a significant amount of low-carbon, low-cost and UK-located solar electricity generation capacity connecting to the National Electricity Transmission System, anticipated to be from 2029. In addition to meeting the urgent national need for secure and affordable low-carbon energy infrastructure and its associated environmental and societal benefits, the Proposed Development delivers wider benefits to the environment and the local community. The Proposed Development is a substantial infrastructure asset, capable of delivering large amounts of secure, affordable low carbon electricity to local and national networks.
	4.2.2 Ensuring the UK is more energy independent, resilient and secure requires the smooth transition to abundant, low-carbon energy. The UK's strategy to increase supply of low carbon energy is dependent on deployment of renewable and nuclear power generation, alongside hydrogen and CCUS. Our energy security and net zero ambitions will only be delivered if we can enable the development of new low carbon sources of energy at speed and scale.	
	4.2.3 With smart and strategic planning, the UK can maintain high environmental standards and minimise impacts while increasing the levels of deployment at the scale and pace needed to meet our energy security and net zero ambitions.	
	4.2.4 As set out in NESO's advice to the Secretary of State and the Secretary of State's Clean Power Action Plan, the pace of planning delivery needs to significantly increase to allow the government to meet its Clean Energy targets. Many more development consent applications will have to enter the system, and be examined and decided within the statutory timescales. These decisions must be made in accordance with this NPS, relevant technology specific NPSs, and all relevant legal requirements, and applications must continue to meet the high standards expected.	The **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** provides a detailed explanation of why the Proposed Development is urgently needed and how the Proposed Development addresses all relevant aspects of established and emerging government energy and climate change policies and commitments. The Applicant has held engagement sessions with officers from City of Doncaster, Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council (RMBC) and North East Derbyshire District Council (NEDDC), in addition to local Parish Councils and statutory advisors. The full details of pre-application engagement are described in the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** . It can be confirmed that the Applicant will continue to engage with the relevant bodies throughout the examination process.
	4.2.5 Government is proposing amendments to infrastructure planning, including to the Planning Act 2008 process. Even with these changes, it will require a significant and sustained effort from applicants, planners, LPAs, statutory advisors, Examining Authorities and decision makers to meet this challenge, while listening to host	

	communities. It is a challenge we must meet, and to do that each part of the system needs to work together efficiently to avoid unnecessary delays. Proportionality and focus at all stages of the project preparation, examination and decision making are vital.	
	4.2.6 Before applications are made applicants are required to carry out preapplication consultation on their proposals. The Planning Act 2008 requires only one such consultation, and proposals can change after that consultation without the need to reconsult, unless the project is so altered as to become a different project altogether. There is then further publicity, consultation and engagement within the formal Planning Act process.	The PA 2008 requires applicants for DCOs to carry out Statutory pre-application consultation on their proposals. The PA 2008 and related regulations set out the requirements for how this consultation must be undertaken.Prior to a statutory consultation in compliance with Sections 42, 47 and 48 of the PA 2008, the Applicant also undertook Non-statutory Consultation as part of developing its proposals and seeking feedback from consultees. Full details of the Statutory and Non-Statutory consultations are described in the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]**.
	4.2.7 We recommend that applicants consider additional consents, licences and permit requirements at the earliest possible stage. Applicants should consider parallel tracking of the environmental permitting and planning applications, and engaging with the Environment Agency's (EA) permitting pre-application service to help ensure that project design considers the requirements of the environmental permitting regime at the earliest opportunity.	The **Consents and Agreements Position Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.3]** has been prepared as part of the DCO Application. The purpose of that document is to provide information on the additional consents and licences potentially required for the Proposed Development, in support of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The Applicant and the consenting bodies for the additional consents and licences listed in the **Consents and Agreements Position Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.3]** are in ongoing discussions, and the Applicant is confident that necessary agreements will be obtained either before or during the examination of this application, in exchange for the inclusion of appropriate protective provisions by the Applicant in the DCO. The Applicant has been in discussion with the following consenting bodies as set out in Appendix A of the **Consents and Agreements Position Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.3]**: • Office of Gas and Electricity Markets • National Grid Electricity Transmission • National Energy System Operator • Natural England (NE) • Environment Agency (EA) • RMBC • City of Doncaster Council (CDC) • NEDDC • Derbyshire County Council (DCC) • Health and Safety Executive (HSE) • Department for Transport (DfT) • National Highways (NH) • Local Police
	4.2.8 Where it is required by law at the pre-application consultation stage, preliminary environmental information should be provided. This information should be enough for	As set out in section 7 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4],** a statutory consultation in compliance with Sections 42, 47 and 48 of the PA 2008 was undertaken

	statutory advisors to develop an informed view of the likely significant environmental effects of the development. It is not expected to be the full, finalised Environmental Statement.	between 16 September 2025 and 28 October 2025, supported by a Preliminary Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) as required by the EIA Regulations.
	4.2.9 While applicants may carry out further non-statutory consultation, these should serve a clear purpose and be focused and targeted at ensuring the project is ready for the statutory consultation. Applicants should avoid using these repeated consultations to test the minimum level of mitigation and compensation for impacts. Instead, mitigations should be built in from the start. For this reason, early engagement with relevant statutory consultees is recommended and applicants should maintain this engagement throughout pre-application. This ensures that issues are identified and addressed as early as possible.	Prior to statutory consultation, the Applicant also undertook Non-statutory Consultation as part of developing its proposals and sought feedback from consultees. Full details of this consultation are described in the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]**.
	4.2.10 Objections to the adequacy of pre-application consultation must be fair, accurate and not based on the objector's view of the underlying Proposed Development. So long as an applicant has acted reasonably and met the statutory requirements there should be no objections to the adequacy of the consultation process.	The **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** provides a detailed explanation of why the Proposed Development is urgently needed, and how the Proposed Development addresses all relevant aspects of established and emerging government energy and climate change policies and commitments.
	4.2.11 MHCLG publish clear guidance on the pre-application stage and PINS offer a pre-application advice service. To meet the Clean Energy challenge applicants must engage with and take note of this guidance and advice.	The Applicant has carried out non-statutory, statutory and further targeted consultation on the Proposed Development at the pre-application stage. Section 10.2 of the **Consultation Report [APP/ EN0110020/5.1]** sets out the Applicant is confident that the seven-week statutory consultation period provided adequate time for participation and feedback, exceeding the minimum 28-day statutory requirement. Paragraph 1.1.15 and **Appendix I** of the **Consultation Report [APP/EN0110020/5.1]** demonstrates the Applicant has considered the Ministry of Housing Communities & Local Government's (MHCLG) Guidance on the pre-application stage for NSIPs (April 2024) and the Planning Inspectorate's Advice entitled Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on the Consultation Report. The Applicant considers that the DCO Application for development consent is ready for examination. The Application includes a proportionate and focused ES setting out the identification of Likely Significant Effects (LSE) of the Proposed Development, and the mitigation measures considered to address these. During examination, the Applicant will be providing tracked change versions of amended documents alongside the clean versions. The Applicant has engaged collaboratively with the Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) during the pre-application phase as set out within the relevant technical chapters of **ES Topic Chapters [EN0110020/APP/6.2]** and the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]**. Regarding paragraph 4.2.15, the Applicant has taken a standard approach to the formal DCO itself and has shared draft requirements with the LPAs ahead of submission. The Applicant confirms there are no known burial grounds or mineral rights holders within the proposed Order Limits.
	4.2.12 Applicants must ensure that applications are ready to be examined before an application is made. The Planning Act 2008 system is designed to be frontloaded and applications should not enter the statutory system if they are not ready to be consented. Examining Authorities, and indeed Secretaries of State, should be focused on considering the planning merits of an application, and not using time during the examination and decision-making stages seeking to address deficiencies in an application. Applicants and affected parties should ensure that protective provisions have been agreed ahead of statutory deadlines.	
	4.2.13 Applicants and their consultants and advisors must ensure that their applications are clear and accessible to both the public and decision makers. Applications should be proportional, clear and focussed in order to ensure the planning process can move at the pace required to meet the Clean Power 2030 Mission. Applicants must ensure their applications are concise whilst still containing the necessary, high quality, information the Examining Authority, statutory consultees and the Secretary of State expect to see in order to make an informed decision. The ES should therefore be proportionate and focused, with just the sufficient detail required to clearly identify the likely significant effects from the proposal.	
	4.2.14 With the increasing number of development consent applications coming forward, this will put pressure on existing systems within the NSIP regime. It's therefore important that all parts of the system work together cohesively to ensure that the impacts of projects are properly assessed and mitigated so that good quality Proposed Developments are consented. LPAs and statutory advisors need the best and most assessable information from applicants so that they can easily identify all the relevant issues, agree the majority of those early and focus their attention on any controversial issues. Applicants providing tracked change versions of amended documents alongside	

	the clean versions is encouraged. Applicants should view their relationships with LPAs and statutory advisors as a valuable collaborative one.	
	4.2.15 Similarly, applicants, consultees, examiners and decision makers, and all their legal teams must work together to streamline the formal DCO itself. Applicants should seek to take a standard approach to issues like compulsory purchase powers, the discharge of requirements and arbitration. Applicants should not introduce subtle changes to make a development easier to carry out and standard articles, such as those on human remains and mineral rights should only be used where there is a known burial ground or mineral rights holder.	
	4.2.16 Government has concluded that there is a critical national priority (CNP) for the provision of nationally significant low carbon infrastructure to meet the Clean Power 2030 Mission and net zero. Paragraphs 4.2.17 and 4.2.18 below set out the projects to be prioritised for the Clean Power 2030 Mission and net zero. The CNP policy below applies to these projects. This does not extend the definition of what counts as nationally significant infrastructure: the scope remains as set out in the Planning Act 2008.	As outlined in Section 4.2 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]**, the Proposed Development is classified as CNP Infrastructure. The **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** consistently accords with NPS EN-1 that the decarbonisation, security of supply and affordability benefits delivered by the Proposed Development to the national urgent need for low-carbon generation should be accorded substantial weight in the planning balance. The Proposed Development meets the definition of CNP Infrastructure because it is for the development of greater than 50MW capacity of a low carbon source of energy. As CNP infrastructure, the urgent need for the Proposed Development to assist in achieving the UK's energy objectives, together with the national security, economic, commercial, and net zero benefits, will, in general, outweigh any other residual impacts not capable of being addressed by application of the mitigation hierarchy.
	4.2.17 Low carbon infrastructure for the purposes of this policy means, for electricity generation, all onshore and offshore generation that does not involve fossil fuel combustion (that is, renewable generation, including anaerobic digestion plants provided they meet existing definitions of low carbon; and nuclear energy generation), as well as natural gas fired generation which is carbon capture ready. EfW developments are not critical to meeting the Clean Power 2030 Mission and therefore CNP policy does not apply to applications for EfW projects. For electricity grid infrastructure, all power lines in scope of EN-5 including network reinforcement and upgrade works, and associated infrastructure such as substations. This is not limited to those associated specifically with a particular generation technology, as all new grid projects will contribute towards greater efficiency in constructing, operating and connecting low carbon infrastructure to the National Electricity Transmission System. Other energy infrastructure, fuels, pipelines and storage infrastructure, which fits within the normal definition of "low carbon", such as hydrogen distribution, and carbon dioxide distribution are also classed as low carbon infrastructure for the purposes of this policy.	
	4.2.19 The overarching need case for each type of energy infrastructure and the substantial weight which should be given to this need in assessing applications, as set out in paragraphs 3.2.8 to 3.2.10 of EN-1, is the starting point for all assessments of energy infrastructure applications.	The **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** provides a detailed explanation of why the Proposed Development is urgently needed, and how the Proposed Development addresses all relevant aspects of established and emerging government energy and climate change policies and commitments. It concludes that the decarbonisation, security of supply, and affordability benefits delivered by the Proposed Development to the national urgent need for low-carbon generation should be accorded substantial weight in the planning balance.
	4.2.20 The CNP policy does not create an additional or cumulative need case or weighting to that which is already outlined for each type of energy infrastructure. The policy applies following the normal consideration of the need case, the impacts of the project, and the application of the mitigation hierarchy. As such, it is relevant during Secretary of State decision making and specifically in reference to any residual impacts that have been identified. It should therefore also be given consideration by the Examining Authority when it is making its recommendation to the Secretary of State.	The **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** and **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** set out the need for the Proposed Development and note the established need for low-carbon infrastructure as a CNP and that such projects should be brought forward with urgency. In compliance with this policy, the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** sets out the needs case, the impacts of the Proposed Development, the application of the mitigation hierarchy, and applies the planning balance in consideration of any benefits and residual

	4.2.21 During decision making, the CNP policy will influence how non-HRA and non-Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) residual impacts are considered in the planning balance. The policy will therefore also influence how the Secretary of State considers whether tests requiring clear outweighing of harm, exceptionality, or very special circumstances have been met by a CNP Infrastructure application. Further detail is provided in paragraphs 4.2.28 to 4.2.30, and Figure 2.	adverse impacts before applying the CNP presumption which applies for this Proposed Development. The Applicant has considered this NPS and relevant technology specific energy NPSs, applying the mitigation hierarchy, as well as any other legal and regulatory requirements to the Proposed Development as CNP infrastructure.
	4.2.23 Applicants for CNP infrastructure must continue to show how their application meets the requirements in this NPS and the relevant technology specific NPS, applying the mitigation hierarchy, as well as any other legal and regulatory requirements.	The **ES [EN0110020/APP/6.1 – 6.20]** provides the baseline environmental information available for the Study Areas that are relevant for the environmental assessment undertaken, the description of the likely environmental effects arising from the Proposed Development, and the mitigation measures proposed to mitigate or reduce adverse environmental effects for the Proposed Development. As well as any necessary monitoring measures. In addition, the Applicant has ensured that a mitigation hierarchy has been applied throughout the Proposed Development, starting from the site selection stage and informing the design of the Proposed Development to avoid, reduce, mitigate or compensate for any adverse impacts.
	4.2.24 Applicants must apply the mitigation hierarchy and demonstrate that it has been applied. They should also seek the advice of the appropriate SNCB or other relevant statutory body when undertaking this process. Applicants should demonstrate that all residual impacts are those that cannot be avoided, reduced or mitigated. Measures that result in a significant reduction in generation capacity for CNP infrastructure are unlikely to be considered to be appropriate as mitigation. There may be exceptional circumstances where the mitigation could have a significant benefit and warrant a small reduction in generation capacity and function. In these circumstances, the Secretary of State may decide that the benefits of the mitigation to reduce the effects outweigh the marginal loss of function.	The **ES Topic Chapters [EN0110020/APP/6.6 – 6.16]** are structured to outline the impacts of the Proposed Development during the construction, operational and maintenance and decommissioning phases. The **ES Topic Chapters [EN0110020/APP/6.6 – 6.16]** identify the significance of an impact upon an assessed receptor, taking account of the environmental measures secured by the Proposed Development's design.
	4.2.25 Compensation, by definition, does not reduce an adverse effect resulting from a development. However, applicants should set out how residual impacts will be compensated for as far as possible. Applicants should also set out how any mitigation or compensation measures will be monitored and reporting agreed to ensure success and that action is taken. Changes to measures may be needed e.g. adaptive management. The cumulative impacts of multiple developments with residual impacts should also be considered.	As set out in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN0110020/APP/6.17]**, a Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA) has been undertaken as part of the EIA in accordance with the Planning Inspectorate's Advice on CEAs. The assessment considered two types of cumulative effects including: • Intra-Project Effects: effects generated by individual effects on a particular receptor. • Inter- Project Effects: effects generated by the Proposed Development and other planned or approved developments on the same receptor. To ensure clarity regarding how the proposed embedded and additional mitigation measures are secured, **ES Volume 3, Appendix 2.3: Commitments Register [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** has been submitted with the DCO Application. This document follows PINS Guidance and identifies how commitments will be secured and implemented, to ensure potential environmental effects arising from the Proposed Development are avoided, reduced or mitigated as far as possible in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy.
	4.2.27 The Secretary of State will continue to consider the impacts and benefits of all CNP Infrastructure applications on a case-by-case basis. The Secretary of State must be satisfied that the applicant's assessment demonstrates that the requirements set out above have been met. Where the Secretary of State is satisfied that they have been met, the CNP presumptions set out below apply.	The **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** consistently concludes with NPS EN-1 that the decarbonisation, security of supply and affordability benefits delivered by the Proposed Development to the national urgent need for low-carbon generation should be accorded substantial weight in the planning balance. The Proposed Development meets the definition of CNP Infrastructure because it is for the development of greater than 50MW capacity of a low-carbon source of energy. As CNP infrastructure, the urgent need for the Proposed Development to assist in achieving the UK's energy objectives, together with the national security, economic, commercial, and net zero benefits, will, in general, outweigh

		any other residual impacts not capable of being addressed by application of the mitigation hierarchy.
Non-HRA and non -MCZ residual impacts of CNP Infrastructure	4.2.28 Where residual non-HRA or non-MCZ impacts remain after the mitigation hierarchy has been applied, these residual impacts are unlikely to outweigh the urgent need for this type of infrastructure. Therefore, in all but the most exceptional circumstances, it is unlikely that consent will be refused on the basis of these residual impacts. The exception to this presumption of consent are residual impacts onshore and offshore which present an unacceptable risk to, or unacceptable interference with, human health and public safety, defence, or irreplaceable habitats. Further, the same exception applies to this presumption for residual impacts which present an unacceptable risk to, or unacceptable interference offshore to navigation, or onshore to flood and coastal erosion risk.	The **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** under Section 4.1 confirms that the CNP presumption applies to the Proposed Development. As summarised in the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]**, there are no residual impacts as a result of the Proposed Development which would outweigh the need, nor are there any residual impacts which present an unacceptable risk to, or unacceptable interference with, human health and public safety, defence, irreplaceable habitats, the achievement of net zero, offshore navigation, flood and coastal erosion. As explained within the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]**, any harm caused by the Proposed Development is outweighed by the substantial benefits that are delivered. It is considered that even without applying the CNP presumption, the planning case is firmly in favour of development consent being granted.
	4.2.29 As a result, the Secretary of State will take as the starting point for decision-making that such infrastructure is to be treated as if it has met any tests which are set out within the NPSs, or any other planning policy, which requires a clear outweighing of harm, exceptionality or very special circumstances.	
4.3 Environmental effects/ considerations	4.3.1 All proposals for projects that are subject to the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations) must be accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) describing the aspects of the environment likely to be significantly affected by the project.	The DCO application for the Proposed Development is accompanied by an **ES [EN0110020/APP/6.1 – 6.20]** that describes aspects of the environment likely to be significantly affected by the Proposed Development.
	4.3.4 To consider the potential effects, including benefits, of a proposal for a project, the applicant must set out information on the likely significant environmental, social and economic effects of the development, and show how any likely significant negative effects would be avoided, reduced, mitigated or compensated for, following the mitigation hierarchy. This information could include matters such as employment, equality, biodiversity net gain, community cohesion, health and wellbeing.	The **ES [EN0110020/APP/6.1 – 6.20]** covers the environmental, social and economic effects arising from the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. The **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** under section 9.3 Planning Balance sets out the full list of other benefits that arise from the Proposed Development, beyond making a significant contribution to the UK's policy commitments and legal decarbonisation targets.
	4.3.5 For the purposes of this NPS and the technology specific NPSs the ES should cover the environmental, social and economic effects arising from pre-construction, construction, operation and decommissioning of the project.	The **ES [EN0110020/APP/6.1 – 6.20]** covers the environmental, social and economic effects arising from the pre-construction, construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development.
	4.3.10 The applicant must provide information proportionate to the scale of the project, ensuring the information is sufficient to meet the requirements of the EIA Regulations.	The Applicant wishes to retain flexibility regarding the design detail of certain components of the Proposed Development. The extent of flexibility required is described in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]** and set out in the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** and **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]**. The Applicant's approach to EIA, including the use of the Rochdale envelope to assess effects, is set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]** and **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: EIA Methodology [EN0110020/APP/6.2]**. With the above need for flexibility in mind, the Applicant confirms that the ES has assessed the likely worst-case development scenario. Establishing the maximum and minimum parameters (where relevant) enables a robust assessment of likely significant environmental effects to be undertaken within the ES for
	4.3.11 In some instances, it may not be possible at the time of the application for development consent for all aspects of the proposal to have been settled in precise detail. Where this is the case, the applicant should explain in its application which elements of the proposal have yet to be finalised, and the reasons why this is the case.	

		topics where the nature of the assessment requires a specific level of detail, such as maximum heights, massing, or noise levels. Thus, the assessment parameters serve as the basis for the assessment. The assessment parameters are detailed in the works descriptions, which are linked to Schedule 1 within the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]** and are spatially shown in the **Works Plans [EN0110020/APP/2.3]** and a number of control documents, as listed within the **Guide to the Application [EN0110020/APP/1.3]**. The Applicant confirms that it has provided a level of information proportionate to the scale of the Proposed Development which is sufficient to meet the requirements of the EIA Regulations.
	4.3.12 Where some details are still to be finalised, the ES should, to the best of the applicant's knowledge, assess the likely worst-case environmental, social and economic effects of the proposed development to ensure that the impacts of the project as it may be constructed have been properly assessed.	The impact assessments set out within the **ES Volume 2, Topic Chapters [EN0110020/APP/6.6 – 6.16]** is based on the worst-case parameters for each of the technical topics and includes the justification. The EIA presented within the ES has been undertaken while adopting the principles set out within the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note Nine: Rochdale Envelope which provides guidance regarding the degree of flexibility that may be considered appropriate within an application for development consent under the Planning Act 2008. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: EIA Methodology [EN0110020/APP/6.2]** sets out for each technical discipline, the maximum (and where relevant, minimum) parameters for the elements where flexibility needs to be retained have been assessed under the Rochdale Envelope approach. The approach also recognises that the worst-case parameter for one technical assessment may differ from another, ensuring that worst case overall impacts are predicted. Each technical chapter **(ES Volume 2, Chapter 6 to Chapter 16 [EN0110020/APP/6.6 – 6.16]**) describes the parameters applied in relation to the relevant assessment.
	4.3.15 Applicants are obliged to include information about the reasonable alternatives they have studied in their ES. This should include an indication of the main reasons for the applicant's choice, taking into account the environmental, social and economic effects and including, where relevant, technical and commercial feasibility.	Regulation 14(1)(d) of the EIA Regulations requires that an ES include a description of the reasonable alternatives studied. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]**, and **Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** describe the site assessment process alongside the consideration of alternatives which was undertaken by the Applicant. **Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** sets out the process undertaken by the Applicant to determine the most suitable site for the Proposed Development. The assessment undertaken considers the locational criteria (environmental, social, economic, and engineering constraints) that geographically influenced the area of search. After undertaking the site selection process, and defining the Order Limits, the Applicant began selecting the preferred locations for the components of the Proposed Development, based on the locational criteria and factors mentioned above, the Applicant developed a set of project design principles, which are described in the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]**. The project design principles influenced the optioneering and the identification of a preferred design, which then underwent further technical and feasibility assessments.
	4.3.16 In some circumstances, the NPSs may impose a policy requirement to consider alternatives.	
	4.3.17 Where there is a policy or legal requirement to consider alternatives, the applicant should describe the alternatives considered in compliance with these requirements.	
	4.3.18 The Secretary of State should consider the worst-case impacts in its consideration of the application and consent, providing some flexibility in the consent to account for uncertainties in specific project details.	The impact assessment within **ES Volume 2, Topic Chapters [EN0110020/APP/6.1 – 6.18]** has been based on the worst-case parameters for each technical topic, and justification is presented within the relevant technical chapter.

	4.3.19 The Secretary of State should consider how the accumulation of, and interrelationship between, effects might affect the environment, economy, or community as a whole, even though they may be acceptable when considered on an individual basis with mitigation measures in place.	As set out in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN0110020/APP/6.17]**, a CE A has been undertaken as part of the EIA in accordance with the Planning Inspectorate's Advice on CEAs. The assessment considered two types of cumulative effects including: • Intra-Project Effects: effects generated by individual effects on a particular receptor. • Inter- Project Effects: effects generated by the Proposed Development and other planned or approved developments on the same receptor.
	4.3.22 Given the level and urgency of need for new energy infrastructure, the Secretary of State should, subject to any relevant legal requirements (e.g. under the Habitats Regulations) which indicate otherwise, be guided by the following principles when deciding what weight should be given to alternatives: • The consideration of alternatives in order to comply with policy requirements should be carried out in a proportionate manner; and • Only alternatives that can meet the objectives of the proposed development need to be considered.	**ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]**, and **Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** describe the detailed site assessment undertaken by the Applicant, alongside the consideration of alternatives. The assessment within the ES and consideration of policy in the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** has been carried out in a proportionate manner. The assessment has also only considered alternatives that would be able to deliver the objectives of the Proposed Development and also confirms as to why these alternatives are not suitable or feasible for the Site. The assessment undertaken considers the locational criteria (environmental, social, economic, and engineering constraints) that geographically influenced the area of search. After undertaking the site selection process, and defining the Order Limits, the Applicant began selecting the preferred locations for the components of the Proposed Development, based on the locational criteria and factors mentioned above, the Applicant developed a set of project design principles, which are described in the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]**.The project design principles influenced the optioneering and the identification of a preferred design, which then underwent further technical and feasibility assessments. The Applicant notes that the Secretary of State should not refuse an application for development on one site simply because fewer adverse impacts would result from developing similar proposed infrastructure on another suitable site. In accordance with this policy, it is noted that sites considered as an alternative may be needed for future proposals. **Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** has been submitted with the DCO application providing an overview of the site assessment process which the Applicant has undertaken for the siting of the Proposed Development. The Applicant notes that any alternatives noted studied by the Applicant as reflected in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]**, and **Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** should only be considered to the extent that the Secretary of State thinks they are both relevant and important to the decision of the DCO. The Applicant considers that the assessment undertaken has been proportionate and considered alternatives that could meet the objectives of the Proposed Development.
	4.3.23 The Secretary of State should be guided in considering alternative proposals by whether there is a realistic prospect of the alternative delivering the same infrastructure capacity (including energy security, climate change, and other environmental benefits) in the same timescale as the proposed development.	
	4.3.24 The Secretary of State should not refuse an application for development on one site simply because fewer adverse impacts would result from developing similar infrastructure on another suitable site, and should have regard as appropriate to the possibility that all suitable sites for energy infrastructure of the type proposed may be needed for future proposals.	
	4.3.25 Alternatives not among the main alternatives studied by the applicant (as reflected in the ES) should only be considered to the extent that the Secretary of State thinks they are both important and relevant to the decision.	
	4.3.26 As the Secretary of State must assess an application in accordance with the relevant NPS (subject to the exceptions set out in section 104 of the Planning Act 2008), if the Secretary of State concludes that a decision to grant consent to a hypothetical alternative proposal would not be in accordance with the policies set out in the relevant NPS, the existence of that alternative is unlikely to be important and relevant to the Secretary of State's decision.	
	4.3.27 Alternative proposals which mean the necessary development could not proceed, for example because the alternative proposals are not commercially viable or alternative proposals for sites would not be physically suitable, can be excluded on the grounds that they are not important and relevant to the Secretary of State's decision.	
	4.3.28 Alternative proposals which are vague or immature can be excluded on the grounds that they are not important and relevant to the Secretary of State's decision.	

	4.3.29 It is intended that potential alternatives to a proposed development should, wherever possible, be identified before an application is made to the Secretary of State (so as to allow appropriate consultation and the development of a suitable evidence base in relation to any alternatives which are particularly relevant). Therefore, where an alternative is first put forward by a third party after an application has been made, the Secretary of State may place the onus on the person proposing the alternative to provide the evidence for its suitability as such and the Secretary of State should not necessarily expect the applicant to have assessed it.	Section 4.6 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]** confirms the factors that the Applicant considered, which included but not limited to, network connection, topography, proximity to dwellings, accessibility and Agricultural Land Classification (ALC). From the full assessment it was clear that the Applicant had identified a suitable site and concluded this within **Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4].**
4.4 Health	4.4.1 Energy infrastructure has the potential to impact on the health and wellbeing ("health") of the population. Access to energy is clearly beneficial to society and to our health as a whole. However, the construction of energy infrastructure and the production, distribution and use of energy may have negative impacts on some people's health.	A detailed human health impact assessment was scoped out of the ES at the EIA Scoping stage. However, it is acknowledged that the Proposed Development has the potential to impact human health via ground / water contamination, air quality, noise, and through changes to the surrounding landscape and views. However, while it was scoped out of assessment in its own right, the impact on Human Health has been considered throughout all of the **ES Volume 2, Topic Chapters [EN0110020/APP/6.6 – 6.16]** and specifically within section 17.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects EN0110020/APP/6.17]**. The **ES Volume 2, Topic Chapters [EN0110020/APP/6.6 – 6.16]** assessments have concluded that due to the appropriate mitigation measures being in place, and best practice construction methods being used, there would be no impact on human health from each environmental effect.
	4.4.2 The direct impacts on health may include • increased traffic • air or water pollution • dust • odour • hazardous waste and substances • noise • exposure to radiation, and • increases in pests	
	4.4.3 New energy infrastructure may also affect the composition and size of the local population, and in doing so have indirect health impacts, for example if it in some way affects access to key public services, transport, or the use of open space for recreation and physical activity.	
	4.4.4 As described in the relevant sections of this NPS and in the technology specific NPSs, where the proposed project has an effect on humans, the ES should assess these effects for each element of the project, identifying any potential adverse health impacts, and identifying measures to avoid, reduce or compensate for these impacts as appropriate.	
	4.4.5 The impacts of more than one development may affect people simultaneously, so the applicant should consider the cumulative impact on health in the ES where appropriate.	
	4.4.6 Opportunities should be taken to mitigate indirect impacts by promoting local improvements to encourage health and wellbeing. This includes potential impacts on vulnerable groups within society and impacts on those with protected characteristics	

	under the Equality Act 2010, i.e. those groups which may be differentially impacted by a development compared to wider society as a whole.	
	4.4.7 Generally, those aspects of energy infrastructure which are most likely to have a significantly detrimental impact on health are subject to separate regulation (for example for air pollution) which will constitute effective mitigation of them, so that it is unlikely that health concerns will either by themselves constitute a reason to refuse consent or require specific mitigation under the Planning Act 2008.	
	4.4.8 However, not all potential sources of health impacts will be mitigated in this way and the Secretary of State may want to take account of health concerns when setting requirements relating to a range of impacts such as noise.	
4.6 Environmental and Biodiversity Net Gain	4.6.1 Environmental net gain is an approach to development that aims to leave the natural environment in a measurably better state than beforehand. Projects should therefore not only avoid, mitigate and compensate harms, following the mitigation hierarchy, but also consider whether there are opportunities for enhancements.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** sets out that there are several low magnitude residual effects on biodiversity and nature conservation identified during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. Mitigation for these residual effects is set out within the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** which is secured by a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. As a result of embedded and residual mitigation measures, during the operational and maintenance phase there are eight direct residual significant beneficial effects as a result of the Proposed Development, which are anticipated in relation to the following ecological features: • Brampton Common Local Wildlife Site (LWS) • Priority Habitats – Native Hedgerow • Priority Habitats – Wet Woodland • Priority Species – Bat • Priority Species – Reptile • Breeding Bird Assemblage • Barn Owl • Hobby Owl The **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** sets out the landscaping and ecological mitigation and enhancement measures for the Proposed Development. The overarching aim of the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** is to set out prescriptions for habitat creation and management in order to provide ecological enhancements, strengthen the green infrastructure within the local area and provide landscape and visual mitigation through the use of screening where required. The proposed mitigation measures will assist in contributing to the overall improvements to the local biodiversity and nature conservation as a result of the Proposed Development. As presented in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Baseline Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, the ecological mitigation and enhancement areas will deliver a
	4.6.2 Biodiversity net gain is an essential component of environmental net gain. Projects in England should consider and seek to incorporate improvements in natural capital, ecosystem services and the benefits they deliver when planning how to deliver biodiversity net gain.	
	4.6.6 Energy NSIP proposals, whether onshore or offshore, should seek opportunities to contribute to and enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity, and the wider environment where possible.	
	4.6.7 In England, applicants for onshore elements of any development are encouraged to use the latest version of the biodiversity metric to calculate their biodiversity baseline and present planned biodiversity net gain outcomes. This calculation data should be presented in full as part of their application	
	4.6.8 Where possible, this data should be shared, alongside a completed biodiversity metric calculation, with the Local Authority, Natural England and, where relevant, the EA, for discussion at the preapplication stage as it can help to highlight biodiversity and wider environmental issues which may later cause delays if not addressed.	
	4.6.10 Biodiversity net gain should be applied after compliance with the mitigation hierarchy and does not change or replace existing environmental obligations.	
	4.6.11 Biodiversity net gain can be delivered onsite or wholly or partially offsite. We encourage details of any off-site delivery of biodiversity net gain to be set out within the application for development consent.	
	4.6.12 When delivering biodiversity net gain off-site, developments should do this in a manner that best contributes to the achievement of relevant wider strategic outcomes, for example by increasing habitat connectivity, enhancing other ecosystem service outcomes, or considering use of green infrastructure strategies. Reference should be made to relevant national or local plans and strategies, to inform off-site biodiversity net gain delivery. If published, the relevant strategy is the Local Nature Recovery Strategy	

	(LNRS). If an LNRS has not been published, the relevant consenting body or planning authority may specify alternative plans, policies or strategies to use.	minimum of 10% as set out in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and secured in the LEMP through Requirement 7 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**, which is secured by a requirement of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**, secures the ongoing management and maintenance measures required for the upkeep of the landscape and ecological mitigation. Therefore, the Applicant does not consider there to be a need for the Secretary of State to impose further requirements or conditions in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]** to secure the Proposed Development's Biodiversity Net Gain goals. Details of the engagement carried out by the Applicant in relation to the Proposed Development are set out in the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1].** The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment for the Proposed Development has not been shared with the LPAs or NE, principally because surveys to underpin the assessment were ongoing until close to the submission of the DCO Application. An earlier version of the BNG Assessment was not shared either, due to the uncertainty until the final design was established, but the overall concept of Biodiversity Net Gain was discussed As confirmed in Section 6.4 of **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Baseline Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** the assessment presented follows the guidance set out in British Standard 8683:2021 (Process for Designing and Implementing Biodiversity Net Gain). It can be confirmed that the design and application of the mitigation hierarchy for the Proposed Development have followed the Biodiversity Net Gain: Good Practice Principles for Development (Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM), Construction Industry Research and Information Association (CIRA), IEMA 2016). The Proposed Development will meet a minimum of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain as set out in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13],** and secured in the LEMP through Requirement 7 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**, with the Applicant committing to achieving: • Habitat Units = 28% • Hedgerow Units = 30% • Watercourse Units = 10% The Applicant can confirm that there is no biodiversity net gain set to be delivered off-site, and all details of on-site biodiversity net gain are available in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Baseline Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**.
	4.6.13 In addition to delivering biodiversity net gain, developments may also deliver wider environmental gains and benefits to communities relevant to the local area, and to national policy priorities, such as: • reductions in GHG emissions • reduced flood risk • improvements to air, water, or soil quality • climate adaptation	In addition to delivering BNG, the Proposed Development principally proposes to facilitate the export of a significant amount of low carbon electricity into the National Grid. The Proposed Development therefore would help the UK to meet carbon reduction commitments by increasing the proportion of electricity supplied by renewable sources. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11] Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].** Furthermore, there are no significant effects from in-combination climate impacts across all phases of the Proposed Development.

	• landscape enhancement • increased access to natural greenspace, and/or • the enhancement, expansion or provision of trees and woodlands. The scope of potential gains will be dependent on the type, scale, and location of specific projects. Applicants should look for a holistic approach to delivering wider environmental gains and benefits through the use of nature-based solutions and Green Infrastructure.	The Greenhouse Gas Assessment included in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** also concludes that the Proposed Development would provide a net climate benefit by offsetting around 16.96mtCO2e. Section 4.3 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** sets out the full list of other benefits beyond making a significant contribution to the UK's meeting of policy commitments and legal decarbonisation targets that arise from the Proposed Development. These benefits occur across different stages of the Proposed Development' lifetime.
	4.6.14 The Environment Act 2021 mandated the preparation of LNRSs across England. They are a new system of spatial strategies for nature recovery and will play a major role in providing detail on the best locations to create, enhance and restore nature and deliver wider environmental benefits. LNRSs will also agree priorities for nature recovery and map the most valuable existing areas for nature. They will be critical in delivering government targets for species abundance and habitat creation commitments, as well as other pressing environmental outcomes for water and flood risk, carbon and tree planting and woodland creations. LNRSs will also drive the creation of a Nature Recovery Network (NRN), a major commitment in the government's Environmental Improvement Plan.	
	4.6.15 Applications for development consent should be accompanied by a statement demonstrating how opportunities for delivering wider environmental net gains have been considered, and where appropriate, incorporated into proposals as part of good design (including any relevant operational aspects) of the project.	Opportunities to deliver wider environmental gains are outlined on a topic-by-topic basis in the relevant sections of the **ES Topic Chapters [EN0110020/APP/6.6 – 6.16]** and the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**. The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** clearly identifies how the design of the Proposed Development has been developed in accordance with a clear design framework, based on the criteria for good design set out in NPS EN-1. Throughout the design process, the Applicant maintained an interdisciplinary approach to design, considering both the opportunities and constraints of the Proposed Development. This included an analysis of the existing physical, environmental, social, and cultural context of the Order Limits by a broad range of technical disciplines (including landscape and visual, noise, ecology, and heritage) as set out and assessed by **ES Volume 2, Topic Chapters [EN0110020/APP/6.6 – 6.16]**. Through the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]**, **ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.4: Baseline Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**, the Applicant has demonstrated a commitment of delivering a minimum net gain of 10% across the Site for onsite habitats, specifically: • Habitat Units = 285% • Hedgerow Units = 30% • Watercourse Units = 10%
	4.6.17 Where environmental net gain considerations have featured as part of the strategic options appraisal process to select a project, applicants should reference that information to supplement the site-specific details.	
4.7 Criteria for "good design" in	4.7.1 The visual appearance of a building, structure, or piece of infrastructure, and how it relates to the landscape it sits within, is sometimes considered to be the most important factor in good design. But high quality and inclusive design goes far beyond	As detailed in section 5 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]**, good design has been a fundamental consideration from the outset of the Proposed Development.

energy infrastructure	aesthetic considerations. The functionality of an object – be it a building or other type of infrastructure – including fitness for purpose and sustainability, is equally important.	The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** demonstrates how the design of the Proposed Development has been developed in accordance with a clear design framework, based on the criteria for good design set out in NPS EN-1. This has included the adoption of **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]** to guide decision making and embed good design outcomes to the Proposed Development. Throughout the design process, the Applicant maintained an interdisciplinary approach to design and considered both the opportunities and constraints of the Proposed Development. This included analysis of the existing physical, environmental, social and cultural context of the Site by a broad range of technical disciplines (including landscape and visual, noise, ecology and heritage) as set out and assessed by the **Aspect Chapters of the ES [EN0110020/APP/6.6 – 6.16]**. This approach has enabled the Applicant to understand the complexities of the Site and identify where multiple opportunities and constraints have the potential to overlap to provide a good design response and allow for co-existence and co-location with other terrestrial uses. As a result of the design approach adopted by the Applicant, the Proposed Development would deliver a number of environmental, social and economic benefits in addition to the generation of secure, low cost, decarbonised, clean, renewable energy. These include significant areas of new habitats that respect and enhance features within the landscape, including over 1240ha of grassland (including calcareous grassland), 15km of new hedgerows and 5.5ha of woodland planting delivering a Biodiversity Net Gain and improvements in ecological connectivity. The Proposed Development would also provide benefits to the local community via an enhanced green infrastructure network including a better-connected footpath and cycle network and access to open space and recreational spaces. The Proposed Development incorporates a series of permissive paths proposed across the Order Limits, as secured in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**, as set out in the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]**. Permissive paths will be open for the operational and maintenance phase of the Proposed Development and be open to equestrians, cyclists and pedestrians. The extent and location of the paths is as follows: • Approximately 2.92 km of permissive paths proposed across Whitestone 1 (W1) to provide additional equestrian routes that link with the existing bridleways. • Approximately 10.8 km of permissive paths are proposed across Whitestone 2 (W2). To the north, two permissive paths provide access around King's Pond Plantation. To the west, the proposed permissive path follows Ulley Brook to connect with the existing footpath to the north and Treeton Lane to the south. To the south of Upper Whiston, a permissive path links Suilthwaite Common Lanlee and Field Lane. To the east of Ulley, a permissive path forms a circular route that begins at Carr Lane, follows the field boundaries north, along Penny Hill Lane, then turns south to rejoin Carr Lane. Permissive paths link with the existing Public Right of Way (PRoW) to create a circular route across Brampton Common. To the east, the permissive path offers an alternative route away from the A57, connecting the A57 sidewalk to Anston Brook and the existing footpath near North Anston. • Approximately 0.86 km long permissive path across Whitestone 3 (W3), begins in Woodal, crosses Stone Hill and joins the existing footpath at Harthill Reservoir.
	4.7.2 Applying good design to energy projects should produce sustainable infrastructure sensitive to place, including impacts on heritage, efficient in the use of natural resources, including land-use, and energy used in their construction and operation, matched by an appearance that demonstrates good aesthetic as far as possible. It is acknowledged, however that the nature of energy infrastructure development will often limit the extent to which it can contribute to the enhancement of the quality of the area.	
	4.7.3 Good design is also a means by which many policy objectives in the NPSs can be met, for example the impact sections show how good design, in terms of siting and use of appropriate technologies, can help mitigate adverse impacts such as noise. Projects should look to use modern methods of construction and sustainable design practices such as use of sustainable timber and low carbon concrete. Where possible, projects should include the reuse of material.	
	4.7.4 Given the benefits of good design in mitigating the adverse impacts of a project, applicants should consider how good design can be applied to a project during the early stages of the project lifecycle.	
	4.7.5 To ensure good design is embedded within the project development, a project board-level design champion could be appointed, and a representative design panel used to maximise the value provided by the infrastructure. Design principles should be established from the outset of the project to guide the development from conception to operation. Applicants should consider how their design principles can be applied post-consent.	
	4.7.6 Whilst the applicant may not have any or very limited choice in the physical appearance of some energy infrastructure, there may be opportunities for the applicant to demonstrate good design in terms of siting relative to existing landscape character, landform and vegetation. Furthermore, the design and sensitive use of materials in any associated development such as electricity substations will assist in ensuring that such development contributes to the quality of the area. Applicants should also, so far as is possible, seek to embed opportunities for nature inclusive design within the design process.	
	4.7.7 Applicants must demonstrate in their application documents how the design process was conducted and how the proposed design evolved. Where a number of different designs were considered, applicants should set out the reasons why the favoured choice has been selected.	

		If consent is given, these design outcomes will be secured and implemented post-consent, in accordance with the various management plans and **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]** which are secured by requirements in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The approach also ensures the conclusions of the E S are upheld, and the appropriate flexibility is provided.
	4.7.8 Applicants should consider taking independent professional advice on the design aspects of a proposal. In particular, the Design Council can be asked to provide design review for nationally significant infrastructure projects and applicants are encouraged to use this service. Applicants should also consider any design guidance developed by the LPA.	Pre-application consultation and engagement were key features of the evolution of the Proposed Development, enabling continuous improvements to the Applicant's proposals. This included consultation and engagement on the design principles which have guided the design of the Proposed Development. In parallel with three phases of formal pre-application consultation on the proposals, the Applicant conducted a programme of stakeholder engagement to gain feedback on the design of the Proposed Development. This included ongoing meetings with a number of stakeholders. The Applicant engaged with specialist and technical officers from NE during the preapplication stage of the Proposed Development. In light of the extensive consultation and engagement, the Applicant did not undertake an independent design review of the Proposed Development, which is consistent with the approach taken by other consented DCO solar Proposed Developments. The Applicant has not sought independent design review given the design of the Proposed Development has evolved through input from a team of experienced solar NSIPs professionals including highways engineers, planners, landscape architects, ecologists, heritage specialists and other relevant environmental professionals.
	4.7.9 Further advice on what applicants should demonstrate by way of good design is provided in the technology specific NPSs where relevant.	The Proposed Development's compliance with the NPSs is considered in Tables 1-3 of this **Policy Compliance Document [EN0110020/APP/5.5]**.
	4.7.10 In the light of the above and given the importance which the Planning Act 2008 places on good design and sustainability, the Secretary of State needs to be satisfied that energy infrastructure developments are sustainable and, having regard to regulatory and other constraints, are as attractive, durable, and adaptable (including taking account of natural hazards such as flooding) as they can be.	The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** has been structured around the good design process, as set out in non-statutory guidance provided by the Planning Inspectorate entitled "Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Good Design". The advice is intended to complement the legislation, regulations and guidance issued by the government and is produced under section 51 of the Planning Act 2008. Section 4.6 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]** sets out that a key principle of site selection is avoiding areas with particular environmental and landscape sensitivity to minimise potential impacts. **Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** sets out how environmental and planning factors have been taken into account from the outset of the Proposed Development in order to avoid and reduce potential impacts. The Proposed Development underwent an iterative design process, which resulted in the delivery of a functional and efficient Proposed Development design which will deliver large scale renewable energy while also being sensitive to the surrounding local area.
	4.7.11 In doing so, the Secretary of State should be satisfied that the applicant has considered both functionality (including fitness for purpose and sustainability) and aesthetics (including its contribution to the quality of the area in which it would be	As detailed in section 5 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]**, good design has been a fundamental consideration from the outset of the Proposed Development.

	located, any potential amenity benefits, and visual impacts on the landscape or seascape) as far as possible.	The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** demonstrates how the design of the Proposed Development has been developed in accordance with a clear design framework, based on the criteria for good design set out in NPS EN-1. This has included the adoption of **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]** to guide decision making and embed good design outcomes to the Proposed Development. Throughout the design process, the Applicant maintained an interdisciplinary approach to design and considered both the opportunities and constraints of the Proposed Development. This included analysis of the existing physical, environmental, social and cultural context of the Site by a broad range of technical disciplines (including landscape and visual, noise, ecology and heritage) as set out and assessed by the **Aspect Chapters of the ES [EN0110020/APP/6.6 – 6.16]**. This approach has enabled the Applicant to understand the complexities of the Site and identify where multiple opportunities and constraints have the potential to stack up with one another to provide a good design response and allow for co-existence and co-location with other terrestrial uses. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]** sets out that during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development, the Applicant anticipates major to moderate adverse residual significant effects on the landscape and visual elements of the land within and surrounding the Proposed Development. The embedded and additional mitigation measures are documented within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11],** and **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and secured via a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The proposed mitigation and enhancement proposals, including new hedgerow planting, as set out within the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** would provide long-term beneficial effects upon the landscape fabric of the Site itself. New planting and maintenance regimes which are outlined within the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** would both serve to increase the sense of enclosure within the central landscape of the Site. In the long term, the Proposed Development would become more enclosed as new planting matures and serves to reinforce the existing hedgerow and tree belts within the Site. Mitigation to address operational battery safety and security of the Proposed Development are set out through the **oBSMP [EN0110020/APP/5.15]**. The plan concludes that, as far as reasonably practicable and for this planning stage of the Proposed Development, that currently foreseeable hazards associated with the equipment have been identified, and these will be developed and managed throughout the life of the installation and added to as necessary as the Proposed Development develops and will be reported on regularly.
	4.7.12 In considering applications, the Secretary of State should take into account the ultimate purpose of the infrastructure and bear in mind the operational, safety and security requirements which the design has to satisfy. Many of the wider impacts of a development, such as landscape and environmental impacts, will be important factors in the design process.	
	4.7.13 The Secretary of State should consider such impacts under the relevant policies in this NPS. Assessment of impacts must be for the stated design life of the Proposed Development rather than a shorter time period.	The Proposed Development's compliance with the NPSs is considered in Tables 1 – 3 of this **Policy Compliance Document [EN0110020/APP/5.5]**.
	4.7.15 Further advice on what the Secretary of State should expect applicants to demonstrate by way of good design is provided in the technology specific NPSs where relevant.	
4.10 Climate Change	4.10.1 Whilst we must continue to accelerate efforts to end our contribution to climate change by reaching Net Zero greenhouse gas emissions, adaptation is also necessary	The Climate Change factors assessed for this Proposed Development are included in Section 11.7 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas**

Adaption and Resilience	to manage the impacts of current and future climate change. If new energy infrastructure is not sufficiently resilient against the possible impacts of climate change, it will not be able to satisfy the energy needs as outlined in Part 3 of this NPS.	**Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]**, which provides parameters for In-combination Climate Change Impacts (ICCI) assessment: • Extreme weather events (heatwaves, storm surges, wildfire and drought); • Temperature changes; • Rainfall changes; and • Changes in wind patterns. Embedded mitigation to limit the effects of these factors is included within Sections 11.6 and 11.7 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]**: • The development of a Construction Health and Safety Plan and other relevant fieldwork specific Job Hazard Analysis (JHAs) to ensure all site workers, employees, and staff are taking necessary safety measures to avoid the health impacts associated with extreme heat • Maintenance schedule to account for replacing any damaged or degraded solar panels. • Maintenance and retrofit schedules to mitigate any thermal shutdowns, fire hazards and operational disruptions as assets are maintained and/or replaced • Critical electrical infrastructure within the Proposed Development to be located within Flood Zone 1 • PV arrays to be located within Flood Zone 1 wherever feasible. Where panels are to be located in Flood Zone 2 or 3, they will be in areas where flood levels for the 1 in 100-year event are 300 mm below the lower edge of panels • PV arrays will be installed on metal frames driven into the ground, reducing their footprint within the floodplain. Alternative solutions will be assessed and appropriately mitigated as required. • All sensitive and electrical equipment on the solar panel will be elevated by legs or mounted on raised frames. • Electrical infrastructure compounds will include a surface water drainage system. • Construction compounds will be located within Flood Zone 1. • Water required for cooling of the BESS and substations is maintained in a closed cooling system, providing resilience for periods of water stress or drought in the region. Section 11.8 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** sets out that additional mitigation measures are not considered to be necessary.
	4.10.2 Climate change is already altering the UK's weather patterns and this will continue to accelerate depending on global carbon emissions. This means it is likely there will be more extreme weather events. As well as climatic and seasonal changes such as hotter, drier summers and warmer, wetter winters, there is also a likelihood of increased flooding, drought, heatwaves, and intense rainfall events, as well as rising sea levels, increased storms and coastal change. Adaptation is therefore necessary to deal with the potential impacts of these changes that are already happening.	
	4.10.3 To support planning decisions, the government produces a set of UK Climate Projections as well as hazard-specific tools and guidance like the EA's climate change allowances for flood risk assessments. In addition, the government's National Adaptation Programme and Adaptation Reporting Power will ensure that reporting authorities (a defined list of public bodies and statutory undertakers, including energy utilities) assess the risks to their organisation presented by climate change.	
	4.10.4 The generic impacts advice in this NPS and the technology specific advice on impacts in the other energy NPSs provide additional information on climate change adaptation and should be read alongside this section (Section 5.3 on greenhouse gas emissions, Section 5.6 on coastal change and Section 5.8 on flood risk in particular provide relevant guidance for consideration).	
	4.10.5 In certain circumstances, measures implemented to ensure a Proposed Development can adapt to climate change may give rise to additional impacts, for example as a result of protecting against flood risk, there may be consequential impacts on coastal change. In preparing measures to support climate change adaptation, applicants should take reasonable steps to maximise the use of nature-based solutions alongside other conventional techniques.	
	4.10.6 Integrated approaches, such as looking across the water cycle, considering coordinated management of water storage, supply, demand, wastewater, and flood risk can provide further benefits to address multiple infrastructure needs, as well as carbon sequestration benefits.	

		ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11] concludes that with the embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no LSEs from climate hazards that would impact receptors within the Order Limits of the Proposed Development. As set out in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, the Proposed Development does not have a significant effect on flood risk.
	4.10.7 In addition to avoiding further GHG emissions when compared with more traditional adaptation approaches, nature-based solutions can also result in biodiversity benefits and net gain, as well as increasing absorption of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** concludes that with the embedded measures in place, there are no LSEs from climate hazards that would impact receptors within the Order Limits of the Proposed Development. The embedded mitigation measures are documented within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, the **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]** and the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** and are secured via a requirement of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
	4.10.8 New energy infrastructure will typically need to remain operational over many decades, in the face of a changing climate. Consequently, applicants must consider the direct (e.g. site flooding, limited water availability, storms, heatwave and wildfire threats to infrastructure and operations) and indirect (e.g. access roads or other critical dependencies impacted by flooding, storms, heatwaves or wildfires) impacts of climate change when planning the location, design, build, operation and, where appropriate, decommissioning of new energy infrastructure.	Table 11-16 in Section 11.7 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** sets out a summary of the direct and indirect impacts of climate change. As set out in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, the Proposed Development does not have a significant effect on flood risk.
	4.10.9 The ES should set out how the proposal will take account of the projected impacts of climate change, using government guidance and industry standard benchmarks such as the Climate Change Allowances for Flood Risk Assessments, Climate Impacts Tool, and British Standards for climate change adaptation, in accordance with the EIA Regulations.	Section 11.2 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** sets out the legislation, policy and guidance relevant to the climate change assessment including, but not limited to, taking into account the recommendations in the IEMA's 'Guide to Assessing Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Evaluating their Significance' and has been adapted to ensure the assessment is proportionate to the Proposed Development.
	4.10.10 Applicants should assess the impacts on and from their proposed energy project across a range of climate change scenarios, in line with appropriate expert advice and guidance available at the time.	Section 11.7 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** sets out the potential impacts of climate change the Proposed Development may face, including low/high precipitation, high temperatures, and an increase in storm intensity. Section 11.10 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** also highlights that there are no significant effects from in-combination climate impacts across all phases of the Proposed Development. Furthermore, Section 11.10 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** sets out that the GHG Assessment concluded that the Proposed Development would provide a net climate benefit by offsetting around 16.96mtCO2e.
	4.10.11 Applicants should demonstrate that proposals have a high level of climate resilience built-in from the outset and should also demonstrate how proposals can be adapted over their predicted lifetimes to remain resilient to a credible maximum climate	Embedded mitigation to build climate resilience into the Proposed Development is included within Sections 11.6 and 11.7 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]**:

	change scenario. These results should be considered alongside relevant research which is based on the climate change projections.	• The development of a Construction Health and Safety Plan and other relevant fieldwork specific Job Hazard Analysis (JHAs) to ensure all site workers, employees, and staff are taking necessary safety measures to avoid the health impacts associated with extreme heat • Maintenance schedule to account for replacing any damaged or degraded solar panels. • Maintenance and retrofit schedules to mitigate any thermal shutdowns, fire hazards and operational disruptions as assets are maintained and/or replaced • Critical electrical infrastructure within the Proposed Development to be located within Flood Zone 1 • PV arrays to be located within Flood Zone 1 wherever feasible. Where panels are to be located in Flood Zone 2 or 3, they will be in areas where flood levels for the 1 in 100-year event are 300 mm below the lower edge of panels • PV arrays will be installed on metal frames driven into the ground, reducing their footprint within the floodplain. Alternative solutions will be assessed and appropriately mitigated as required. • All sensitive and electrical equipment on the solar panel will be elevated by legs or mounted on raised frames. • Electrical infrastructure compounds will include a surface water drainage system. • Construction compounds will be located within Flood Zone 1. • Water required for cooling of the BESS and substations is maintained in a closed cooling system, providing resilience for periods of water stress or drought in the region. Further detail including positioning of solar panels outside of Flood Zones 2 and 3 are included within the **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]**.
	4.10.12 Where energy infrastructure has safety critical elements, the applicant should apply a credible maximum climate change scenario. It is appropriate to take a risk-averse approach with elements of infrastructure which are critical to the safety of its operation.	The Proposed Development is to be operational for a period of up to 60 years. Climate projections have been sourced by ERM's Global Climate Database (GDC). The Assessment has been prepared taking into account the latest guidance set out in IEMA's (2020) 'Guide to Climate Change Resilience and Adaptation'.
	4.10.13 The Secretary of State should be satisfied that applicants for new energy infrastructure have taken into account the potential impacts of climate change using the latest UK Climate Projections and associated research and expert guidance (such as the EA's Climate Change Allowances for Flood Risk Assessments or the Welsh Government's Climate change allowances and flood consequence assessments) available at the time the ES was prepared to ensure they have identified appropriate mitigation or adaptation measures. This should cover the estimated lifetime of the new infrastructure, including any decommissioning period.	The Proposed Development's design and integrated mitigation measures effectively address climate change risks. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** provides a description of how the Proposed Development will be affected by climate change impacts, taking into consideration the embedded mitigation measures that have been designed into the Proposed Development so that it will be more resilient to the impacts identified during the review of the UK Climate Projections 2018. The embedded mitigation will be secured through **ES Volume 3, Appendix 2.3: Commitments Register [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the relevant outline management plans including the **oCEMP**

		[EN0110020/APP/5.9], the **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]** and the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**
	4.10.15 The Secretary of State should be satisfied that there are not features of the design of new energy infrastructure critical to its operation which may be seriously affected by more radical changes to the climate beyond that projected in the latest set of UK climate projections, taking account of the latest credible scientific evidence on, for example, sea level rise (for example by referring to additional maximum credible scenarios – i.e. from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change or EA) and that necessary action can be taken to ensure the operation of the infrastructure over its estimated lifetime.	Sections 11.6 and 11.7 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** set out extensive embedded mitigation to deal with the impacts of even the most extreme effects of climate change. Furthermore, Section 11.3 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** sets out that the potential effect of sea level rise has been scoped out in agreement with the Planning Inspectorate given that the Proposed Development is not located in a coastal area.
	4.10.16 If any adaptation measures give rise to consequential impacts (for example on flooding, water resources or coastal change) the Secretary of State should consider the impact of the latter in relation to the application as a whole and the impacts guidance set out in Part 5 of this NPS.	Section 11.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** sets out that mitigation measures will be implemented at the time of construction, and that the assessed impacts of climate change have been addressed with embedded mitigation throughout the lifetime of the development.
	4.10.17 Any adaptation measures should be based on the latest set of UK Climate Projections, the government's latest UK Climate Change Risk Assessment, when available, and in consultation with the EA's Climate Change Allowances for Flood Risk Assessments or the Welsh Government's Climate change allowances and flood consequence assessments.	
	4.10.18 The Secretary of State may take into account reporting authorities' reports (see paragraph 4.10.3 above) to the Secretary of State when considering adaptation measures proposed by an applicant for new energy infrastructure.	
	4.10.19 Adaptation measures should be required to be implemented at the time of construction where necessary and appropriate to do so. However, where they are necessary to deal with the more extreme impacts of climate change, including credible maximum climate change scenarios, and that measure would have an adverse effect on other aspects of the project and/or surrounding environment (for example coastal processes), the Secretary of State may consider requiring the applicant to keep the need for the adaptation measure under review, and ensure that the measure could be implemented should the need arise, rather than at the outset of the development (for example increasing height of existing, or requiring new, sea walls).	
4.11 Network Connection	4.11.4 Transmission network infrastructure, and related network reinforcement and upgrade works, associated with nationally significant low carbon infrastructure is considered as CNP Infrastructure. Further guidance can be found in Section 4.2 of this NPS and EN-5.	The **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** and the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** set out that the Proposed Development meets the definition of Critical National Priority (CNP) Infrastructure, given that it has a capacity greater than 100MW capacity of a low carbon energy source. Tables 2 and 3 of the **Policy Compliance Document [EN0110020/APP/5.5]** (this document) provide guidance on how the Applicant has addressed EN-3 and EN-5. The Applicant holds a grid connection offer from the National Energy System Operator (NESO) to connect the Proposed Development to the NETS. The connection agreement is for an export connection of up to 750MW, as discussed within the **Grid Connection Statement [EN0110020/APP/7.1]**. It is worth noting that the original Bilateral Connection Agreement (BCA) was issued by NESO in January 2022 for connection to the existing Brinsworth substation at 275kV. The agreement was accepted in April 2022. NESO
	4.11.6 Applicants may wish to take a commercial risk where they have not received or accepted a formal offer of a grid connection from the relevant network operator at the time of the application. In this situation applicants should provide information as part of their application confirming that there is no obvious reason why a network connection would not be possible.	
	4.11.7 The Planning Act 2008 aims to create a holistic planning regime so that the cumulative effect of different elements of the same project can be considered together. Co-ordinated applications typically bring economic efficiencies and reduced	

	environmental impact. The government therefore envisages that wherever reasonably possible, applications for new generating stations and related infrastructure should be contained in a single application to the Secretary of State or in separate applications submitted in tandem which have been prepared in an integrated way, as outlined in EN-5. This is particularly encouraged to ensure development of more co-ordinated transmission overall.	later revised the agreement in January 2025 to reflect the connection to the new Long Lane 400kV Substation. At the same time, the connection date was moved to October 2029. The revised agreement was accepted by the Applicant in March 2025. In accordance with Paragraph 4.11.5 of NPS EN-5, the Applicant continues to have engagement with NESO and, as demonstrated through the connection agreement, held discussions around connections in the south Yorkshire region following acknowledgement of available capacity at Brinsworth Substation. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]** sets out that the Proposed Development comprises the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of a solar photovoltaic (PV) electricity generating station and associated development comprising Battery Energy Storage System (BESS), and onsite substation. The Proposed Development would allow for the generation and export of over 100MW of renewable energy, connecting into the National Electricity Transmission System. The impact assessment within **ES Topic Chapters [EN0110020/APP/6.6 – 6.16]** has been based on the worst-case parameters for each technical topic, and justification is presented within the relevant technical chapter.
	4.11.8 On some occasions it may not be possible to coordinate applications. For example, different elements of a project may have different lead-in times and be undertaken by different legal entities subject to different commercial and regulatory frameworks (for example grid companies operate within OFGEM controls) making it inefficient from a delivery perspective to submit one application. Applicants may therefore decide to submit separate applications for each element. Where this is the case, the applicant should include information on the other elements and explain the reasons for the separate application confirming that there are no obvious reasons for why other elements are likely to be refused.	
	4.11.9 If this option is pursued, the applicant accepts the implicit risks involved in doing so and must ensure they provide sufficient information to comply with the EIA Regulations including the indirect, secondary, and cumulative effects, which will encompass information on grid connections.	
	4.11.12 The Secretary of State should be satisfied that appropriate network connection arrangements are/will be in place for a given project regardless of whether one or multiple (linked) applications are submitted.	
	4.11.13 Where the Secretary of State has decided to grant consent for one project this should not in any way fetter the Secretary of State's ability to take subsequent decisions on any related projects.	
4.12 Pollution control and other environmental regulatory regimes	4.12.7 Applicants should understand what non-planning permits / consents the development will require and consider the timings for gaining these permissions alongside the timing for gaining the DCO. They should make early contact with relevant regulators, including EA or NRW and the MMO, to discuss their requirements for Environmental Permits and other consents, such as marine licences. Applicants can access enhanced (paid for) pre-application support before applying for an environmental permit. Enhanced pre-application advice is recommended for complex or significant developments to ensure applications contain the necessary assessments to address the risks associated with the proposed activity. Applicants can also explore options, such as submitting their application in stages through this route if the application is complex or uses novel technologies. Early engagement on the permissions required for the development is strongly advised and helps the management of these within the timescale for development. This is particularly advisable in circumstances where applicants have a number of permissions to obtain from the EA for their development.	The **Consents and Agreements Position Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.3]** has been prepared as part of this DCO Application. The purpose of this document is to provide information on the additional consents and licences potentially required for the Proposed Development, in addition to the permissions set out in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** sets out the matters that the Applicant has engaged with the Environmental Agency on to date. NRW and MMO were not contacted given that the Proposed Development is not relevant to these regulators
	4.12.8 Wherever appropriate, applicants should submit applications for Environmental Permits and other necessary consents at the same time as applying to the Secretary of State for development consent.	

	4.12.9 In considering an application for development consent the Secretary of State should focus on whether the development itself is an acceptable use of the land or sea, and the impact of that use, rather than the control of processes, emissions or discharges themselves.	The Applicant considers that the Proposed Development's use of land is acceptable and is supported, in principle, by the needs and critical national priority case which weights in favour of the Proposed Development. In addition, the Application is supported by several management plans which include: • **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** • **Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.10]** • **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** • **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** • **Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** • **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** • **Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.15]** • **Outline Written Proposed Development of Investigation [EN0110020/APP/5.16]** • **Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy (oSWDS) [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** • **Outline Skills and Supply Chain Management Plan (oSSCMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.18]** • **Outline Cable Construction Method Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.19]** The above management plans and strategies provide the framework for the Proposed Development to control emissions and discharges to the local environment. However, the Applicant considers that, under paragraph 4.12.16 of NPS EN-1 and based on the **Consents and Agreements Position Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.3]**, there should be no reason for the Secretary of State to believe that any operational pollution permits, licences and/or other consents will not be granted.
	4.12.10 The Secretary of State should work on the assumption that the relevant pollution control regime and other environmental regulatory regimes, including those on land drainage, water abstraction and biodiversity, will be properly applied and enforced by the relevant regulator. The Secretary of State should act to complement but not seek to duplicate those regulatory regimes, but without prejudice to the Secretary of State's duty to 'secure' compliance with the relevant regulatory requirements.	
	4.12.13 In considering the impacts of the project, the Secretary of State may wish to consult the regulator on matters relevant to the grant of, or conditions which would otherwise be included in, an environmental permit. The Secretary of State should be satisfied that development consent can be granted taking full account of environmental impacts.	
	4.12.14 Working in close cooperation with the EA or NRW and/or the pollution control authority, and other relevant bodies, such as the MMO, the SNCB, Drainage Boards, and water and sewerage undertakers, the Secretary of State should be satisfied, before consenting any potentially polluting developments, that: • the relevant pollution control authority is satisfied that potential releases can be adequately regulated under the pollution control framework • the effects of existing sources of pollution in and around the site are not such that the cumulative effects of pollution when the proposed development is added would make that development unacceptable, particularly in relation to statutory environmental quality limits	
4.12 Safety	4.13.5 Applicants should consult with the HSE on matters relating to safety.	The Applicant consulted with the HSE. As per Section 3 of the COMAH Regulations 2015, Solar and BESS development is not applicable to the regime and therefore no further response is required. As the Proposed Development is not subject to the Control of Major Accident Hazards (COMAH) Regulations 2015, Paragraphs 4.13.5 – 4.13.8 of NPS EN-1 are not engaged. Notwithstanding the fact that BESS is not applicable to the COMAH Regulations 2015, this DCO application is accompanied by an **oBSMP [EN0110020/APP/5.15]**, which sets out
	4.13.6 Applicants seeking to develop infrastructure subject to the COMAH regulations should make early contact with the Competent Authority.	
	4.13.7 If a safety report is required it is important to discuss with the Competent Authority the type of information that should be provided at the design and development stage, and what form this should take. This will enable the Competent Authority to review as much information as possible before construction begins, in order to assess	

	whether the inherent features of the design are sufficient to prevent, control and mitigate major accidents.	the key fire safety provisions for the BESS, including measures to reduce fire risk and fire protection measures.
	4.13.8 The Secretary of State should be satisfied that a safety assessment has been prepared, where required, and that the Competent Authority has raised no safety objections.	
4.15 Common law nuisance and statutory nuisance	4.15.5 At the application stage of an energy NSIP, possible sources of nuisance under section 79(1) of the EPA 1990 and how they may be mitigated or limited should be identified by the applicant so that appropriate requirements can be included in any subsequent order granting development consent (see Section 5.7 on dust, odour, artificial light etc. and Section 5.12 on noise and vibration).	The Applicant has prepared a **Statutory Nuisance Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.2]** as is required under APFP Regulation 5(2)(f) and Paragraph 4.15.5 of NPS EN-1. The **Statutory Nuisance Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.2]** draws upon the assessment conclusions from **ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]** to set out that the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development would not cause a statutory nuisance. No claim against statutory nuisance in respect of noise and vibration is therefore envisaged in respect of a statutory nuisance under Section 79(1)(g) or (ga) of the EPA 1990. The defence to proceedings in respect of statutory nuisance is set out in Part 2, Article 10 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
	4.15.6 At the application stage of an energy NSIP, possible sources of nuisance under section 79(1) of the EPA 1990 and how they may be mitigated or limited should be considered by the Secretary of State so that appropriate requirements can be included in any subsequent order granting development consent (see Section 5.7 on dust, odour, artificial light etc. and Section 5.12 on noise and vibration).	As such, the Applicant considers that sufficient assessment and mitigation measures are proposed to be secured to enable the Secretary of State to conclude that no statutory nuisances would arise from the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases.
5.2 Air Quality and Emissions ***Applicant Assessment***	5.2.8 Where the project is likely to have adverse effects on air quality the applicant should undertake an assessment of the impacts of the proposed project as part of the ES.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]** provides an assessment of the impacts of the Proposed Development on air quality from the construction and decommissioning phases. Table 12.2 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]** sets out that the operation and maintenance phase has been scoped out given that it will generate a low level of traffic which will be insufficient to trigger the threshold for assessment as set out in the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) traffic screening methodology and therefore remains scoped out of this assessment. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]** concludes that with the mitigation measures set out in Section 12.7, the impacts of the Proposed Development are negligible and not significant. There will be no potential eutrophication impacts.
	5.2.9 The ES should describe: • existing air quality concentrations and the relative change in air quality from existing levels; • any significant air quality effects, mitigation action taken and any residual effects, distinguishing between the project stages and taking account of any significant emissions from any road traffic generated by the project; • the predicted absolute emissions, concentration change and absolute concentrations as a result of the proposed project, after mitigation methods have been applied; and • any potential eutrophication impacts.	

	5.2.10 In addition, applicants should consider the Environment Targets (Fine Particulate Matter) (England) Regulations 2023 and associated Defra guidance.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]** identifies 'The Environment Targets (Fine Particulate Matter) (England) Regulations 2023' as important and relevant legislation to the assessment and confirms that the assessment has considered the Regulations.
	5.2.11 Defra publishes future national projections of air quality based on estimates of future levels of emissions, traffic, and vehicle fleet. Projections are updated as the evidence base changes and the applicant should ensure these are current at the point of an application. The applicant's assessment should be consistent with this but may include more detailed modelling and evaluation to demonstrate local and national impacts. If an applicant believes they have robust additional supporting evidence, to the extent they could affect the conclusions of the assessment, they should include this in their representations to the Examining Authority along with the source.	In 2023, the Environmental Improvement Plan (EIP) outlined updates to the PM2.5 Air Quality Objective for future years. These are the long-term targets of 10 µg/m3 by 2040 and the interim targets of 12 µg/m3 by 2028. In 2028, the first anticipated year of operation, Department for Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) predicted background concentrations of PM2.5 were between 7.9 – 8.2 µg/m3 across the Order Limits, which is comfortably below the 12 µg/m3 interim target. No future projections have been made by DEFRA past 2030, so it is not possible to consider concentrations up to 2040 when the long-term target of 10 µg/m3 should be achieved; however, there are not expected to be significant sources of PM2.5 during the Proposed Development's operational phase. At the time of writing, there had been no further updates to relevant Air Quality Objectives for other pollutants considered in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]**.
	5.2.12 Where a proposed development is likely to lead to a breach of any relevant statutory air quality limits, objectives or targets, or affect the ability of a non-compliant area to achieve compliance within the timescales set out in the most recent relevant air quality plan/strategy at the time of the decision, the applicant should work with the relevant authorities to secure appropriate mitigation measures to ensure that those statutory limits, objectives or targets are not breached.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]** confirms that the Proposed Development would not lead to a breach of any relevant statutory air quality thresholds or affect the ability of a non-compliant area to achieve compliance.
	5.2.13 The Secretary of State should consider whether mitigation measures are needed both for operational and construction emissions over and above any which may form part of the project application. A construction management plan may help codify mitigation at this stage. In doing so the Secretary of State should have regard to the Air Quality Strategy in England, or the Clean Air Plan for Wales in Wales, or any successors to these and should consider relevant advice within Local Air Quality Management guidance and PM2.5 targets guidance.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]** discusses potential Air Quality impacts arising as a result of the Proposed Development. With the measures set out in the **oCEMP [APP/5.9]**, and the **oCTMP [APP/5.12]**, **ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]** concludes that the Proposed Development is not likely to result in significant air quality effects.
	5.2.14 The mitigations identified in Section 5.14 on traffic and transport impacts will help mitigate the effects of air emissions from transport.	Section 4.6 of the **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** states that a Travel Plan will be developed to manage the arrival and departure profile of workers and to encourage sustainable modes of transport, especially car-sharing. The Worker Travel Plan will be administered by the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) Co-ordinator and would be a contractual requirement as part of the Principal Contractor's contract with the Applicant. The Worker Travel Plan will be developed to reduce the number of single occupancy car journeys to and from the Proposed Development during construction and will minimise traffic on the Local Road Network (LRN). In order to achieve these aims, the package of measures would include:

		• Provision of public transport information to access where workers will be resident or collected from by buses provided under the Worker Travel Plan, so there is no need for non-local workers to bring cars to the wider area; • Minibus service for transport of non-local construction workers; • Promotion of a car sharing Proposed Development; and • Car parking management. Each of the aims and measures set out above seek to mitigate the effect of air emissions from transport by reducing the number of vehicles used for transporting workers.
Secretary of State decision making	5.2.15 Many activities involving air emissions are subject to pollution control. The considerations set out in Section 4.12 on the interface between planning and pollution control therefore apply. The Secretary of State must also consider duties under other legislation including duties under the Environment Act 2021 in relation to environmental targets and have regard to policies set out in the government's Environmental Improvement Plan.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]** discusses the potential Air Quality impacts arising as a result of the Proposed Development. Embedded mitigation measures have been established based on the 'IAQM Guidance on the Assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction v2.2 (2024)' to minimise the dust and exhaust emission impacts from the Proposed Development. These will inform the development of a Dust Management Plan (DMP) which may include measures to control other emissions, approved by the Local Authorities.
	5.2.16 The Secretary of State should give air quality considerations substantial weight where a project would lead to a deterioration in air quality. This could for example include where an area breaches any national air quality limits or statutory air quality objectives. However, air quality considerations will also be important where substantial changes in air quality levels are expected, even if this does not lead to any breaches of statutory limits, objectives or targets.	
	5.2.17 The Secretary of State should give air quality considerations substantial weight where a project is proposed near a sensitive receptor site, such as an education or healthcare facility, residential use or a sensitive or protected habitat.	The justification for the Air Quality Assessment Study Area, including the Study Area extent figure showing proposed construction routes, receptor locations (ecological and human) has been provided in **ES Volume 3, Figure 12.1 Air Quality Study Area [EN0110020/APP/6.19].** The Proposed Development is not near any sensitive receptors such as an education or healthcare facility, residential use or a sensitive or protected habitat, therefore the effects during construction and decommissioning would not be significant. With the measures set out in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]** concludes that the Proposed Development is not likely to result in significant air quality effects.
	5.2.18 Where a project is proposed near to a sensitive receptor site for air quality, if the applicant cannot provide justification for this location, and a suitable mitigation plan, the Secretary of State should refuse consent.	
	5.2.19 In all cases, the Secretary of State must take account of any relevant statutory air quality limits, objectives and targets. If a project will lead to non-compliance with a statutory limit, objective or target the Secretary of State should refuse consent.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]** confirms that the Proposed Development would not lead to a breach of any relevant statutory air quality thresholds or affect the ability of a non-compliant area to achieve compliance.
5.3 Greenhouse Gas Emission ***Applicant Assessment***	5.3.4 All proposals for energy infrastructure projects should include a GHG assessment as part of their ES (See Section 4.3). This should include: • A whole life GHG assessment showing construction, operational and decommissioning GHG impacts, including impacts from change of land use.	Sections 11.4, 11.5, 11.7, and 11.10 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** set out the GHG Assessment for the Proposed Development.

	• An explanation of the steps that have been taken to drive down the climate change impacts at each of those stages. • Measurement of embodied GHG impact from the construction stage. • How reduction in energy demand and consumption during operation has been prioritised in comparison with other measures. • How operational emissions have been reduced as much as possible through the application of BAT for that type of technology. • Calculation of operational energy consumption and associated carbon emissions. • Whether and how any residual GHG emissions will be (voluntarily) offset or removed using a recognised framework. • Where there are residual emissions, the level of emissions and the impact of those on national and international efforts to limit climate change, both alone and where relevant in combination with other developments at a regional or national level, or sector level, if sectoral targets are developed.	Section 11.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** sets out the embedded mitigation measures to drive down the climate change impacts at each phase of the Proposed Development. Section 11.10 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** sets out that the total construction emissions are expected to reach 427,000 tCO_2e, which is considered not significant in EIA terms. To reduce emissions during the operation phase, the **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]** utilises the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** where applicable to increase the efficiency of maintenance activities. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** concludes that with the embedded measures in place, there are no LSEs from climate hazards that would impact receptors within the Order Limits of the Proposed Development. The embedded mitigation measures are documented within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, the **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]** and the **outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** and are secured via a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
Mitigation	5.3.5 A GHG assessment should be used to drive down GHG emissions at every stage of the proposed development and ensure that emissions are minimised as far as possible for the type of technology, taking into account the overall objectives of ensuring our supply of energy always remains secure, reliable and affordable, as we transition to net zero. 5.3.6 Applicants should look for opportunities within the proposed development to embed nature-based or technological solutions to mitigate or offset the emissions of construction and decommissioning. 5.3.7 Steps taken to minimise and offset emissions should be set out in a GHG Reduction Strategy, secured under the Development Consent Order. The GHG Reduction Strategy should consider the creation and preservation of carbon stores and sinks including through woodland creation, hedgerow creation and restoration, peatland restoration and through other natural habitats.	A GHG Impact Assessment, which considers the embodied carbon GHG emissions at each phase of the Proposed Development, is outlined in Sections 11.4, 11.5, 11.7, and 11.10 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]**. Section 11.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** outlines the embedded mitigation measures for climate change impacts at each phase of the Proposed Development. The **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]** detail the measures incorporated in the Proposed Development to drive down GHG emissions during the construction and operation of the Proposed Development. These will be secured through the requirements in Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. These include (but are not limited to): • Use of lower GHG-emitting construction plant, equipment and technologies, and efficient construction practices to minimise fuel consumption; • Engineering design and construction sequencing to reduce unnecessary material use and construction activities; • Minimisation of waste generation and re-use of excavated materials on site where suitable; • Recycling and local disposal of construction waste to reduce transport-related emissions; • Avoidance or minimisation of equipment containing high-global-warming-potential insulating gases (e.g. SF_6), where practicable and consistent with design requirements;

		• Contractor awareness and implementation of measures to reduce construction-phase GHG emissions, secured through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). The Proposed Development also includes nature-based solutions as set out in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**. This consists of targeted planting of trees, shrubs, and grassland as well as the management of them to improve biodiversity in and around the Proposed Development. Similar measures to the construction phase will be developed prior to the decommissioning phase for the use of lower-carbon and more climate change resilient methods, as highlighted in the **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]**.
Secretary of State decision making	5.3.8 The Secretary of State must be satisfied that the applicant has as far as possible assessed the GHG emissions of all stages of the development.	The GHG emissions at each phase of the Proposed Development are outlined in Section 11.7 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11].** Embedded mitigation to reduce GHG emissions of the construction and decommissioning phases is set out in Section 11.6 **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11].** The following embedded mitigation has been set out in Section 11.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** through the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10],** and **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** and are commitments secured through the relevant requirements of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**, to mitigate or offset the emissions of the construction and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development: Section 11.7 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** sets out that the significant residual effects are defined as… The Proposed Development also includes nature-based solutions as set out in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**. This consists of targeted planting of trees, shrubs, and grassland as well as the management of them to improve biodiversity in and around the Proposed Development.
	5.3.9 The Secretary of State should be content that the applicant has taken all reasonable steps to reduce the GHG emissions of the construction and decommissioning stage of the development.	
	5.3.10 The Secretary of State should give appropriate weight to projects that embed nature-based or technological processes to mitigate or offset the emissions of construction and decommissioning within the proposed development. However, in light of the vital role energy infrastructure plays in the process of economy wide decarbonisation, the Secretary of State must accept that there are likely to be some residual emissions from construction and decommissioning of energy infrastructure.	
	5.3.11 Operational GHG emissions are a significant adverse impact from some types of energy infrastructure which cannot be totally avoided (even with full deployment of CCS technology). Given the characteristics of these and other technologies, as noted in Part 3 of this NPS, and the range of non-planning policies that can be used to decarbonise electricity generation, such as the UK ETS (see Section 2.4), government has determined that operational GHG emissions are not reasons to prohibit the consenting of energy projects or to impose more restrictions on them in the planning policy framework than are set out in the energy NPSs (e.g. the CCR requirements). Any carbon assessment will include an assessment of operational GHG emissions, but the policies set out in Part 2, including the UK ETS, can be applied to these emissions.	Section 11.7 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** sets out the GHG emissions expected for the operation and maintenance phase of the Proposed Development. **ES Chapter 11: Climate Change and Green House Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** concludes that with embedded mitigation measures in place, there will be a net climate benefit, by offsetting around 16,964,000tCO2, across the Proposed Development's operation and maintenance phase. The embedded mitigation measures are documented within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, the **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]** and the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** and secured via a requirement of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
	5.3.12 Operational emissions will be addressed in a managed, economy-wide manner, to ensure consistency with carbon budgets, net zero and our international climate commitments. The Secretary of State does not, therefore need to assess individual	Section 11.7 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** sets out that on average, the operation and

	applications for planning consent against operational carbon emissions and their contribution to carbon budgets, net zero and our international climate commitments.	maintenance phase of the Proposed Development accounts for <0.1% of the 2028-2032 Carbon budget.
5.4 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation ***Applicant Assessment***	5.4.18 Where the development is subject to EIA, the applicant should ensure that the ES clearly sets out any effects on internationally, nationally, and locally designated sites of ecological or geological conservation importance (including those outside England and Wales), on protected species and on habitats and other species identified as being of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity, including irreplaceable habitats.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** sets out the effects on the Proposed Development of internationally, nationally and locally designated sites of ecological conservation importance, protected species, habitats and other species identified as being of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity, including irreplaceable habitats. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** confirms that there are low magnitude adverse effects on locally designated sites, and priority habitats. However, during the operational and maintenance phase these change to moderate beneficial effects as a result of the proposed mitigation methods.
	5.4.20 The applicant should show how the project has taken advantage of opportunities to conserve and enhance biodiversity and geological conservation interests.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** sets out that the design of the Proposed Development has evolved to avoid impacts and effects on ecology and biodiversity as far as practicable. The Proposed Development incorporates a number of enhancements resulting in a number of significant beneficial effects, including (but not limited to): • New habitats would be created within the Site, and existing habitats would be enhanced for biodiversity and secured through the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and managed and maintained for at least 30 years. The habitat enhancement and creation would mature, and soils would recover as a result of the reduction or cessation of fertiliser and insecticide inputs. It is expected that biodiversity at all levels of the ecosystem would benefit, with the abundance and richness of flora and fauna expanding over time. • Hedgerow loss during construction would be compensated for by improving the quality of existing hedgerows within the LWS (e.g. gapping up or addition of trees, use of optimum management practices) or the planting of new connecting hedgerows with the Site. • The Proposed Development will achieve a minimum of 10% BNG. However, the Applicant anticipates delivering substantially more than this, as evidenced by the BNG Assessment, which demonstrates what is likely to be proposed. The **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]** secures the following increases: • Habitat Units = 28% • Hedgerow Units = 30% • Watercourse Units = 10% The design of the Proposed Development incorporates nature-based solutions, where practicable, such as developing biodiversity enhancement measures ad considering factors related to hydrology, flood risk, landscape and ecology. As part of the EIA process, an iterative approach has been adopted where significant environmental effects have been avoided where possible through design refinements and iterations.
	5.4.21 Applicants should consider wider ecosystem services and benefits of natural capital when designing enhancement measures.	
	5.4.22 As set out in Section 4.7, the design process should embed opportunities for nature inclusive design. Energy infrastructure projects have the potential to deliver significant benefits and enhancements beyond Biodiversity Net Gain, which result in wider environmental gains (see Section 4.6 on Environmental and Biodiversity Net Gain). The scope of potential gains will be dependent on the type, scale, and location of each project.	

	5.4.23 The design of energy NSIP proposals will need to consider the movement of mobile/migratory species such as birds, fish and marine and terrestrial mammals and their potential to interact with infrastructure. As energy infrastructure could occur anywhere within England and Wales, both inland and onshore and offshore, the potential to affect mobile and migratory species across the UK and more widely across Europe (transboundary effects) requires consideration, depending on the location of development. Applicants should consider relevant plan policies in marine plans in England.	In **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]**, the Proposed Development has considered the impact on the movement of mobile/migratory species, such as birds, fish, and marine and terrestrial mammals, and their potential interactions with infrastructure. The chapter concludes that there are low magnitude residual effects on biodiversity and nature conservation during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development but these are not relevant to mobile/migratory species but rather priority habitats.
Habitats Regulations	5.4.26 The applicant should seek the advice of the appropriate SNCB and provide the Secretary of State with such information as the Secretary of State may reasonably require, to determine whether an HRA Appropriate Assessment is required. Applicants can request and agree 'Evidence Plans' with SNCBs, which is a way to record upfront the information the applicant needs to supply with its application, so that the HRA can be efficiently carried out. If an AA is required, the applicant must provide the Secretary of State with such information as may reasonably be required to enable the Secretary of State to conduct the AA. This should include information on any mitigation measures that are proposed to minimise or avoid likely significant effects.	It was concluded by the Planning Inspectorate that a habitat regulation assessment was to be scoped out of the EIA assessment associated with the Proposed Development, as highlighted within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 2.2: EIA Scoping Opinion [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. NE acknowledged in writing through the statutory consultation that there are no pathways that could lead to effects on a European site from the Proposed Development and that no HRA is required.
	5.4.27 If, during the pre-application stage, the SNCB indicate that the proposed development is likely to adversely impact the integrity of habitat sites, the applicant must include with their application such information as may reasonably be required to assess a potential derogation under the Habitats Regulations.	
	5.4.28 If the SNCB gives such an indication at a later stage in the development consent process, the applicant must provide this information as soon as is reasonably possible and before the close of the examination. This information must include assessment of alternative solutions, a case for IROPI and appropriate environmental compensation.	
	5.4.29 Provision of such information will not be taken as an acceptance of adverse impacts and if an applicant disputes the likelihood of adverse impacts, it can provide this information as part of its application 'without prejudice' to the Secretary of State's final decision on the impacts of the potential development. If, in these circumstances, an applicant does not supply information required for the assessment of a potential derogation, there will be no expectation that the Secretary of State will allow the applicant the opportunity to provide such information following the examination.	
	5.4.30 It is vital that applicants consider the need for compensation as early as possible in the design process as 'retrofitting' compensatory measures will introduce delays and uncertainty to the consenting process.	
	5.4.31 Applicants should work closely at an early stage in the pre-application process with SNCB and Defra/Welsh Government to develop a compensation plan for all protected sites adversely affected by the development. Applicants should engage with the relevant LPA at an early stage regarding the proposed location of compensatory measures. Applicants should also take account of any strategic plan level compensation plans in developing project level compensation plans.	

	5.4.32 Before submitting an application, applicants should seek the views of the SNCB and Defra/Welsh Government as to the suitability, securability and effectiveness of the compensation plan to ensure the development will not hinder the achievement of the conservation objectives for the protected site. In cases where such views are provided, the applicant should include a copy of this information with the compensation plan in their application for further consideration by the Examining Authority.	
Ancient woodland, ancient trees, veteran trees and other irreplaceable habitats	5.4.33 Applicants should include measures to mitigate fully the direct and indirect effects of development on ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees or other irreplaceable habitats during both construction and operational phases.	Ancient and Veteran trees are to be retained with appropriate buffers. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** confirms that there are no ancient woodlands contained within the Order Limits. The application of protective buffers around habitats from the developed areas within the Order Limits will be applied to prevent adverse effects on habitat function and quality. These are stated in the **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]** and would include: • Ancient and semi-natural woodland - a buffer zone of at least 15m from the boundary of the ancient or broadleaved woodland edge boundary to avoid root damage (known as the root protection area). • Ancient/veteran trees, a minimum buffer zone of at least 15 times larger than the diameter of each tree in an ancient or broadleaved woodland edge or per individual ancient or veteran tree. The buffer zone should be 5 metres from the edge of the tree's canopy if that area is larger than 15 times the tree's diameter.
Protection and enhancement of habitats and species	5.4.34 Applicants should consider any reasonable opportunities to maximise the restoration, creation, and enhancement of wider biodiversity, and the protection and restoration of the ability of habitats to store or sequester carbon as set out under Section 4.6.	As secured within the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**, new habitats will be provided as part of the Proposed Development, with the aim of improving biodiversity gains, where this does not conflict with construction, operational and maintenance and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. Some of the habitat creation and enhancement measures to be implemented include: • Over 6km of species-rich native hedgerow with trees (including existing hedgerow enhancement); • Approximately 34km of species-rich native hedgerow; • Approximately 1ha of native tree belts; and • Approximately 980ha of species-rich grassland accounted for across the Order Limits in hedgerow and field margins, riparian zones, wildflower meadows and tussock mixes beneath solar panels. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** confirms that, as relevant, legislation and guidance have been used to inform the Proposed Development's consideration of improvements and impacts on species.
	5.4.35 Consideration should be given to improvements to, and impacts on, habitats and species in, around and beyond developments, for wider ecosystem services and natural capital benefits, beyond those under protection and identified as being of principal importance. This may include considerations and opportunities identified through Local Nature Recovery Strategies, and national goals and targets set through the Environment Act 2021 and the Environmental Improvement Plan.	
Mitigation	5.4.36 Applicants should include appropriate avoidance, mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures as an integral part of the proposed development. In particular, the applicant should demonstrate that:	Regarding biodiversity and conservation, the mitigation hierarchy has been applied to the design of the Proposed Development to avoid, mitigate and compensate its effects on key biological and geological receptors. The **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** secure management and control mechanisms to ensure that the construction activities are

	• during construction, they will seek to ensure that activities will be confined to the minimum areas required for the works; • the timing of construction has been planned to avoid or limit disturbance; • during construction and operation best practice will be followed to ensure that risk of disturbance or damage to species or habitats is minimised, including as a consequence of transport access arrangements; • habitats will, where practicable, be restored after construction works have finished; • opportunities will be taken to enhance existing habitats rather than replace them, and where practicable, create new habitats of value within the site landscaping proposals. Where habitat creation is required as mitigation, compensation, or enhancement, the location and quality will be of key importance. In this regard habitat creation should be focused on areas where the most ecological and ecosystems benefits can be realised; and • mitigations required as a result of legal protection of habitats or species will be complied with.	planned to avoid and minimise disturbance and that works take place in the most effective ways to minimise the impact of construction spatially. The **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]** and **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/13]** apply across the operational phase of the Proposed Development and secure how the Order Limits will be restored and enhanced post-construction. As secured in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/13]**, new habitats will be provided as part of the Proposed Development, with the aim of improving biodiversity gains, where this does not conflict with the construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development.
	5.4.37 Applicants should produce and implement a Biodiversity Management Strategy as part of their development proposals. This could include provision for biodiversity awareness training to employees and contractors so as to avoid unnecessary adverse impacts on biodiversity during the construction and operation stages.	The Applicant has created an **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/13]** for the Proposed Development, alongside an **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** which provides an understanding of the training to be provided on relevant matters.
Secretary of State decision making	5.4.40 The government's Environmental Improvement Plan and the Environment Act 2021 mark a step change in ambition for wildlife and the natural environment. The Secretary of State should have regard to the aims and goals of the government's Environmental Improvement Plan, and in Wales the objectives of the Nature Recovery Plan, and any relevant measures and targets, including statutory targets set under the Environment Act or elsewhere.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** has been produced in accordance with the aims of the 25-Year Environment Plan and the Environment Act 2021, as evidenced by the extensive habitat provision secured under the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/13]**.
	5.4.42 The benefits of nationally significant low carbon energy infrastructure development may include benefits for biodiversity and geological conservation interests and these benefits may outweigh harm to these interests. The Secretary of State may take account of any such net benefit in cases where it can be demonstrated.	As presented in the **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Baseline Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, the ecological mitigation and enhancement areas will deliver a net gain of: • Habitat Units = 28% • Hedgerow Units = 30% • Watercourse Units = 10% As committed to in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/13]** and secured via a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].**
	5.4.43 As a general principle, and subject to the specific policies below, development should, in line with the mitigation hierarchy, aim to avoid significant harm to biodiversity and geological conservation interests, including through consideration of reasonable alternatives (as set out in Section 4.3 above). Where significant harm cannot be	Regarding biodiversity and conservation, the mitigation hierarchy has been applied to the design of the Proposed Development to avoid, mitigate and compensate its effects on key biological and geological receptors.

	avoided, impacts should be mitigated and as a last resort, appropriate compensation measures should be sought.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** describes the baseline levels and assesses the anticipated biodiversity and nature conservation effects of the Proposed Development's construction, operational and maintenance and decommissioning. The chapter provides an assessment of the potential effects on internationally, nationally and locally designated sites of ecological or geological importance, on protected species, and on habitats and the species identified as being of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** concludes that with embedded and additional mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse ecology and biodiversity related effects expected over construction, operational and maintenance phases. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** concludes that with embedded and additional mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse ecology and biodiversity related effects expected across the Proposed Development phases. As a result of embedded and additional mitigation and enhancement measures, there are three direct residual significant (in EIA terms) beneficial effects as a result of the Proposed Development, which are anticipated in relation to the following ecological features: • Brampton Common LWS • Priority Habitats – native hedgerow and wet woodland • Priority Species – Bat and Reptile • Breeding Bird Assemblage • Barn Owl • Hobby Owl The expected residual beneficial effects outlined in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** rely on controls established in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9], oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]** and the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/13]**. Section 6.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** outlines the mitigation measures relevant to biodiversity that are embedded in the Proposed Development.
	5.4.44 If significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (for example through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then the Secretary of State will give significant weight to any residual harm.	
	5.4.45 The Secretary of State should consider what appropriate requirements should be attached to any consent and/or in any planning obligations entered into, in order to ensure that any mitigation or biodiversity net gain measures, if offered, are delivered and maintained. Any habitat creation or enhancement delivered including linkages with existing habitats for compensation or biodiversity net gain should generally be maintained for a minimum period of 30 years, or for the lifetime of the project, if longer.	For Biodiversity Net Gain, monitoring is detailed within and secured by the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/13]**. After 30 years, monitoring would be reviewed to ensure habitat management prescriptions for the remainder of the operational and maintenance phase are appropriate.
	5.4.46 The Secretary of State will need to take account of what mitigation measures may have been agreed between the applicant and the SNCB and the MMO/NRW (where appropriate). The Secretary of State will also need to consider whether the	Section 6.3 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** outlines the stakeholder engagement conducted in relation to biodiversity and nature conservation, including engagement with NE and the LPAs. The

	SNCB or the MMO/NRW has granted or refused, or intends to grant or refuse, any relevant licences, including protected species mitigation licences.	**Consultation Report Appendices [EN0110020/APP/5.2]**, submitted in support of the DCO Application, outline the feedback received from NE during non-statutory, statutory, and targeted consultations, as well as how the Applicant has taken each matter raised into account. As detailed in Section 5 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]**, good design has been a fundamental consideration from the outset of the Proposed Development. The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** demonstrates how the design of the Proposed Development has been developed in accordance with a clear design framework, based on the criteria for good design set out in NPS EN-1. This has included the adoption of project level design principles (Project Principles) to guide decision making and embed good design outcomes to the Proposed Development. The **Works Plans [EN0110020/APP/2.3]** and the **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]**, secure the design of the Proposed Development through the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. As presented in the **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Baseline Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, the ecological mitigation and enhancement areas will deliver a net gain of: • Habitat Units = 28% • Hedgerow Units = 30% • Watercourse Units = 10% as committed to in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and secured in the LEMP through Requirement 7 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]** The Proposed Development, has, therefore, taken advantage of opportunities to conserve and enhance biodiversity.
	5.4.47 Development proposals provide many opportunities for building-in beneficial biodiversity or geological features as part of good design. The Secretary of State should give appropriate weight to environmental and biodiversity enhancements, although any weight given to gains provided to meet a legal requirement (for example under the Environment Act 2021) is likely to be limited.	
	5.4.48 When considering proposals, the Secretary of State should maximise such reasonable opportunities in and around developments, using requirements or planning obligations where appropriate. This can help towards delivering biodiversity net gain as part of or in addition to the approach set out at Section 4.6.	
	5.4.49 In taking decisions, the Secretary of State should ensure that appropriate weight is attached to designated sites of international, national, and local importance; protected species; habitats and other species of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity; and to biodiversity and geological interests within the wider environment.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** has been produced taking due consideration for the appropriate weighting to be attached to designated sites of international, national and local importance; protected species; habitats and other species of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity; and to biodiversity and geological interests within the wider environment. With the sensitivity weighting established, **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** undertakes an assessment which considers embedded and secured additional mitigation measures. The chapter concludes that there are no residual effects on ecology and biodiversity identified during the construction and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. While some moderate adverse residual effects have been identified, mitigation for these is set out in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** which is secured by a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
Secretary of State decision making –	5.4.51 The Secretary of State must consider whether the project is likely to have a significant effect on a protected site which is part of the National Site Network (a habitat	It was concluded by the Planning Inspectorate that a habitat regulation assessment was to be scoped out of the EIA assessment associated with the Proposed Development, as highlighted within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 2.2: EIA Scoping Opinion [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. NE acknowledged in writing through the statutory consultation

Habitats Regulations	site), a protected marine site, or on any site to which the same protection is applied as a matter of policy, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.	that there are no pathways that could lead to effects on a European site from the Proposed Development and that no HRA is required.
Secretary of State decision making – Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs)	5.4.52 The Secretary of State should use requirements and/or planning obligations to mitigate the harmful aspects of the development and, where possible, to ensure the conservation and enhancement of the site's biodiversity or geological interest.	There are no SSSIs located on the land within the Order Limits, nor is it located immediately adjacent to any. The closest SSSI is Crabtree Wood SSSI which is located 0.9km southeast of W3. Given the distance from the Order Limits, there are no direct or indirect impacts anticipated on this SSSI for the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** includes an assessment of the LSEs on SSSIs and concludes that, with appropriate mitigation, no significant adverse effects are anticipated.
Secretary of State decision making – Regional and Local Sites	5.4.54 The Secretary of State should give due consideration to regional or local designations. However, given the need for new nationally significant infrastructure, these designations should not be used in themselves to refuse development consent.	Regarding Locally Designated Sites, Brampton Common LWS lies partially within the Site and will be directly affected by the Proposed Development. Ulley Country Park LWS and Firsby Reservoir Local Nature Reserves (LNR) are adjacent to the Site (see **Statutory and Non-Statutory Designated Ecological Sites [EN0110020/APP/2.6]**). As set out in section 6 of the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/13]**, Brampton Common LWS is designated in recognition of the following qualifying features: • Species rich hedgerows, including ancient hedgerows which are considered irreplaceable; and • Breeding skylark population. The Proposed Development aims to secure the long-term protection, enhancement, and favourable management of Brampton Common LWS, introducing solar panels and associated features whilst safeguarding its species rich hedgerows and breeding skylark population and delivering high quality habitat that contributes to biodiversity net gain. This is set out in further detail within the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/13]**, including the strategy to ensure long-term benefits for this wildlife site are delivered. The strategy to ensure long-term benefits for the Brampton Common LWS, as set out within the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/13]** will be secured as part of the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan to be prepared under Requirement 9 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The Applicant commits to the following: • Long-term management of the proposed and existing habitats supporting skylark and wading birds will extend across the LWS within the Order Limits. • Long-term operational monitoring across the LWS within the Order Limits will be undertaken annually during the peak breeding time for five years, to better understand habitat improvements and biodiversity.
Secretary of State decision making – Ancient woodland, ancient trees, veteran trees and other	5.4.55 The Secretary of State should not grant development consent for any development that would result in the loss or deterioration of any irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland, and ancient and veteran trees unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists.	Trees and hedgerows will be retained and avoided wherever possible within the Cable Corridor. An arboriculture survey, and Tree Constraints Plan (TCP) has been provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.14: Arboriculture Survey and Tree Constraints Plan [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** the scope of which covered access points to the Proposed Development. Further arboricultural surveys will be undertaken prior to construction and mitigation measures within the CEMP (secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**) will be provided to ensure trees and woodland are

irreplaceable habitats		protected during construction, operation and decommissioning in compliance with BS5837:2012.
Secretary of State decision making – Protection and enhancement of habitats and species	5.4.56 The Secretary of State should ensure that species and habitats identified as being of importance for the conservation of biodiversity are protected from the adverse effects of development by using requirements, planning obligations, or licence conditions where appropriate. 5.4.57 The Secretary of State should refuse consent where harm to a protected species and relevant habitat would result, unless there is an overriding public interest and the other relevant legal tests are met. In this context the Secretary of State should give substantial weight to any such harm to the detriment of biodiversity features of national or regional importance or the climate resilience and the capacity of habitats to store carbon, which they consider may result from a proposed development.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** describes the existing levels and assesses the anticipated ecology and biodiversity effects of the Proposed Development's construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning. The chapter provides an assessment of the potential effects on internationally, nationally, and locally designated sites of ecological or geological importance, on protected species, and on habitats and other species identified as being of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity, including irreplaceable habitats. The chapter concludes that there are no significant residual effects on ecology and biodiversity identified during the construction and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. While some low maintenance adverse residual effects have been identified, mitigation for these is set out in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** which is secured by a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The chapter also concludes that there is no harm to protected species and relevant habitats during the construction, operation and maintenance, or decommissioning of the Proposed Development. Appropriate monitoring will be undertaken during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning as set out and secured in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]**, **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** and the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13].** These commitments are secured via corresponding requirements in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
5.5 - Civil and military aviation and defence interests ***Applicant Assessment***	5.5.38 Where the proposed development may affect the performance of civil or military aviation CNS, meteorological radars and/or other defence assets an assessment of potential effects should be set out in the ES (see Section 4.3). 5.5.39 The requirement for ATC and non-cooperative surveillance – i.e. radar/tracking technologies – forms part of the environmental baseline for proposed developments. 5.5.40 The applicant should consult the MOD, Met Office, Civil Aviation Authority (CAA), NATS and any aerodrome – licensed or otherwise – likely to be affected by the proposed development in preparing an assessment of the proposal on aviation, meteorological or other defence interests. 5.5.41 Any assessment of effects on aviation, meteorological or other defence interests should include potential impacts of the project upon the operation of CNS infrastructure, Instrument Flight Procedures, flight patterns (both civil and military), generation of weather warnings and forecasts, other defence assets (including radar) and aerodrome operational procedures. It should also assess the demonstratable cumulative effects of the project with other relevant projects in relation to aviation, meteorological and defence. 5.5.42 In addition, consideration of developments near aerodromes should take into account the following factors: • Bird Strike Risk – Aircraft are vulnerable to wildlife strike, in particular bird strike. Birds and other wildlife may be attracted to the vicinity of an aerodrome by various types of development, for example, large buildings with perching/roosting opportunities for birds. It is therefore important that infrastructure, buildings and	As set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 2.1: EIA Scoping Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and agreed by PINS in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 2.2: EIA Scoping Opinion [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, an individual Glint and Glare chapter is not required in the ES. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16]** assesses glint and glare effects in respect of those matters that are scoped in. The locations of relevant receptors are shown within the supporting **ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.2: Glint and Glare Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16]** concludes that, with embedded mitigation measures in place, there is no potential for significant glint and glare effects as a result of the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. The potential for glint and glare to affect aircraft has been assessed in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.2: Glint and Glare Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, and with the implementation of anti-reflective coating the effect of glint and glare from the Proposed Development on Netherthorpe Airfield and Doncaster Airport is assessed as not significant, in EIA terms. The Proposed Development does not propose significant buildings or structures; therefore, turbulence has not been assessed. Thermal Plume Turbulence is not considered relevant as the Proposed Development does not propose dry cooling systems.

	other elements from energy installations, as well as environmental mitigation and enhancement are designed in such a way so as not to increase the bird strike risk to the airport for developments within 13km (this can vary) • Building Induced Turbulence – If a significant building or structure is proposed close to the airport/runways, there is potential for building induced turbulence/wind shear to be created which has the potential to impact on aircraft on take-off and landing. Studies may be required to identify the extent of any turbulence resulting from the energy infrastructure. • Thermal Plume Turbulence – This is caused under certain conditions by the release of hot air from a power plant equipped with a dry cooling system. The plumes generated by these facilities have the potential to create invisible turbulence that can affect the manoeuvrability of aircraft.	
	5.5.44 If any relevant changes are made to proposals during the preapplication and determination period, it is the responsibility of the applicant to ensure that the relevant aviation, meteorological and defence consultees are informed as soon as reasonably possible.	
Mitigation	5.5.45 The applicant should include appropriate mitigation measures as an integral part of the proposed development.	Embedded mitigation measures have been included in the **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, these include the following: • Retention and maintenance of landscape planting and screening designed to reduce glint and glare effects; • Use of solar PV panels with anti-reflective coatings; and • Any operational maintenance or modification activities with the potential to alter glint and glare characteristics will be managed through the Operational Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) to ensure continued consistency with the assessed mitigation.
	5.5.46 Mitigation for infringement of OLS may include: • Agreed changes to operational procedures of the aerodromes in accordance with relevant guidance, provided that safety assurances can be provided by the operator that are acceptable to the CAA where the changes are proposed to a civilian aerodrome. Applicants should engage airport operators at an early stage of the planning process to understand the potential impacts of development on aviation operations and develop mitigations if appropriate; or • Installation of obstacle lighting and/or by notification in Aeronautical Information Service publications	
Secretary of State decision making	5.5.51 The Secretary of State should be satisfied that the effects on meteorological radars, civil and military aerodromes, aviation technical sites and other defence assets or operations have been addressed by the applicant and that any necessary assessment of the proposal on aviation, NSWWS or defence interests has been carried out.	As set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 2.1: EIA Scoping Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and agreed by PINS in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 2.2: EIA Scoping Opinion [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, and individual Glint and Glare chapter is not required in the ES. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16]** assesses glint and glare effects in respect of those matters that are scoped in. The

	5.5.52 In particular, the Secretary of State should be satisfied that the proposal has been designed, where possible, to minimise adverse impacts on the operation and safety of aerodromes and that realistically achievable mitigation is carried out on existing surveillance systems such as radar/tracking technologies. It is incumbent on Operators of aerodromes to regularly review the possibility of agreeing to make reasonable changes to operational procedures.	locations of relevant receptors are shown within the supporting **ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.2: Glint and Glare Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16]** concludes that, with embedded mitigation measures in place, there is no potential for significant glint and glare effects as a result of the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. The potential for glint and glare to affect aircraft has been assessed in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.2: Glint and Glare Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, and with the implementation of anti-reflective coating the effect of glint and glare from the Proposed Development on Netherthorpe Airfield and Doncaster Airport is assessed as not significant, in EIA terms.
	5.5.55 If there are conflicts between the government's energy and transport policies and military interests in relation to the application, the Secretary of State should expect the relevant parties to have made appropriate efforts to work together to identify realistic and pragmatic solutions to the conflicts. In so doing, the parties should seek to protect the aims and interests of the other parties as far as possible, recognising simultaneously the evolving landscape in terms of the UK's energy security and the need to tackle climate change, which necessitates the installation of wind turbines, and the need to maintain air safety and national defence and the national weather warning service.	
	5.5.56 There are statutory requirements concerning lighting to tall structures. Where lighting is requested on structures that goes beyond statutory requirements by any of the relevant aviation and defence consultees, the Secretary of State should be satisfied of the necessity of such lighting taking into account the case put forward by the consultees. The effect of such lighting on the landscape and ecology may be a relevant consideration.	

	5.5.62 Where, after reasonable mitigation, operational changes, obligations and requirements have been proposed, the Secretary of State should consider whether: • a development would prevent a licensed aerodrome from maintaining its licence and the operational loss of the said aerodrome would have impacts on national security and defence, or result in substantial local/national economic loss, or emergency service needs • it would cause harm to aerodromes' training or emergency service needs • the development would impede or compromise the safe and effective use of defence assets or unacceptably limit military training • the development would have a negative impact on the safe and efficient provision of en-route air traffic control services for civil aviation, in particular through an adverse effect on CNS infrastructure • the development would compromise the effective provision of weather warnings by the NSWWS, or flood warnings by the UK's flood agencies	
5.7 - Dust, odour, artificial light, smoke, steam and insect infestation ***Applicant Assessment***	5.7.5 The applicant should assess the potential for insect infestation and emissions of odour, dust, steam, smoke, and artificial light to have a detrimental impact on amenity, as part of the ES.	An **Outline Dust Management Plan** has been submitted in section 8 of the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**. The aim of the Outline Dust Management Plan is to identify any construction activities associated with dust production and implement the necessary mitigation measures to reduce the significance of any potential effects. A **BESS Plume Assessment [EN0110020/APP/7.2]** has been submitted with the DCO Application which considers combustion emissions in the event of a battery fire. The **oBSMP [EN0110020/APP/5.15]** sets out the safety measures proposed to be installed to reduce fire risk, as well as fire protection measures. The Proposed Development is not anticipated to cause any effects from insect infestation, steam or odour. Construction activities will be undertaken using best practice measures to minimise emissions, as set out in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**. This management plan is secured via its corresponding requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
	5.7.6 In particular, the assessment provided by the applicant should describe: • the type, quantity and timing of emissions • aspects of the development which may give rise to emissions • premises or locations that may be affected by the emissions • effects of the emission on identified premises or locations • measures to be employed in preventing or mitigating the emissions	
	5.7.7 The applicant is advised to consult the relevant LPA and, where appropriate, the EA about the scope and methodology of the assessment.	Section 12.3 of **ES Volume 3, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]** sets out that the Applicant has been in consultation with the LPAs and the NE in relation to air quality.
Mitigation	5.7.8 Mitigation measures may include one or more of the following:	An **Outline Dust Management Plan** has been submitted in section 8 of the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**. The aim of the Outline Dust Management Plan is to identify any

	• engineering: prevention of a specific emission at the point of generation; control, containment and abatement of emissions if generated • lay-out: adequate distance between source and sensitive receptors; reduced transport or handling of material • administrative: limiting operating times; restricting activities allowed on the site; implementing management plans	construction activities associated with dust production and implement the necessary mitigation measures to reduce the significance of any potential effects. Dust emissions associated with construction activities will be controlled through mitigation measures outlined in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**. With the inclusion of the mitigation measures outlined in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** potential dust emissions associated with on-site activities during the construction and decommissioning phases are not anticipated to be significant. Vehicle traffic emissions produced during the Construction phase, including exhaust and non-exhaust emissions such as brake and tyre wear, as well as measures to minimise dust emissions arising from vehicles entering and leaving the Site, will be controlled through mitigation measures specified in the **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]**. It is not expected that vehicle movements associated with the decommissioning phase will exceed the vehicle movements calculated for the construction phase. The **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** and the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** are secured via requirements in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
	5.7.9 Construction should be undertaken in a way that reduces emissions, for example the use of low emission mobile plant during the construction, and demolition phases as appropriate, and consideration should be given to making these mandatory in Development Consent Order requirements.	
	5.7.10 Demolition considerations should be embedded into designs at the outset to enable demolition techniques to be adopted that remove the need for explosive demolition.	
	5.7.11 A construction management plan may help clarify and secure mitigation.	
Secretary of State decision making	5.7.12 The Secretary of State should satisfy itself that: • an assessment of the potential for artificial light, dust, odour, smoke, steam and insect infestation to have a detrimental impact on amenity has been carried out • that all reasonable steps have been taken, and will be taken, to minimise any such detrimental impacts	An **Outline Dust Management Plan** has been submitted in section 8 of the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**. The aim of the Outline Dust Management Plan is to identify any construction activities associated with dust production and implement the necessary mitigation measures to reduce the significance of any potential effects. All relevant assessments covering artificial light, dust, odour, smoke, steam and insect infestation have been considered across the **ES [EN0110020/APP/6.1 – 6.20]** and **Statutory Nuisance Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.2]**.
	5.7.13 If development consent is granted for a project, the Secretary of State should consider whether there is a justification for all of the authorised project (including any associated development) to be covered by a defence of statutory authority against nuisance claims. If the Secretary of State cannot conclude that this is justified, the Secretary of State should disapply in whole or in part the defence through a provision in the Development Consent Order.	The Applicant has prepared and submitted a **Statutory Nuisance Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.2]** as is required under APFP Regulation 5(2)(f) and Paragraph 4.15.5 of NPS EN-1. The **Statutory Nuisance Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.2]** draws upon the assessment conclusions from **ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]** and **ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** to set out that the construction, operational and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development would not cause a statutory nuisance. Article XX of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]** deals with defence to proceedings in respect of statutory nuisance. It provides that no person is able to bring statutory nuisance proceedings under the EPA 1990 in respect of noise, if the noise is created in the course of carrying out construction, maintenance or decommissioning of the authorised development and for which notice has been given under section 60 or consent obtained under section 61(9) of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 or which cannot be reasonably avoided as a consequence of the authorised development.
	5.7.14 Where the Secretary of State believes it appropriate, the Secretary of State may consider attaching requirements to the development consent, to secure certain mitigation measures.	The Applicant considers that all relevant mitigation measures have been secured via the suite of management plans and other documents forming part of the requirements in Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.

	5.7.15 In particular, the Secretary of State should consider whether to require the applicant to abide by a Proposed Development of management and mitigation concerning insect infestation and emissions of odour, dust, steam, smoke, and artificial light from the development. The Secretary of State should consider the need for such a Proposed Development to reduce any loss to amenity which might arise during the construction, operation and decommissioning of the development. A construction management plan may help codify mitigation at that stage.	
Part 5.8 - Flood Risk	5.8.12 Development should be designed to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere, accounting for the predicted impacts of climate change throughout the lifetime of the development. There should be no net loss of floodplain storage and any deflection or constriction of flood flow routes should be safely managed within the site. Mitigation measures should make as much use as possible of natural flood management techniques.	The majority of the Order limits are within Flood Zone 1, with a small proportion of land located within Flood Zones 2 and 3. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** to the **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]**, and Chapter 8 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** advises how the flood risk Sequential Test applied to the location of the Proposed Development has been met. However, it should be noted that where there are areas of flood zones 2 and 3, no sensitive electrical infrastructure has been placed within these areas, only solar panels and mitigation. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** assess the impacts of the Proposed Development on water quality, water bodies or protected areas, and concludes that with the embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse water effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases on water quality, water bodies or protected areas. The non-significant residual effects outlined in the assessment rely on controls established within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**. These outline management plans and the **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** set out the water related measures to manage any potential water effects that may arise from the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. The DCO Application is supported by **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** which addresses each requirement of NPS EN-1 Paragraphs 5.8.13 and 5.8.15. As set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** surface water runoff from the Solar PV will be managed through Rural SuDS and Natural Flood Management techniques such as grassland/wildflower areas, which will act to bind soils, slow surface water, and increase water quality compared to the baseline scenario. The **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** sets out how surface water runoff from the Site will be managed in line with the national, regional and local requirements regarding flood risk and drainage. As the Proposed Development does not currently have a detailed layout, a detailed drainage strategy cannot be provided with the principles and design criteria at this stage. These criteria will be applied during the detailed design phase, and the detailed SuDS will be secured in the DCO through a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
Application Assessment	5.8.13 A site-specific flood risk assessment should be provided for all energy projects in Flood Zones 2 and 3 in England or Defended Flood Zones and Flood Zones 2 and 3 in Wales. In Flood Zone 1 in England or Flood Zone 1 in Wales, an assessment should accompany all proposals involving: • sites of 1 hectare or more • land which has been identified by the EA or NRW as having critical drainage problems • land identified (for example in a local authority strategic flood risk assessment) as being at increased flood risk in future • land that may be subject to other sources of flooding (for example surface water) • where the EA or NRW, Lead Local Flood Authority, Internal Drainage Board or other body have indicated that there may be drainage problems.	
	5.8.14 This assessment should identify and assess the risks of all forms of flooding to and from the project and demonstrate how these flood risks will be managed, taking climate change into account.	
	5.8.15 The minimum requirements for Flood Risk Assessments (FRA) are that they should: • Be proportionate to the risk and appropriate to the scale, nature and location of the project; • Consider the risk of flooding arising from the project in addition to the risk of flooding to the project; • Take the impacts of climate change into account, across a range of climate scenarios, clearly stating the development lifetime over which the assessment has been made;	

	• Be undertaken by competent people, as early as possible in the process of preparing the proposal;
	• Consider both the potential adverse and beneficial effects of flood risk management infrastructure, including raised defences, flow channels, flood storage areas and other artificial features, together with the consequences of their failure and exceedance;
	• Consider the vulnerability of those using the site, including arrangements for safe access and escape;
	• Consider and quantify the different types of flooding (whether from natural and human sources and including joint and cumulative effects) and include information on flood likelihood, speed-of-onset, depth, velocity, hazard and duration;
	• Identify and secure opportunities to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding overall, making as much use as possible of natural flood management techniques as part of an integrated approach to flood risk management;
	• Consider the effects of a range of flooding events including extreme events on people, property, the natural and historic environment and river and coastal processes;
	• Include the assessment of the remaining (known as 'residual') risk after risk reduction measures have been taken into account and demonstrate that these risks can be safely managed, ensuring people will not be exposed to hazardous flooding;
	• Consider how the ability of water to soak into the ground may change with development, along with how the proposed layout of the project may affect drainage systems. Information should include:
	  ○ Describe the existing surface water drainage arrangements for the site;
	  ○ Set out (approximately) the existing rates and volumes of surface water run-off generated by the site. Detail the proposals for restricting discharge rates;
	  ○ Set out proposals for managing and discharging surface water from the site using sustainable drainage systems and accounting for the predicted impacts of climate change. If sustainable drainage systems have been rejected, present clear evidence of why their inclusion would be inappropriate;
	  ○ Demonstrate how the hierarchy of drainage options has been followed;
	  ○ Explain and justify why the types of SuDS and method of discharge have been selected and why they are considered appropriate;
		The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** includes the adoption of project level design principles to guide decision making and embed good design outcomes into the Proposed Development. Table 3, Section 4.3, sets out that whilst pockets of potential flood areas are present, the majority of land would not be impacted.

	○ Explain how sustainable drainage systems have been integrated with other aspects of the development such as open space or green infrastructure, so as to ensure an efficient use of the site; ○ Describe the multifunctional benefits the sustainable drainage system will provide; ○ Set out which opportunities to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding have been identified and included as part of the proposed sustainable drainage system; ○ Explain how run-off from the completed development will be prevented from causing an impact elsewhere; ○ Explain how the sustainable drainage system been designed to facilitate maintenance and, where relevant, adoption. Set out plans for ensuring an acceptable standard of operation and maintenance throughout the lifetime of the development; • Detail those measures that will be included to ensure the development will be safe and remain operational during a flooding event throughout the development's lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere; • Identify and secure opportunities to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding overall during the period of construction; and • Be supported by appropriate data and information, including historical information on previous events.	
	5.8.16 Further guidance can be found in the Planning Practice Guidance Flood Risk and Coastal Change section which accompanies the NPPF, TAN15 for Wales or successor documents.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** considers relevant sections of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), the NPPF, and the government's associated planning guidance on water.
	5.8.17 Development (including construction works) will need to account for any existing watercourses and flood and coastal erosion risk management structures or features, or any land likely to be needed for future structures or features so as to ensure: • Access, clearances and sufficient land are retained to enable their maintenance, repair, operation, and replacement, as necessary; • Their standard of protection is not reduced; and • Their condition or structural integrity is not reduced.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** describes the existing levels and assesses the anticipated water effects of the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning in accordance with this policy. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** assesses the impacts of the Proposed Development on water quality, water bodies or protected areas, and concludes that with embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse water effects exposed across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases on water quality, water bodies or protected areas. The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** sets out that in the siting of substations, impacts on surface and groundwater sources has been avoided.
	5.8.18 Applicants for projects which may be affected by, or may add to, flood risk should arrange pre-application discussions before the official preapplication stage of the	Section 10.3 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** sets out that the Applicant has been in consultation with Severn

	NSIP process with the EA or NRW, and, where relevant, other bodies such as Lead Local Flood Authorities, Internal Drainage Boards, sewerage undertakers, navigation authorities, highways authorities and reservoir owner and operators.	Trent, Yorkshire Water, the EA, RMBC, and North East Derbyshire Council in relation to water resources. The Applicant has considered the advice and taken account of the feedback received through consultation.
	5.8.19 Such discussions should identify the likelihood and possible extent and nature of the flood risk, help scope the FRA, and identify the information that will be required by the Secretary of State to reach a decision on the application when it is submitted. The Secretary of State should advise applicants to undertake these steps where they appear necessary but have not yet been addressed.	The EA confirmed during this pre-application consultation that there will not be a requirement for any Flood Risk Activity Permits which is confirmed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]**. The pre-application consultation undertaken by the Applicant, and how feedback from consultees has informed the Proposed Development, it reported in the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** and **Consultation Report Appendices [EN0110020/APP/5.1]**.
	5.8.20 If the EA, NRW or another flood risk management authority has reasonable concerns about the proposal on flood risk grounds, the applicant should discuss these concerns with the EA or NRW and take all reasonable steps to agree ways in which the proposal might be amended, or additional information provided, which would satisfy the authority's concerns.	
	5.8.21 The Sequential Test ensures that a sequential, risk-based approach is followed to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding, taking all sources of flood risk and climate change into account. Where it is not possible to locate development in low-risk areas, the Sequential Test should go on to compare reasonably available sites with medium risk areas and then, only where there are no reasonably available sites in low and medium risk areas, within high-risk areas.	The majority of the Order limits are within Flood Zone 1, with a small proportion of land located within Flood Zones 2 and 3. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** to the **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]**, and Chapter 8 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** advises how the Sequential Test has been met. However, it should be noted that where there are areas of flood zones 2 and 3, no sensitive electrical infrastructure has been placed within these areas, only solar panels and mitigation.
	5.8.22 The technology specific NPSs set out some exceptions to the application of the Sequential Test. However, when seeking development consent on a site allocated in a development plan through the application of the Sequential Test, informed by a strategic flood risk assessment, applicants need not apply the Sequential Test, provided the proposed development is consistent with the use for which the site was allocated and there is no new flood risk information that would have affected the outcome of the test.	
	5.8.23 Consideration of alternative sites should take account of the policy on alternatives set out in Section 4.3. All projects should apply the Sequential Test to locating development within the site.	
Mitigation	5.8.24 To satisfactorily manage flood risk, arrangements are required to manage surface water and the impact of the natural water cycle on people and property.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** assesses the impacts of the Proposed Development on water quality, water bodies or protected areas, an concludes that with embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse water effects exposed across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases on water quality, water bodies or protected areas. The non-significant residual effects outlined in the assessment rely on controls established within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**. These outline management plans and the **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** set out the water related measures to manage any potential water effects that may arise from the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases.

5.8.25 In this NPS, the term SuDS refers to the whole range of sustainable approaches to surface water drainage management including, where appropriate: • Source control measures including rainwater recycling and drainage; • Infiltration devices to allow water to soak into the ground, that can include individual soakaways and communal facilities; • Filter strips and swales, which are vegetated features that hold and drain water downhill mimicking natural drainage patterns; • Filter drains and porous pavements to allow rainwater and run-off to infiltrate into permeable material below ground and provide storage if needed; • Basins, ponds and tanks to hold excess water after rain and allow controlled discharge that avoids flooding; and • Flood routes to carry and direct excess water through developments to minimise the impact of severe rainfall flooding.	As set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** surface water runoff from the Solar PV will be managed through Rural SuDS and Natural Flood Management techniques such as grassland/wildflower areas, which will act to bind soils, slow surface water, and increase water quality compared to the baseline scenario. The **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** sets out how surface water runoff from the Site will be managed in line with the national, regional and local requirements regarding flood risk and drainage. As the Proposed Development does not currently have a detailed layout, a detailed drainage strategy cannot be provided with the principles and design criteria at this stage. These criteria will be applied during the detailed design phase, and the detailed SuDS will be secured in the DCO through a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** includes the adoption of project level design principles to guide decision making and embed good design outcomes into the Proposed Development. Table 3, Section 4.3, sets out that whilst pockets of potential flood areas are present, the majority of land would not be impacted.
5.8.26 Site layout and surface water drainage systems should cope with events that exceed the design capacity of the system, so that excess water can be safely stored on or conveyed from the site without adverse impacts.	The DCO Application is supported by **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, which considers the impacts of the Proposed Development on drainage.
5.8.27 The surface water drainage arrangements for any project should, accounting for the predicted impacts of climate change throughout the development's lifetime, be such that the volumes and peak flow rates of surface water leaving the site are no greater than the rates prior to the proposed project, unless specific off-site arrangements are made and result in the same net effect.	As set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** surface water runoff from the Solar PV will be managed through Rural SuDS and Natural Flood Management techniques such as grassland/wildflower areas, which will act to bind soils, slow surface water, and increase water quality compared to the baseline scenario.
5.8.28 It may be necessary to provide surface water storage and infiltration to limit and reduce both the peak rate of discharge from the site and the total volume discharged from the site. There may be circumstances where it is appropriate for infiltration facilities or attenuation storage to be provided outside the project site, if necessary, through the use of a planning obligation.	The **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** sets out how surface water runoff from the Site will be managed in line with the national, regional and local requirements regarding flood risk and drainage. As the Proposed Development does not currently have a detailed layout, a detailed drainage strategy cannot be provided with the principles and design criteria at this stage. These criteria will be applied during the detailed design phase, and the detailed SuDS will be secured in the DCO through a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
5.8.29 The sequential approach should be applied to the layout and design of the project. Vulnerable aspects of the development should be located on parts of the site at lower risk and residual risk of flooding. Applicants should seek opportunities to use	The majority of the Order limits are within Flood Zone 1, with a small proportion of land located within Flood Zones 2 and 3. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** to the **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood**

	open space for multiple purposes such as amenity, wildlife habitat and flood storage uses. Opportunities should be taken to lower flood risk by reducing the built footprint of previously developed sites and using SuDS.	**Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]**, and Chapter 8 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** advises how the Sequential Test has been met. However, it should be noted that where there are areas of flood zones 2 and 3, no sensitive electrical infrastructure has been placed within these areas, only solar panels and mitigation.
	5.8.30 Where a development may result in an increase in flood risk elsewhere through the loss of flood storage, on-site level-for-level compensatory storage, accounting for the predicted impacts of climate change over the lifetime of the development, should be provided.	The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** includes the adoption of project level design principles to guide decision making and embed good design outcomes into the Proposed Development. Table 3, Section 4.3, sets out that whilst pockets of potential flood areas are present, the majority of land would not be impacted.
	5.8.31 Where it is not possible to provide compensatory storage on site, it may be acceptable to provide it off-site if it is hydraulically and hydrologically linked. Where development may cause the deflection or constriction of flood flow routes, these will need to be safely managed within the site.	The DCO Application is supported by **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, which considers the impacts of the Proposed Development on drainage. As set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** surface water runoff from the Solar PV will be managed through Rural SuDS and Natural Flood Management techniques such as grassland/wildflower areas, which will act to bind soils, slow surface water, and increase water quality compared to the baseline scenario. The **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** sets out how surface water runoff from the Site will be managed in line with the national, regional and local requirements regarding flood risk and drainage. As the Proposed Development does not currently have a detailed layout, a detailed drainage strategy cannot be provided with the principles and design criteria at this stage. These criteria will be applied during the detailed design phase, and the detailed SuDS will be secured via a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
	5.8.32 Where development may contribute to a cumulative increase in flood risk elsewhere, the provision of multifunctional sustainable drainage systems, natural flood management and green infrastructure can also make a valuable contribution to mitigating this risk whilst providing wider benefits.	As concluded in the **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, the Proposed Development is not considered to contribute to a cumulative increase in flood risk elsewhere.
	5.8.33 The receipt of and response to warnings of floods is an essential element in the management of the residual risk of flooding. Flood Warning and evacuation plans should be in place for those areas at an identified risk of flooding.	As outlined in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, and the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**, there is a requirement to monitor weather forecasts and news for EA flood warnings, relevant weather warnings, and water levels of local waterways.
	5.8.34 The applicant should take advice from the local authority emergency planning team, emergency services and, where appropriate, from the local resilience forum when producing an evacuation plan for a manned energy project as part of the FRA. Any emergency planning documents, flood warning and evacuation procedures that are required should be identified in the FRA.	
	5.8.35 Flood resistant and resilient materials and design should be adopted to minimise damage and speed recovery in the event of a flood.	The Proposed Development has been designed to safeguard the water environment and the provisioning of resiliency measures to flooding (now and in the future), as set out in the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]**.
Secretary of State decision making	5.8.36 In determining an application for development consent, the Secretary of State should be satisfied that where relevant: • The application is supported by an appropriate FRA;	The DCO Application is supported by **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20].** The majority of the Order limits are within Flood Zone 1, with a small proportion of land located within Flood Zones 2 and 3. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** to the **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood**

	• The Sequential Test has been applied and satisfied as part of site selection (subject to the exception set out in paragraph 5.8.22 of this NPS, and any technology specific exceptions set out in other NPSs); • A sequential approach has been applied at the site level to minimise risk by directing the most vulnerable uses to areas of lowest flood risk; • The proposal is in line with any relevant national and local flood risk management strategy; • SuDS (as required in the next paragraph on National Standards) have been used unless there is clear evidence that their use would be inappropriate; • In flood risk areas the project is designed and constructed to remain safe and operational during its lifetime, without increasing flood risk elsewhere (subject to the exceptions set out in paragraph 5.8.22); • The project includes safe access and escape routes where required, as part of an agreed emergency plan, and that any residual risk can be safely managed over the lifetime of the development; and • Land that is likely to be needed for present or future flood risk management infrastructure has been appropriately safeguarded from development to the extent that development would not prevent or hinder its construction, operation or maintenance.	**Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]**, and Chapter 8 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** advises how the Sequential Test has been met. However, it should be noted that where there are areas of flood zones 2 and 3, no sensitive electrical infrastructure has been placed within these areas, only solar panels and mitigation. The Proposed Development's compliance with the national and local flood risk policies is considered in this **Policy Compliance Document [EN0110020/APP/5.5]**. As set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** surface water runoff from the Solar PV will be managed through Rural SuDS and Natural Flood Management techniques such as grassland/wildflower areas, which will act to bind soils, slow surface water, and increase water quality compared to the baseline scenario. The **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** sets out how surface water runoff from the Site will be managed in line with the national, regional and local requirements regarding flood risk and drainage. As the Proposed Development does not currently have a detailed layout, a detailed drainage strategy cannot be provided with the principles and design criteria at this stage. These criteria will be applied during the detailed design phase, and the detailed SuDS will be secured through a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. As concluded in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, is it not considered that the Proposed Development would contribute to an increase in flood risk elsewhere.
	5.8.37 For energy projects which have drainage implications, approval for the project's drainage system, including during the construction period, will form part of the development consent issued by the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State will therefore need to be satisfied that the proposed drainage system complies with any National Standards published by Ministers under paragraph 5(1) of Schedule 3 to the Flood and Water Management Act 2010.	The **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** sets out how surface water runoff from the Site will be managed in line with the national, regional and local requirements regarding flood risk and drainage. As the Proposed Development does not currently have a detailed layout, a detailed drainage strategy cannot be provided with the principles and design criteria at this stage. These criteria will be applied during the detailed design phase, and the detailed SuDS will be secured through a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** has considered the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 in its assessment of the Proposed Development.
	5.8.38 In addition, the Development Consent Order, or any associated planning obligations, will need to make provision for appropriate operation and maintenance of any SuDS throughout the project's lifetime. Where this is secured through the adoption of any SuDS features, any necessary access rights to property will need to be granted.	The **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** has been prepared, accounting for predicted impacts of climate change, setting out how surface water will be managed across the Proposed Development to avoid an increase in flood risk elsewhere. The proposed surface water drainage design set out in the Surface Water Drainage Strategy demonstrates that sustainable drainage techniques have been designed into the Proposed Development and will be maintained by the Applicant to be confirmed and secured through a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
	5.8.39 Where relevant, the Secretary of State should be satisfied that the most appropriate body is being given the responsibility for maintaining any SuDS, taking into account the nature and security of the infrastructure on the proposed site. Responsible bodies could include, for example the landowner, the relevant lead local flood authority	Section 10.3 of **ES Volume 3, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** sets out that the Applicant has been in consultation with Severn Trent, Yorkshire Water, the EA, RMBC, and North East Derbyshire Council in relation to water resources. The Applicant has considered the advice and taken account of the feedback received through consultation.

	or water and sewerage company (through the Ofwat-approved Sewerage Sector Guidance), or another body, such as an Internal Drainage Board.	The pre-application consultation undertaken by the Applicant, and how feedback from consultees has informed the Proposed Development, is reported in the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** and **Consultation Report Appendices [EN0110020/APP/5.1]**.
	5.8.40 If the EA, NRW or another flood risk management authority continues to have concerns and objects to the granting of development consent on the grounds of flood risk, the Secretary of State can grant consent, but would need to be satisfied before deciding whether or not to do so that all reasonable steps have been taken by the applicant and the authority to try to resolve the concerns.	The majority of the Order limits are within Flood Zone 1, with a small proportion of land located within Flood Zones 2 and 3. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** to the **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]**, and Chapter 8 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** advises how the Sequential Test has been met. However, it should be noted that where there are areas of flood zones 2 and 3, no sensitive electrical infrastructure has been placed within these areas, only solar panels and mitigation.
	5.8.41 Energy projects should not normally be consented within Flood Zone 3b, or Zone C2 in Wales, or on land expected to fall within these zones within its predicted lifetime. This may also apply where land is subject to other sources of flooding (for example surface water). However, where essential energy infrastructure has to be located in such areas, for operational reasons, they should only be consented if the development will not result in a net loss of floodplain storage, and will not impede water flows.	
	5.8.42 Exceptionally, where an increase in flood risk elsewhere cannot be avoided or wholly mitigated, the Secretary of State may grant consent if they are satisfied that the increase in present and future flood risk can be mitigated to an acceptable and safe level and taking account of the benefits of, including the need for, nationally significant energy infrastructure as set out in Part 3 above. In any such case the Secretary of State should make clear how, in reaching their decision, they have weighed up the increased flood risk against the benefits of the project, taking account of the nature and degree of the risk, the future impacts on climate change, and advice provided by the EA or NRW and other relevant bodies.	
Part 5.9 - Historic Environment ***Applicant Assessment***	5.9.11 The applicant should undertake an assessment of any likely significant heritage impacts of the proposed development as part of the EIA, and describe these along with how the mitigation hierarchy has been applied in the ES (see Section 4.3). This should include consideration of heritage assets above, at, and below the surface of the ground. Consideration will also need to be given to the possible impacts, including cumulative, on the wider historic environment. The assessment should include reference to any historic landscape or seascape character assessment and associated studies as a means of assessing impacts relevant to the proposed project.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** provides an assessment of the Proposed Development's impact on the historic environment, both above and below ground assets, within the Order limits, or that will be impacted by the Proposed Development. The chapter describes the Heritage Assets within the Study Area for the Proposed Development and their significance, and the significance of their contribution to the Setting. The chapter concludes that there are no significant residual effects identified during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Proposed Development.
	5.9.12 As part of the ES the applicant should provide a description of the significance of the heritage assets affected by the proposed development, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the importance of the heritage assets and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum, the applicant should have consulted the relevant Historic Environment Record203 (or, where the development is in English or Welsh waters, Historic England or Cadw) and assessed the heritage assets themselves using expertise where necessary according to the proposed development's impact.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** has been informed by the Historic Environment Record (HER).
	5.9.13 Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or the available evidence suggests it has the potential to include, heritage assets with an archaeological interest, the applicant should carry out appropriate desk-based assessment and, where such desk-based research is insufficient to properly assess the interest, a field	**ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Baseline [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** sets out the existing cultural heritage baseline conditions, with further details presented in the following appendices:

	evaluation. Where proposed development will affect the setting of a heritage asset, accurate representative visualisations may be necessary to explain the impact.	• **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.1: Legislation, Policy and Guidance [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.3: Sieving Exercise [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.5: Geoarchaeological Desk Based Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.6: Geophysical Survey [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7: Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** **ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** concludes that there are no significant residual effects identified during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Proposed Development.
	5.9.14 The applicant should ensure that the extent of the impact of the proposed development on the significance of any heritage assets affected can be adequately understood from the application and supporting documents. Studies will be required on those heritage assets affected by noise, vibration, light and indirect impacts, the extent and detail of these studies will be proportionate to the significance of the heritage asset affected.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** provides an assessment of the Proposed Development's impact on the historic environment, both above and below ground assets, within the Order limits, or that will be impacted by the Proposed Development. The chapter concludes that there are no significant residual effects identified during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. The assessment of the heritage impact of noise (including construction and decommissioning phase noise) has been based on assumptions set out in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]**.
	5.9.15 The applicant is encouraged, where opportunities exist, to prepare proposals which can make a positive contribution to the historic environment, and to consider how their Proposed Development takes account of the significance of heritage assets affected. This can include, where possible: • Enhancing, through a range of measures such a sensitive design, the significance of heritage assets or setting affected; • Considering where required the development of archive capacity which could deliver significant public benefits; and • Considering how visual or noise impacts can affect heritage assets, and whether there may be opportunities to enhance access to, or interpretation, understanding and appreciation of, the heritage assets affected by the Proposed Development.	Section 8.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** sets out the embedded mitigation proposed in relation to historic environment, both above and below ground assets. Section 8.8 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** sets out that no additional mitigation is proposed in relation to historic environment, both above and below ground assets. Section 8.5 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8] sets out** that if the Proposed Development was not to proceed, it is presumed that there would be continued agricultural use within the Order Limits., which includes ploughing that would damage subsurface archaeological remains. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 18: Summary of Significant Effects [EN0110020/APP/6.18]** outlines that no significant residual effects were identified for cultural heritage and archaeology.
	5.9.16 Careful consideration in preparing the Proposed Development will be required on whether the impacts on the historic environment will be direct or indirect, temporary, or permanent.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** provides an assessment of the Proposed Development's impact on the historic environment, both above and below ground assets, within the Order limits, or that will be impacted by the Proposed Development. The chapter describes the Heritage Assets within

		the Study Area for the Proposed Development and their significance, and the significance of their contribution to the Setting. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** concludes that, with embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant residual adverse heritage related effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. The embedded mitigation measures are documented within **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**, **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]**, and the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and are secured via requirements of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
	5.9.17 Applicants should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably.	There are no World Heritage Sites affected by the Proposed Development. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Baseline [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** notes that there are 13 Conservation Areas (CAs) within the 1km Study Area. Of this, the Barlborough and Ulley CAs are outlined as moderate adverse and minor adverse significant effects, but with the embedded mitigation in place these are determined as not significant residual effects on the setting of the CAs in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]**.
Mitigation	5.9.18 A documentary record of our past is not as valuable as retaining the heritage asset, and therefore the ability to record evidence of the asset should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted, and whether or not consent should be given.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** provides an assessment of the Proposed Development's impact on the historic environment, both above and below ground assets, within the Order limits, or that will be impacted by the Proposed Development. The chapter describes the Heritage Assets within the Study Area for the Proposed Development and their significance, and the significance of their contribution to the Setting.
	5.9.19 Where the loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset's significance is justified, the Secretary of State will require the applicant to record and advance understanding of the significance of the heritage asset before it is lost (wholly or in part). The extent of the requirement should be proportionate to the asset's importance and significance and the impact. The applicant should be required to publish this evidence and to deposit copies of the reports with the relevant Historic Environmental Record. They should also be required to deposit the archive generated in a local museum or other public repository willing to receive it.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** concludes that, with embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant residual adverse heritage related effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. The embedded mitigation measures are documented within **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**, **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]**, and the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and are secured via requirements of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. Effects arising during the construction stage will be temporary, limited to the construction period only and reversible. Decommissioning is anticipated to commence 60 years after final commissioning. The effects to all identified Heritage Assets during the decommissioning phase are likely to be similar to construction effects, including being temporary and reversible.
	5.9.20 Where appropriate, the Secretary of State will impose requirements on the Development Consent Order to ensure that the work is undertaken in a timely manner, in accordance with a written Proposed Development of investigation that complies with the policy in this NPS and which has been agreed in writing with the relevant local authority, and to ensure that the completion of the exercise is properly secured.	An **outline Written Scheme of Investigation (oWSI) [EN0110020/APP/5.16]** has been provided and demonstrates compliance.

	5.9.21 Where the loss of significance of any heritage asset has been justified by the applicant on the merits of the new development and the significance of the asset in question, the Secretary of State should consider: • Imposing a requirement in the Development Consent Order; and • Requiring the applicant to enter into an obligation that will prevent the loss occurring until the relevant part of the development has commenced, or it is reasonably certain that the relevant part of the development is to proceed.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** concludes that, with embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant residual adverse heritage related effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. The embedded mitigation measures are documented within **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**, **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]**, and the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and are secured via requirements of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. Where avoidance of archaeological remains is not practicable, controlled archaeological investigation and recording will be undertaken in advance of or during construction to preserve the archaeological resource by record. These measures will be implemented in accordance with the **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7: APS [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]** and coordinated through the CEMP.
	5.9.22 Where there is a high probability (based on an adequate assessment) that a development site may include as yet undiscovered heritage assets with archaeological interest, the Secretary of State will consider requirements to ensure appropriate procedures are in place for the identification and treatment of such assets discovered during construction.	
Secretary of State decision making	5.9.23 In determining applications, the Secretary of State should seek to identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by the proposed development, including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset, taking account of: • Relevant information provided with the application and, where applicable, relevant information submitted during the examination of the application; • Any designation records, including those on the National Heritage List for England205, or included on Cof Cymru for Wales; • Historic landscape character records; • The relevant Historic Environment Record(s), and similar sources of information; • Representations made by interested parties during the examination process; and • Expert advice, where appropriate, and when the need to understand the significance of the heritage asset demands it.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** sets out the criteria for assessing the importance of Heritage Assets within the Study Area. The importance of a Heritage Asset is the overall value assigned to it reflecting its statutory designation, or in the case of Non-designated assets, the professional judgement of the assessor with reference to national and local guidance and the planning policy tests. Section 8.2 of **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Baseline [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** sets out various designations, historic landscape character records, relevant HERs, and equivalent resources which are within or surrounding the Proposed Development, but this does not change the overall impact that there are no significant residual effects identified during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. Historic England (HE) guidance also refers to an asset's "level of significance" which in this usage has the same meaning as importance.
	5.9.24 The Secretary of State must also comply with the requirements on listed buildings, conservation areas and scheduled monuments, set out in regulation 3 of the Infrastructure Planning (Decisions) Regulations 2010.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** provides an assessment of the Proposed Development's impact on the historic environment, both above and below ground assets, within the Order limits, or that will be impacted by the Proposed Development. The chapter describes the Heritage Assets within the Study Area for the Proposed Development and their significance, and the significance of their contribution to the Setting. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** concludes that, with embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant residual adverse heritage related effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. The embedded mitigation measures are documented within **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**, **oCTMP**
	5.9.26 The Secretary of State should consider the desirability of sustaining and, where appropriate, enhancing the significance of heritage assets, the contribution of their settings and the positive contribution that their conservation can make to sustainable communities, including to their quality of life, their economic vitality, and to the public's enjoyment of these assets.	
	5.9.27 The Secretary of State should also consider the desirability of the new development making a positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the historic environment. The consideration of design should include scale, height, massing, alignment, materials, use and landscaping (for example, screen planting).	

	5.9.28 When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, the Secretary of State should give great weight to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss, or less than substantial harm to its significance.	**[EN0110020/APP/5.12]**, and the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and are secured via requirements of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. Section 8.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** sets out the embedded mitigation proposed in relation to historic environment, both above and below ground assets.
	5.9.29 The Secretary of State should give considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving all heritage assets. Any harm or loss of significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting) should require clear and convincing justification.	Section 8.8 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** sets out that no additional mitigation is proposed in relation to historic environment, both above and below ground assets. Section 8.5 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** that if the Proposed Development was not to proceed, it is presumed that there would be continued agricultural use within the Proposed Development., which includes ploughing that would damage subsurface archaeological remains. Therefore the Proposed Development will have a positive effect. The following embedded mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Proposed Development for the construction phase, detailed within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**: • Where practicable, construction activities will be planned to avoid unnecessary disturbance to buried archaeological remains. Measures will include implementation of **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7: Archaeological Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, incorporation of exclusion zones, micrositing of infrastructure and adoption of non-intrusive construction methods where required. These measures will be secured and implemented through the CEMP in coordination with the Archaeological Preservation Strategy. • Areas identified as having heightened archaeological sensitivity will be protected through avoidance-led measures, including exclusion zones with no ground disturbance, micrositing of infrastructure and, where necessary, alternative construction methods that allow installation above or below archaeological remains without truncation. The identification and protection of Heightened Archaeological Sensitivity areas and the requirement for implementation of avoidance is secured through **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7: Archaeological Preservation Strategy) [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]**. • Where avoidance of archaeological remains is not practicable, controlled archaeological investigation and recording will be undertaken in advance of or during construction to preserve the archaeological resource by record. These measures will be implemented in accordance with the **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7: Archaeological Preservation Study [EN0110020/APP/6.20] oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]** and coordinated through the CEMP. • Archaeological monitoring will be undertaken during defined construction activities where there is potential for impacts to below-ground archaeology, including monitoring of soil stripping where required. Procedures for archaeological

		supervision and monitoring will be secured through the CEMP in accordance with the **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]**. • Standard pollution prevention and construction management measures will be implemented to reduce the risk of contamination or degradation of archaeological remains. This will include compliance with relevant Construction Design and Management (CDM) requirements, safe handling and storage of fuels and hazardous materials, provision of spill kits on site and incident response procedures, all secured through the CEMP. • Procedures will be in place to manage the discovery of previously unknown archaeological remains during construction, including measures to halt works in affected areas and implement appropriate archaeological responses. These procedures will be set out within the CEMP. The following embedded mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Proposed Development for the operation and maintenance phase, detailed within the **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**: • The layout of the Proposed Development (see **Volume 3, ES Figure 5.1: Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/6.19]**) has been informed by the need to locate above ground infrastructure outside the setting of sensitive heritage receptors where practicable, or within areas of the landscape where effects on Setting are minimised. Where additional mitigation is required during operation, landscape screening (see **ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1: Illustrative Mitigation Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/6.19]**) may be used to reduce the visibility of infrastructure in views that contribute to the setting and significance of Heritage Assets. Screening measures, where appropriate, will be delivered through landscape planting and managed in accordance with the approved **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**. The following embedded mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Proposed Development for the decommissioning phase, detailed within the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**: • No additional mitigation specific to the decommissioning phase is proposed beyond that already defined and secured for the construction phase of the Proposed Development. Decommissioning activities will be undertaken in a sensitive manner and will apply the same principles, controls and avoidance measures established for construction. • Decommissioning activities within areas of archaeological sensitivity will be undertaken in accordance with the sensitive decommissioning strategy set out in the **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7: Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and secured by the **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]**. This includes the application of appropriate archaeological controls, mitigation and monitoring measures equivalent to those established for construction, where relevant.

	5.9.30 Substantial harm to or loss of significance of a grade II Listed Building or a grade II Registered Park or Garden should be exceptional.	**ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Baseline [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** outlines the baseline conditions of Heritage Assets. Section 8.2 of this appendix sets out the 448 designated and other Non-designated Heritage Assets that have been scoped in as receptors/matters for assessment. The receptors/matters assessed include: Designated Assets: • One Registered Park and Garden (Barlborough Hall) (RPG); • Four Scheduled Monuments (SMs); • 13 CAs; and • 107 Listed Buildings (Three Grade I, eight Grade II*, and 96 Grade II) Non-designated Assets: • 33 dating to the Early Prehistoric period; • 45 dating to the Later Prehistoric period; • 40 dating to the Roman period; • 88 dating to the Medieval period; • 78 dating to the Post-Medieval; • 15 dating to the Modern period.
	5.9.31 Substantial harm to or loss of significance of assets of the highest significance, including Scheduled Monuments; Protected Wreck Sites; Registered Battlefields; grade I and II* Listed Buildings; grade I and II* Registered Parks and Gardens; and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.	
	5.9.32 Where the proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset the Secretary of State should refuse consent unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm to, or loss of, significance is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all the following apply: • The nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; • No viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; • Conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and • The harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.	
	5.9.33 Where the proposed development will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate securing its optimum viable use.	
	5.9.34 In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** concludes that there are no significant adverse effects anticipated on Non-designated Heritage Assets.
	5.9.35 Not all elements of a Conservation Area or World Heritage Site will necessarily contribute to its significance. Loss of a building (or other element) which makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site should be treated either as substantial harm under paragraph 5.9.30 or less than substantial harm under paragraph 5.9.31, as appropriate, considering the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site as a whole.	There are no World Heritage Sites affected by the Proposed Development. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Baseline [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** notes that there are 13 CAs within the 1km Study Area. Of this, the Barlborough and Ulley CAs are outlined as moderate adverse and minor adverse significant effects, but with the embedded mitigation in place these are determined as not significant residual effects on the setting of the CAs in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]**.
	5.9.36 Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the Secretary of State should not take its deteriorated state into account in any decision.	There are no Heritage Assets identified in the Study Area where evidence was found of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, the asset.
	5.9.37 When considering applications for development affecting the setting of a designated heritage asset, the Secretary of State should give appropriate weight to the desirability of preserving the setting of such assets and treat favourably applications that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to, or better reveal the significance of, the asset. When considering applications that do not do this, the Secretary of State should give great weight to any negative effects, when	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** provides an assessment of the Proposed Development's impact on the historic environment, both above and below ground assets, within the Order limits, or that will be impacted by the Proposed Development. The chapter describes the Heritage Assets within

	weighing them against the wider benefits of the application. The greater the negative impact on the significance of the designated heritage asset, the greater the benefits that will be needed to justify approval.	the Study Area for the Proposed Development and their significance, and the significance of their contribution to the Setting. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** concludes that, with embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant residual adverse heritage related effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. The embedded mitigation measures are documented within **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**, **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]**, and the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and are secured via requirements of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
Part 5.10 - Landscape and Visual ***Applicant Assessment***	5.10.5 Virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will have adverse effects on the landscape, but there may also be beneficial landscape character impacts arising from mitigation.	The landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development are presented in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7].**
	5.10.6 Projects need to be designed carefully, taking account of the potential impact on the landscape. Having regard to siting, operational and other relevant constraints the aim should be to minimise harm to the landscape, providing reasonable mitigation where possible and appropriate.	The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** provides a detailed account as to how the Proposed Development delivers good design. It describes the existing landscape context both at the national and local scale and sets out a series of design principles that have informed the design of the Proposed Development in order to retain existing landscape features, minimise impact on landscape character and enhance the existing landscape framework. It also explains how the design of the Proposed Development has sought to minimise visual impact by careful siting of project components and through the introduction of new planting.
	5.10.7 National Parks, the Broads and National Landscapes have been confirmed by the government as having the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and natural beauty. Each of these designated areas has specific statutory purposes. Projects should be designed sensitively given the various siting, operational, and other relevant constraints. For development proposals located within designated landscapes the Secretary of State should be satisfied that measures which seek to further purposes of the designation are sufficient, appropriate and proportionate to the type and scale of the development.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]** explains that no part of the Site or its immediately surrounding context falls within a statutorily designated landscape. On this basis, both National Parks and National Landscapes are scoped out of assessment, which is explained further in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.3 Landscape Character Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**.
	5.10.12 Outside nationally designated areas, there are landscapes that may be highly valued locally. Where a local development document in England or a local development plan in Wales has policies based on landscape or waterscape character assessment, these should be paid particular attention. However, locally valued landscapes should not be used in themselves to refuse consent, as this may unduly restrict acceptable development.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]** confirms that there are no local statutory landscape designations within the Site and as such, this has been scoped out of the ES. Local non-statutory landscape designations have been considered within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.3: Landscape Character Baseline and Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20].**
	5.10.13 All proposed energy infrastructure is likely to have visual effects for many receptors around proposed sites. 5.10.14 The Secretary of State will have to judge whether the visual effects on sensitive receptors, such as local residents, and other receptors, such as visitors to the local area, outweigh the benefits of the project.	The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has undertaken an assessment of effects on Landscape and Visual Receptors which is set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.3: Landscape Character Baseline Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Representative Viewpoint Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20].** While the NPS recognises that there will be visual effects for many receptors, a range of mitigation and enhancement measures have been incorporated into the design of the

		Proposed Development as described in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7].** Such measures include planting, siting of components and inclusion of offsets from sensitive receptors. The Proposed Development is considered acceptable in terms of overall landscape, visual and residential amenity impacts and the nature of the visual impacts are not considered to outweigh the benefits of the Proposed Development, including the delivery of a significant level of low carbon energy generation.
Applicant assessment	5.10.16 The applicant should carry out a landscape and visual impact assessment and report it in the ES, including cumulative effects (see Section 4.3). Several guides have been produced to assist in addressing landscape issues.	A landscape and visual impact assessment is included within **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7].** The assessment takes into account relevant local and national policies and guidance including Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA3) by the Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment. It also includes references to local and national landscape character assessments and associated studies as a means of assessing landscape impacts. Section 7.9 of Chapter 7 addresses the potential cumulative Landscape and Visual effects of the Proposed Development.
	5.10.17 The landscape and visual assessment should include reference to any landscape character assessment and associated studies as a means of assessing landscape impacts relevant to the proposed project. The applicant's assessment should also take account of any relevant policies based on these assessments in local development documents in England and local development plans in Wales.	
	5.10.19 The applicant should consider landscape and visual matters in the early stages of siting and design, where site choices and design principles are being established. This will allow the applicant to demonstrate in the ES how negative effects have been minimised and opportunities for creating positive benefits or enhancement have been recognised and incorporated into the design, delivery and operation of the Proposed Development.	The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** sets out the design evolution of the Proposed Development including how the proposed embedded mitigation measures to minimise landscape and visual impact evolved throughout the pre-application phase, responding to feedback received from statutory consultees, local communities and technical requirements. Mitigation embedded into the Proposed Development design is outlined in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]** and the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13].** **Appendix 1 - Site Selection Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** describes the site assessment process alongside the consideration of alternatives which was undertaken by the Applicant. The site selection assessment considered landscape and visual matters when setting the Order Limits and siting the proposed infrastructure for the Proposed Development. These matters were considered early in the design process which reduced adverse landscape and visual effects from the outset.
	5.10.20 The assessment should include the effects on landscape components and character (including key characteristics) during construction and operation. For projects which may affect a National Park, The Broads or a National Landscape the assessment should include effects on the natural beauty and special qualities of these areas.	A landscape and visual impact assessment is included within **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7].** The assessment considers impacts of the Proposed Development on character visual receptors, landscape fabric and designations during construction, operation and decommissioning.
	5.10.21 The assessment should include the visibility and conspicuousness of the project during construction and of the presence and operation of the project and potential impacts on views and visual amenity. This should include light pollution effects, including on dark skies, local amenity and nature conservation.	
	5.10.22 The assessment should also address the landscape and visual effects of light pollution and other emissions (see Section 5.2 and Section 5.7), from construction and	

	operational activities on residential amenity and on sensitive locations, receptors and views, and how these will be minimised.	
	5.10.24 Applicants should consider how landscapes can be enhanced using landscape management plans, as this will help to enhance environmental assets where they contribute to landscape and townscape quality.	Confirmed mitigation measures and detailed enhancement measures are included in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13].** The Proposed Development includes management of existing planting, new native planting, hedgerow enhancement, and planting of suitable seed mixes. The DCO will secure a detailed LEMP based on the oLEMP which would be implemented, and this would cover the establishment and long-term management of all new structural planting as well as other habitats.
	5.10.25 In considering visual effects it may be helpful for applicants to draw attention, in the supporting evidence to their applications, to any examples of existing permitted infrastructure they are aware of with a similar magnitude of impact on equally sensitive receptors. This may assist the Secretary of State in judging the weight they should give to the assessed visual impacts of the proposed development.	The potential cumulative Landscape and Visual effects of the Proposed Development are set out in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]** and within **ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN0110020/APP/6.17].** The CEA considers inter-cumulative effects that may arise from other existing and, or approved developments within reasonable proximity of the Proposed Development, which individually might not be significant, but when considered together could create a significant cumulative effect on a shared receptor. The assessment concludes that no significant direct cumulative effects are identified during construction or operation with respect to landscape character. Furthermore, the assessment identified that there would be likely to be no significant adverse cumulative effects on views and visual amenity at either construction phase or during operation.
Mitigation	5.10.26 Reducing the scale of a project can help to mitigate the visual and landscape effects of a proposed project. However, reducing the scale or otherwise amending the design of a proposed energy infrastructure project may result in a significant operational constraint and reduction in function – for example, electricity generation output. There may, however, be exceptional circumstances, where mitigation could have a very significant benefit and warrant a small reduction in function. In these circumstances, the Secretary of State may decide that the benefits of the mitigation to reduce the landscape and/or visual effects outweigh the marginal loss of function.	Landscape and visual effects, and how these could best be avoided, has been a consideration throughout the design evolution of the Proposed Development. As set out in **Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]**, potential visual and landscape effects were a key consideration in the initial selection of the Order Limits. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]** provides an account of the alternatives that have been studied by the Applicant, once the Site was chosen, in developing the siting and design of the Proposed Development. It sets out the main reasons for the Applicant's choices, including for the site layout and the scale of the Proposed Development, taking into account environmental, social and economic effects as well as technical and commercial feasibility. The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** additionally provides a detailed account of the approach to design, taking into account the existing landscape context and any technical constraints relating to the construction and operation of the required infrastructure. It also details the changes made to avoid and minimise impact on sensitive receptors throughout the design process including the removal of solar panels in certain areas of the Order Limits and provision of additional offsets.
	5.10.27 Adverse landscape and visual effects may be minimised through appropriate siting of infrastructure within its development site and wider setting. The careful consideration of colours and materials will support the delivery of a well-designed Proposed Development, as will sympathetic landscaping and management of its immediate surroundings.	
	5.10.28 Depending on the topography of the surrounding terrain and areas of population it may be appropriate to undertake landscaping off site. For example, filling in gaps in existing tree and hedge lines may mitigate the impact when viewed from a more distant vista.	
Secretary of State decision making	5.10.29 The Secretary of State should take into consideration the level of detailed design which the applicant has provided and is secured in the Development Consent Order, and the extent to which design details are subject to future approvals.	The Applicant wishes to retain flexibility regarding the design detail of certain components of the Proposed Development. The extent of flexibility required is described in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]** and set out in the

	5.10.30 The Secretary of State should be satisfied that local authorities will have sufficient design content secured to ensure future consenting will meet landscape, visual and good design objectives.	**Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** and **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3].** Good design outcomes will be secured in the detailed design of the Proposed Development, in accordance with the ES assessment and via management plans. The relevant management plans are to be certified by the Secretary of State and are listed in Schedule 14 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].** Final versions of the relevant management plans are to be submitted to and approved by relevant local planning authorities prior to commencement of the authorised development. These management plans provide sufficient certainty about the size and scale of the Proposed Development. Adherence to the management plans will secure good design outcomes, uphold the conclusions of the ES and provide for flexibility. A full list of management plans is set out in the **Guide to the Application [EN0110020/APP/1.3].**
	5.10.32 When considering applications for development within National Parks, the Broads and National Landscapes the conservation and enhancement of the landscape and scenic beauty should be given great weight by the Secretary of State in deciding on applications for development consent in these areas. The Secretary of State may grant development consent in these areas in exceptional circumstances. Such development should be demonstrated to be in the public interest and consideration of such applications should include an assessment of: • The need for the development, including in terms of national considerations, and the impact of consenting or not consenting it upon the local economy; • The cost of, and scope for, developing all or part of the development elsewhere outside the designated area or meeting the need for it in some other way, taking account of the policy on alternatives set out in Section 4.3; and • Any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.	As set out in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7],** no part of the Proposed Development or its immediate surrounding context falls within a statutory designated landscape. On this basis, both National Parks and National Landscapes are scoped out of the assessment.
	5.10.34 The duty to seek to further the purposes of nationally designated landscapes also applies when considering applications for projects outside the boundaries of these areas, which may have impacts within them. The aim should be to avoid harming the purposes of designation or to minimise adverse effects on the designation. Such projects should be designed sensitively given the various siting, operational, and other relevant constraints. The fact that a proposed project will be visible from within a designated area should not in itself be a reason for the Secretary of State to refuse consent.	
	5.10.35 The scale of energy projects means that they will often be visible across a very wide area. The Secretary of State should judge whether any adverse impact on the landscape would be so damaging that it is not offset by the benefits (including need) of the project.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]** sets out that there would be the potential for significant adverse landscape and visual effects during construction and operation. The LVIA found that the construction phase would result in significant effects on the host LCA's with Moderate to Major Adverse (Significant) effects on Landscape Character Area (LCA) 8: Central Rotherham Coalfield Farmland and Moderate Adverse (Significant) upon LCA A1: Conisbrough and Denaby Coafield Farmlands. During operation (Year 15) the Proposed Development would result in a Moderate Adverse (Significant) effect upon the
	5.10.36 In reaching a judgement, the Secretary of State should consider whether any adverse impact is temporary, such as during construction, and/or whether any adverse impact on the landscape will be capable of being reversed in a timescale that the Secretary of State considers reasonable.	

		host LCA A1: Coalfield Farmland - Conisbrough to Denaby Coalfield Farmlands and the LCA 8: Central Rotherham Coalfield Farmland. With respect to visual effects, during construction there would be Major / Moderate to Major (Significant) Effects upon Viewpoints 4, 35, 37, 39, 40, 44, 47, 48, 59, and 60. There would also be a Moderate Adverse (Significant) Effect upon Viewpoints 1, 5, 16, and 39. The Year 15 assessment found that there would be Major / Moderate to Major Adverse (Significant) Effects upon Viewpoints 4, 35, 40, 44, and 47 and Moderate Adverse (Significant) Effects upon Viewpoints 1, 5, and 44. Notwithstanding the potential effects, the Applicant considers that the wider benefits of the Proposed Development, including the delivery of a significant level of low carbon energy generation and biodiversity net gain outweigh the identified adverse landscape and visual effects, with the Proposed Development assessed as being acceptable in terms of overall landscape, visual and residential amenity impacts.
	5.10.37 The Secretary of State should consider whether the project has been designed carefully, taking account of environmental effects on the landscape and siting, operational and other relevant constraints, to minimise harm to the landscape, including by appropriate mitigation.	The Proposed Development has been designed taking into account the environmental effects on the landscape, siting, operational and other relevant constraints, to minimise adverse effects on the landscape, including by appropriate mitigation. This is outlined in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]** and the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13].**
	5.10.38 The Secretary of State should consider whether requirements to the consent are needed requiring the incorporation of particular design details that are in keeping with the statutory and technical requirements for landscape and visual impacts.	The **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]** and **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** will secure the design of the Proposed Development via requirements in the DCO. They will be carried out in line with statutory and technical requirements.
Part 5.11 Land Use, Including Open Space, Green Infrastructure, and Green Belt ***Applicant Assessment***	5.11.8 The ES (see Section 4.3) should identify existing and proposed land uses near the project, any effects of replacing an existing development or use of the site with the proposed project or preventing a development or use on a neighbouring site from continuing. Applicants should also assess any effects of precluding a new development or use proposed in the development plan. The assessment should be proportionate to the scale of the preferred Proposed Development and its likely impacts on such receptors. For developments on previously developed land, the applicant should ensure that they have considered the risk posed by land contamination and how it is proposed to address this.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15]** confirms that the Site includes landholdings for agricultural business. The assessment concludes that the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases will have a minor adverse effect on land use, which is not significant in EIA terms. The surrounding land is predominantly agricultural. The Proposed Development is not considered to impact the continued use of this land for agricultural purposes.
	5.11.9 Applicants will need to consult the local community on their proposals to build on existing open space, sports or recreational buildings and land. Taking account of the consultations, applicants should consider providing new or additional open space including green and blue infrastructure, sport or recreation facilities, to substitute for any losses as a result of their proposal. When considering proposals for green infrastructure, applicants should refer to the Green Infrastructure Framework	The Proposed Development does not impact any open space, sports or recreational buildings or land. The Proposed Development does not involve the loss of playing fields.
	5.11.10 Applicants should use any up-to-date local authority assessment or, if there is none, provide an independent assessment to show whether the existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land is surplus to requirements.	

	5.11.11 During any pre-application discussions with the applicant the LPA should identify any concerns it has about the impacts of the application on land use, having regard to the development plan and relevant applications and including, where relevant, whether it agrees with any independent assessment that the land is surplus to requirements.	Section 9.3 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]**, the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** and the **Consultation Report Appendices [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** set out the discussions between the Applicant and the Local Planning Authorities about land use.
	5.11.12 Applicants should seek to minimise impacts on the best and most versatile agricultural land (defined as land in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification) and preferably use land in areas of poorer quality (grades 3b, 4 and 5).	The Applicant has developed the design of the Proposed Development to minimise the land take of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land, where practicable. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** describes the existing levels and assesses the anticipated soil effects of the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases, in accordance with this policy. Agricultural land quality was a key consideration in the Applicant's site selection process. As set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]**, the Applicant has sought to identify non-BMV agricultural land in its site selection for the Proposed Development. **Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** provides an overview of the site evaluation process, which sets out that the Site's suitability is due to it being located away from key environmental related designations where possible, limited residential receptors, the absence of BMV on the published "provisional" ALC maps, and accessibility from a major highway network. The Applicant has now undertaken a soil classification survey and a subsequent detailed ALC survey, as set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20],** and it is concluded that only 20.1% of the Site is BMV (ALC grades 1, 2, and 3a). The Proposed Development is mostly temporary and reversible in nature and therefore will have a low magnitude affect on the long-term agricultural resource. When the operational phase ends, the Solar PV Site would be decommissioned and the land returned to its original use and condition as far as practicable and returned to the landowner. The decommissioning measures are set out in the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** and secured by a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The design of Solar PV Sites allows some farming practices to continue during the operation of the Proposed Development, such as sheep grazing. Therefore, whilst land would not be available for crop production, there may be an opportunity to limit the effects on agricultural production during the Proposed Development's lifetime through other forms of agricultural practice. Mitigation is proposed as set out in the **Outline Soil Management Plan (oSMP)** which is included in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** to reduce the effects on soils as a result of the proposed Development. The construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Proposed Development is not anticipated to have any significant residual effects on soil resources. Further details are provided in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** and **ES Volume 2, Chapter 18: Summary of Significant Effects [EN0110020/APP/6.18]**. The benefits of the Proposed Development justify the limited inclusion of BMV land, namely the Proposed Development's contribution to meeting the established and urgent need for renewable energy infrastructure such as solar, which has been identified as a critical national priority in NPS EN-1 Part 4.2 and the other wider economic and environmental benefits set out in Section 4 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]**.

		Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment [EN0110020/APP/5.4] of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** outlines that the Applicant considered factors, including but not limited to the site area, topography, access, and the absence of designations, when determining the suitability of the available land. The Applicant concluded that the land found was suitable.
	5.11.13 Applicants should also identify any effects and seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and improve soil quality taking into account any mitigation measures proposed.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** concludes that with embedded and additional mitigation measures in place, there would be no significant effects on ground conditions and land quality as a result of the Proposed Development. Section 9.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** sets out the following embedded mitigation, outlined within the outline SMP (which is provided as part of the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and secured by requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1])**, during each phase of the lifetime of the Proposed Development to minimise damage to soil structure: Construction Phase • Wherever possible, areas designated for landscaping, through enhancement and BNG, should remain undisturbed and be clearly fenced off from active work zones to protect soil quality; • Appropriate management of managing vehicle and machinery movements and soil disturbance activities, including undertaking 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; • Temporary placement of material into windrows if it is not possible to strip topsoil when it is below the plastic limit. Once it has dried sufficiently, it can then be lifted and placed into its final position; • Storage of stripped soils in designated bunds, ideally located near their intended area of reuse and sited outside of floodplains. The bunds should be a maximum of 3 m in height and in place for the least amount of time practicable in order to minimise damage to the soil or site. All bunds which will be in place for more than 6 months should be sown with a low maintenance grass seed mix; • Restoration of soils in areas of temporary disturbance to the pre-existing condition, as far as reasonably practicable. Restoration activities should begin at the furthest point from each site exit to ensure that reinstated soils are not compacted by subsequent earth-moving machinery. Upon completion soil structure should be stabilised and a vigorous, well-rooted crop should be established to maximise the likelihood of successful and sustainable restoration; • Reinstatement of soil should be monitored by a suitably qualified and competent person, such as an ECoW or Geotechnical Engineer; and

		• Permanent post-construction drainage may be required as part of land reinstatement. Any existing drainage systems damaged during the works will be repaired or replaced to ensure continued functionality. Where existing drains are cut or disrupted by construction activities, they should be diverted into local drainage traps to minimise sediment release and maintain effective water management. Operation and Maintenance phase • Measures to maintain land quality throughout the operational phase of the Proposed Development, which will be outlined and secured through implementation of the operational phase of the SMP. The SMP will identify areas within the Site that may be more vulnerable to damage (such as steep slopes), as well as conditions under which soil handling would be inappropriate (for example, when the soil is wet or following periods of heavy rainfall or strong winds). It will also set out best practice soil management measures aimed at preserving the physical properties of the soil, ensuring the land retains its capacity to support its intended function throughout the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development; • Maintenance works will be subject to appropriate method statements, detailing, amongst things, use of PPE, management of (unexpected) contamination, soil management and polluting substance storage and handling; and • Although potential impacts on soils during the operational phase are expected to be minimal, good practice will be applied to ensure that any activities, such as the maintenance and management of land beneath the solar PV modules, are carried out in a way that avoids damage and encourages regeneration of the soil resource, as far as reasonably practicable. These measures will also contribute to BNG by supporting soil health and enhancing habitat quality across the Site. Decommissioning • The measures for the Construction phase also apply to the Decommissioning phase.
	5.11.14 Applicants are encouraged to develop and implement a Soil Management Plan which could help minimise potential land contamination. The sustainable reuse of soils needs to be carefully considered in line with good practice guidance where large quantities of soils are surplus to requirements or are affected by contamination.	Section 9.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** includes an outline SMP which is provided as part of the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, this includes: • Details of relevant guidance relating to soil resources and their management • Relevant background information, including climate, geology, altitude, topography, soil type and land use, and descriptions of the soil resources identified in the survey work undertaken across the Proposed Development • Appropriate soils handling methods for stripping, stockpiling and reinstatement of soils; and • Monitoring procedures

		The objective of the outline SMP is to identify the importance and sensitivity of the soil resource and to provide specific guidance to ensure that there is no significant adverse effect on the soil resource as a result of the Proposed Development
	5.11.17 Applicants should ensure that a site is suitable for its proposed use, taking account of ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability and contamination.	**ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]** outlines the suitability of the land for solar development, due to it being located away from key environmental related designations where possible, limited residential receptors, the absence of BMV on the published "provisional" ALC maps, and accessibility from a major highway network. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** concludes that there are no identified risks associated with land instability and contamination as a result of former activities.
	5.11.19 Applicants should safeguard any mineral resources on the proposed site as far as possible, taking into account the long-term potential of the land use after any future decommissioning has taken place.	Section 9.5 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** notes that the entire administrative areas of RMBC and CDC are classified as an MSA for coal, fireclay and brick clay. However, based on the district-wide designation and the very low likelihood of coal resources being exploited, it is not assed further herein. While there is some overlap with a Magnesian Limestone MSA and a sand and gravel MSA, the effects are considered negligible.
Mitigation	5.11.23 Although in the case of most energy infrastructure there may be little that can be done to mitigate the direct effects of an energy project on the existing use of the proposed site (assuming that some of that use can still be retained post project construction) applicants should nevertheless seek to minimise these effects and the effects on existing or planned uses near the site by the application of good design principles, including the layout of the project and the protection of soils during construction.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15]** confirms that the Site includes landholdings for agricultural business. The assessment concludes that the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases will have a minor adverse effect on land use, which is not significant in EIA terms. The surrounding land is predominantly agricultural. The Proposed Development is not considered to impact the continued use of this land for agricultural purposes. The Applicant has developed the design of the Proposed Development to minimise the land take of BMV land, where practicable. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** describes the existing levels and assesses the anticipated soil effects of the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases, in accordance with this policy. Section 9.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** sets out the following embedded mitigation, outlined within the outline SMP (which is provided as part of the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and secured by a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1])**, during each phase of the lifetime of the Proposed Development to minimise damage to soil structure: Construction Phase • Wherever possible, areas designated for landscaping, through enhancement and BNG, should remain undisturbed and be clearly fenced off from active work zones to protect soil quality; • Appropriate management of managing vehicle and machinery movements and soil disturbance activities, including undertaking 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; • Temporary placement of material into windrows if it is not possible to strip topsoil when it is below the plastic limit. Once it has dried sufficiently, it can then be lifted and placed into its final position; • Storage of stripped soils in designated bunds, ideally located near their intended area of reuse and sited outside of floodplains. The bunds should be a maximum of 3 m in height and in place for the least amount of time practicable in order to minimise damage to the soil or site. All bunds which will be in place for more than 6 months should be sown with a low maintenance grass seed mix; • Restoration of soils in areas of temporary disturbance to the pre-existing condition, as far as reasonably practicable. Restoration activities should begin at the furthest point from each site exit to ensure that reinstated soils are not compacted by subsequent earth-moving machinery. Upon completion soil structure should be stabilised and a vigorous, well-rooted crop should be established to maximise the likelihood of successful and sustainable restoration; • Reinstatement of soil should be monitored by a suitably qualified and competent person, such as an ECoW or Geotechnical Engineer; and • Permanent post-construction drainage may be required as part of land reinstatement. Any existing drainage systems damaged during the works will be repaired or replaced to ensure continued functionality. Where existing drains are cut or disrupted by construction activities, they should be diverted into local drainage traps to minimise sediment release and maintain effective water management. Operation and Maintenance phase • Measures to maintain land quality throughout the operational phase of the Proposed Development, which will be outlined and secured through implementation of the operational phase of the SMP. The SMP will identify areas within the Site that may be more vulnerable to damage (such as steep slopes), as well as conditions under which soil handling would be inappropriate (for example, when the soil is wet or following periods of heavy rainfall or strong winds). It will also set out best practice soil management measures aimed at preserving the physical properties of the soil, ensuring the land retains its capacity to support its intended function throughout the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development; • Maintenance works will be subject to appropriate method statements, detailing, amongst things, use of PPE, management of (unexpected) contamination, soil management and polluting substance storage and handling; and • Although potential impacts on soils during the operational phase are expected to be minimal, good practice will be applied to ensure that any activities, such as the maintenance and management of land beneath the solar PV modules, are

		carried out in a way that avoids damage and encourages regeneration of the soil resource, as far as reasonably practicable. These measures will also contribute to BNG by supporting soil health and enhancing habitat quality across the Site. Decommissioning • The measures for the Construction phase also apply to the Decommissioning phase. The Proposed Development is mostly temporary and reversible in nature and therefore will have a low magnitude affect the long-term agricultural resource. When the operational phase ends, the Solar PV Site would be decommissioned and the land returned to its original use and condition as far as practicable and returned to the landowner. The decommissioning measures are set out in the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** and secured by a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
	5.11.24 Where green infrastructure is affected, the Secretary of State should consider imposing requirements to ensure the functionality and connectivity of the green infrastructure network is maintained in the vicinity of the development and that any necessary works are undertaken, where possible, to mitigate any adverse impact and, where appropriate, to improve that network and other areas of open space including appropriate access to National Trails and other public rights of way and new coastal access routes.	The **oPROWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** outlines the mitigation measures proposed to protect green infrastructure and its users during necessary works: • Provision of banksmen to hold vehicles when PRoW users are present, and to advise PRoW users of potential vehicle movements • Wider access tracks to create more room for PRoW users when vehicles pass them • Drivers will stop and give-way to any PRoW user that they encounter • Appropriate signage will be installed to make PRoW users aware of construction activity The **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** notes the creation of 14.58km of permissive paths throughout the Order Limits to provide new connections to extend options and routes for pedestrians, equestrians and cyclists. Landscape and ecological enhancements and mitigation measures are included within the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**.
	5.11.27 Existing trees and woodlands should be retained wherever possible. Under the Environment Act 2021 the government set a legally binding target to increase the tree canopy and woodland cover to 16.5% of total land area of England by 2050. The Environmental Improvement Plan recognises the need to protect and increase tree canopy and woodland covers. The applicant should assess the impacts on, and loss of, all trees and woodlands within the project boundary and develop mitigation measures to minimise adverse impacts and any risk of net deforestation as a result of the Proposed Development. Mitigation may include, but is not limited to, the use of buffers to enhance resilience, improvements to connectivity, and improved woodland management. Where woodland loss is unavoidable, compensation Proposed Developments will be required, and the long-term management and maintenance of newly planted trees should be secured. Where possible, projects should include the reuse of materials and use of sustainable materials such as timber, or recycled materials.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]**, sets out that the design of the Proposed Development has evolved to avoid impacts and effects on ecology and biodiversity as far as practicable. The Proposed Development incorporates a number of enhancements resulting in a number of significant beneficial effects, including (but not limited to) long-term beneficial effects at the local level in relation to hedgerow and woodland habitats, as a result of the proposed hedgerow, woodland and tree planting set out in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**.

	5.11.28 Where a proposed development has an impact upon a Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA), the Secretary of State should ensure that appropriate mitigation measures have been put in place to safeguard mineral resources. 5.11.29 Where a project has a sterilising effect on land use (for example in some cases under transmission lines) there may be scope for this to be mitigated through, for example, using or incorporating the land for nature conservation or wildlife corridors or for parking and storage in employment areas.	Section 9.5 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** notes that the entire administrative areas of RMBC and CDC are classified as an MSA for coal, fireclay and brick clay. However, based on the district-wide designation and the very low likelihood of coal resources being exploited, it is not assed further herein. While there is some overlap with a Magnesian Limestone MSA and a sand and gravel MSA, the effects are considered negligible.
	5.11.30 Public Rights of way, National Trails, and other rights of access to land are important recreational facilities for example for walkers, cyclists and horse riders. The Secretary of State should expect applicants to take appropriate mitigation measures to address adverse effects on coastal access, National Trails, other rights of way and open access land and, where appropriate, to consider what opportunities there may be to improve or create new access. In considering revisions to an existing right of way, consideration should be given to the use, character, attractiveness, and convenience of the right of way.	The **oPROWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** outlines the mitigation measures proposed to protect green infrastructure and its users during necessary works: • Provision of banksmen to hold vehicles when PRoW users are present, and to advise PRoW users of potential vehicle movements • Wider access tracks to create more room for PRoW users when vehicles pass them • Drivers will stop and give-way to any PRoW user that they encounter • Appropriate signage will be installed to make PRoW users aware of construction activity The **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** notes the creation of 14.58km of permissive paths throughout the Order Limits to provide new connections to extend options and routes for pedestrians, equestrians and cyclists.
	5.11.31 The Secretary of State should consider whether the mitigation measures put forward by an applicant are acceptable and whether requirements or other provisions in respect of these measures should be included in any grant of development consent.	With the mitigation measures set out in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]**, **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** and **ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15]**, there would be no significant effect on land use across the Proposed Development. The embedded and additional mitigation measures are documented within the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and **oPROWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** and secured via corresponding requirements in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
Secretary of State Decision Making	5.11.34 The Secretary of State should ensure that applicants do not site their Proposed Development on the best and most versatile agricultural land without justification. Where Proposed Developments are to be sited on best and most versatile agricultural land the Secretary of State should take into account the economic and other benefits of that land. Where development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality.	As set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]**, the Applicant has sought to identify non-BMV agricultural land in its site selection for the Proposed Development. **Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** provides an overview of the site evaluation process, which sets out that the Site's suitability is due to it being located away from key environmental related designations where possible, limited residential receptors, the absence of BMV on the published "provisional" ALC maps, and accessibility from a major highway network. The Applicant has now undertaken a soil classification survey and a subsequent detailed ALC survey, as set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20],** and it is concluded that only 20.1% of the Site is BMV (ALC grades 1, 2, and 3a). The Proposed Development is mostly temporary and reversible in nature and therefore will have a low magnitude affect the long-term agricultural resource. When the operational phase ends, the Solar PV Site would be decommissioned and the land returned to its original use and condition as far as practicable and returned to the landowner. The

		decommissioning measures are set out in the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** and secured by requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The benefits of the Proposed Development justify the limited inclusion of BMV land, namely the Proposed Development's contribution to meeting the established and urgent need for renewable energy infrastructure such as solar, which has been identified as a critical national priority in NPS EN-1 Part 4.2 and the other wider economic and environmental benefits set out in Section 4 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]**.

Part 5.12 - Noise and Vibration *Applicant Assessment*	5.12.6 Where noise impacts are likely to arise from the proposed development, the applicant should include the following in the noise assessment:
	
	• A description of the noise generating aspects of the development proposal leading to noise impacts, including the identification of any distinctive tonal characteristics, if the noise is impulsive, whether the noise contains particular high or low frequency content or any temporal characteristics of the noise;
	
	• Identification of noise sensitive receptors and noise sensitive areas that may be affected;
	
	• The characteristics of the existing noise environment;
	
	• A prediction of how the noise environment will change with the proposed development;
	
	  o In the shorter term, such as during the construction period;
	
	  o In the longer term, during the operating life of the infrastructure; and
	
	  o At particular times of the day, evening and night (and weekends) as appropriate, and at different times of year.
	
	• An assessment of the effect of predicted changes in the noise environment on any noise-sensitive receptors, including an assessment of any likely impact on health and quality of life / wellbeing where appropriate, particularly among those disadvantaged by other factors who are often disproportionately affected by noise-sensitive areas;
	
	• If likely to cause disturbance, an assessment of the effect of underwater or subterranean noise; and
	
	• All reasonable steps taken to mitigate and minimise potential adverse effects on health and quality of life.
		ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14] presents a noise assessment in accordance with the requirements of this policy, including a description of the noise generating aspects of the Proposed Development.
		
		Table 14.2-1 of **ES Volume 3, Appendix 14.2: Baseline Conditions [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and on **ES Volume 3, Figures 14.1 – 14.3: Noise Monitoring Locations [EN0110020/APP/6.19]** sets out the representative noise assessment locations (AL001 to AL146) identified to represent highly noise sensitive receptors within the Study Areas.
		
		Section 14.5 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]** describes the existing characteristics of the noise environment for the Proposed Development and surrounding areas.
		
		Section 14.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]** describes the embedded design mitigation relevant to the Proposed Development with respect to noise and vibration, encompassing the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases.
		
		Section 14.7 and 14.8 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]** assess the noise and vibration effects and residual effects, respectively, on receptors arising from the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development at particular times of the day and at night on the noise environment.
		
		ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14] concludes that, with embedded mitigation measures in place, the Proposed Development, together with the cumulative Proposed Developments assessed, the effects from noise and vibration are not considered to be negligible or minor and are therefore not significant.

	5.12.7 The nature and extent of the noise assessment should be proportionate to the likely noise impact.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]** presents a noise assessment in accordance with the requirements of this policy, including a description of the noise generating aspects of the Proposed Development. The noise assessment is proportionate to the likely noise impact. Following the implementation of embedded mitigation measures, no significant residual effects are anticipated on any noise sensitive receptors.

	5.12.8 Applicants should consider the noise impact of ancillary activities associated with the development, such as increased road and rail traffic movements, or other forms of transportation.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]** considers the noise impact of ancillary activities associated with the Proposed Development, such as increased road and rail traffic movements, or other forms of transportation. It concludes that with the implementation of mitigation measures, significant adverse noise and vibration effects during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Proposed Development will be avoided at sensitive receptors. The embedded mitigation measures are documented within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**, and the **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** and are secured via requirements in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
	5.12.9 Operational noise, with respect to human receptors, should be assessed using the principles of the relevant British Standards and other guidance. Further information on assessment of particular noise sources may be contained in the technology specific NPSs. In particular, for renewables (EN-3) and electricity networks (EN-5) there is assessment guidance for specific features of those technologies. For the prediction, assessment and management of construction noise, reference should be made to any relevant British Standards and other guidance which also give examples of mitigation strategies.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]** assesses operational noise at the identified sensitive noise receptors following BS 4142 guidance, BS 8233:2014 and World Health Organisation guidance. Construction and decommissioning noise and vibration impacts have been assessed per Annex E of British Standards 5228-1.
	5.12.10 Some noise impacts will be controlled through environmental permits and parallel tracking is encouraged where noise impacts determined by an environmental permit interface with planning issues (i.e. physical design and location of development). The applicant should consult the EA and / or the SNCB, and other relevant bodies, such the MMO or NRW, as necessary, and in particular regarding assessment of noise on protected species or other wildlife. The results of any noise surveys and predictions may inform the ecological assessment. The seasonality of potentially affected species in nearby sites may also need to be considered.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]** presents a noise assessment in accordance with the requirements of this policy, including a description of the noise generating aspects of the Proposed Development. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]** considers the noise impact of the Proposed Development. It concludes that with the implementation of mitigation measures, significant adverse noise and vibration effects during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Proposed Development will be avoided at sensitive receptors. The embedded mitigation measures are documented within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**, and the **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** and are secured via requirements in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. Residual noise and vibration effects from construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning activities on highly sensitive residential receptors would reduce to a low or negligible magnitude of impact in all cases, which is associated with short term Minor Adverse effects at most, which is not significant in EIA terms. Section 14.9 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]** presents an assessment of cumulative effects between the Proposed Development and other existing and/or approved developments on noise and vibration. The cumulative effect assessment finds that the Proposed Development, cumulatively with the other developments identified, would be not significant in EIA terms. In accordance with NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.12.12, mitigation has been incorporated to minimise potential adverse effects on health and quality of life. Mitigation measures are summarised in Section 14.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]**.
	5.12.12 Applicants should submit a detailed impact assessment and mitigation plan as part of any development plan, including the use of noise mitigation and noise abatement technologies during construction and operation.	

Mitigation	5.12.13 The Secretary of State should consider whether mitigation measures are needed both for operational and construction noise over and above any which may form part of the project application. In doing so the Secretary of State may wish to impose mitigation measures. Any such mitigation measures should take account of the NPPF or any successor to it and the Planning Practice Guidance on Noise.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]** considers the noise impact of the Proposed Development. It concludes that with the implementation of mitigation measures, significant adverse noise and vibration effects during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Proposed Development will be avoided at sensitive receptors. The embedded mitigation measures are documented within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**, and the **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** and are secured via requirements of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. Residual noise and vibration effects from construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning activities on highly sensitive residential receptors would reduce to a low or negligible magnitude of impact in all cases, which is associated with short term Minor Adverse effects at most, which is not significant in EIA terms. These mitigation measures included within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**, and the **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** have been taken into account in accordance with the NPPF and the PPG on Noise.
	5.12.14 Mitigation measures may include one or more of the following: • Engineering: reducing the noise generated at source and/or containing the noise generated; • Lay-out: where possible, optimising the distance between the source and noise-sensitive receptors and/or incorporating good design to minimise noise transmission through the use of screening by natural or purpose-built barriers, or other buildings; • Administrative: using planning conditions/obligations to restrict activities allowed on the site at certain times and/or specifying permissible noise limits/noise levels, differentiating as appropriate between different times of day, such as evenings and late at night, and taking into account seasonality of wildlife in nearby designated sites; and • Insulation: mitigating the impact on areas likely to be affected by noise including through noise insulation when the impact is on a building.	
	5.12.15 The project should demonstrate good design through selection of the quietest or most acceptable cost-effective plant available; containment of noise within buildings wherever possible, taking into account any other adverse impacts that such containment might cause (e.g. on landscape and visual impacts; optimisation of plant layout to minimise noise emissions; and, where possible, the use of landscaping, bunds or noise barriers to reduce noise transmission).	In compliance with Paragraph 5.12.15 of NPS EN-1, the Scheme has sought to design in the quietest and most acceptable cost-effective plant. For example, **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]** outlines design features such as PCS and BESS being designed to ensure a low night time noise rating level. Embedded mitigation measures are secured through the **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**.
	5.12.16 A development must be undertaken in accordance with statutory requirements for noise. Due regard must be given to the relevant sections of the Noise Policy Statement for England, the NPPF, and the government's associated planning guidance on noise. In Wales the relevant policy will be PPW and the TANs, as well as the Welsh Government's Noise and Soundscape Action Plan.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]** considers relevant sections of the Noise Policy Statement, the NPPF, and the government's associated planning guidance on noise, within its assessment.
Secretary of State decision making	5.12.17 The Secretary of State should not grant development consent unless they are satisfied that the proposals will meet the following aims, through the effective management and control of noise: • Avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise; • Mitigate and minimise other adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise; and • Where possible, contribute to improvements to health and quality of life through the effective management and control of noise.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]** presents a noise assessment in accordance with the requirements of this policy, including a description of the noise generating aspects of the Proposed Development. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]** outlines that there are no significant residual effects associated with construction noise or construction traffic and operation and maintenance. Therefore, there will be no significant effects on human receptors as a result of noise and vibration.

	5.12.18 When preparing the Development Consent Order, the Secretary of State should consider including measurable requirements or specifying the mitigation measures to be put in place to ensure that noise levels do not exceed any limits specified in the development consent. These requirements or mitigation measures may apply to the construction, operation, and decommissioning of the energy infrastructure development.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]** considers the noise impact of the Proposed Development. It concludes that with the implementation of mitigation measures, significant adverse noise and vibration effects during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Proposed Development will be avoided at sensitive receptors. The embedded mitigation measures are documented within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**, and the **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** and are secured via requirements in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. Residual noise and vibration effects from construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning activities on highly sensitive residential receptors would reduce to a low or negligible magnitude of impact in all cases, which is associated with short term Minor Adverse effects at most, which is not significant in EIA terms. Section 14.8 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]** outlines that no additional construction, operation and maintenance, or decommissioning of the Proposed Development. Section 14.9 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]** presents an assessment of cumulative effects between the Proposed Development and other existing and/or approved developments on noise and vibration. The cumulative effect assessment finds that the Proposed Development, cumulatively with the other developments identified, would be not significant in EIA terms.
Part 5.13 - Socio-economic ***Applicant Assessment***	5.13.2 Where the project is likely to have socio-economic impacts at local or regional levels, the applicant should undertake and include in their application an assessment of these impacts as part of the ES (see Section 4.3).	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15]** describes the baseline levels and assesses the anticipated socio-economic effects of the Proposed Development's construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning in accordance with this policy.
	5.13.3 The applicant is strongly encouraged to engage with relevant local authorities during early stages of project development so that the applicant can gain a better understanding of local or regional issues and opportunities.	The Applicant has engaged with the LPAs on socio-economic matters, to better understand the socio-economic fabric of the area to assist the preparation of both the **ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15]** and also the **oSSCMP [EN0110020/APP/5.18]**. Details on the feedback received from the statutory consultation, including the response to each matter raised and how it has been addressed, are provided in the **Consultation Report Appendices [EN0110020/APP/5.1]**.
	5.13.4 The applicant's assessment should consider all relevant socioeconomic impacts, which may include: • The creation of jobs and training opportunities. Applicants may wish to provide information on the sustainability of the jobs created, including where they will help to develop the skills needed for the UK's transition to Net Zero; • The contribution to the development of low-carbon industries at the local and regional level as well as nationally; • The provision of additional local services and improvements to local infrastructure, including the provision of educational and visitor facilities;	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15]** describes the baseline levels and assesses the anticipated socio-economic effects of the Proposed Development's construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning in accordance with this policy. In order to assess the likely effects, **ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15]** provides an estimate of likely employment generation for each phase of the Proposed Development. During the construction phase, the Proposed Development is expected to support 1,616 jobs with 538 of those being within the local Study Area (the local administrative areas of CDC and RMBC). During the Operational Phase of the Proposed Development, there will also be periods of maintenance requiring temporary workers. Table 15-28 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 15:**

	• Any indirect beneficial impacts for the region hosting the infrastructure, in particular in relation to use of local support services and supply chains; • Effects (positive and negative) on tourism and other users of the area impacted; • The impact of a changing influx of workers during the different construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the energy infrastructure. This could change the local population dynamics and could alter the demand for services and facilities in the settlements nearest to the construction work (including community facilities and physical infrastructure such as energy, water, transport and waste). There could also be effects on social cohesion depending on how populations and service provision change as a result of the development; and • Cumulative effects - if development consent were to be granted for a number of projects within a region and these were developed in a similar timeframe, there could be some short-term negative effects, for example a potential shortage of construction workers to meet the needs of other industries and major projects within the region.	**Socio-Economics and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15]** notes that there will 39 operational jobs associated with the Proposed Development, with 15 of these being local jobs. The Decommissioning Phase is expected to start in 2089 and is assumed to support a lower number of direct, indirect, induced and local jobs than the Construction Phase. Section 15.5 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15]** describes the existing levels and assesses the anticipated cumulative socio-economic effects of the Scheme's construction, operational, and decommissioning, in accordance with this policy. Section 15.10 concludes that there will be a negligible effect as a result of the Proposed Development's construction, operational and decommissioning phases.
	5.13.5 Applicants should describe the existing socio-economic conditions in the areas surrounding the proposed development and should also refer to how the development's socio-economic impacts correlate with local planning policies.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15]** describes the baseline levels and assesses the anticipated socio-economic effects of the Proposed Development's construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning phases within the Study Area. The Proposed Development's compliance with local policies is considered in Tables 6 to 8 of the **Policy Compliance Document [EN0110020/APP/5.5]**.
	5.13.6 Socio-economic impacts may be linked to other impacts, for example visual impacts considered in Section 5.10 but may also have an impact on tourism and local businesses. Applicants are encouraged, where possible, to demonstrate that local suppliers have been considered in any supply chain.	The **oSSCMP [EN0110020/APP/5.18]** sets out the Applicant's plan to actively promote work opportunities for businesses in order to deliver local benefits. The Proposed Development will support a range of supply chain opportunities to local businesses. It is expected that the Proposed Development will utilise the local supply chain to source materials and components, foster partnerships among suppliers, manufacturers, and distributors, and, as such, stimulate economic activity within the local area.
	5.13.7 Applicants should consider developing accommodation strategies where appropriate, especially during construction and decommissioning phases, that would include the need to provide temporary accommodation for construction workers if required.	
Mitigation	5.13.8 The Secretary of State should consider whether mitigation measures are necessary to mitigate any adverse socio-economic impacts of the development. For example, high quality design can improve the visual and environmental experience for visitors and the local community alike.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15]** concludes that with embedded and additional mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse socio-economic related effects expected across the Scheme's construction, operational and decommissioning phases. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15]** concludes that with embedded and additional mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse effects relating to socio-economic across the operational and maintenance phase. However, during there is a moderate adverse residual impact on BMV land as a result of the Proposed Development being constructed on BMV

		land and therefore changing availability of this land for arable use. This effect is mitigated and not present during the operational and maintenance phase of development.
Secretary of State decision making	5.13.9 The Secretary of State should have regard to the potential socioeconomic impacts of new energy infrastructure identified by the applicant and from any other sources that the Secretary of State considers to be both relevant and important to its decision.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15]** concludes that with embedded and additional mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse socio-economic related effects expected across the Scheme's construction, operational and decommissioning phases.
	5.13.10 The Secretary of State may conclude that limited weight is to be given to assertions of socio-economic impacts that are not supported by evidence (particularly in view of the need for energy infrastructure as set out in this NPS).	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15]** concludes that with embedded and additional mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse effects relating to socio-economic across the operational and maintenance phase. However, during there is a moderate adverse residual impact on BMV land as a result of the Proposed Development being constructed on BMV land and therefore changing availability of this land for arable use. The residual effects outlined in the **ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15]** rely on controls established within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oSSCMP [EN0110020/APP/5.17], oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]** and the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** and are secured via requirements in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
	5.13.11 The Secretary of State should consider any relevant positive provisions the applicant has made or is proposing to make to mitigate impacts (for example through planning obligations) and any legacy benefits that may arise as well as any options for phasing development in relation to the socio-economic impacts.	The **oSSCMP [EN0110020/APP/5.18]** sets out the Applicant's plan to actively promote work opportunities for businesses in order to deliver local benefits. The Proposed Development will support a range of supply chain opportunities to local businesses. It is expected that the Proposed Development will utilise the local supply chain to source materials and components, foster partnerships among suppliers, manufacturers, and distributors, and, as such, stimulate economic activity within the local area.
	5.13.12 The Secretary of State may wish to include a requirement that specifies the approval by the local authority of an employment and skills plan detailing arrangements to promote local employment and skills development opportunities, including apprenticeships, education, engagement with local schools and colleges and training programmes to be enacted.	
Part 5.14 - Traffic and Transport ***Applicant Assessment***	5.14.5 If a project is likely to have significant transport implications, the applicant's ES (see Section 4.3) should include a vision for transport and an assessment of potential transport impacts.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** concludes that with the embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant residual transport and access-related effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operational and maintenance and decommissioning phases.
	5.14.6 The DfT's Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG) and Welsh Governments WelTAG provides guidance on modelling and assessing the impacts of transport Proposed Developments.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** both demonstrate that the assessment has been prepared in accordance with the appropriate guidance including the DfT's guidance on Travel Plans, Transport Assessments (TAs) and Statements of Decision Taking (2014).

	5.14.7 National Highways and Highways Authorities are statutory consultees on NSIP applications including energy infrastructure where it is expected to affect the strategic road network and / or have an impact on the local road network. Applicants should consult with National Highways and Highways Authorities as appropriate on the assessment, including any reasonable future tested scenarios and mitigation to inform the application to be submitted.	The Applicant has consulted with the relevant highway authorities, including NH, CDC, RMBC and DCC. Section 13.3 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** sets out the consultation undertaken as part of the Proposed Development for this topic including comments from these stakeholders.
	5.14.8 The applicant should prepare a travel plan adopting a vision-led approach to identify demand management and monitoring and fallback measures that proactively mitigate transport impacts by providing details of proposed measures to improve access by active, public and shared transport to: • Reduce the need for parking associated with the proposal; • Contribute to decarbonisation of the transport network; and • Improve user travel options by offering genuine modal choice.	Section 4.6 of the **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** sets out that a Worker Travel Plan will be developed to manage the arrival and departure profile of workers on Site and to encourage sustainable modes of transport, such as car-sharing. The Worker Travel Plan will be administered by the CTMP Co-ordinator and would be a contractual requirement as part of the Principal Contractor's contract with the Applicant. In order to reduce the number of single-occupancy trips to the Site during the construction period, this travel plan looks to include measures such as: • Provision of public transport information to access where workers will be resident or collected from by buses provided under the Worker Travel Plan, so there is no need for non-local workers to bring cars to the wider area; • Minibus service for transport of non-local construction workers; • Promotion of a car sharing to the Proposed Development; and • Car parking management. Section 13.7 of the **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** sets out the proposed development construction traffic routes. Proposed Development construction traffic is provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. Section 7 of the **Transport Statement** contains details of how construction traffic is assigned to each surveyed Automatic Traffic Counts (ATC) location within the Study Area. The Applicant confirms that these routes have been informed through consultation with the relevant Local Highway Authorities and NH. It is proposed that the main construction and decommissioning access points to the Proposed Development will be from the LRN. The routing will utilise the LRN to connect to the following Strategic Road Network (SRN) junctions: • Junction 1 of the A1 (M) will be utilised to provide SRN routing onto the local highway network for W1. • Junction 1 of the M18 motorway will be utilised to provide SRN routing onto the local highway network for W1 and W2.
	5.14.9 The assessment should also consider any possible disruption to services and infrastructure (such as road, rail and airports).	
	5.14.9 If additional transport infrastructure is needed or proposed, it should always include good quality walking, wheeling and cycle routes, and associated facilities (changing/storage etc.) needed to enhance active transport provision.	

		• Junction 31 of the M1 motorway will be utilised to provide SRN routing onto the local highway network for W2 and W3. • Junction 33 will of the M1 also provide routing to W2. All proposed vehicle routing on the LRN, as well as the proposed access points, are shown in Appendix A: Proposed Vehicle Routing of **ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. The **Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans [EN0110020/APP/2.4]** demonstrates that safe access is ensured for pedestrians and cyclists. As set out in the **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]**, the alignment of existing PRoW within the Site has been incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development. As such, the alignment of PRoW will be unaffected by the Proposed Development during the operation and maintenance phase of the Proposed Development. Within the **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]**, the Travel Plan sets out the aim for improving the usage of PRoW as a method of attending Site. The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** sets out that the Proposed Development will be incorporating approximately 14.58km of Permissive Paths to assist with the active movement of workers and other users.
Mitigation	5.14.12 Where mitigation is needed, possible demand management measures must be considered. This could include identifying opportunities to: • Reduce the need to travel by consolidating trips; • Locate development in areas already accessible by active travel and public transport; • Provide opportunities for shared mobility; • Re-mode by shifting travel to a sustainable mode that is more beneficial to the network; • Retime travel outside of the known peak times; and • Reroute to use parts of the network that are less busy.	The Transport and Access Assessment that has been conducted and demonstrated within **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]**, confirms that due to the proposed mitigation measures proposed for all phases of the Proposed Development will not result in residual adverse effects upon highway safety or generate any highway capacity issues. Embedded mitigation measures proposed to be used within the construction phase of the Proposed Development will include the following measures: • Designing entry / exit points onto the road network in accordance with national road design standards and in consultation with the local highway authority to ensure safety; • Managing interactions with the public road network through visibility splays, signage, and traffic controls, with construction traffic yielding to other road users; • Distributing details of vehicle routes to workers to reduce peak-time congestion in sensitive areas; • Scheduling Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) movements outside of peak traffic hours to avoid additional congestion; • Implementing a delivery management system to regulate HGV arrival times and monitor compliance with routing and scheduling; • Monitoring HGV routes and delivery times to ensure adherence to agreed protocols and address any non-compliance; and
	5.14.13 If feasible and operationally reasonable, such mitigation should be required, before considering requirements for the provision of new inland transport infrastructure to deal with remaining transport impacts. All stages of the project should support and prioritise a modal shift of freight from road to more environmentally sustainable alternatives, such as rail, cargo bike, maritime and inland waterways, as well as making appropriate provision for and infrastructure needed to support the use of alternative fuels including charging for electric vehicles.	

		• Employing specialised haulage services for abnormal loads, including necessary permits and coordination with relevant authorities.
	5.14.14 Regard should always be given to the needs of freight at all stages in the construction and operation of the development including the need to provide appropriate facilities for HGV drivers as appropriate.	The needs of freight during all phases of the Proposed Development are covered within the **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]**. Mitigation measures as set out above are included where relevant throughout each phase of the Proposed Development to ensure the safe and effective movement of HGVs and the provision of facilities for the drivers.
	5.14.15 The Secretary of State may attach requirements to a consent where there is likely to be substantial HGV traffic that: • Control numbers of HGV movements to and from the site in a specified period during its construction and possibly on the routing of such movements; • Make sufficient provision for HGV parking, and associated high quality drive facilities either on the site or at dedicated facilities elsewhere, to support driver welfare, avoid 'overspill' parking on public roads, prolonged queuing on approach roads and uncontrolled on-street HGV parking in normal operating conditions; and • Ensure satisfactory arrangements for reasonably foreseeable abnormal disruption, in consultation with network providers and the responsible police force.	Section 13.7 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** sets out the expected trip generation of the Proposed Development for construction operation and maintenance and decommissioning phases. Section 4.5 of the **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** sets out the HGV Management Measures and Controls. Construction vehicles will avoid travel during the weekday morning and evening network peak hours, where possible. Therefore, deliveries will be arranged to occur after 09:00 and before 17:00. Section 4.5 of the **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** sets out the HGV management mitigation measures, which specifically references methods such as a delivery management system, traffic marshalling and site management, communications strategy and site access arrangements. It is discussed in section 4.5 of the **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** that for the movement of Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs), all movements will follow the agreed HGV routing strategy when travelling to and from the Site. A specialised haulage service will be employed to allow these components to be transported with the necessary escort, permits and traffic management, with the contractor consulting the relevant highways authorities to ensure the correct permits are obtained. The police will also be given advanced notification under the Road Vehicle Authorisation of Special Types Order 2003.
	5.14.16 The Secretary of State should have regard to the cost-effectiveness of demand management measures compared to new transport infrastructure, as well as the aim to secure more sustainable patterns of transport development when considering mitigation measures.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** describes the existing baseline levels of traffic movements and provides an assessment of the anticipated transport and access effects of the Proposed Developments construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases in accordance with this policy.
Secretary of State decision making	5.14.19 A new energy NSIP may give rise to substantial impacts on the surrounding transport infrastructure and the Secretary of State should therefore ensure that the applicant has sought to mitigate these impacts, including during the construction phase of the development and by enhancing active, public and shared transport provision and accessibility.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** concludes that with the mitigation measures from the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9], Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.12], oOEMP [APP/7.8],** and **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** in place, there are no residual transport and access-related effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning phases. A number of embedded mitigation measures are outlined in the **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** for controlling the vehicles associated with the construction phase. This includes the following: • Delivery Management; • Wheel Washing Facilities; and • Vehicle Tracking.
	5.14.21 Development consent should not be withheld provided that the applicant is willing to enter into planning obligations for funding new infrastructure or requirements can be imposed to mitigate transport impacts. In this situation the Secretary of State should apply appropriately limited weight to residual effects on the surrounding transport infrastructure.	
	5.14.22 The Secretary of State should only consider refusing development on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe, or it does not show how	

	consideration has been given to the provision of adequate active public or shared transport access and provision.	As highlighted in section 13.7 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]**, there are no residual effects identified for this Proposed Development. The **Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans [EN0110020/APP/2.4]**, **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]**, and **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** outline new permissive paths associated with the Proposed Development and site access points that facilitate active transport by enhancing the accessibility and quality of the access options available to visitors.
Part 5.15 – Resource and Waste Management ***Applicant Assessment***	5.15.6 Applicants must ensure that all proposals align with circular economy objectives. In England, applicants must demonstrate that development proposals are in line with Defra's policy statement on the role of EfW in treating residual waste.	The Proposed Development has been designed and will be constructed and operated to minimise the creation of waste, maximise the use of recycled materials, and assist in the collection, separation, sorting, recycling, and recovery of waste arising from the development during its use. Waste is considered in Section 16.2 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16]** and gives consideration to The Waste Prevention Programme for England: Maximising Resources, Minimising Waste 2023 and the Environment Act 2021, both of which promote a circular economy. The construction of the Proposed Development will be subject to measures and procedures defined within a detailed CEMP and Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP). These measures will include the implementation of industry standard practice and control measures for material and waste management on-site. These measures are set out in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** submitted with the DCO Application. As set out in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, to minimise the impacts of waste on the surrounding environment, the following measures would be implemented: • Agreements with material suppliers to reduce the amount of packaging or to participate in a packaging take-back from the Proposed Development; • Implementation of a 'just-in-time' material delivery system to avoid materials being stockpiled, which increases the risk of their damage and disposal as waste; • Attention to material quantity requirements to avoid over-ordering and generation of waste materials; • Re-use of materials (e.g. excavated soil) where feasible; • Segregation of waste at source where practical; and • Re-use and recycling of materials offsite where re-use onsite is not practical (e.g. through use of an offsite waste segregation facility and re-sale for direct re-use or re-processing).
	5.15.7 The applicant should set out the arrangements that are proposed for managing any waste produced and prepare a report that sets out the sustainable management of waste and use of resources throughout any relevant demolition, excavation and construction activities.	
	5.15.8 The arrangements described and a report setting out the sustainable management of waste and use of resources should include information on how re-use and recycling will be maximised in addition to the proposed waste recovery and disposal system for all waste generated by the development. They should also include an assessment of the impact of the waste arising from development on the capacity of waste management facilities to deal with other waste arising in the area for at least five years of operation.	
	5.15.10 The applicant must consider the Circular Economy and how to ensure that their project aligns with the government's circular economy ambitions. In Wales applicants are encouraged to refer to 'Towards Zero Waste: Our Waste Strategy for Wales.	
	5.15.11 The UK is committed to transitioning to a circular economy, a future where resources are kept in use for longer, and waste is reduced; we accelerate the path to net zero, we see investment in critical infrastructure and green jobs, our economy prospers, and nature thrives. Where possible, applicants are encouraged to source materials from recycled or reused sources and use low carbon materials, sustainable sources and local suppliers. Construction best practices should be used to ensure that material is reused or recycled onsite where possible.	
	5.15.12 Applicants are also encouraged to prepare a construction materials management plan to inform the use of construction best practices in relation to storing materials in an adequate and protected place on site to prevent waste, or degeneration of valuable materials, for example, from accidental damage or excessive weathering. The use of Building Information Management tools (BIM, or similar) to record the materials used in construction can help to reduce waste and realise further value in future decommissioning of facilities, by identifying materials that can be recycled or reused.	
	5.15.13 The Secretary of State should consider the extent to which the applicant has proposed an effective system for managing hazardous and non-hazardous waste	The Proposed Development has been designed and will be constructed and operated to minimise the creation of waste, maximise the use of recycled materials and assist the

Secretary of State decision making	arising from the construction, operation and decommissioning of the proposed development.	collection, separation, sorting recycling and recovery of waste arising from the development during its use. Waste is considered in Section 16.2 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16]**. The construction of the Proposed Development will be subject to measures and procedures defined within a detailed CEMP and SWMP. These measures will include the implementation of industry standard practice and control measures for material and waste management on-site. These measures are set out in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** submitted with the DCO Application. As set out in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, to minimise the impacts of waste on the surrounding environment, the following measures would be implemented: • Agreements with material suppliers to reduce the amount of packaging or to participate in a packaging take-back Proposed Development; • Implementation of a 'just-in-time' material delivery system to avoid materials being stockpiled, which increases the risk of their damage and disposal as waste; • Attention to material quantity requirements to avoid over-ordering and generation of waste materials; • Re-use of materials (e.g. excavated soil) where feasible; • Segregation of waste at source where practical; and • Re-use and recycling of materials offsite where re-use onsite is not practical (e.g. through use of an offsite waste segregation facility and re-sale for direct re-use or re-processing).
	5.15.14 The Secretary of State should be satisfied that: • Any such waste will be properly managed, both on-site and off-site; • The waste from the proposed facility can be dealt with appropriately by the waste infrastructure which is, or is likely to be, available. Such waste arisings should not have an adverse effect on the capacity of existing waste management facilities to deal with other waste arisings in the area; and • Adequate steps have been taken to give consideration to the circular economy, minimise the volume of waste arisings, and of the volume of waste arisings sent for recovery or disposal, except where that is the best overall environmental outcome.	
	5.15.15 Where necessary, the Secretary of State should use requirements or obligations to ensure that appropriate measures for waste management are applied.	
	5.15.18 The Secretary of State should have regard to any potential impacts on the achievement of resource efficiency and waste reduction targets set under the Environment Act 2021 and circular economy objectives.	
Part 5.16 - Water Quality and Resources ***Applicant assessment***	5.16.3 Where the project is likely to have effects on the water environment, the applicant should undertake an assessment of the existing status of, and impacts of the proposed project on, water quality, water resources and physical characteristics of the water environment, and how this might change due to the impact of climate change on rainfall patterns and consequently water availability across the water environment, as part of the ES or equivalent (see Section 4.3 and 4.10).	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** describes the existing levels and assesses the anticipated water effects of the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning in accordance with this policy. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** assess the impacts of the Proposed Development on water quality, water bodies or protected areas, and concludes that with embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse water effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operational and decommissioning phases on water quality, water bodies or protected areas.
	5.16.4 The applicant should make early contact with the relevant regulators, including the local authority, the EA and Marine Management Organisation, where appropriate, for relevant licensing and environmental permitting requirements. Applicants should make early contact with the EA, NRW and water companies with their proposed water requirements to understand whether water is available and if new water infrastructure is	Section 10.3 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** sets out that the Applicant has been in consultation with Severn Trent, Yorkshire Water, the EA, RMBC, CDC, and North East Derbyshire Council in relation to water resources. The Applicant has considered the advice and taken account of the feedback received through consultation.

	required. If insufficient water is available for abstraction the EA and NRW will be unable to authorise an abstraction licence.	The pre-application consultation undertaken by the Applicant, and how feedback from consultees has informed the Proposed Development, it reported in the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** and **Consultation Report Appendices [EN0110020/APP/5.1]**.
	5.16.5 Where appropriate, applicants should manage surface water during construction by treating surface water runoff from exposed topsoil prior to discharging and to limit the discharge of suspended solids e.g. from car parks or other areas of hard standing, during operation.	As set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** surface water runoff from the Solar PV will be managed through Rural SuDS and Natural Flood Management techniques such as grassland/wildflower areas, which will act to bind soils, slow surface water, and increase water quality compared to the baseline scenario. The **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** sets out how surface water runoff from the Site will be managed in line with the national, regional and local requirements regarding flood risk and drainage. As the Proposed Development does not currently have a detailed layout, a detailed drainage strategy cannot be provided with the principles and design criteria at this stage. These criteria will be applied during the detailed design phase, and the detailed SuDS will be secured in the DCO through a Requirement of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
	5.16.6 Applicants should avoid locating potentially polluting activities in the most sensitive locations for groundwater, in particular Source Protection Zone 1 (SPZ) and close to nationally important drinking water supplies. Applicants should consider implementing protective measures to control the risk of pollution to groundwater, for example, through the use of protective barriers.	
	5.16.7 The ES should in particular describe: • The existing quality of waters affected by the proposed project and the impacts of the proposed project on water quality, noting any relevant existing discharges, proposed new discharges and proposed changes to discharges; • Existing water resources affected by the proposed project and the impacts of the proposed project on water resources, noting any relevant existing abstraction rates, proposed new abstraction rates and proposed changes to abstraction rates (including any impact on or use of mains supplies and reference to Abstraction Licensing Strategies) and also demonstrate how proposals minimise the use of water resources and water consumption in the first instance; • Existing physical characteristics of the water environment (including quantity and dynamics of flow) affected by the proposed project and any impact of physical modifications to these characteristics; • Any impacts of the proposed project on water bodies or protected areas (including shellfish protected areas) under the Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017 and source protection zones (SPZs) around potable groundwater abstractions; • How climate change could impact any of the above in the future; and • Any cumulative effects.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** assesses the impacts of the Proposed Development on water quality, water bodies or protected areas, an concludes that with embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse water effects exposed across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases on water quality, water bodies or protected areas. The DCO Application is supported by **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, which considers the impacts of the Proposed Development on drainage. The depth of flooding and reasonable assumptions for the impacts of climate change on flood depths have been assessed as part of a FRA using the data available on flooding. A Surface Water Drainage Strategy (which will form part of a detailed CEMP) will include details of pre-construction, construction, and post-construction water quality monitoring. These measures are set out in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and the **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** submitted with the DCO Application. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** concludes that, with embedded mitigation measures in place, the Proposed Development, together with the cumulative Proposed Developments assessed, are not considered to result in significant adverse residual water effects. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2: Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** concludes that the Proposed Development does not present a risk of deterioration of status of WFD waterbodies or jeopardise the attainment of 'good' overall status of WFD waterbodies.
Mitigation	5.16.8 The Secretary of State should consider whether mitigation measures are needed over and above any which may form part of the project application. A construction management plan may help codify mitigation at that stage.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** assesses the impacts of the Proposed Development on water quality, water bodies or protected areas, an concludes that with embedded mitigation measures in place, there are

	5.16.9 If insufficient water is available for abstraction, the applicant will need to find alternative sources of water to be able to proceed, whether this is developing their own source or collaborating with the water industry or other water abstractors to develop a joint source.	no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse water effects exposed across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases on water quality, water bodies or protected areas. The residual effects outlined in the assessment rely on controls established within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**. These outline management plans and the **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** set out the water related measures to manage any potential water effects that may arise from the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. A Surface Water Drainage Strategy (which will form part of a detailed CEMP) will include details of pre-construction, construction, and post-construction water quality monitoring. These measures are set out in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and the **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** submitted with the DCO Application.
	5.16.15 The Secretary of State should be satisfied that a proposal has regard to current River Basin Management Plans and meets the requirements of the Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017 (including regulation 19). The specific objectives for particular river basins are set out in River Basin Management Plans. The Secretary of State must refuse development consent where a project is likely to cause deterioration of a water body or its failure to achieve good status or good potential, unless the requirements set out in regulation 19 are met. A project may be approved in the absence of a qualifying Overriding Public Interest test only if there is sufficient certainty that it will not cause deterioration or compromise the achievement of good status or good potential.	**ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2: Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** concludes that the Proposed Development does not present a risk of deterioration of status of WFD waterbodies or jeopardise the attainment of 'good' overall status of WFD waterbodies. Section 10.2 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** sets out that due regard has been given to the Humber River Basin District River Management Plan 2024 the assessment of the potential effects of the Proposed Development.
	5.16.16 The Secretary of State should also consider the interactions of the proposed project with other plans such as Water Resources Management Plans and Shoreline Management Plans.	As set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** surface water runoff from the Solar PV will be managed through Rural SuDS and Natural Flood Management techniques such as grassland/wildflower areas, which will act to bind soils, slow surface water, and increase water quality compared to the baseline scenario. The **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** sets out how surface water runoff from the Site will be managed in line with the national, regional and local requirements regarding flood risk and drainage. As the Proposed Development does not currently have a detailed layout, a detailed drainage strategy cannot be provided with the principles and design criteria at this stage. These criteria will be applied during the detailed design phase, and the detailed SuDS will be secured in the DCO through a Requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
	5.16.17 The Secretary of State should consider proposals to mitigate adverse effects on the water environment and any enhancement measures put forward by the applicant and whether appropriate requirements should be attached to any development consent and/or planning obligations are necessary.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** assesses the impacts of the Proposed Development on water quality, water bodies or protected areas, an concludes that with embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse water effects exposed across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases on water quality, water bodies or protected areas. The residual effects outlined in the assessment rely on controls established within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**. These outline management plans and the **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** set out the

		water related measures to manage any potential water effects that may arise from the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. A Surface Water Drainage Strategy (SWDS) (which will form part of a detailed CEMP(s)) will include details of pre-construction, construction, and post-construction water quality monitoring. These measures are set out in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and the **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** submitted with the DCO Application.

TABLE 2: NATIONAL POLICY STATEMENT EN-3 (DECEMBER 2025) – TABLE OF COMPLIANCE

Policy	Policy Text	Assessment
Part 2.4 Climate change adaptation	2.4.11 Solar photovoltaic (PV) sites may also be proposed in low lying exposed sites. For these proposals, applicants should consider, in particular, how plant will be resilient to: • increased risk of flooding; and • impact of higher temperatures	The majority of the Proposed Development includes land within Flood Zone 1, with a small proportion of land located within Flood Zones 2 and 3. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** to the **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]**, and Chapter 8 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** advises how the Sequential Test has been met. However, it should be noted that where there are areas of Flood Zones 2 and 3, no sensitive electrical infrastructure has been placed within these areas, only solar panels and mitigation. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** assesses the impacts of the Proposed Development on water quality, water bodies or protected areas, and concludes that with embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse water effects exposed across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases on water quality, water bodies or protected areas. Embedded mitigation to limit the effects of the increased risk of flooding and the impact of higher temperatures is included within Sections 11.6 and 11.7 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]**. The increased risk of flooding is mitigated by the following: • Critical electrical infrastructure within the Proposed Development to be located within Flood Zone 1 • PV arrays to be located within Flood Zone 1 wherever feasible. Where panels are to be located in Flood Zone 2 or 3, they will be in areas where flood levels for the 1 in 100-year event are 300 mm below the lower edge of panels • PV arrays will be installed on metal frames driven into the ground, reducing their footprint within the floodplain. Alternative solutions will be assessed and appropriately mitigated as required. • All sensitive and electrical equipment on the solar panel will be elevated by legs or mounted on raised frames. • Electrical infrastructure compounds will include a surface water drainage system. • Construction compounds will be located within Flood Zone 1. The impact of higher temperatures will be mitigated by the following: • The development of a Construction Health and Safety Plan and other relevant fieldwork specific Job Hazard Analysis (JHAs) to ensure all site workers, employees,

		and staff are taking necessary safety measures to avoid the health impacts associated with extreme heat • Maintenance schedule to account for replacing any damaged or degraded solar panels. • Maintenance and retrofit schedules to mitigate any thermal shutdowns, fire hazards and operational disruptions as assets are maintained and/or replaced Water required for cooling of the BESS and substations is maintained in a closed cooling system, providing resilience for periods of water stress or drought in the region. These measures are included within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, and the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** and are secured by requirement of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
Part 2.5 Consideration for good design for energy infrastructure	2.5.1 Section 4.7 of EN-1 sets out the criteria for good design that should be applied to all energy infrastructure. 2.5.2 Proposals for renewable energy infrastructure should demonstrate good design, particularly in respect of landscape and visual amenity, opportunities for co-existence/co-location with other marine and terrestrial uses, and in the design of the project to mitigate impacts such as noise and effects on ecology and heritage.	As detailed in Section 5 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]**, good design has been a fundamental consideration from the outset of the Proposed Development. The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP5.7]** illustrates how the design of the Proposed Development has been developed in accordance with a clear design framework, based on the criteria for good design as outlined in NPS EN-1. This has included the adoption of project design principles to guide decision-making and embed good design outcomes in the Proposed Development. Throughout the design process, the Applicant maintained an interdisciplinary approach to design, considering both the opportunities and constraints of the Proposed Development. This included an analysis of the existing physical, environmental, social and cultural context of the Order Limits by a broad range of technical disciplines as set out and assessed within **ES Topic Chapters [EN0110020/APP/6.6 – 6.16]**. The **Works Plans [EN0110020/APP/2.3]** and the **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]** secure the design of the Proposed Development through relevant requirements in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].**
Part 2.6 Flexibility in the project details	2.6.1 Where details are still to be finalised, applicants should explain in the application which elements of the proposal have yet to be finalised, and the reason why this is the case. 2.6.2 Where flexibility is sought in the consent as a result, applicants should, to the best of their knowledge, assess the likely worst-case environmental, social and economic effects of the proposed development to ensure that the impacts of the project as it may be constructed have been properly assessed. 2.6.3 Full guidance on how applicants and the Secretary of State should manage flexibility is set out in Section 4.3 of EN-1.	The Applicant wishes to retain flexibility regarding the design detail of certain components of the Proposed Development. The extent of flexibility required is described in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]** and set out in the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** and **outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3].** Good design outcomes will be secured in the detailed design of the Proposed Development, in accordance with the ES assessment and via management plans. The relevant management plans are to be certified by the Secretary of State and are listed Schedule 14 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].** Final versions of the relevant management plans are to be submitted to and approved by relevant local planning authorities prior to commencement of the authorised development. These management plans provide sufficient certainty about the size and scale of the Proposed Development. Adherence to the management plans will secure good design outcomes, uphold the conclusions of the ES and provide for flexibility. A full list of management plans is set out in the **Guide to the Application [EN0110020/APP/1.3].**

		The Applicant's approach to EIA, including the use of the Rochdale envelope to assess effects, is set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: EIA Methodology [EN0110020/APP/6.2]** and **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]**. With the above need for flexibility in mind, the Applicant confirms that the ES has assessed the likely worst-case development scenario.
Applicant Assessment– Irradiance and site topography	2.10.11 Irradiance will be a key consideration for the applicant in identifying a potential site as the amount of electricity generated on site is directly affected by irradiance levels. Irradiance of a site will in turn be affected by surrounding topography, with an uncovered or exposed site of good elevation and favourable south-facing aspect more likely to increase year-round irradiance levels. This in turn affects the carbon emission savings and the commercial viability of the site. 2.10.12 In order to maximise irradiance, applicants may choose a site and design its layout with variable and diverse panel types and aspects, and panel arrays may also follow the movement of the sun in order further to maximise the solar resource.	**Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** presents the reasoning for why the Proposed Development and Order Limits are located in the Site's particular location. As outlined in **Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4],**solar irradiation within South Yorkshire is above the UK average, and given that the opportunities to connect large-scale solar schemes located in this area to the National Grid are limited, it is clear that the Proposed Development, which makes use of existing and available infrastructure to provide large-scale solar generation capacity, is an essential part of delivering against the urgent need for significant new renewable generation capacities to connect in the next decade to support the drive towards net zero. The combination of rolling topography and flatter land within the South Yorkshire Region means there were several locations with favourable levels of irradiation which influenced the focus on this area for the location of the Proposed Development. Due to the fast-evolving pace of Solar PV technology, the Proposed Development has allowed for flexibility in the design, allowing opportunity to utilise specific technology closer to construction within the parameters outlined in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN011020/APP/6.5]** and the **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]**.
Applicant Assessment – Network Connection	2.10.13 Applicants should consider important issues relating to network connection at Section 4.11 of EN-1 and in EN-5. In particular, and where appropriate, applicants should proceed in a manner consistent with the regulatory regime for offshore transmission networks established by Ofgem, details of which are set out in EN-5. 2.10.14 Many solar farms are connected into the local distribution network. The capacity of the local grid network to accept the likely output from a proposed solar farm is critical to the technical and commercial feasibility of a development proposal. 2.10.15 Larger developments may seek connection to the transmission network if there is available network capacity and/or supportive infrastructure 2.10.16 In either case the connection voltage, availability of network capacity, and the distance from the solar farm to the existing network can have a significant effect on the commercial feasibility of a development proposal. 2.10.17 To maximise existing grid infrastructure, minimise disruption to existing local community infrastructure or biodiversity and reduce overall costs, applicants may choose a site based on nearby available grid export capacity.	The **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** and the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** set out that the Proposed Development meets the definition of Critical National Priority (CNP) Infrastructure, given that it has a capacity greater than 100MW capacity of a low carbon energy source. Tables 2 and 3 of the **Policy Compliance Document [EN0110020/APP/5.5]** (this document) provide guidance on how the Applicant has addressed EN-3 and of EN-5. The Applicant holds a grid connection offer from the National Energy System Operator (NESO) to connect the Proposed Development to the National Electricity Transmission System (NETS). The connection agreement is for an export connection of up to 750MW, as discussed within the **Grid Connection Statement [EN0110020/APP/7.1]**. It is worth noting that the original Bilateral Connection Agreement (BCA) was issued by NESO in January 2022 for connection to the existing Brinsworth substation at 275kV. The agreement was accepted in April 2022. NESO then later revised the agreement in January 2025 to reflect the connection to the new Long Lane 400kV substation. At the same time, the connection date was moved to October 2029. The revised agreement was accepted by the Applicant in March 2025. In accordance with Paragraph 4.11.5 of NPS EN-5, the Applicant continues to have engagement with NESO and as demonstrated through the connection agreement held

	2.10.18 Where this is the case, applicants should consider the cumulative impacts of situating a solar farm in proximity to other energy generating stations and infrastructure.	discussions around connections in the south Yorkshire region following acknowledgement of available capacity at Brinsworth Substation. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]** sets out that the Proposed Development comprises the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of a solar photovoltaic (PV) electricity generating station and associated development comprising Battery Energy Storage System (BESS), and onsite substation. The Proposed Development would allow for the generation and export of over 100MW of renewable energy, connecting into the National Electricity Transmission System. The impact assessments within **ES Topic Chapters [EN0110020/APP/6.6 – 6.16]** has been based on the worst-case parameters for each technical topic, and justification is presented within the relevant technical chapter. Regarding cumulative impacts, this was a site selection factor considered within **Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]**. Following the identification of the South Yorkshire region, the Applicant team undertook a review of nearby NSIPs that could influence the extent and location of the immediate Search Area. A substantial number of NSIP schemes are located to the east of the South Yorkshire region, with a notable cluster around areas such as Gainsborough and Gate Burton. This concentration of projects increased the potential for cumulative effects. This too acted as a limiting factor in the depiction of the Search Area, and amongst other considerations, helped to define the 12km radius as being appropriate, taking into account the absence of other solar NSIP schemes within this area. This approach was adopted to help minimise the potential for cumulative impacts across a range of environmental topics, including traffic and transport, landscape and visual effects, and noise.
Applicant Assessment – Proximity of site to dwellings	2.10.19 Utility-scale solar farms are large sites that may have a significant zone of visual influence. The two main impact issues that determine distances to sensitive receptors are therefore likely to be visual amenity and glint and glare. These are considered in Landscape, Visual and Residential Amenity (paragraphs 2.10.852.10.93) and Glint and Glare (paragraphs 2.10.94 – 2.10.98) impact sections of this NPS.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]** provides an assessment of the Proposed Development's impact on landscape and visual within the Order Limits. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16]** assesses glint and glare effects in respect of those matters that are scoped in. The locations of relevant receptors are shown within the supporting **ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.2: Glint and Glare Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, including, but not limited to, dwellings within the 1km Study Area. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16]** concludes that, with embedded mitigation measures in place, there is no potential for significant glint and glare effects as a result of the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases, including on dwellings.
Applicant Assessment – Agriculture Land Classification and land type	2.10.20 Solar is a highly flexible technology and as such can be deployed on a wide variety of land types. 2.10.21 While land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of the site location applicants should, where possible, utilise suitable previously developed land, brownfield land, contaminated land and industrial land. Where the proposed use of any agricultural land has been shown to be necessary, poorer quality land should be preferred to higher quality land avoiding the use of "Best and Most Versatile" agricultural land where possible. 'Best and Most	**Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** presents the reasoning for the location of the Proposed Development. In line with NPS EN-3 , both **Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** and **ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]** confirm that the Applicant considered whether there was sufficient brownfield land available to develop a utility-scale solar development in close proximity to the grid connection. The search of the LPAs' brownfield registers confirmed that

	Versatile agricultural land is defined as land in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification (ALC).	none of the brownfield sites would have the capability of meeting the Proposed Development's objectives, largely due to the size and urban locations of the brownfield sites. The use of commercial rooftops was considered not to be a viable alternative to the scheme. A very large number of commercial rooftops would be required to deliver a utility-scale solar farm. This would require multiple land ownerships, and the legal complexities involved in combining multiple sites of this nature would be prohibitive. The Applicant sought to identify countryside/undeveloped greenfield land, which, according to the provisional ALC mapping (provided by DEFRA and Natural England), could meet the objectives of the Scheme whilst avoiding, as far as practicable, the take of BMV land. It is concluded that 79.9% of the Site is non-BMV and 20.1% of the Site is BMV. Further information on ALC is provided within **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20].** During the design process for the Proposed Development, the Applicant continued to seek, where possible, to reduce the use of BMV land. However, due to the nature of the land quality in both the Order Limits and Search Area, it was not possible to avoid it fully.
	2.10.22 Whilst the development of ground mounted solar arrays is not prohibited on Best and Most Versatile agricultural land, or sites designated for their natural beauty, or recognised for ecological or archaeological importance, the impacts of such are expected to be considered and are discussed under paragraphs 2.10.67 – 84 and 2.10.99 – 2.10.118 of this NPS.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** sets out an assessment which demonstrates that the effects of the Proposed Development being on BMV land have been considered. It is acknowledged that development of ground mounted solar arrays is not prohibited on BMV agricultural land. The Proposed Development is mostly temporary and reversible in nature and therefore will have a low magnitude affect the long-term agricultural resource. When the operational phase ends, the Solar PV Site would be decommissioned and the land returned to its original use and condition as far as practicable and returned to the landowner.
	2.10.23 It is recognised that at this scale, it is likely that applicants' developments will use some agricultural land. Applicants should explain their choice of site, noting the preference for development to be on suitable brownfield, industrial and low and medium grade agricultural land.	**Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** presents the reasoning for the location of the Proposed Development. In line with NPS EN-3, both **Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** and **ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]** confirm that the Applicant considered whether there was sufficient brownfield land available to develop a utility-scale solar development in close proximity to the grid connection. The search of the LPAs' brownfield registers confirmed that none of the brownfield sites would have the capability of meeting the Proposed Development's objectives, largely due to the size and urban locations of the brownfield sites. The use of commercial rooftops was considered not to be a viable alternative to the scheme. A very large number of commercial rooftops would be required to deliver a utility-scale solar farm. This would require multiple land ownerships, and the legal complexities involved in combining multiple sites of this nature would be prohibitive.
	2.10.24 Where sited on agricultural land, consideration may be given as to whether the proposal allows for continued agricultural use and/or can be co-located with other functions (for example, onshore wind generation, storage, hydrogen electrolysers) to maximise the efficiency of land use.	
	2.10.25 The ALC is the only approved system for grading agricultural quality in England and Wales and, if necessary, field surveys should be used to establish the ALC grades in accordance with the current, or any successor to it, grading criteria and identify the soil types to inform soil management at the construction, operation, and decommissioning phases in line with the Defra Construction Code. Applicants should refer to Natural England guidance, or any successor to it, for	

	more information about the assessment process for development proposals on agricultural land.	The Applicant sought to identify countryside/undeveloped greenfield land, which, according to the provisional ALC mapping (provided by DEFRA and Natural England), could meet the objectives of the Scheme whilst avoiding, as far as practicable, the take of BMV land. It is concluded that 79.9% of the Site is non-BMV and 20.1% of the Site is BMV. Further information on ALC surveys undertaken in accordance with paragraph 2.10.25 of this policy is provided within **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20].** During the design process for the Proposed Development, the Applicant continued to seek, where possible, to reduce the use of BMV land; however, due to the nature of the land quality in both the Order Limits and Search Area, it was not entirely possible to avoid it fully.
	2.10.26 Applicants are encouraged to develop and implement a Soil Resources and Management Plan which could help to use and manage soils sustainably and minimise adverse impacts on soil health and potential land contamination. This should be in line with the ambition set out in the Environmental Improvement Plan to bring at least 40% of England's agricultural soils into sustainable management by 2028 and increase this up to 60% by 2030. This should include consideration of mitigation against impacts to peat soils where these are present.	The Applicant has provided an outline SMP within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** which sets out how soil will be handled, monitored, and restored during the lifetime of the Proposed Development. The outline SMP is provided as part of the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and is secured via a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. Section 9.4 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** sets out that by following the measures within the outline SMP which is provided as part of the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, soils will not be permanently affected. The impacts will be temporary and of low magnitude, resulting in a minor adverse effect which is not significant in EIA terms and is therefore in line with the ambition sets out in the Environmental Improvement Plan (2025).
Applicant Assessment – Accessibility	2.10.27 Applicants will need to consider the suitability of the access routes to the proposed site for both the construction and operation of the solar farm with the former likely to raise more issues.	Section 13.7 of the **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** sets out the proposed development construction traffic routes. Details of construction traffic are provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. Section 7 of the **Transport Statement** contains details of how construction traffic is assigned to each surveyed ATC location within the Study Area. The Applicant confirms that development and selection of these routes have been informed through consultation with the relevant Local Highway Authorities and with National Highways. It is proposed that the main construction and decommissioning access points to the Proposed Development will be from the local road network. The routing will utilise the local road network to connect to the following SRN junctions: • Junction 1 of the A1 (M) will be utilised to provide SRN routing onto the local highway network for Whitestone 1. • Junction 1 of the M18 motorway will be utilised to provide SRN routing onto the local highway network for Whitestone 1 and 2. • Junction 31 of the M1 motorway will be utilised to provide SRN routing onto the local highway network for Whitestone 2 and 3. • Junction 33 will of the M1 also provide routing to Whitestone 2. All proposed vehicle routing on the local road network, as well as the proposed access points, are shown in **Appendix A: Proposed Vehicle Routing** of **ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. Regarding internal access tracks, these will
	2.10.28 Given that potential solar farm sites are largely in rural areas, access for the delivery of solar arrays and associated infrastructure during construction can be a significant consideration for solar farm siting.	
	2.10.29 Developers will usually need to construct on-site access routes for operation and maintenance activities, such as footpaths, earthworks, or landscaping.	
	2.10.30 In addition, sometimes access routes will need to be constructed to connect solar farms to the public road network.	
	2.10.31 Applications should include the full extent of the access routes necessary for operation and maintenance and an assessment of their effects.	

		be located within the Order Limits, and the Applicant will also be utilising existing internal access tracks from other developments. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** concludes that with the embedded mitigation in place across the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12], oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**, and **oPRoWPPMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]**, there are no residual transport and access effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operational, and decommissioning phases.
Applicant Assessment – Public Rights of Way	2.10.32 Proposed developments may affect the provision of public rights of way networks.	The **oPRoWPPMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** outlines the measures to limit disruption and ensure that the PRoW network can continue to be used throughout the construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development, while minimising the impact on PRoW users. The Proposed Development includes opportunities for advancement, including the proposed approximately 14.58km of permissive path within the Order Limits, as set out within the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]**. The **oPRoWPPMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** is secured via a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** sets out project specific design principles which have influenced the design of the Proposed Development. The project design principles of relevance to sustainable transport include the following – • Find out what is important to people about the local area and seek to incorporate feedback • Consider how people engage with their local environment and retain these patterns • Enhance recreational access across the landscape These project design principles set out how the Proposed Development will consider the experience of the people using the Public Rights of Way during the operational phase of the Proposed Development. The **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** confirms that during the construction phase of the Proposed Development, there will be approximately 30 PRoWs that are to be temporarily diverted for approximately 2-3 weeks. Section 4 of the **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** confirms that the existing PRoWs and proposed permissive paths, which pass through or run adjacent to the Order Limits are expected to be unaffected during the operation phase. Minimum widths have been incorporated into the design to enable a suitable distance between any PRoWs and proposed infrastructure. In all cases, the PRoW will see perimeter fencing being installed a minimum distance from the centreline of the PRoW of 10m to either side (creating a 20m corridor) if Solar PV Arrays lie on both sides of the PRoW, and 15m if Solar PV Arrays are to one side only. This will help avoid the perception of being channelled into narrow passages between Solar PV Arrays.
	2.10.33 Public rights of way may need to be temporarily closed or diverted to enable construction, however, applicants should keep, as far as is practicable and safe, all public rights of way that cross the proposed development site open during construction and protect users where a public right of way borders or crosses the site.	The **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** confirms that during the construction phase of the Proposed Development, there will be approximately 30 PRoWs that are to be temporarily diverted for approximately 2-3 weeks. Section 4 of the **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** confirms that the existing PRoWs and proposed permissive paths, which pass through or run adjacent to the Order Limits are expected to be unaffected during the operation phase.

	2.10.34 Applicants are encouraged to design the layout and appearance of the site to ensure continued recreational use of public rights of way where possible during construction, and in particular during operation of the site.	
	2.10.35 Applicants are encouraged where possible to minimise the visual impacts of the development for those using existing public rights of way, considering the impacts this may have on any other visual amenities in the surrounding landscape.	Section 4 of the **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** confirms that the existing PRoWs and proposed permissive paths, which pass through or run adjacent to the Order Limits are expected to be unaffected during the operation phase. Minimum widths have been incorporated into the design to enable a suitable distance between any PRoWs and proposed infrastructure. In all cases, the PRoWs will see perimeter fencing being installed a minimum distance from the centreline of the PRoW of 10m to either side (creating a 20m corridor) if Solar PV Arrays lie on both sides of the PRoW, and 15m if Solar PV Arrays are to one side only. This will minimise the visual impacts of the development as far as possible and help avoid the perception of being channelled into narrow passages between Solar PV Arrays.
	2.10.36 Applicants should consider and maximise opportunities to facilitate enhancements to the public rights of way and the inclusion, through site layout and design of access, of new opportunities for the public to access and cross proposed solar development sites (whether via the adoption of new public rights of way or the creation of permissive paths), taking into account, where appropriate, the views of landowners.	It is confirmed within the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP5.7]** that there will be the creation of 14.58km of permissive paths throughout the Order Limits to provide new connections to extend options and routes for pedestrians, equestrians and cyclists. These commitments are set out in the the **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** and will be secured by a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
	2.10.37 Applicants should set out detail on how public rights of way would be managed to ensure they are safe to use in an outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan.	As noted in section 3.5 of the **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]**, PRoWs will be managed to ensure they are safe to use during the construction phase of the Proposed Development. Some of the measures that will be implemented where necessary are listed below: • Giving advanced notice of where PRoWs will be subject to management measures. • Fencing to be installed around the Site at the first stage of construction to ensure preservation of PRoW during construction. • Where PRoWs cross or are adjacent to the Site the fencing will be erected from the inside of the Site without impacting the PRoWs or preventing its use. • The PRoWs will be buffered from the perimeter fencing, with fencing being installed a minimum distance of 10m either side of the centre of the PRoW where Solar PV Arrays lie to both sides (creating a 20m wide corridor between the fence lines), or 15m if Solar PV Arrays are to one side only. There will be a further 5m from the perimeter fence to the Solar PV Arrays. • Visibility of construction vehicles will be maximised (e.g. usage of flashing lights) where motorised vehicle use is planned for the PRoWs in question. • Traffic management (e.g. advanced signage to advise other users of the works) will be implemented where motorised vehicle use is planned for the PRoWs in question. • Use of manned controls and crossing points where the Proposed Development crosses PRoWs (i.e. marshals or banksmen), with a default priority that construction traffic will give way to other users; and • The existing PRoWs will be reinstated during the operation and maintenance phase, albeit public access will be retained throughout.

		• Where existing PRoWs are to be upgraded to bridleways, appropriate signage would be introduced to denote the routes as bridleways and where required other measures such as widening (where possible) would be considered. An **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** and an **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** will provide mitigation and management measures for PRoWs during construction.
Applicant Assessment – Security and Lighting	2.10.38 Security of the site is a key consideration for developers. Applicants may wish to consider not only the availability of natural defences such as steep gradients, hedging and rivers but also perimeter security measures such as fencing, electronic security, CCTV and lighting, with the measures proposed on a site-specific basis.	**ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN011020/APP/6.5]** sets out that during operation; perimeter fencing will enclose the Site, comprising of wooden post and wire fencing. Fencing surrounding the solar PV array is anticipated to be a maximum of 2.2m in height. If necessary, a double fence may be installed. Mammal gates would be incorporated into perimeter fencing to allow for movement of wildlife as secured within the **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]**.
	2.10.39 Applicants should assess the visual impact of these security measures, as well as the impacts on local residents, including for example issues relating to intrusion from CCTV and light pollution in the vicinity of the site.	The BESS, satellite and substation compounds would be surrounded by a double fence of galvanised welded wire which would be a maximum of 3m in height, with an additional 1m of electrified fencing. Fencing would be muted in colour, and sensitive with the surrounding environment. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN011020/APP/6.5]** confirms that daytime and infrared CCTV systems, mounted on poles and facing internally, would be installed around the perimeter of the operational areas of the Site. CCTV cameras would be installed on poles with a maximum height of 4m AGL. The CCTV cameras would have fixed viewing angles and would be positioned to face along the fence. The **ES Volume 3, Non-Technical Summary [EN0110020/APP/6.21]** sets out that lighting would only be installed at the Substation and BESS compounds and be operated manually or by sensors. Lighting would be directed inwards, away from ecological or residential receptors. Any landscaping and biodiversity works would be designed to avoid compromising the effectiveness of the CCTV or security fencing.
Technical Considerations – Capacity of a site	2.10.41 Applications for solar farms are likely to comprise a number of elements including solar panel arrays, piling, inverters, mounting structures, cabling, earthworks, and measures associated with site security, and may also include associated infrastructure such as energy storage and electrolysers associated with the production of low carbon hydrogen	The Applicant wishes to retain flexibility regarding the design detail of certain components of the Proposed Development. The extent of flexibility sought by the Applicant is described within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN011020/APP/6.5]**. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]** outlines that the physical size and generating capacity of individual PV modules should not be seen as fixed metrics specified in the Application that constrain the design of the solar development. Rather, the detailed design will be guided by the **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]** and the maximum total area of solar PV array will be as shown in the **Works Plans [EN0110020/APP/2.3]** which has been considered as a worst-case scenario in this ES for identifying potential environmental effects. The Proposed Development would include management of existing planting, new native planting, hedgerow enhancement, and planting of suitable seed mixes amongst the solar PV arrays. Indigenous planting would also be used to provide natural screening. Further details of these measures and commitments for aftercare are discussed in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**. It is important to note that the exact design details of the Proposed Development cannot be confirmed until consent is granted and the construction tendering process for the design has been completed. The local planning authorities would be required to approve the detailed
	2.10.42 Solar panels generate electricity in direct current (DC) form. A number of panels feed an external inverter, which is used to convert the electricity to alternating current (AC). After inversion a transformer will step up the voltage for export to the grid. Because the inverter is separate from the panels, the total capacity of a solar farm can be measured either in terms of the combined capacity of installed solar panels (measured in DC) or in terms of combined capacity of installed inverters (measured in AC).	
	2.10.45 For the purposes of section 15 of the Planning Act 2008, the maximum combined capacity of the installed inverters (measured in alternating current (AC)) should be used for the purposes of determining solar site capacity.	
	2.10.47 The installed generating capacity of a solar farm will decline over time in correlation with the reduction in panel array efficiency. There is a range of sources of degradation that developers need to consider when deciding on a solar panel	

	technology to be used. Applicants may account for this by overplanting solar panel arrays.	design in advance of works commencing, should development consent be granted. The detailed design must be approved by the relevant planning authority in accordance with the requirements outlined in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]** and must comply with the **Works Plan [EN0110020/APP/2.3]**. To maintain flexibility in the design and layout at this stage in the process and ensure maximum effects are assessed in the EIA and considered by the Secretary of State, the Proposed Development has adopted the Rochdale Envelope approach, this involves specifying parameter ranges, including details of the maximum and where relevant minimum size (footprint, width, height), technology, and locations of the different elements of the Proposed Development where flexibility needs to be retained. The use of the Rochdale Envelope has therefore been adopted to ensure that the likely worst-case scenario is presented in the assessment of potential environmental effects from the Proposed Development. As set out in the **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** degradation of solar panels may mean that panels need to be replaced during the operational life of solar developments. Other than in instances of the premature failure of individual panels (which would likely be replaced under a warranted maintenance arrangement) panel replacement is likely to be guided by data gathered through monitoring panel performance throughout the life of the solar developments. This may be carried out on a rolling or programmed basis subject to any parameters which defined the assessment of the solar development's impacts on the environment.
	2.10.48 AC installed export capacity should not be seen as an appropriate tool to constrain the impacts of a solar farm. Applicants should use other measurements, such as panel size, total area and percentage of ground cover to set the maximum extent of development when determining the planning impacts of an application.	
Technical Considerations – Site layout design, and appearance	2.10.51 Applicants should consider the criteria for good design set out in Section 4.7 of EN-1 at an early stage when developing projects.	As detailed in Section 5 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]**, good design has been a key consideration from the outset for the Applicant.
	2.10.52 As set out above applicants will consider several factors when considering the design and layout of sites, including proximity to available grid capacity to accommodate the scale of generation, orientation, topography, previous land-use, and ability to mitigate environmental impacts and flood risk.	**Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** and **ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]** describe the detailed site evaluation and assessment of alternatives process undertaken by the Applicant. As set out in these documents, the location and design of the Proposed Development is the result of a comprehensive site selection process that was environmentally, technically, and planning-led to avoid and minimise the potential impacts of the Proposed Development as early as possible. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]** discusses how the design and layout, and extent, of the Proposed Development has been subject to an iterative process involving the developer, the design team and design principles, the environmental consultant team and is informed by feedback from statutory consultees, host authorities and local communities through both the scoping and consultation process. The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** demonstrates how the design of the Proposed Development has been developed in accordance with a clear design framework, based on the criteria for good design set out in NPS EN-1. This has included the adoption of **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]** to guide decision making and embed good design outcomes to the Proposed Development. Throughout the design process, the Applicant maintained an interdisciplinary approach to design and considered both the opportunities and constraints of the Proposed Development. This included analysis of the existing physical, environmental, social and cultural context of the Site by a broad range of technical disciplines (including landscape and visual, noise, ecology and heritage) as set out and assessed by the **Aspect Chapters of the ES Volume 2 [EN0110020/APP/6.6 – 6.16]**.
	2.10.53 For a solar farm to generate electricity efficiently the panel array spacing should seek to maximise the potential power output of the site. The type, spacing and aspect of panel arrays will depend on the physical characteristics of the site such as site elevation.	

		This approach has enabled the Applicant to understand the complexities of the Site and identify where multiple opportunities and constraints have the potential to stack up with one another to provide a good design response and allow for co-existence and co-location with other terrestrial uses. The **Works Plans [EN0110020/APP/2.3]** and **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]** secure the design of the Proposed Development through the relevant requirements in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
	2.10.54 In terms of design and layout, applicants may favour a south-facing arrangement of panels to maximise output although other orientations may be chosen for alternative reasons, such as to match peaks in demand. For example, an east-west layout, whilst likely to result in reduced output compared to south-facing panels on a panel-by-panel basis, may allow for a greater density of panels to compensate and therefore for generation to be spread more evenly throughout the day.	As detailed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN011020/APP/6.5]**, the solar PV modules will be installed as fixed arrays. The final layout of the Proposed Development will seek to maximise the potential power output of the Proposed Development whilst seeking to avoid and reduce effects on the environment. The fixed panels would be arranged as rows of solar PV modules aligned as south-facing. Fixed Solar PV modules would be angled at a tilt of +/- 8 to 25 degrees from horizontal to optimise daylight absorption.
	2.10.55 It is likely that underground and overhead cabling will be required to connect the electrical assets of the site, such as from the substation to the panel arrays or storage facilities.	**ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN011020/APP/6.5]** describes the works required for the Proposed Development. Works that include cabling includes Works No. 2: Interconnection Cables. All high voltage cabling to be installed as part of the Proposed Development would be laid below ground according to British Standards and regulations. The construction method for installation of the cable would typically be open cut trench and trenchless methods in required locations, as set out in full detail in Section 5.4 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN011020/APP/6.5]**.
	2.10.56 In the case of underground cabling, applicants are expected to provide a method statement describing cable trench design, installation methodology, as well as details of the operation and maintenance regime.	The Proposed Development allows for necessary spatial flexibility in the routing of the interconnecting cables. As per table 5.3 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN011020/APP/6.5]**, cable trenches would be a maximum of 10m in width, with excavations for joint bays extending up to 20m wide.
Technical Considerations – Project Lifetime	2.10.57 Applicants should consider the design life of solar panel efficiency over time when determining the period for which consent is required. An upper limit of 40 years is typical, although applicants may seek consent without a time-period or for differing time-periods of operation.	Decommissioning is expected to take between 12 and 24 months, and for the purposes of the assessment, is expected to occur after the 60-year design life of the Proposed Development in 2089 as discussed within the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**. The approach to decommissioning of the Proposed Development in accordance with a final DEMP is secured by a requirement t in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
	2.10.58 Time limited consent, where granted, is described as temporary because there is a finite period for which it exists, after which the project would cease to have consent and therefore must seek to extend the period of consent or be decommissioned and removed.	
	2.10.59 Solar panel efficiency deteriorates over time and applicants may elect to replace panels during the lifetime of the site.	Section 5.6 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN011020/APP/6.5]** confirms that due to general wear and tear, and expected lifespan of components of the Proposed Development, it is anticipated that some elements would need to be replaced during the operation and maintenance phase. Table 5.10 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN011020/APP/6.5]** indicates the expected lifespan of each component of the Proposed Development. This is as follows -

Proposed Development Component	Expected Lifespan
Solar PV modules	25-40 years

		Inverters	10-25 years
		Solar mounting structures	Replacement not anticipated
		Above ground, low-voltage cabling	25-30 years
		Transformers	Replacement not anticipated
		Monitoring and control systems	10-20 years
		Batteries	5-15 years
		Meteorological sensors	5-15 years
		Substation equipment	Replacement not anticipated
		Communication equipment	10-20 years
Technical Considerations – Decommissioning	2.10.60 Solar panels can be decommissioned relatively easily and cheaply. The nature and extent of decommissioning of a site can vary. Generally, it is expected that the panel arrays and mounting structures will be decommissioned, and underground cabling dug out to ensure that prior use of the site can continue. 2.10.61 Applicants should set out what would be decommissioned and removed from the site at the end of the operational life of the generating station, considering instances where it may be less harmful for the ecology of the site to keep or retain certain types of infrastructure, for example underground cabling, and where there may be socio-economic benefits in retaining site infrastructure after the operational life, such as retaining pathways through the site or a site substation.	An **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** has been prepared and submitted with the DCO Application. This sets out the general principles to be followed during the decommissioning phase of the Proposed Development. The **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]** includes a requirement that a detailed DEMP will be prepared substantially in accordance with the oDEMP and approved by the host local authorities at the time of decommissioning, in advance of the commencement of decommissioning works, and would include timescales and transportation methods. As set out in section 5.7 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN011020/APP/6.5]**, decommissioning is likely to involve the dismantling and recycling of the PV arrays with associated vehicle movements. Removal of BESS and substation foundations to 1.2m BGL would be completed subject to landowner agreement. Components of the Proposed Development such as mitigation planting, Site accesses, and ducts for cabling buried beneath plough-depth would be left in place subject to landowner agreement. These activities would be managed through a detailed DEMP and industry best practices and are not expected to result in any adverse environmental impacts. Post-decommissioning, the landowners would choose how the land is to be used and managed. The landowner may return all of the land to agricultural use, although it is likely that established habitats, such as hedgerows and woodland, would be retained, given their potential benefits to agricultural land and the wider farming estate. Permissive paths would be removed during decommissioning, with the precise timing to be determined by the contractor(s) and communicated to the LPAs in accordance with the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**.
Technical Considerations – Flexibility in the project details	2.10.62 In many cases, not all aspects of the proposal may have been settled in precise detail at the point of application. Such aspects may include: • the type, number and dimensions of the panels; • layout and spacing; • the type of inverter or transformer; and	The Applicant wishes to retain flexibility regarding the design detail of certain components of the Proposed Development. The extent of flexibility sought by the Applicant is described within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN011020/APP/6.5]**. It is important to note that the exact design details of the Proposed Development cannot be confirmed until consent is granted and the construction tendering process for the design has been completed. The local planning authorities would be required to approve the detailed design in advance of works commencing, should development consent be granted. The

	• whether storage will be installed (with the option to install further panels as a substitute).	detailed design must be approved by the relevant planning authority in accordance with the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** and **outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]** pursuant to a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]** and must comply with the **Works Plan [EN0110020/APP/2.3]**. To maintain flexibility in the design and layout at this stage in the process and ensure maximum effects are assessed in the EIA and considered by the Secretary of State, the Proposed Development has adopted the Rochdale Envelope approach, This involves specifying parameter ranges, including details of the maximum and where relevant minimum size (footprint, width, height), technology, and locations of the different elements of the Proposed Development where flexibility needs to be retained. The use of the Rochdale Envelope has therefore been adopted to ensure that the likely worst-case scenario is presented in the assessment of potential environmental effects from the Proposed Development. As set out in the **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** degradation of solar panels may mean that panels need to be replaced during the operational life of solar developments. Other than in instances of the premature failure of individual panels (which would likely be replaced under a warranted maintenance arrangement) panel replacement is likely to be guided by data gathered through monitoring panel performance throughout the life of the Proposed Development. This may be carried out on a rolling or programmed basis subject to any parameters which defined the assessment of the Proposed Development's impact on the environment.
	2.10.63 Applicants should set out a range of options based on different panel numbers, types and layout, with and without storage.	
Impacts – Biodiversity, ecological, geological conservation and water management	2.10.68 The applicant's ecological assessments should identify any ecological risk from developing on the proposed site.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** describes the baseline levels and assesses the anticipated biodiversity and nature conservation effects of the Proposed Development's construction, operational and maintenance and decommissioning. The chapter provides an assessment of the potential effects on internationally, nationally and locally designated sites of ecological or geological importance, on protected species, and on habitats and the species identified as being of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** concludes that with embedded and additional mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse ecology and biodiversity related effects expected over construction, operational and maintenance phases. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** concludes that with embedded and additional mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse ecology and biodiversity related effects expected across the Proposed Development phases. The expected operational residual beneficial effects outlined in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** rely on controls established in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9], oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10], oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** and the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** which are secured via corresponding requirements in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
	2.10.69 Issues that need assessment may include habitats, ground nesting birds, wintering and migratory birds, bats, dormice, reptiles, great crested newts, water voles and badgers.	
	2.10.70 The applicant should use an advising ecologist during the design process to ensure that adverse impacts are avoided, minimised or mitigated in line with the mitigation hierarchy, and biodiversity enhancements are maximised.	The Biodiversity and Nature Conservation chapter has been prepared by ERM, as noted in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 1.1: EIA Authors [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, to ensure that adverse

		impacts are avoided, minimised or mitigated in line with the mitigation hierarchy, and biodiversity enhancements are maximised (where possible).
	2.10.71 The assessment may be informed by a 'desk study' of existing ecological records, an evaluation of the likely impacts of the solar farm upon ecological features, and should specify mitigation to avoid or minimise these impacts, and any further surveys required.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** describes the existing levels and assesses the anticipated biodiversity and nature conservation effects of the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases and is supported by extensive survey work to confirm the ecological habitats and species likely to be affect by the Proposed Development including: • **Appendix 6.1 - Legislation, Policy and Guidance [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **Appendix 6.2 - UK Habitat Survey Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **Appendix 6.3 - Confidential Badger Survey Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **Appendix 6.4 - Baseline Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **Appendix 6.5 - Wintering Bird Survey Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **Appendix 6.6 - Breeding Bird Survey Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **Appendix 6.7 - Confidential Ornithology Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **Appendix 6.8 - Great Crested Newt Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **Appendix 6.9 - Reptile Survey Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **Appendix 6.10 - Bat Survey Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **Appendix 6.11 - Otter and Water Vole Survey Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **Appendix 6.12 - Hedgerow Regulations Assessment Survey Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **Appendix 6.13 - Fisheries and White Clawed Crayfish eDNA Survey Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** The expected operational residual beneficial effects outlined in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** rely on controls established in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9], oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10], oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** and the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and are secured via corresponding requirements in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
	2.10.72 Applicants should consider earthworks associated with construction compounds, access roads and cable trenching.	**ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN011020/APP/6.5]** describes the works required for the Proposed Development. Work No. 1 and No. 2 include works associated with the Solar PV Area and interconnection cables, which includes trenching/earthworks. The Proposed Development also includes associated development in connection with the Solar PV Area and Interconnection Cables, which include but not limited to earthworks.

	2.10.73 Where soil stripping occurs, topsoil and subsoil should be stripped, stored, and replaced separately to minimise soil damage and to provide optimal conditions for site restoration. Further details on minimising impacts on soil and soil handling are above at paragraphs 2.10.25 and 2.10.26.	An **Outline Soil Management Plan** at section 9 of the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** has been submitted with this application and the purpose of this document is to: • Protect soil structure, function and quality; • Minimise soil compaction, erosion and degradation; • Safeguard agricultural land quality, including Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land; • Enable effective reinstatement of temporarily disturbed land to its pre-construction condition, as far as reasonably practicable; and • Support the conclusions of the ES that effects on soil resources are temporary, reversible and not significant. Section 9.6 of the outline soil management discusses the methods to soil management, focusing on how to minimise soil disturbance, timing of soil handling and also the protection of soil profiles. The Outline Soil Management Plan is included in the oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9] which is secured via a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].**
	2.10.74 Applicants should consider how security and lighting installations may impact on the local ecology. Where pole mounted CCTV facilities are proposed the location of these facilities should be carefully considered to minimise impact. If lighting is necessary, it should be minimised and directed away from areas of likely habitat.	**ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN011020/APP/6.5]** confirms that daytime and infrared CCTV systems, mounted on poles and facing internally, would be installed around the perimeter of the operational areas of the Site. CCTV cameras would be installed on poles with a maximum height of 4m AGL. Any landscaping and biodiversity works would be designed to avoid compromising the effectiveness of the CCTV or security fencing. Section 6.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** outlines the mitigation measures relevant to biodiversity that are embedded in the Proposed Development. The Proposed Development includes measures to ensure that potential effects on light-sensitive species such as bats are fully mitigated.
	2.10.75 Applicants should consider how site boundaries are managed. If any hedges/scrub are to be removed, further surveys may be necessary to account for impacts. Buffer strips between perimeter fencing and hedges may be proposed, and the construction and design of any fencing should account for enabling mammal, reptile and other fauna access into the site if required to do so in the ecological report.	The **ES [EN0110020/APP/6.1 – 6.20]** takes account of all works boundaries and hedgerows. Buffers to woodland and hedgerows are included, and proposals for fencing incorporate features to enable the movement of mammals, reptiles and other fauna. These are outlined in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** and the **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3].**
	2.10.76 Where a Flood Risk Assessment has been carried out this must be submitted alongside the applicant's ES. This will need to consider the impact of drainage. As solar PV panels will drain to the existing ground, the impact will not, in general, be significant.	The DCO Application is supported by **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** which considers flood risk throughout each stage of development, potential sources of flooding, and assesses the risk of flooding to the Scheme. It concludes that flood risk from all sources to the Scheme is negligible to low and embedded mitigation has been incorporated into the Scheme design to increase its flood resilience.
	2.10.77 Where access tracks need to be provided, permeable tracks should be used, and localised Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), such as swales and infiltration trenches, should be used to control any run-off where recommended.	As set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2: Flood Risk Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** surface water runoff from the Solar PV will be managed through Rural SuDS and Natural Flood Management techniques such as grassland/wildflower areas, which will act to bind soils, slow surface water, and increase water quality compared to the baseline scenario.

		The **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** sets out how surface water runoff from the Site will be managed in line with the national, regional and local requirements regarding flood risk and drainage. As the Proposed Development does not have a detailed layout, a detailed drainage strategy cannot be provided at this stage, with the principles and design criteria presented in this document. These criteria will be applied during the detailed design phase, and the detailed SuDS will be part of the final Surface Water Drainage Strategy which will be secured pursuant to a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
	2.10.78 Given the temporary nature of solar PV farms, sites should be configured or selected to avoid the need to impact on existing drainage systems and watercourses.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** assesses the impacts of the Proposed Development on water quality, water bodies or protected areas, an concludes that with embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse water effects exposed across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases on water quality, water bodies or protected areas. The residual effects outlined in the assessment rely on controls established within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**. These outline management plans and the **OSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** set out the water related measures to manage any potential water effects that may arise from the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. A Surface Water Drainage Strategy (which will form part of a detailed CEMP) will include details of pre-construction, construction, and post-construction water quality monitoring. These measures are set out in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and the **OSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** submitted with the DCO Application.
	2.10.79 Culverting existing watercourses/drainage ditches should be avoided.	
	2.10.80 Where culverting for access is unavoidable, applicants should demonstrate that no reasonable alternatives exist and where necessary it will only be in place temporarily for the construction period.	
	2.10.81 Solar farms have the potential to increase the biodiversity value of a site, especially if the land was previously intensively managed. In some instances, this can result in significant benefits and enhancements beyond biodiversity net gain, which result in wider environmental gains which is encouraged.	
	2.10.82 For projects in England, applicants should consider any reasonable opportunities to maximise restoration, creation, and enhancement of wider biodiversity. This may include considerations and opportunities identified through Local Nature Recovery Strategies, and national goals and targets set through the Environment Act 2021 and the Environmental Improvement Plan.	
Impacts – Landscape, Visual and residential amenity	2.10.85 Generic landscape and visual impacts are covered in Section 5.10 of EN-1.	Table 1 of this Appendix responds to the generic landscape and visual impacts covered in section 5.10 of NPS EN-1.
	2.10.86 The approach to assessing cumulative landscape and visual impact of large-scale solar farms is likely to be the same as assessing other onshore energy infrastructure. Solar farms are likely to be in low lying areas of good exposure and as such may have a wider zone of visual influence than other types of onshore energy infrastructure.	As set out in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN0110020/APP/6.17]**, a Cumulative Effects Assessment has been undertaken as part of the EIA in accordance with the Planning Inspectorate's Advice on Cumulative Effects Assessment. The assessment considered two types of cumulative effects including: • Intra-Project Effects: effects generated by individual effects on a particular receptor; and • Inter- Project Effects: effects generated by the Proposed Development and other planned or approved developments on the same receptor. Section 7.9 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]** summarises the potential cumulative Landscape and Visual effects of the Proposed Development.
	2.10.87 However, whilst it may be the case that the development covers a significant surface area, in the case of ground-mounted solar panels it should be	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]** assesses the visual impact of the Proposed Development. The study

	noted that with effective screening and appropriate land topography, the area of a zone of visual influence could be appropriately minimised.	area for the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been informed through a combination of Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) analysis and site work. As such, the assessment is supported by the following figures in **ES Volume 3 [EN0110020/APP/6.19]**: • Figure 7.1: LVIA Study Area and Order Limits; • Figure 7.2: Cable Corridor Study Area; • Figure 7.3: Landscape Designations • Figure 7.4: Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) Overview; • Figure 7.5: Zone of Theoretical Visibility – Whitestone 1; • Figure 7.6: Zone of Theoretical Visibility – Whitestone 2; • Figure 7.7: Zone of Theoretical Visibility – Whitestone 3; • Figure 7.8: Zone of Theoretical Visibility Cable Corridor; • Figure 7.9: BESS Zone of Theoretical Visibility; • Figure 7.10: Substation Zone of Theoretical Visibility; • Figure 7.11: Topography Plan; • Figure 7.3.1: National Landscape Character Areas; • Figure 7.3.2: Local Landscape Character Areas; • Figure 7.3.3: Local Landscape Character Areas with ZTV; • Figure 7.4.1: Representative Viewpoints ZTV – W1; • Figure 7.4.2: Representative Viewpoints ZTV – W2; • Figure 7.4.3: Representative Viewpoints ZTV – W3; • Figure 7.4.4: Public Rights of Way and Private Receptors with ZTV – W1; • Figure 7.4.5: Public Rights of Way and Private Receptors with ZTV – W2; • Figure 7.4.6: Public Rights of Way and Private Receptors with ZTV – W3; and • Figures 7.4.7 to 7.4.62: Representative Viewpoint.
	2.10.88 Landscape and visual impacts should be considered carefully pre-application. Potential impacts on the statutory purposes of nationally designated landscapes and their settings should form a part of the pre- application process.	
	2.10.89 Applicants should carry out a landscape and visual assessment (LVIA) and report it in the ES. Photomontage visualisations may be required to demonstrate the effects of a proposed solar farm, on sensitive or valued landscapes, particularly designated landscapes, the setting of heritage assets and any nearby residential areas or viewpoints.	
	2.10.90 Applicants should follow the criteria for good design set out in Section 4.7 of EN-1 when developing projects and will be expected to direct considerable effort towards minimising the landscape and visual impact of solar PV arrays especially within nationally designated landscapes.	In keeping with the criteria for good design set out in Section 4.7 of EN-1, potential landscape and visual effects have been considered from the outset of the Proposed Development as detailed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7].** The design mitigation has been embedded into the Proposed Development to minimise effects on landscape character and visual amenity as set out in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13].** The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** sets out how the Proposed Development has followed an iterative design process that responds directly to landscape character, views and visual amenity. It sets out a series of 'design prompts' that were used to inform subsequent design development. Specially, the landscape design prompts seek to achieve the following: • Retain existing pattern and scale of the landscape by maintaining existing vegetated structure, limiting vegetation removal as far as practicable; • Minimise impact on landscape character areas with the highest levels of sensitivity and • Enhance the existing landscape framework with focus on re-establishment and enhancement of hedgerows. The design prompt with respect to views and visual amenity seeks to minimise the visual impact experienced by people through careful siting of project components and introduction and successful establishment of new planting as part of the Proposed Development.

		The Applicant confirms that there are no Nationally Designated Landscapes within the Order Limits.
	2.10.91 Whilst there is an acknowledged need to ensure solar PV installations are adequately secured, required security measures such as fencing should consider the need to minimise the impact on the landscape and visual impact (see paragraphs 2.10.38 – 2.10.40 of this NPS).	As set out in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7],** fencing surrounding the solar PV array is anticipated to be a maximum of 2.2m in height. If necessary, a double fence may be installed. Mammal gates would be incorporated into perimeter fencing to allow for movement of wildlife. The substation compounds would be surrounded by a double fence of galvanised welded wire which would be a maximum of 3m in height, with an additional 1m of electrified fencing. Fencing would be muted in colour, and sensitive with the surrounding environment. The BESS compound would be surrounded by a double fence of galvanised welded wire which would be a maximum of 3m in height, with an additional 1m of electrified fencing. Fencing would be muted in colour, and sensitive to the surrounding environment.
	2.10.92 The applicant should consider as part of the design, layout, construction, and future maintenance plans how to protect and retain, wherever possible, the growth of vegetation on site boundaries, as well as the growth of existing hedges, established vegetation, including mature trees within boundaries. Applicants should also consider opportunities for individual trees within the boundaries to grow on to maturity.	The design of the Proposed Development has incorporated a number of standard buffers for the location of infrastructure from easily identifiable features, with the aim of reducing any potential impacts to sensitive receptors where practicable. These buffers, as set out in the **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]**, are: • 5m from hedgerows; • 25m from woodland; and • 15m from individual trees. With reference to the demonstration of 'tree-led design', the Proposed Development has sought to minimise vegetation loss across the extent of the Order limits. As well as the buffers detailed above, the extent of works has been designed to fit within the existing structure of vegetation (trees and hedgerows). The location of access points on the edge of, and within, the Order Limits has been designed to maximise use of existing access points or gaps in vegetation as far as practicable. Where limited removal has been identified, this is detailed on the **Vegetation Removal Plan [EN0110020/APP/2.9].** Where this is required, replacement planting is proposed. Additionally, the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** sets out how existing and new habitats will be protected and / or implemented. These habitats include: • Existing retained trees and shrubs (including existing hedgerows with trees, woodland, and mature trees); • Drainage ditches (including riparian zones); • Hedgerow (with trees); • Woodland (including woodland buffers and tree belts); • Individual trees (including scattered trees); and • Species-rich grassland. The oLEMP describes the establishment and long-term management and maintenance regimes for each habitat type and sets out indicative locations for proposed planting.
	2.10.93 The impact of the proposed development on established trees and hedges should be informed by a tree survey and arboricultural / hedge assessment as appropriate	Arboricultural surveys were undertaken at access point locations during March and April 2026, the results of which are presented in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.14: Arboriculture Survey and Tree Constraints Plan [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. Further arboricultural surveys will be undertaken prior to construction, and the detailed CEMP will include mitigation measures to

		ensure trees and woodland are protected throughout the lifecycle of the Proposed Development.
Impacts – Glint and Glare	2.10.96 When a quantitative glint and glare assessment is necessary, applicants are expected to consider the geometric possibility of glint and glare affecting nearby receptors, and provide an assessment of potential impact and impairment based on the angle and duration of incidence and the intensity of the reflection.	As set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 2.1: EIA Scoping Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and agreed by PINS in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 2.2: EIA Scoping Opinion [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, an individual Glint and Glare chapter is not required in the ES. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16]** assesses glint and glare effects in respect of those matters that are scoped in. The locations of relevant receptors are shown within the supporting **ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.2: Glint and Glare Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.2: Glint and Glare Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and **ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16]** concludes that, with embedded mitigation measures in place, there is no potential for significant glint and glare effects as a result of the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. Embedded mitigation measures have been included in the **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, these include the following: • Retention and maintenance of landscape planting and screening designed to reduce glint and glare effects; and • Use of solar PV panels with anti-reflective coatings. Any operational maintenance or modification activities with the potential to alter glint and glare characteristics will be managed through the OEMP to ensure continued consistency with the assessed mitigation.
	2.10.97 The extent of reflectivity analysis required to assess potential impacts will depend on the specific project site and design. This may need to account for 'tracking' panels if they are proposed as these may cause differential diurnal and/or seasonal impacts.	Section 16.3 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16]** considers both fixed and tracker panel options, as either type of panel may constitute the worst-case scenario.
	2.10.98 When a glint and glare assessment is undertaken, the potential for solar PV panels, frames and supports to have a combined reflective quality may need to be assessed, although the glint and glare of the frames and supports is likely to be significantly less than the panels.	**ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.2: Glint and Glare Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** considers solar panels with anti-reflective coating.
Impacts – Cultural Heritage	2.10.99 The impacts of solar PV developments on the historic environment will require expert assessment in most cases and may have effect both above and below ground.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** provides an assessment of the Proposed Development's impact on the historic environment, both above and below ground assets, within the Order limits, or that will be impacted by the Proposed Development. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** concludes that, with embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant residual adverse heritage related effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. The embedded mitigation measures are documented within **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**, **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]**,
	2.10.100 Above ground impacts may include the effects on the setting of Listed Buildings and other designated heritage assets as well as on Historic Landscape Character.	
	2.10.101 Below ground impacts, although generally limited, may include direct impacts on archaeological deposits through ground disturbance associated with trenching, cabling, foundations, fencing, temporary haul routes etc.	

		and the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and are secured via requirements in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
	2.10.102 Equally, solar PV developments may have a positive effect, for example heritage assets may be protected by a solar PV farm as the site is removed from regular ploughing and shoes or low-level piling is stipulated.	Section 8.5 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** that if the Proposed Development was not to proceed, it is presumed that there would be continued agricultural use within the Order Limits, which includes ploughing that would damage subsurface archaeological remains..Therefore, the Proposed Development will have a positive effect.
	2.10.104 Applicant assessments should be informed by information from Historic Environment Records (HERs) or the local authority.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** provides an assessment of the Proposed Development's impact on the historic environment, both above and below ground assets, within the Order limits, or that will be impacted by the Proposed Development and has been informed by the HER.
	2.10.105 Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, the applicant should submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation. These should be carried out using expertise where necessary and in consultation with the LPA, and should identify archaeological study areas and propose appropriate schemes of investigation, and design measures, to ensure the protection of relevant heritage assets.	**ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Baseline [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** sets out the existing cultural heritage baseline conditions, with further details presented in the following appendices: • **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.1: Legislation, Policy and Guidance [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.3: Sieving Exercise [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.5: Geoarchaeological Desk Based Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.6: Geophysical Survey [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7: Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**
	2.10.106 In some instances, field studies may include investigative work (and may include trial trenching beyond the boundary of the proposed site) to assess the impacts of any ground disturbance, such as proposed cabling, substation foundations or mounting supports for solar panels on heritage assets.	
	2.10.107 The extent of investigative work should be proportionate to the sensitivity of, and extent of, proposed ground disturbance in the associated study area.	
	2.10.108 Applicants should take account of the results of historic environment assessments in their design proposal.	As detailed in Section 5 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]**, good design has been a fundamental consideration from the outset of the Proposed Development. The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** illustrates how the design of the Proposed Development has been developed in accordance with a clear design framework, based on the criteria for good design outlined in NPS EN-1. This has included the adoptions of project level design principles (Project Principles) to guide decision making and embed good design outcomes into the Proposed Development. Throughout the design process, the Applicant maintained an interdisciplinary approach to design, considering both the opportunities and constraints of the Proposed Development. This included analysis of the existing physical, environmental, social and cultural context of the Proposed Development by a broad range of technical disciplines (including landscape and visual, noise, and ecology).
	2.10.109 Applicants should consider what steps can be taken to ensure heritage assets are conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, including the impact of proposals on views important to their setting.	
	2.10.110 As the significance of a heritage asset derives not only from its physical presence but also from its setting, careful consideration should be given to the impact of large-scale solar farms which depending on their scale, design, and prominence, may cause substantial harm to the significance of the asset.	

		ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8] provides an assessment of the Proposed Development's impact on the historic environment, both above and below ground assets, within the Order limits, or that will be impacted by the Proposed Development. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** concludes that, with embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant residual adverse heritage related effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. The embedded mitigation measures are documented within **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**, **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]**, and the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and are secured via requirements in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
	2.10.111 Applicants may need to include visualisations to demonstrate the effects of a proposed solar farm on the setting of heritage assets.	Photographs and visualisations have been included to support the descriptions of the baseline views and visual effects in reference to the viewpoints, which were agreed upon through consultation with the relevant local planning authorities. A range of visualisations have been prepared to support the **ES Appendix 7.4: Representative Viewpoint Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. The visualisations include: • Figure 7.4.1: Representative Viewpoints ZTV – W1; • Figure 7.4.2: Representative Viewpoints ZTV – W2; • Figure 7.4.3: Representative Viewpoints ZTV – W3; • Figure 7.4.4: Public Rights of Way and Private Receptors with ZTV – W1; • Figure 7.4.5: Public Rights of Way and Private Receptors with ZTV – W2; • Figure 7.4.6: Public Rights of Way and Private Receptors with ZTV – W3; and • Figures 7.4.7 to 7.4.62: Representative Viewpoint.
Impacts – Construction including traffic and transport noise and vibration	2.10.112 Modern solar farms are large sites that are mainly comprised of small structures that can be transported separately and constructed on-site, with developers designating a compound onsite for the delivery and assemblage of the necessary components.	As noted within section 3.2 of the **ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, the Proposed Development is situated in close proximity to three roads that form part of the Strategic Road Network. In terms of vehicle routing, these roads will be the origins of trips to the Proposed Development. The three roads of relevance that form part of the Strategic Road Network include – • **A1** - spans approximately 410 miles (660 km) from London to Edinburgh, passing through major towns and cities such as Peterborough, Doncaster, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and Berwick-upon-Tweed. The A1 includes sections that are designated as A1(M), which are upgraded to motorway standards. Junction 1 of the A1 (M) will be utilised to provide SRN routing onto the local highway network for Whitestone 1. • **M18** - The M18 motorway is a key route in Yorkshire, stretching approximately 26 miles (42 km) from the east of Rotherham to Goole in a north-east to south-west direction. It connects several major motorways, including the M1, A1(M), M180, and M6212. Junction 1 of the M18 motorway will be utilised to provide SRN routing onto the local highway network for Whitestone 1 and 2. • **M1** - The M1 motorway connects London to Leeds and spans approximately 193 miles (311 km). The motorway passes through several counties, including Greater London, Hertfordshire, Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Northamptonshire, Leicestershire, Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire, and Yorkshire. It also intersects with other major motorways such as the M25, M6, M69, M18, M62, and M62112. Junction 31 of the M1
	2.10.113 Many solar farms will be sited in areas served by a minor road network. Public perception of the construction phase of solar farms will derive mainly from the effects of traffic movements, which is likely to involve smaller vehicles than typical onshore energy infrastructure but may be more voluminous.	
	2.10.115 Applicants should assess the various potential routes to the site for delivery of materials and components where the source of the materials is known at the time of the application, and select the route that is the most appropriate.	

		motorway will be utilised to provide SRN routing onto the local highway network for Whitestone 2 and 3. Junction 33 will also provide routing to Whitestone 2. As set out within section 4.2 of **Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]**, one of the key site selection principles that assisted in determining a suitable location for the Proposed Development was to ensure it would be situated in an appropriate location to access motorways and other major road infrastructure corridors for construction purposes. As demonstrated within the **Location Plans [EN0110020/APP/2.1]**, the Proposed Development is well connected to the local motorways, including the M18 and M1 but also the wider major road infrastructure and Local Road Network. This enables the chosen site to be accessed from all necessary road networks for construction, operation (and maintenance) and decommissioning phases. The Applicant's approach to EIA, including the use of the Rochdale Envelope to assess the effects, is set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]** and **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: EIA Methodology [EN0110020/APP/6.3]**. With the need for flexibility in mind, the Applicant confirms that the ES has assessed the likely worst-case development scenario.
	2.10.116 Where the exact location of the source of construction materials, such as crushed stone or concrete is not known at the time of the application, applicants should assess the worst-case impact of additional vehicles on the likely potential routes.	Section 3.8 of the **OCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** notes that all vehicles and other AILs will be required to follow the routing strategy that has been agreed with both the Local Highway Authorities when travelling to and from the Proposed Development. The main construction access points to the Proposed Development will be from the local road network. The proposed access points for the Site and Cable Corridor are presented in a figure within **Appendix A-1 Access Point Locations** of the **OCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]**. The proposed routing has been informed by the reasonable worst-case scenario as set out within **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]**.
	2.10.117 Applicants should ensure all sections of roads and bridges on the proposed delivery route can accommodate the weight and volume of the loads and width of vehicles. Although unlikely, where modifications to roads and/or bridges are required, these should be identified, and potential effects addressed in the ES.	As set out within section 4.7 of the **OCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]**, the overall management and implementation of the final construction traffic management plan will be the responsibility of the Applicant. The Applicant will appoint a Traffic Safety Control Officer to develop, implement and management the CTMP with one of the controls being to demonstrate any need for measures and areas of the proposed road structure to be improved. Work No. 5, as set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]** is regarding the highway works associated with the Proposed Development. Highways Works refer to the creation of access points, visibility splays, and any localised upgrades to roads required to accommodate the delivery of Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs) and other traffic associated with the Proposed Development.
	2.10.118 Where a cumulative impact is likely because multiple energy infrastructure developments are proposing to use a common port and/or access route and pass through the same towns and villages, applicants should include a vision-led transport assessment to manage cumulative impacts as part of the ES. This should consider the impacts of abnormal traffic movements relating to the project in question in combination with those from any other relevant development. Consultation with the relevant local highways authorities is likely to be necessary.	Section 13.8 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** sets out the potential cumulative traffic and transport effects of the Proposed Development. Table 13.26 notes that it is unlikely that the peak construction period associated with the other developments in the Study Area will overlap with the peak construction period of the Proposed Development as the applications are at different stages in the planning process and each development has varying lengths of construction period. However, in a worst case scenario, where there could be some overlap in construction activity the magnitude of cumulative traffic increases would remain low.

		It is summarised from the assessment undertaken for **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** that the cumulative effect of the Proposed Development and other developments in the area would not lead to any changes in the significance of effects predicted for the Proposed Development following the implementation of embedded mitigation measures.
Mitigations – Agriculture Land classification and land type	2.10.119 The Defra Construction code of practice for the sustainable use of soils on construction sites provides guidance on ensuring that damage to soil during construction is mitigated and minimised. Mitigation measures focus on minimising damage to soil that remains in place, and minimising damage to soil being excavated and stockpiled. The measures aim to preserve soil health and soil structure to minimise soil carbon loss and maintain water infiltration and soil biodiversity. Mitigation measures for agricultural soils include use of green cover, multispecies cover crops - especially during the winter - minimising compaction and adding soil organic matter. Mitigation of impacts to peat soils should include water table management and minimising soil disturbance.	Section 9.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]**, sets out the following embedded mitigation to minimise damage to soil structure during the construction phase of the Proposed Development: • All works will be undertaken in accordance with the relevant Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2015; • Appropriate procedures to address the risk of soil and groundwater contamination and deleterious ground conditions during ground disturbance works will be identified and implemented. This includes **ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.7 – 9.9: Phase 1 Contaminated Land Report [EN0110020/APP/9.20]**; • Handling of potentially polluting substances (e.g. fuels, soils, drilling fluids), including excavated soils and wastes, in line with technical guidance and best working practices. All fuel and COSHH substances will be stored and handled in accordance with the relevant Environment Agency Pollution Prevention Guidance (PPG) notes , e.g. storage and refuelling in designated areas with secondary containment, routine inspections and maintenance of machinery and infrastructure and spill response planning and training; • Management of clean topsoil and subsoil by the implementation of a Soil Management Plan (SMP), developed in line with the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs' (DEFRA) 2009 *Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites PB13298,* including retuning temporary working areas to their pre-existing condition, as far as reasonably practicable; • Implementation of dust suppression measures as necessary to prevent the mobilisation and off-site migration of dust particles, for example damping down using water sprays, covering of stockpiles and wheel-washing; • Piling activities will be undertaken in accordance with industry best practice. Ground investigation findings will inform foundation and piling risk assessments, which will determine the most appropriate piling techniques and foundation design to effectively mitigate potential risks; • Trenchless crossings for cable installation will be undertaken in accordance with industry best practice and carefully managed to prevent the inadvertent release of drilling fluids into aquifers or the surrounding surface environment, including land and water bodies; • In areas of steeper terrain in western W2, geotechnical investigations will be undertaken prior to construction in order to inform the design of a roadway and cable installation method;

		• Identification and appropriate procedures to address the risks of soil and groundwater contamination during dewatering, if required, including management of water from excavations via the Site drainage / treatment system; • A UXO risk assessment will be conducted prior to construction, and if required, a safety plan will be developed to ensure UXO risk is identified and addressed before construction begins, where required; and Section 9.6 of the O**utline Soil Management Plan** of the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** sets out the key soil management principles that will be undertaken during the construction phase, including: • Minimisation of soil disturbance: o Soil disturbance will be minimised wherever practicable through design and construction planning; and o Soils will be retained in situ where ground disturbance is not required. • Timing of Soil Handling o Soil stripping, handling and trafficking will only be undertaken when soils are in a suitable, dry and friable condition; and o Soil handling will be avoided during periods of excessive rainfall or when soils are at or above their plastic limit. • Protection of Soil profiles o Where soil stripping is required, topsoil and subsoil will be stripped and stored separately; and o Soil horizons will not be mixed during stripping, storage or reinstatement. • Prevention of Compaction o Vehicle movements will be restricted to defined routes; o Low-ground-pressure machinery will be used where practicable; and o Trafficking on stripped or exposed soils will be minimised.
Mitigations – Biodiversity and ecological conservation	2.10.120 In England, proposed enhancements should take account of the above factors and as set out in Sections 4.6 and 5.4 of EN-1 aim to achieve environmental and biodiversity net gain in line with the ambition set out in the Environmental Improvement Plan and any relevant measures and targets, including statutory targets set under the Environment Act 2021 or elsewhere.	As presented in the **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Baseline Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, the ecological mitigation and enhancement areas will deliver a net gain of: • Area habitat units = 28% • Hedgerow units = 30% • Watercourse units = 10%

		This net gain is outlined in the oLEMP which is secured via a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].**
	2.10.121 This might include maintaining or extending existing habitats and potentially creating new important habitats, for example by installing cultivated strips/plots for rare arable plants, rough grassland margins, bumble bee plant mixes, and wild bird seed mixes.	Maximising the restoration, creation, and enhancement of wider biodiversity has been key to the evolution of the Scheme's design. As set out in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/13]**, new habitats will be provided as part of the Scheme, with the aim of improving biodiversity gains, where this does not conflict with construction, operation and decommissioning functions of the Scheme.
	2.10.122 Applicants are advised to develop an ecological monitoring programme to monitor impacts upon the flora of the site and upon any particular ecological receptors (such as bats and wintering birds). Results of the monitoring will then inform any changes needed to the land management of the site, including, if appropriate, any livestock grazing regime.	Appropriate monitoring will be undertaken during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning as set out in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** and the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13],** which are secured via corresponding requirements in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
Mitigations – Landscape, Visual and Residential Amenity	2.10.123 Applicants should consider the potential to mitigate landscape and visual impacts through, for example, screening with native hedges, trees and woodlands.	Landscape and visual mitigation measures, which include screening measures, are outlined within **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]** and the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13].**
	2.10.124 Applicants should aim to minimise the use and height of security fencing. Where possible applicants should utilise existing features, such as hedges or landscaping, to assist in site security, or screen security fencing.	**ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]** and **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]** include the design specifications of security fencing. The design of security fencing is only to the extent necessary to reasonably secure the Proposed Development.
	2.10.125 Applicants should minimise the use of security lighting. Any lighting should utilise a passive infra-red (PIR) technology and should be designed and installed in a manner which minimises impact.	**ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]** and **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]** outline the security measures, including lighting, incorporated in the Proposed Development's design. Lighting is not required within the solar arrays. However, it would be installed in the primary and satellite substation compounds and the BESS location(s) and would be used only as needed for maintenance and security purposes. All lighting would be manually operated or PIR motion activated and directed into the compounds, avoiding hedgerows, tree lines, woodland blocks, watercourses, ponds, and other areas to minimise impact on nocturnal or crepuscular fauna and potential sensitive residential receptors where possible.
Mitigations – Glint and Glare	2.10.126 Applicants should consider using, and in some cases the Secretary of State may require, solar panels to comprise of (or be covered with) anti-glare/anti-reflective coating with a specified angle of maximum reflection attenuation for the lifetime of the permission.	Section 16.3 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16]** considers both fixed and tracker panel options, as type of panel may constitute the worst-case scenario. As described in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]**, the Proposed Development would comprise south-facing, fixed solar PV modules at an angle of between 8 and 25 degrees. The proposed maximum height of the top of the solar PV modules would be 3.8 m AGL. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.2: Glint and Glare Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** considered solar panels with anti-reflective coating. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16]** concludes that, with embedded mitigation measures in place, there is no potential for significant glint and glare effects as a result of the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. Embedded mitigation measures have been included in the **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, these include the following:
	2.10.127 Applicants may consider using screening between potentially affected receptors and the reflecting panels to mitigate the effects.	
	2.10.128 Applicants may consider adjusting the azimuth alignment of, or changing the elevation tilt angle of, a solar panel within the economically viable range, to alter the angle of incidence. In practice this is unlikely to remove the potential impact altogether but in marginal cases may contribute to a mitigation strategy.	

		• Retention and maintenance of landscape planting and screening designed to reduce glint and glare effects; and • Use of solar PV panels with anti-reflective coatings. Any operational maintenance or modification activities with the potential to alter glint and glare characteristics will be managed through the OEMP to ensure continued consistency with the assessed mitigation.
Mitigations – Cultural Heritage	2.10.129 The ability to microsite specific elements of the proposed development during the construction phase should be an important consideration by the Secretary of State when assessing the risk of damage to archaeology.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** concludes that, with embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant residual adverse heritage related effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. The embedded mitigation measures are documented within **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**, **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]**, and the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and are secured via requirements in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
Mitigation – Construction including traffic and transport noise and vibration	2.10.131 In some cases, the local highway authority may request that the Secretary of State impose controls on the number of vehicle movements to and from the solar farm site in a specified period during its construction and, possibly, on the routeing of such movements particularly by heavy vehicles. 2.10.132 Where the Secretary of State agrees that this is necessary, requirements could be imposed on development consent.	Section 4 of the **OCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** and section 13.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** sets out measures required to control any impacts from construction traffic associated with the Proposed Development. The mitigation measures proposed include: • Designing entry / exit points onto the road network in accordance with national road design standards and in consultation with the local highway authority to ensure safety; • Managing interactions with the public road network through visibility splays, signage, and traffic controls, with construction traffic yielding to other road users; • Distributing details of vehicle routes to workers to reduce peak-time congestion in sensitive areas; • Scheduling HGV movements outside of peak traffic hours to avoid additional congestion; • Implementing a delivery management system to regulate HGV arrival times and monitor compliance with routing and scheduling; • Monitoring HGV routes and delivery times to ensure adherence to agreed protocols and address any non-compliance; and • Employing specialised haulage services for abnormal loads, including necessary permits and coordination with relevant authorities. The Applicant does not consider that any additional requirements need to be imposed by the Secretary of State on the Proposed Development.
	2.10.133 Where cumulative effects on the local road network or residential amenity are predicted from multiple solar farm developments, it may be appropriate for applicants for various projects to work together to ensure that the number of abnormal loads and deliveries are minimised, and the timings of	Section 13.8 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** sets out the potential cumulative traffic and transport effects of the Proposed Development. Table 13.26 in Chapter 13 notes that it is unlikely that the peak construction period associated with the other developments in the Study Area will overlap with the peak construction period

	deliveries are managed and coordinated to ensure that disruption to residents and other highway users is reasonably minimised.	of the Proposed Development as the applications are at different stages in the planning process and each development has varying lengths of construction period. However, as a worst case, where there could be some overlap in construction activity the magnitude of cumulative traffic increases would remain low.
	2.10.134 It may also be appropriate for the highway authority to set limits for, and coordinate these deliveries through, active management of the delivery schedules through the abnormal load approval process.	Section 4.5 of the **OCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** sets out that deliveries and the movement of construction vehicles will be arranged to occur outside of network peak hours. This includes the following – • Avoiding arrivals or departures on a weekday during the network peak hours (08:00–09:00 and 17:00–18:00); • Limiting deliveries to between the hours of 09:00 and 16:00; • No arrivals or departures on Saturday before 08:00 or after 13:00; • No arrivals or departures on Sundays or public holidays. These times are relevant to both the movements/delivery associated with HGV and Abnormal Indivisible Loads.
	2.10.135 Once consent for a scheme has been granted, applicants should liaise with the relevant local highway authority (or other coordinating body) regarding the start of construction and the broad timing of deliveries. Applicants may need to agree a planning obligation to secure appropriate measures, including restoration of roads and verges.	As demonstrated within Section 13.3 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]**, liaison and agreement on various elements have been discussed with National Highways and the Local highway Authorities in the form of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council, City of Doncaster Council and North East Derbyshire District Council. Further engagement with all stakeholders listed here will continue by the Applicant throughout the examination process of the DCO application.
	2.10.136 Further, it may be appropriate for any non-permanent highway improvements carried out for the development (such as temporary road widening) to be made available for use by other subsequent solar farm developments.	Section 4.5 of the **OCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** sets out that deliveries and the movement of construction vehicles will be arranged to occur outside of network peak hours. This includes the following – • Avoiding arrivals or departures on a weekday during the network peak hours (08:00–09:00 and 17:00–18:00); • Limiting deliveries to between the hours of 09:00 and 16:00; • No arrivals or departures on Saturday before 08:00 or after 13:00; • No arrivals or departures on Sundays or public holidays. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]** sets out that the Proposed Development includes highway works including the creation of access points, visibility splays and localised upgrades to roads required to accommodate the delivery of Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs) and other traffic associated with the Proposed Development. These works are spatially secured under Work No. 5 in the **Works Plans [EN0110020/APP/2.3]**.
Secretary of State decision making* - Factors *influencing site selection and	2.10.137 The Secretary of State should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. The Secretary of State	Section 9.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** sets out the following embedded mitigation during each phase of the lifetime of the Proposed Development to minimise damage to soil structure:

design – Agriculture land classification and land type	should ensure that the applicant has put forward appropriate mitigation measures to minimise impacts on soils or soil resources.	• Construction phase ○ All works will be undertaken in accordance with the relevant Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2015; ○ Appropriate procedures to address the risk of soil and groundwater contamination and deleterious ground conditions during ground disturbance works will be identified and implemented. This includes **ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.7 – 9.9**: **Phase 1 Contaminated Land Report [EN0110020/APP/9.20]**; ○ Handling of potentially polluting substances (e.g. fuels, soils, drilling fluids), including excavated soils and wastes, in line with technical guidance and best working practices; ○ Management of clean topsoil and subsoil by the implementation of a Soil Management Plan (SMP), developed in line with the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs' (DEFRA) 2009 Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites PB13298, including retuning temporary working areas to their pre-existing condition, as far as reasonably practicable; ○ Implementation of dust suppression measures as necessary to prevent the mobilisation and off-site migration of dust particles, for example damping down using water sprays, covering of stockpiles and wheel-washing; ○ Design of the Site drainage to adequately manage surface water discharges, including water quality monitoring, containment and treatment, as required. The Lead Flood Authority (LFA) and the appropriate utility company will be consulted on the potential requirement for an oil interceptor and sediment trap for the BESS and the substation areas at the point where site surface water runoff enters any sewerage network; ○ Piling activities will be undertaken in accordance with industry best practice. Ground investigation findings will inform foundation and piling risk assessments, which will determine the most appropriate piling techniques and foundation design to effectively mitigate potential risks; ○ Trenchless crossings for cable installation will be undertaken in accordance with industry best practice and carefully managed to prevent the inadvertent release of drilling fluids into aquifers or the surrounding surface environment, including land and water bodies; ○ In areas of steeper terrain in western W2, geotechnical investigations will be undertaken prior to construction in order to inform the design of a roadway and cable installation method; ○ Identification and appropriate procedures to address the risks of soil and groundwater contamination during dewatering, if required, including management of water from excavations via the Site drainage / treatment system;

		○ A UXO risk assessment will be conducted prior to construction, and if required, a safety plan will be developed to ensure UXO risk is identified and addressed before construction begins, where required; and ○ Construction workers will be required to use appropriate Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) and adhere to all relevant Health & Safety protocols, plans, and procedures. ○ Management of clean topsoil and subsoil by the implementation of a Soil Management Plan (SMP), developed in line with the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs' (DEFRA) 2009 Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites PB13298, including retuning temporary working areas to their pre-existing condition, as far as reasonably practicable; ○ Implementation of dust suppression measures as necessary to prevent the mobilisation and off-site migration of dust particles, for example damping down using water sprays, covering of stockpiles and wheel-washing; ○ Design of the Site drainage to adequately manage surface water discharges, including water quality monitoring, containment and treatment, as required. The Lead Flood Authority (LFA) and the appropriate utility company will be consulted on the potential requirement for an oil interceptor and sediment trap for the BESS and the substation areas at the point where site surface water runoff enters any sewerage network; and ○ An **Excavated Materials Management Plan (EMMP)**, part of the CEMP, will also be developed to ensure the appropriate handling, storage, re-use and disposal of excavated materials during the construction phase. This plan will help ensure that all excavated materials are managed in an environmentally responsible and compliant manner throughout the construction process. • Operation and Maintenance phase ○ Measures to maintain land quality throughout the operational phase of the Proposed Development, which will be outlined and secured through implementation of the operational phase of the SMP; ○ Maintenance works will be subject to appropriate method statements, detailing, amongst things, use of PPE, management of (unexpected) contamination, soil management and polluting substance storage and handling; and ○ Although potential impacts on soils during the operational phase are expected to be minimal, good practice will be applied to ensure that any activities, such as the maintenance and management of land beneath the solar PV modules, are carried out in a way that avoids damage and encourages regeneration of the soil resource, as far as reasonably practicable. These measures will also contribute to BNG by supporting soil health and enhancing habitat quality across the Site. • Decommissioning phase

		○ Potential effects and embedded mitigation for decommissioning of the Proposed Development are similar in nature to those during construction. These effects would be substantially lesser in magnitude than during construction. ○ The DEMP will outline the potential environmental effects associated with the decommissioning and Site closure/restoration, and detail appropriate management and mitigation measures similar to those in the CEMP.
Secretary of State decision making – Technical Considerations – Project lifetime and decommissioning	2.10.138 The Secretary of State should ensure that the applicant has put forward outline plans for decommissioning the generating station when no longer in use and restoring the land to a suitable use (taking into account paragraphs 2.10.60 and 2.10.61)	Decommissioning is expected to take between 12 and 24 months, and for the purposes of the assessment, is expected to occur after the 60-year design life of the Scheme in 2093. A commitments governing the decommissioning process for the Proposed Development is secured via a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
	2.10.139 Where the consent for a solar farm is to be time-limited, the DCO should impose a requirement setting that time-limit from the date the solar farm starts to generate electricity.	
	2.10.140 Such a requirement should also secure the decommissioning of the generating station after the expiration of its permitted operation to ensure that inoperative plant is removed after its operational life.	
	2.10.141 An upper limit of 40 years is typical, although applicants may seek consent without a time period or for differing time-periods for operation.	
	2.10.142 The time limited nature of the solar farm, where a time limit is sought as a condition of consent, is likely to be an important consideration for the Secretary of State	
	2.10.143 The Secretary of State should consider the period of time the applicant is seeking to operate the generating station, as well as the extent to which the site will return to its original state, when assessing impacts such as landscape and visual effects and potential effects on the settings of heritage assets and nationally designated landscapes.	The Proposed Development is mostly temporary and reversible in nature and therefore will have a low magnitude affect on the long-term agricultural resource. When the operational phase ends, the Solar PV Site would be decommissioned and the land returned to its original use and condition as far as practicable and returned to the landowner. The decommissioning measures are set out in the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** and secured by a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
Secretary of State decision making – Impacts – Biodiversity, ecological, geological conservation and water management	2.10.146 Water management is a critical component of site design for ground mount solar plants. Where previous management of the site has involved intensive agricultural practice, solar sites can deliver significant ecosystem services value in the form of drainage, flood attenuation, natural wetland habitat, and water quality management.	The majority of the Order limits are within Flood Zone 1, with a small proportion of land located within Flood Zones 2 and 3. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** to the **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]**, and Chapter 8 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** advises how the Sequential Test has been met. However, it should be noted that where there are areas of Flood Zones 2 and 3, no sensitive electrical infrastructure has been placed within these areas, only solar panels and mitigation. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** assesses the impacts of the Proposed Development on water quality, water bodies or protected areas, an concludes that with embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse water effects exposed across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases on water quality, water bodies or protected areas.

		Embedded mitigation measures that have been incorporated into the Proposed Development's design for the construction phase include: • 10m watercourse buffers will be in place for construction works with the exception of watercourse crossings for access tracks and cable crossings • Onsite access tracks will utilise existing access road and / tracks where possible, limiting the need for construction of new access tracks, minimise ground disturbance and soil compaction, reduce the need for new watercourse crossings, and minimise the associated impacts to water quality and watercourse geomorphology. • Where new watercourse crossings are needed, they will be designed in accordance with best practice with sufficient capacity to cover the 1 in 100 year plus climate change event and freeboard allowance The **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and the **OSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** describes the water management measures to control surface water runoff and drain hardstanding and other structures during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. The following embedded mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Proposed Development design for the operation and maintenance phase: • Areas of hardstanding (substations, BESS, power conversion stations) will be served by a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) to prevent an increase in surface water runoff and control runoff rates to greenfield levels. An **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** has been prepared and the DCO includes a requirement for a DEMP to be prepared in advance of the commencement of decommissioning works. The DEMP will ensure that decommissioning is undertaken safely and with regard to the environmental legislation at the time of decommissioning, including relevant waste legislation. The residual effects outlined in the assessment rely on controls established within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**. These outline management plans and the **OSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** set out the water related measures to manage any potential water effects that may arise from the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. As set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **OSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** surface water runoff from the Solar PV will be managed through Rural SuDS and Natural Flood Management techniques such as grassland/wildflower areas, which will act to bind soils, slow surface water, and increase water quality compared to the baseline scenario. The **OSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** sets out how surface water runoff from the Site will be managed in line with the national, regional and local requirements regarding flood risk and drainage. As the Proposed Development does not have a detailed layout, a detailed drainage strategy cannot be provided at this stage, with the principles and design criteria presented in this document. These criteria will be applied during the detailed design phase, and the detailed SuDS will be secured through a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.

Secretary of State decision making - Impacts – Landscape, visual and residential amenity	2.10.149 The Secretary of State will consider the landscape and visual impact of any proposed solar PV farm, taking account of any sensitive visual receptors, and the effect of the development on landscape character, together with the possible cumulative effect with any existing or proposed development. Nationally designated landscapes and their settings (National Parks, The Broads and National Landscapes) are afforded extra protection due their statutory purpose. Development in these areas needs to satisfy policy as set out in EN-1 Section 5.10.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]** explains that no part of the Site or its immediately surrounding context falls within a statutorily designated landscape. On this basis, both National Parks and National Landscapes are scoped out of assessment. The potential cumulative Landscape and Visual effects of the Proposed Development are set out in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]** and within **ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN0110020/APP/6.17].**
Secretary of State decision making - Impacts – Glint and Glare	2.10.150 Solar PV panels are designed to absorb, not reflect, irradiation. However, the Secretary of State should assess the potential impact of glint and glare on nearby homes, motorists, public rights of way, and aviation infrastructure (including aircraft departure and arrival flight paths).	As set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 2.1: EIA Scoping Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and agreed by PINS in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 2.2: EIA Scoping Opinion [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, and individual Glint and Glare chapter is not required in the ES. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16]** assesses glint and glare effects in respect of those matters that are scoped in. The locations of relevant receptors are shown within the supporting **ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.2: Glint and Glare Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16]** concludes that, with embedded mitigation measures in place, there is no potential for significant glint and glare effects as a result of the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases.
	2.10.151 Whilst there is some evidence that glint and glare from solar farms can be experienced by pilots and air traffic controllers in certain conditions, there is no evidence that glint and glare from solar farms results in significant impairment on aircraft safety. Therefore, unless a significant impairment can be demonstrated, the Secretary of State is unlikely to give any more than limited weight to claims of aviation interference because of glint and glare from solar farms.	The potential for glint and glare to affect aircraft has been assessed in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.2: Glint and Glare Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, and with the implementation of anti-reflective coating the effect of glint and glare from the Proposed Development on Netherthorpe Airfield and Doncaster Airport is assessed as not significant, in EIA terms.
Secretary of State decision making - Impacts – Cultural Heritage	2.10.152 Solar farms are generally consented on the basis that they will be time-limited in operation. The Secretary of State should therefore consider the length of time for which consent is sought when considering the impacts of any indirect effect on the historic environment, such as effects on the setting of designated heritage assets.	Decommissioning is expected to take between 12 and 24 months, and for the purposes of the assessment, is expected to occur after the 60-year design life of the Proposed Development. The commitments governing the processes for decommissioning the Proposed Development are secured via a requirement in the **Draft DCO [APP/3.1]**. The assessment within **ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** has been carried out for the 60-year design life of the Scheme.
Secretary of State decision making - Impacts – Construction including traffic and transport noise and vibration	2.10.153 Once solar farms are in operation, traffic movements to and from the site are generally very light, in some instances as little as a few visits each month by a light commercial vehicle or car. Should there be a need to replace machine components, this may generate heavier commercial vehicle movements, but these are likely to be infrequent.	Section 1.2 and 3.2 of the **OCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** notes that once the construction phase is complete, the operational phase will generate negligible levels of traffic. The traffic associated with the operational and maintenance phase would be limited to occasional maintenance visits by service vehicles. The low level of traffic generated during the operational phase of the Proposed Development is such that this matter has been scoped out of the assessment within **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13].**
	2.10.154 The Secretary of State is unlikely to give any more than limited weight to traffic and transport noise and vibration impacts from the operational phase of a project.	

TABLE 3: NATIONAL POLICY STATEMENT EN-5 (DECEMBER 2025) – TABLE OF COMPLIANCE

Policy	Policy Text	Assessment
Part 1.1 Background	1.1.1 The security and reliability of the UK's current and future energy supply is highly dependent on having an electricity network which will enable the new electricity generation, storage, and interconnection infrastructure that our country needs to meet the rapid increase in electricity demand required to transition to Clean Power by 2030 and net zero, while maintaining energy security.	The Proposed Development would make a significant contribution to the achievement of both the national renewable energy targets and to the UK's contribution to global efforts to reduce the effects of climate change. The **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** explains that the meaningful and timely contributions offered by the Proposed Development to UK decarbonisation and security of supply, while helping lower bills for consumers throughout its operational life, will be critical on the path to net zero beyond delivery of the government's 'Clean Power by 2030' mission. Without the Proposed Development, a significant opportunity to develop a large-scale low carbon generation Proposed Development would be passed over, increasing the risk that future Carbon Budgets and the net zero 2050 target will not be achieved.
	1.1.6 As identified in EN-1, government has concluded that there is a critical national priority (CNP) for the provision of nationally significant low carbon infrastructure. This includes for electricity grid infrastructure, all power lines in scope of EN-5 including network reinforcement and upgrade works, and associated infrastructure such as substations. This is not limited to those associated specifically with a particular generation technology, as all new grid projects will contribute towards greater efficiency in constructing, operating and connecting low carbon infrastructure to the National Electricity Transmission System. These are viewed by the government as being CNP infrastructure and should be progressed as quickly as possible.	The Proposed Development is low carbon solar PV generation infrastructure and therefore qualifies as a CNP. Substantial weight should be afforded to the Proposed Development in the decision-making process due to its need being established as a CNP. The associated infrastructure for the Proposed Development is also considered CNP infrastructure under NPS EN-5, and includes substations incorporated into the Proposed Development. The **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** explains that the Proposed Development will be a substantial infrastructure asset, which, if consented, will deliver over 100 MW of secure, low-carbon electricity, which will help the UK achieve its Sixth Carbon Budget commitments and stay on track to achieve net zero by 2050.
Part 2.2 Factors influencing site selection and design	2.2.1 The Secretary of State should bear in mind that the initiating and terminating points – or development zone – of new electricity networks infrastructure is not substantially within the control of the applicant.	The Applicant holds a grid connection offer from the National Energy System Operator (NESO) to connect the Proposed Development to the National Electricity Transmission System (NETS). The connection agreement is for an export connection of up to 750MW, as discussed within the **Grid Connection Statement [EN0110020/APP/7.1]**. It is worth noting that the original Bilateral Connection Agreement (BCA) was issued by NESO in January 2022 for connection to the existing Brinsworth substation at 275kV. The agreement was accepted in April 2022. NESO then later revised the agreement in January 2025 to reflect the connection to the new Long Lane 400kV substation. At the same time, the connection date was moved to October 2029. The revised agreement was accepted by the Applicant in March 2025. As noted within the **Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** this grid connection was the starting point for the site selection process. However, once chosen **ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]** sets out the consideration of alternatives carried out by the Applicant during the site selection process in order to assist with the identification of the Site, proposed layout and choice of technology to support the UK Government net zero goals. **Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** provides an appraisal of alternative sites and demonstrates that consideration of planning policy has been undertaken, focusing on how it applies to the assessment process undertaken by the Applicant. This appendix also provide justification for why the Proposed Development are located in this particular location. As outlined in **Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** confirms that solar irradiation within South Yorkshire is above the UK
	2.2.2 Siting is determined by: • the location of new generating stations or other infrastructure requiring connection to the network, and/or • system capacity and resilience requirements determined by the NESO.	
	2.2.8 There will usually be a degree of flexibility in the location of the development's associated infrastructure such as substations, and applicants should consider carefully their location, as well as their design.	
	2.2.9 In particular, the applicant should consider such characteristics as the local topography, the possibilities for screening of the infrastructure and/or other options to mitigate any impacts (See Sections 2.9 – 2.10 below and Section 5.10 in EN-1.)	

		average, and given that the opportunities to connect large-scale solar schemes located in this area to the National Grid are limited, it is clear that the Proposed Development, which makes use of existing and available infrastructure to bring large-scale solar generation capacity to the grid, is an essential part of delivering to the urgent need for significant new renewable generation capacities to connect in the next decade to support the drive towards net zero.
Part 2.3 Climate change adaptation and resilience	2.3.2 As climate change is likely to increase risks to the resilience of some of this infrastructure, from flooding for example, or in situations where it is located near the coast or an estuary or is underground, applicants should in particular set out to what extent the proposed development is expected to be vulnerable, and, as appropriate, how it has been designed to be resilient to: • Flooding, particularly for substations that are vital to the network; and especially in light of changes to groundwater levels resulting from climate change; • The effects of wind and storms on overhead lines; • Higher average temperatures leading to increased transmission losses; • Earth movement or subsidence caused by flooding or drought (for underground cables); and • Coastal erosion – for the landfall of offshore transmission cables and their associated substations in the inshore and coastal locations respectively.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** assesses the impacts of the Proposed Development on climate as a result of a number of impacts, including, but not limited to stronger winds, heatwaves, heavy precipitation and increased risk of fires/wildfires. Due to the nature of the Proposed Development, coastal erosion has not been assessed. Section 11.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** sets out the following embedded mitigation measures to ensure that the Proposed Development is resilient to the increased risks associated with climate change: • The development of a Construction Health and Safety Plan and other relevant fieldwork specific Job Hazard Analysis (JHAs) to ensure all site workers, employees, and staff are taking necessary safety measures to avoid the health impacts associated with extreme heat • Maintenance schedule to account for replacing any damaged or degraded solar panels. • Maintenance and retrofit schedules to mitigate any thermal shutdowns, fire hazards and operational disruptions as assets are maintained and/or replaced • Critical electrical infrastructure within the Proposed Development to be located within Flood Zone 1 • PV arrays to be located within Flood Zone 1 wherever feasible. Where panels are to be located in Flood Zone 2 or 3, they will be in areas where flood levels for the 1 in 100-year event are 300 mm below the lower edge of panels • PV arrays will be installed on metal frames driven into the ground, reducing their footprint within the floodplain. Alternative solutions will be assessed and appropriately mitigated as required. • All sensitive and electrical equipment on the solar panel will be elevated by legs or mounted on raised frames. • Electrical infrastructure compounds will include a surface water drainage system. • Construction compounds will be located within Flood Zone 1. • Water required for cooling of the BESS and substations is maintained in a closed cooling system, providing resilience for periods of water stress or drought in the region. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** assess the impacts of the Proposed Development on water quality, water bodies or protected areas, and concludes that with the embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse water effects expected across the Proposed
	2.3.3 Section 4.10 of EN-1 advises that the resilience of the project to the effects of climate change must be assessed in the Environmental Statement (ES) accompanying an application. For example, future increased risk of flooding would be covered in any flood risk assessment (see Section 5.8 in EN-1). Consideration should also be given to coastal change (see Section 5.6 in EN-1).	

		Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases on water quality, water bodies or protected areas. The residual effects outlined in the assessment rely on controls established within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**. These outline management plans and the **OSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** set out the water related measures to manage any potential water effects that may arise from the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. As set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **OSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** surface water runoff from the Solar PV will be managed through Rural SuDS and Natural Flood Management techniques such as grassland/wildflower areas, which will act to bind soils, slow surface water, and increase water quality compared to the baseline scenario. The **OSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** sets out how surface water runoff from the Site will be managed in line with the national, regional and local requirements regarding flood risk and drainage. As the Proposed Development does not have a detailed layout, a detailed drainage strategy cannot be provided at this stage, with the principles and design criteria presented in this document. These criteria will be applied during the detailed design phase, and the detailed SuDS will be secured in the Surface Water Drainage Strategy pursuant to a requirement of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** includes the adoption of project level design principles to guide decision making and embed good design outcomes into the Proposed Development. Table 3, Section 4.3, sets out that whilst pockets of potential flood areas are present, the majority of land would not be impacted.
Part 2.4 – Consideration of good design for energy infrastructure	2.4.1 The Planning Act 2008 requires the Secretary of State to have regard, in designating an NPS, and in determining applications for development consent, to the desirability of good design.	As detailed in Section 5 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]**, good design has been a fundamental consideration from the outset of the Proposed Development. The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** illustrates how the design of the Proposed Development has been developed in accordance with a clear design framework, based on the criteria for good design as outlined in NPS EN-1. This has included the adoption of project design principles to guide decision-making and embed good design outcomes in the Proposed Development. Throughout the design process, the Applicant maintained an interdisciplinary approach to design, considering both the opportunities and constraints of the Proposed Development. This included an analysis of the existing physical, environmental, social and cultural context of the Order Limits by a broad range of technical disciplines as set out and assessed within **ES Topic Chapters [EN0110020/APP/6.6 – 6.16]**. The **Works Plans [EN0110020/APP/2.3]** and the **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]** secure the design of the Proposed Development through a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].**
	2.4.2 Applicants should consider the criteria for good design set out in EN1 Section 4.7, the Holford and Horlock rules and Electricity Transmission Design Principles (see Section 2.9 below) at an early stage when developing projects.	
	2.4.3 However, the Secretary of State should bear in mind that electricity networks infrastructure must in the first instance be safe and secure, and that the functional design constraints of safety and security may limit an applicant's ability to influence the aesthetic appearance of that infrastructure.	
	2.4.4 While the above principles should govern the design of an electricity networks infrastructure application to the fullest possible extent – including in its avoidance and/or mitigation of potential adverse impacts (particularly those detailed in Section 2.10 below) – the functional performance of the infrastructure in respect of security of supply and public and occupational safety must not thereby be threatened.	
Part 2.5 Environmental and Biodiversity Net Gain	2.5.1 When planning and evaluating the proposed development's contribution to environmental and biodiversity net gain, it will be important – for both the applicant and the Secretary of State – to supplement the generic guidance set out in EN-1 (Section 4.6) with recognition that the linear nature of electricity networks infrastructure can allow for excellent opportunities to: • Reconnect important habitats via green corridors, biodiversity stepping zones, and reestablishment of appropriate hedgerows; and/or	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** describes the baseline levels and assesses the anticipated biodiversity and nature conservation effects of the Proposed Development's construction, operational and maintenance and decommissioning. The chapter provides an assessment of the potential effects on internationally, nationally and locally designated sites of ecological or geological importance, on protected species, and on habitats and the species identified as being of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity.

	• Connect people to the environment, for instance via footpaths and cycleways constructed in tandem with environmental enhancements.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** concludes that with embedded and additional mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse ecology and biodiversity related effects expected over construction, operational and maintenance phases. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** concludes that with embedded and additional mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse ecology and biodiversity related effects expected across the Proposed Development phases. The expected operational residual beneficial effects outlined in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** rely on controls established in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9], oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10], oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** and the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and are secured via corresponding requirements in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. As presented in the **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Baseline Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, the ecological mitigation and enhancement areas will deliver a net gain of: • Area habitat units = 28% • Hedgerow units = 30% • Watercourse units = 10% As set out in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** which is secured via a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].** Finally, the **oPRoWPPMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** outlines the measures to limit disruption and ensure that the PRoW network can continue to be used throughout the construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development, while minimising any impact on the users of PRoWs. The proposed Development also incorporated opportunities for enhancements, including the creation of 14.58km of permissive paths throughout the Order Limits to provide new connections to extend options and routes for pedestrians, equestrians and cyclists.
Part 2.7 Holistic planning	2.7.1 EN-1 explains that the Planning Act 2008 aims to create a holistic planning regime, such that the cumulative effects of the same project can be considered together. Co-ordinated applications typically bring economic efficiencies and reduced environmental impact. 2.7.2 Accordingly, the government envisages that, wherever reasonably possible, applications for new generating stations and their related infrastructure should be contained in a single application to the Secretary of State. However, a consolidated approach of this kind may not always be possible, nor represent the most efficient strategy for delivery of new infrastructure. 2.7.4 It may also be the case that the electricity networks infrastructure application and the application for a related generating station will of necessity come from different legal entities, or from entities subject to different commercial and regulatory frameworks.	As set out in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN0110020/APP/6.17]**, a Cumulative Effects Assessment has been undertaken as part of the EIA in accordance with the Planning Inspectorate's Advice on Cumulative Effects Assessment. The assessment considered two types of cumulative effects including: • Intra-Project Effects: effects generated by individual effects on a particular receptor. • Inter- Project Effects: effects generated by the Proposed Development and other planned or approved developments on the same receptor. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]** confirms that the Proposed Development comprises the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of more than 100 MW of solar PV arrays, BESS, onsite substations and supporting infrastructure, and grid connection infrastructure. The grid connection infrastructure would connect the Proposed Development to the National Grid at the new Long Lane 400kV Substation, located east of Long Lane, Rotherham. The new National Grid substation is not forming part of the Proposed Development, but rather is being brought forward by National Grid and they submitted a TCPA application to Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council in November 2025.

Part 2.8 Strategic Network Planning	2.8.7 The Secretary of State should also take into account that Transmission Owners (TOs) and Distribution Network Operators (DNOs) are required under section 9 of the Electricity Act 1989 to bring forward efficient and economical proposals in terms of network design. 2.8.8 TOs and DNOs are also required to facilitate competition in the generation and supply of electricity, and have to provide a connection when requested.	The Applicant holds a grid connection offer from the National Energy System Operator (NESO) to connect the Proposed Development to the NETS. The connection agreement is for an export connection of up to 750MW, as discussed within the **Grid Connection Statement [EN0110020/APP/7.1]**. It is worth noting that the original Bilateral Connection Agreement (BCA) was issued by NESO in January 2022 for connection to the existing Brinsworth substation at 275kV. The agreement was accepted in April 2022. NESO then later revised the agreement in January 2025 to reflect the connection to the new Long Lane 400kV substation. At the same time, the connection date was moved to October 2029. The revised agreement was accepted by the Applicant in March 2025.
Part 2.9 Applicant Assessment - *Biodiversity and Geological Conservation*	2.9.3 Electricity networks infrastructure pose a particular potential risk to birdlife including large birds, such as swans and geese, and perching birds. These may collide with overhead lines and risk being electrocuted. Large birds may also be electrocuted when landing or taking off by completing an electric circuit between live and ground wires. Even perching birds can be killed as soon as their wings touch energised parts of the infrastructure. 2.9.4 Applicants should consider measures to make lines more visible such as bird flappers and diverters which are covered in more detail in Sections 2.10.2 - 2.10.4. 2.9.5 The applicant will need to consider whether the proposed line will cause such problems at any point along its length and take this into consideration in the preparation of the ES (see Section 4.3 of EN-1). 2.9.6 Particular consideration should be given to feeding and hunting grounds, migration corridors and breeding grounds, where they are functionally linked to sites designated or allocated under the 'national site network' provisions of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations and Conservation of Offshore Marine Habitats and Species Regulations.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** describes the baseline levels and assesses the anticipated biodiversity and nature conservation effects of the Proposed Development's construction, operational and maintenance and decommissioning. The chapter provides an assessment of the potential effects on internationally, nationally and locally designated sites of ecological or geological importance, on protected species, and on habitats and the species identified as being of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** concludes that with embedded and additional mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse ecology and biodiversity related effects expected over construction, operational and maintenance phases. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** concludes that with embedded and additional mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse ecology and biodiversity related effects expected across the Proposed Development phases. Whilst NPS EN-5 includes the presumption for overhead lines, the project team concluded that overhead lines would have resulted in greater adverse environmental impacts than underground lines, particularly on landscape character and people's visual amenity. Underground cable routes were therefore selected as part of the project commitment to avoid and minimise environmental impacts. The expected operational residual beneficial effects outlined in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** rely on controls established in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9], oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10], oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** and the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and are secured via corresponding requirements in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
Part 2.9 Applicant Assessment - *Landscape and Visual Impact*	2.9.7 While the government does not believe that the development of overhead lines is incompatible in principle with applicants' statutory duty under Schedule 9 to the Electricity Act 1989, to have regard to visual and landscape amenity and to reasonably mitigate possible impacts thereon, in practice new overhead lines can give rise to adverse landscape and visual impacts. 2.9.8 These impacts depend on the type (for example, whether lines are supported by towers or monopole structures), scale, siting, and degree of screening of the lines, as well as the characteristics of the landscape and local environment through which they are routed. 2.9.9 New substations, sealing end compounds (including terminal towers), and other above-ground installations that serve as connection, switching, and voltage transformation points on the electricity network may also give rise to adverse landscape and visual impacts.	**The Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** describes the process the Applicant took throughout design development including with respect to the cable route. An extensive optioneering exercise was undertaken by the project design team in the definition of cable routes. Whilst NPS EN-5 includes the presumption for overhead lines, the project team concluded that overhead lines would have resulted in greater adverse environmental impacts than underground lines, particularly on landscape character and people's visual amenity. Underground cable routes were therefore selected as part of the project commitment to avoid and minimise environmental impacts. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]** provides an assessment of the Proposed Development on the Landscape and Views and Visual Amenity of people within a prescribed Study Area. A corridor

	2.9.10 Cumulative adverse landscape, seascape and visual impacts may arise where new overhead lines are required along with other related developments such as substations, wind farms, and/or other new sources of generation.	width of 0.5km has been designated as the Study Area for the Cable Corridors due to the cables being underground and construction works would be low in height and for a short duration. While the actual extent of the cabling will be confined to a 40m working width, this assessment has defined the Cable Corridor Study Area to account for the possibility that the cabling could be installed anywhere within the designated Cable Corridors. The Cable Corridor Study Area is presented on **ES Volume 3, Figure 7.1: LVIA Study Area and Order Limits [EN0110020/APP/6.19]** and **ZTV on ES Volume 3, Figure 7.4: Zone of Theoretical Visibility [EN0110020/APP/6.19].** **ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]** sets out the evolution and alternatives considered with respect to the grid connection cable route options.
	2.9.11 Landscape and visual benefits may arise through the reconfiguration, rationalisation, or undergrounding of existing electricity network infrastructure. Though mitigation of the landscape and visual impacts arising from overhead lines and their associated infrastructure is usually possible, it may not always be so, and the impossibility of full mitigation in these cases does not countermand the need for overhead lines.	
	2.9.12 However, in nationally designated landscapes (National Parks, The Broads and National Landscapes) even residual impacts may make an overhead line proposal unacceptable in planning terms (see paragraph 2.9.21 below for guidance on this case).	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]** explains that no part of the Site or its immediately surrounding context falls within a statutorily designated landscape. On this basis, both National Parks and National Landscapes are scoped out of assessment.
	2.9.13 Where possible, applicants should ensure that the principles detailed in paragraphs 2.9.16-2.9.19 below are embodied in the design of their proposed overhead line route and its associated infrastructure. Applicants should also offer proposals (for instance those detailed in Section 2.10 below) for additional mitigation.	As noted above, underground cable routes were selected as part of the project commitment to avoid and minimise environmental impacts. **The Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** describes the design principles that influenced the design of the Proposed Development including the optioneering work undertaken with respect to the underground cable routes.
	2.9.14 Where the nature or proposed route of an overhead line will likely result in particularly significant landscape and visual impacts, as would be assessed through seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment (SLVIA), the applicant should demonstrate that they have given due consideration to the costs and benefits of feasible alternatives to the overhead line. This could include, where appropriate re-routing, underground or subsea cables and the feasibility e.g. in cost, engineering or environmental terms of these. Applicants should note the policy position for nationally designated landscapes at paragraph 2.9.21 below.	
Part 2.9 Applicant Assessment - *Noise and Vibration*	2.9.33 Surface grease on conductors can also give rise to audible noise effects as grease is able to move slowly under the influence of an electric field, tending to form points which then initiate discharge activity. Surface grease is likely to occur along the entire length of a conductor. Hence there may be many potential discharge sources and, consequently, a higher noise level.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]** presents a noise assessment in accordance with the requirements of NPS EN-5, including a description of the noise generating aspects of the Proposed Development. The noise assessment is proportionate to the likely noise impact. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]** consists of, but is not limited to, an assessment of potential effects upon Noise Sensitive Receptors (NSRs) during the operation and maintenance phase of the Proposed Development, from the operation of the Long Lane 400kV Substation and Battery Energy Storage System (BESS). It concludes that with the implementation of mitigation measures, significant adverse noise and vibration effects during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Proposed Development will be avoided at sensitive receptors. The embedded mitigation measures are documented within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**, and the **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** and are secured via requirements in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]** assesses operational noise at the identified sensitive noise receptors following BS 4142 guidance, BS 8233:2014 and World Health Organisation guidance. Construction and decommissioning noise and vibration impacts have been assessed per Annex E of British Standards 5228-1.
	2.9.34 This will only occur if substandard grease has been used during manufacture or if the conductor has been overheated by carrying excessive electrical load. This can be mitigated through good design or by replacement.	
	2.9.40 For the assessment of noise from substations, standard methods of assessment and interpretation using the principles of the relevant British Standards28 are satisfactory.	
	2.9.41 For the assessment of noise from overhead lines, the applicant must use an appropriate method to determine the sound level produced by the line in both dry and wet weather conditions, in addition to assessing the impact on noise-sensitive receptors.	
	2.9.42 For instance, the applicant may use an appropriate noise modelling tool or tools for the prediction of overhead line noise and its propagation over distance, such as an ISO 9613-2 or Technical Report TR(T)94	
	2.9.43 When assessing the impact of noise generated by overhead lines in wet weather relative to existing background sound levels, the applicant should consider the effect of varying background sound levels due to rainfall.	

Part 2.9 Applicant Assessment - *Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMFs)*	2.9.47 All overhead power lines produce EMFs. These tend to be highest directly under a line and decrease to the sides at increasing distance. Although putting cables underground eliminates the electric field, they still produce magnetic fields, which are highest directly above the cable. EMFs can have both direct and indirect effects on human health, aquatic and terrestrial organisms.	The Applicant does not anticipate any significant adverse EMF effects on any receptors. A high-level electromagnetic assessment has been conducted in Section 16.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16]**, which concludes that there is no potential for significant effects as a result of the Proposed Development in respect of EMF, and there is no potential for significant cumulative effects in relation to EMF as a result of the Proposed Development and other identified developments within the Study Area.
	2.9.48 The direct effects occur in terms of impacts on the central nervous system resulting in its normal functioning being affected. Indirect effects occur through electric charges building up on the surface of the body producing a microshock on contact with a grounded object, or vice versa, which, depending on the field strength and other exposure factors, can range from barely perceptible to being an annoyance or even painful.	

TABLE 4: NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (SUPERSEDED) – TABLE OF COMPLIANCE

Policy	Policy Text	Assessment
Section 2: Achieving sustainable development. **Paragraph 8**	Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways (so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives): an economic objective – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure; a social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering well-designed, beautiful and safe places, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being; and an environmental objective – to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.	The **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 15.1: Legislation, Policy and Guidance [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** outlines how the Proposed Development achieves the relevant aspects of the three objectives of sustainable development outlined in Paragraph 8 of the NPPF. The **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** and the **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** set out the critical need for large scale ground mounted solar deployment, as established under national planning policy, specifically NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-3. The Proposed Development would contribute substantially to the need for low carbon energy, in order for the government to meet its objectives and commitments. By generating low carbon energy at a low marginal cost, large-scale solar power reduces the energy generated by more expensive and more carbon intensive forms of generation. The Proposed Development will help to decarbonise the electricity system and lower the market price of electricity.
Section 6: Building a strong, competitive economy. **Paragraph 85**	Planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development. The approach taken should allow each area to build on its strengths, counter any weaknesses and address the challenges of the future. This is particularly important where Britain can be a global leader in driving innovation, and in areas with high levels of productivity, which should be able to capitalise on their performance and potential.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economic and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15]** describes the baseline levels and assesses the anticipated socio-economic effects of the Proposed Development's construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning in accordance with this policy. The Proposed Development will provide construction job opportunities over the anticipated 24-month construction programme. The Applicant estimates that a maximum of 1,616 construction jobs will be created during the construction phase of the Proposed Development, with 538 being local to the Site. During the Operation and maintenance phase, the enhanced permissive paths network is anticipated to benefit local residents and tourists from outside the area. This is because users are more likely to utilise the PRoW network, due to the enhanced permissive path network, thereby improving the level of accessibility. Therefore, there is anticipated to be a beneficial (not significant) effect on users of PRoWs. There is also anticipated to be a beneficial (not significant) effect on accommodation providers due to the increased number of service users. The Proposed Development is not anticipated to impact any local services and community facilities as these are not situated within the Order Limits. However, the
Supporting a prosperous rural economy **Paragraph 88**	Planning policies and decisions should enable: a) the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed, new buildings; b) the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses; c) sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside; and	

	d) the retention and development of accessible local services and community facilities, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship	idea of Open Space will be impacted but, through the creation of relevant mitigation and enhancement strategies, this is expected to be limited.
Section 8: Promoting healthy and safe communities. **Paragraph 103**	Access to a network of high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity is important for the health and well- being of communities, and can deliver wider benefits for nature and support efforts to address climate change. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the need for open space, sport and recreation facilities (including quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses) and opportunities for new provision. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sport and recreational provision is needed, which plans should then seek to accommodate.	A number of Public Rights of Way traverse the Order Limits of the Proposed Development. The Proposed Development also incorporates a series of permissive paths proposed across the Order Limits, as detailed in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** which will be connected to the existing PRoWs. Permissive paths will be open for the operational and maintenance phase of the Proposed Development and be open to equestrians, cyclists and pedestrians. The extent and location of the paths is as follows: • Approximately 2.92 km of permissive paths proposed across Whitestone 1 to provide additional equestrian routes that link with the existing bridleways. • Approximately 10.8 km of permissive paths are proposed across Whitestone 2. To the north, two permissive paths provide access around King's Pond Plantation. To the west, the proposed permissive path follows Ulley Brook to connect with the existing footpath to the north and Treeton Lane to the south. To the south of Upper Whiston, a permissive path links Suilthwaite Common Lanlee and Field Lane. To the east of Ulley, a permissive path forms a circular route that begins at Carr Lane, follows the field boundaries north, along Penny Hill Lane, then turns south to rejoin Carr Lane. Permissive paths link with the existing PRoW to create a circular route across Brampton Common. To the east, the permissive path offers an alternative route away from the A57, connecting the A57 sidewalk to Anston Brook and the existing footpath near North Anston. • Approximately 0.86 km long permissive path across Whitestone 3, begins in Woodal, crosses Stone Hill and joins the existing footpath at Harthill Reservoir. An **oPROWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** has been prepared in support of the DCO application. The **oPROWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** sets out the mitigation, management and monitoring measures for PRoW affected by construction which may require temporary diversion/closure.
Paragraph 105	Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks including National Trails.	An **oPROWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** has been prepared in support of the DCO application. The **oPROWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** sets out the mitigation, management and monitoring measures for PRoW affected by construction which may require temporary diversion/closure.
Section 9: Promoting sustainable transport. **Paragraph 109**	Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, using a vision-led approach to identify transport solutions that deliver well-designed, sustainable and popular places. This should involve: a) making transport considerations an important part of early engagement with local communities;	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** assesses the anticipated transport and access effects of the Proposed Development's construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning, in accordance with this policy.

	b) ensuring patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes, and contribute to making high quality places; c) understanding and addressing the potential impacts of development on transport networks; d) realising opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure, and changing transport technology and usage – for example in relation to the scale, location or density of development that can be accommodated; e) identifying and pursuing opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use; and f) identifying, assessing and taking into account the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure – including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains.	Section 13.3 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** provides a summary of the Applicant's engagement regarding transport and access. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** concludes that with the mitigation measures in place, there are no residual transport and access-related effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operational and maintenance and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. By securing the mechanisms for the embedded mitigation measures as outlined in Section 13.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]**, which are secured in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9], OCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12], oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10],** and **oPROWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** and are secured via the requirements of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**, it is concluded that there are no residual effects identified for this Proposed Development.
Paragraph 115	In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that: a) sustainable transport modes are prioritised taking account of the vision for the site, the type of development and its location; b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users; c) the design of streets, parking areas, other transport elements and the content of associated standards reflects current national guidance, including the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code; and d) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree through a vision-led approach.	The **oPROWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** outlines the measures to limit disruption and ensure that the PRoW network can continue to be used throughout the construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development, while minimising the impact on PRoW users. The Proposed Development includes opportunities for advancement, including the proposed approximately 14.58km of permissive paths within the Order Limits. The **oPROWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** is secured via a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** sets out project specific design principles which have influenced the design of the Proposed Development. The project design principles of relevance to sustainable transport include the following – • Find out what is important to people about the local area and seek to incorporate feedback • Consider how people engage with their local environment and retain these patterns • Enhance recreational access across the landscape These project design principles set out how the Proposed Development will consider the experience of the people using the Public Rights of Way during the operational phase of the Proposed Development.
Paragraph 116	Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** concludes that with the mitigation measures in place, there are no residual transport and access effects associated during the Proposed Development's construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. Section 13.8 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** sets out the potential cumulative traffic and transport effects of the Proposed Development. Table 13.26 of Chapter 13 notes that it is unlikely that

		the peak construction period associated with the other developments in the Study Area will overlap with the peak construction period of the Proposed Development as the applications are at different stages in the planning process and each development has varying lengths of construction period. However, as a worst case scenario, where there could be some overlap in construction activity, the magnitude of cumulative traffic increases would remain low.
Paragraph 118	All developments that will generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a travel plan, and the application should be supported by a vision-led transport statement or transport assessment so that the likely impacts of the proposal can be assessed and monitored.	Section 4.6 of the **OCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** sets out that a Worker Travel Plan will be developed to manage the arrival and departure profile of workers on Site and to encourage sustainable modes of transport, such as car-sharing. The Worker Travel Plan will be administered by the CTMP Co-ordinator and would be a contractual requirement as part of the Principal Contractor's contract with the Applicant. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** both demonstrate that the assessment has been prepared in accordance with the appropriate guidance including the Department for Transport's guidance on Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements of Decision Taking (2014).
Section 11: Making effective use of land **Paragraph 125(a)**	Planning policies and decisions should 'encourage multiple benefits from both urban and rural land, including through […] taking opportunities to achieve net environmental gains – such as developments that would enable new habitat creation […].'	As presented in the **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Baseline Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]ES Volume 3, ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Baseline Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, the ecological mitigation and enhancement areas will deliver a net gain of: • Area habitat units = 28.35% • Hedgerow units = 37.71% • Watercourse units = 10.11% as secured in the oLEMP which is secured via a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].** Maximising the restoration, creation, and enhancement of wider biodiversity has been key to the evolution of the Proposed Development's design. As outlined in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**, new habitats will be provided as part of the Proposed Development, with the aim of enhancing biodiversity gains, provided this does not conflict with the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning functions of the Proposed Development. Examples of habitat creation and enhancement measures to be implemented as part of the Proposed Development include: • A range of good quality and well managed habitats that provide opportunities for a range of legally protected and notable flora and fauna to thrive; • Heterogeneity within habitats to ensure that large expanses of open habitats can be used effectively by a range of species;

		• Connectivity of habitats through the careful location of infrastructure and delivery of habitat corridors providing access to wider expanses of habitat both within and outside of the Order Limits; and • Focusing on providing habitats for local conservation priorities to maximise benefit to the most vulnerable species present within the locale.
Section 12: Achieving well-designed and beautiful places. **Paragraph 131**	The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Being clear about design expectations, and how these will be tested, is essential for achieving this. So too is effective engagement between applicants, communities, local planning authorities and other interests throughout the process.	As detailed in section 5 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]**, good design has been a fundamental consideration from the outset of the Proposed Development. The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** demonstrates how the design of the Proposed Development has been developed in accordance with a clear design framework, based on the criteria for good design set out in NPS EN-1. This has included the adoption of **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]** to guide decision making and embed good design outcomes to the Proposed Development. Throughout the design process, the Applicant maintained an interdisciplinary approach to design and considered both the opportunities and constraints of the Proposed Development. This included analysis of the existing physical, environmental, social and cultural context of the Site by a broad range of technical disciplines (including landscape and visual, noise, ecology and heritage) as set out and assessed by the **Aspect Chapters of the ES [EN0110020/APP/6.6 – 6.16]**. This approach has enabled the Applicant to understand the complexities of the Site and identify where multiple opportunities and constraints have the potential to stack up with one another to provide a good design response and allow for co-existence and co-location with other terrestrial uses.
Paragraph 137	Design quality should be considered throughout the evolution and assessment of individual proposals. Early discussion between applicants, the local planning authority and local community about the design and style of emerging schemes is important for clarifying expectations and reconciling local and commercial interests. Applicants should, where applicable, provide sufficient information to demonstrate how their proposals will meet the design expectations set out in local and national policy, and should work closely with those affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the views of the community. Applications that can demonstrate early, proactive and effective engagement with the community should be looked on more favourably than those that cannot.	
Paragraph 139	Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes. Conversely, significant weight should be given to: a) development which reflects local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes; and/or b) outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings	The Proposed Development's compliance with national policies is considered in Tables 1-4 of this **Policy Compliance Document [EN0110020/APP/5.5]**. The Proposed Development's compliance with local policies is considered in Tables 5 to 8 of this **Policy Compliance Document [EN0110020/APP/5.5]**. The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** has been prepared in accordance with the Planning Inspectorate's guidance titled 'Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Good Design' and sets out the design decisions taken at each step of the Proposed Development, and the rationale for these decisions, as well as the mechanisms by which good design will be secured post consent.
Section 14: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change. **Paragraph 161**	The planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050 and take full account of all climate impacts including overheating, water scarcity, storm and flood risks and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure.	Section 11.6 and 11.7 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** sets out the following embedded mitigation measures to ensure the Proposed Development is resilient to the increased risks associated with climate change: • The development of a Construction Health and Safety Plan and other relevant fieldwork specific Job Hazard Analysis (JHAs) to ensure all site workers, employees, and staff are taking necessary safety measures to avoid the health impacts associated with extreme heat

		• Maintenance schedule to account for replacing any damaged or degraded solar panels. • Maintenance and retrofit schedules to mitigate any thermal shutdowns, fire hazards and operational disruptions as assets are maintained and/or replaced • Critical electrical infrastructure within the Proposed Development to be located within Flood Zone 1 • PV arrays to be located within Flood Zone 1 wherever feasible. Where panels are to be located in Flood Zone 2 or 3, they will be in areas where flood levels for the 1 in 100-year event are 300 mm below the lower edge of panels • PV arrays will be installed on metal frames driven into the ground, reducing their footprint within the floodplain. Alternative solutions will be assessed and appropriately mitigated as required. • All sensitive and electrical equipment on the solar panel will be elevated by legs or mounted on raised frames. • Electrical infrastructure compounds will include a surface water drainage system. • Construction compounds will be located within Flood Zone 1. • Water required for cooling of the BESS and substations is maintained in a closed cooling system, providing resilience for periods of water stress or drought in the region. The Proposed Development would make a significant contribution to achieving both the national renewable energy targets and the UK's contribution to global efforts to mitigate effects of climate change. The **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** and the **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** set out that the Proposed Development will deliver a significant amount of low-carbon, low-cost and UK-located solar electricity generation capacity connecting to the National Electricity Transmission System, anticipated to be from 2029. In addition to meeting the urgent national need for secure and affordable low-carbon energy infrastructure and its associated environmental and societal benefits, the Proposed Development delivers wider benefits to the environment and the local community. The **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** sets out the evidence in support of ground mounted solar electricity generation generally, and the Proposed Development specifically, in relation to the benefit brought towards meeting the UK's critical strategic needs, including those set out in the Clean Power 2030 Action Plan. The **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** concludes that the decarbonisation, security of supply, and affordability benefits delivered by the Proposed Development

		to the national urgent need for low-carbon generation should be accorded substantial weight in the planning balance.
Paragraph 164	New development should be planned for in ways that: a) avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change. When new development is brought forward in areas which are vulnerable, care should be taken to ensure that risks can be managed through suitable adaptation measures, including through incorporating green infrastructure and sustainable drainage systems; and b) help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, such as through its location, orientation and design. Any local requirements for the sustainability of buildings in plans should reflect the Government's policy for national technical standards.	The impacts associated with flooding are outlined in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** and Sections 11.6 and 11.7 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]**. Mitigation measures such as ensuring all sensitive and electrical equipment on the solar panel is elevated by legs or mounted on raised frames, are outlined in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, and **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** sets out that the GHG Assessment concluded that the Proposed Development would provide a net climate benefit by offsetting around 16.96mtCO2e.
Paragraph 168	When determining planning applications for all forms of renewable and low carbon energy developments and their associated infrastructure, local planning authorities should: a) not require applicants to demonstrate the overall need for renewable or low carbon energy, and give significant weight to the benefits associated with renewable and low carbon energy generation and the proposal's contribution to a net zero future; b) recognise that small-scale and community-led projects provide a valuable contribution to cutting greenhouse gas emissions; c) in the case of applications for the repowering and life-extension of existing renewable sites, give significant weight to the benefits of utilising an established site.	The **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** and **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** set out the need for the Proposed Development and note the established need for low-carbon infrastructure as a Critical National Priority as set out in NPS EN-1. Such schemes should be brought forwards with urgency to make tangible and essential advances in decarbonisation in the near term. By generating low carbon electricity at a low marginal cost, large-scale solar power reduces the energy generated by more expensive and more carbon intensive forms of generation. The Proposed Development will help to decarbonise the electricity system and lowers the market price of electricity. The urgent need for the Proposed Development is also established by NPS EN-1, specifically paragraphs 3.2.8–3.2.10. It is demonstrated within the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** that any harm caused by the Proposed Development is outweighed by the substantial benefits that are delivered. It is considered that even without applying the CNP presumption, the planning case is firmly in favour of development consent being granted. It is not possible to deliver solar generation of this scale - to meet the CNP - on established sites (see **ES Volume 2, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]** and **Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment** to the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]**), but the design will ensure that over the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development, repowering and life extension opportunities are not precluded.
Paragraph 170	Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere.	The majority of the Order limits are within Flood Zone 1, with a small proportion of land located within Flood Zones 2 and 3. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** to the **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]**, and Chapter 8 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** advises how the Sequential Test has been met. However, it should be noted that where there are areas of Flood Zones 2 and 3, no sensitive
Paragraph 171	Strategic policies should be informed by a strategic flood risk assessment and should manage flood risk from all sources. They should consider cumulative impacts in, or affecting, local areas susceptible to flooding, and take account of advice from the	

	Environment Agency and other relevant flood risk management authorities, such as lead local flood authorities and internal drainage boards.	electrical infrastructure has been placed within these areas (including Flood Zone 3b), only solar panels and mitigation. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** outlines the Proposed Development's evidence and compliance with the Sequential Test at both the site selection and site-level stages. The assessment relies on controls established within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, and **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**. These outline management plans and the **OSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** set out the water related measures to manage any potential water effects that may arise from the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. As outlined in Section 5.3 of **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, to pass the Exception Test the following must be demonstrated: • the development that has to be in a flood risk area will provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk; and • the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall. Section 8.7 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** sets out that in relation to the first bullet point, above, the Applicant considers that the substantial benefits that the Proposed Development would deliver, as set out in Section 3 of this Planning Statement and considered further in the planning balance at Section 9, would clearly outweigh the flood risk. As documented within the **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]**, these are considered to be sustainability benefits to the wider community because significant renewable energy schemes at this scale are required to be able to meet the legal binding commitment to achieve net zero and make energy more affordable and reliable for all. The Proposed Development also delivers local community benefits through the additional proposed permissive paths, biodiversity net gain and environmental enhancements. Socio-economic benefits are also anticipated to be available for the local communities as documented within **ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15]** and managed within the **oSSCMP [EN0110020/APP/5.18]**. The Proposed Development is to introduce various mitigation measures, including: • Management of Chemical Pollution - 10 m watercourse buffers will be in place for construction works with the exception of watercourse crossings for access tracks and cable crossings. This is to reduce the risk of direct spills to watercourses. • Management of Sediment and Erosion - 10 m watercourse buffers will be in place for construction works with the exception of watercourse
Paragraph 173	A sequential risk-based approach should also be taken to individual applications in areas known to be at risk now or in future from any form of flooding, by following the steps set out below.	
Paragraph 174	Within this context the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test.	
Paragraph 175	The sequential test should be used in areas known to be at risk now or in the future from any form of flooding, except in situations where a site-specific flood risk assessment demonstrates that no built development within the site boundary, including access or escape routes, land raising or other potentially vulnerable elements, would be located on an area that would be at risk of flooding from any source, now and in the future (having regard to potential changes in flood risk).	
Paragraph 177	Having applied the sequential test, if it is not possible for development to be located in areas with a lower risk of flooding (taking into account wider sustainable development objectives), the exception test may have to be applied. The need for the exception test will depend on the potential vulnerability of the site and of the development proposed, in line with the Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification set out in Annex 3.	
Paragraph 178	The application of the exception test should be informed by a strategic or site-specific flood risk assessment, depending on whether it is being applied during plan production or at the application stage. To pass the exception test it should be demonstrated that: a) the development would provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk; and b) the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall.	
Paragraph 179	Both elements of the exception test should be satisfied for development to be allocated or permitted.	

		crossings for access tracks and cable crossings. This is to reduce the risk high influxes of sediment into watercourses. • Water Consumption and Wastewater - A Water Consumption Plan will be developed prior to construction to fully identify the water consumption needs, where water will be sourced from, the relevant licences needed, and to ensure no impacts to water quantity for licenced EA abstractions and / or PWS. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: Flood Risk Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** concludes that the Proposed Development will not increase flood risk from any sources. The Applicant therefore considers that the Proposed Development complies with the Exception Test requirements set out in paragraphs 177 – 179 of the NPPF as well as paragraph 5.8.11 of EN-1.
Paragraph 181	When determining any planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Where appropriate, applications should be supported by a site-specific flood-risk assessment. Development should only be allowed in areas at risk of flooding where, in the light of this assessment (and the sequential and exception tests, as applicable) it can be demonstrated that: a) within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, unless there are overriding reasons to prefer a different location; b) the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient such that, in the event of a flood, it could be quickly brought back into use without significant refurbishment; c) it incorporates sustainable drainage systems, unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate; d) any residual risk can be safely managed; and e) safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate, as part of an agreed emergency plan.	The majority of the Proposed Development is within Flood Zone 1, with a small proportion of land located within Flood Zones 2 and 3. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** to the **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]**, and Chapter 8 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** advises how the Sequential Test has been met. However, it should be noted that where there are areas of Flood Zones 2 and 3, no sensitive electrical infrastructure has been placed within these areas, only solar panels and mitigation. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** assess the impacts of the Proposed Development on water quality, water bodies or protected areas, and concludes that with the embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse water effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases on water quality, water bodies or protected areas. The non-significant residual effects outlined in the assessment rely on controls established within **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, and **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**. These outline management plans and the **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** set out the water related measures to manage any potential water effects that may arise from the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. As set out in the **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, surface water runoff from the Solar PV will be managed through Rural SuDS and Natural Flood Management techniques such as grassland/wildflower areas, which will act to bind soils, slow surface water, and increase water quality compared to the baseline scenario. An **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** has been submitted with the DCO Application, which sets out how surface water runoff from the Site will be managed in accordance with national, regional, and local requirements regarding flood risk and drainage. As the Proposed Development does not have a detailed layout, a detailed drainage strategy can't be provided at this stage, although the principles and design criteria

		presented in this document are applicable. These criteria will be applied at the detailed design phase.
Paragraph 182	Applications which could affect drainage on or around the site should incorporate sustainable drainage systems to control flow rates and reduce volumes of runoff, and which are proportionate to the nature and scale of the proposal. These should provide multifunctional benefits wherever possible, through facilitating improvements in water quality and biodiversity, as well as benefits for amenity. Sustainable drainage systems provided as part of proposals for major development should: a) take account of advice from the Lead Local Flood Authority; b) have appropriate proposed minimum operational standards; and c) have maintenance arrangements in place to ensure an acceptable standard of operation for the lifetime of the development.	An **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** has been submitted with the DCO Application, which sets out how surface water runoff from the Site will be managed in line with the national, regional and local requirements regarding flood risk and drainage. As the Proposed Development does not have a detailed layout, a detailed drainage strategy cannot be provided at this stage, with the principles and design criteria presented in this document. These criteria will be applied at the detailed design phase. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** confirms that the Application has engaged in pre-application discussions with the Environment Agency, and Local Planning Authorities (the Lead Local Flood Authority) on the matter of water resources.
Section 15: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment. **Paragraph 187A**	Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan); b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland; c) maintaining the character of the undeveloped coast, while improving public access to it where appropriate; d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures and incorporating features which support priority or threatened species such as swifts, bats and hedgehogs; e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans; and f) remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** describes the baseline levels and assesses the anticipated biodiversity and nature conservation effects of the Proposed Development's construction, operational and maintenance and decommissioning. The chapter provides an assessment of the potential effects on internationally, nationally and locally designated sites of ecological or geological importance, on protected species, and on habitats and the species identified as being of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** concludes that with embedded and additional mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse ecology and biodiversity related effects expected over construction, operational and maintenance phases. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** concludes that with embedded and additional mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse ecology and biodiversity related effects expected across the Proposed Development phases. As presented in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Baseline Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, the ecological mitigation and enhancement areas will deliver: • Area habitat units = 28% • Hedgerow units = 30% • Watercourse units = 10% which aligns with the commitment set out in the **oLEMP EN0110020/APP/5.13]** which is secured via a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. Section 9.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** includes an outline SMP which is provided as part of the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**. The objective of the outline SMP is to identify the

		importance and sensitivity of the soil resource, and it provides mitigation measures which ensure that there is no significant adverse effect on land quality as a result of the Proposed Development.
Paragraph 189	Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and National Landscapes which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads. The scale and extent of development within all these designated areas should be limited, while development within their setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]** explains that no part of the Site or its immediately surrounding context falls within a statutorily designated landscape. On this basis, both National Parks and National Landscapes are scoped out of assessment. However, the Site does incorporate land allocated as a locally designated Site known as Brampton Common Local Wildlife Site. Further information around the strategy to reduce impact on this designation is detailed within the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**. As set out in section 6 of the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**, Brampton Common LWS is designated in recognition of the following qualifying features: • Species rich hedgerows, including ancient hedgerows which are considered irreplaceable; and • Breeding skylark population. The Proposed Development aims to secure the long-term protection, enhancement, and favourable management of Brampton Common Local Wildlife Site, introducing solar panels and associated features whilst safeguarding its species rich hedgerows and breeding skylark population and delivering high quality habitat that contributes to biodiversity net gain. This is set out in further detail within the **OLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**, including the strategy to ensure long-term benefits for this wildlife site are delivered. The strategy to ensure long-term benefits for the Brampton Common Local Wildlife Site, as set out within the **OLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** will be secured as part of the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan to be prepared under Requirement 9 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The Applicant commits to the following: • Long-term management of the proposed and existing habitats supporting skylark and wading birds will extend across the LWS within the Order Limits. • Long-term operational monitoring across the LWS within the Order Limits will be undertaken annually during the peak breeding time for five years, to better understand habitat improvements and biodiversity.
Paragraph 193	When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused; b) development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it (either individually or in	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** describes the existing levels and assesses the anticipated ecology and biodiversity effects of the Proposed Development's construction, operational, and decommissioning. The chapter provides an assessment of the potential effects on internationally, nationally, and locally designated sites of ecological or geological importance, on protected species, and on habitats and other species identified as being of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity and nature conservation.

	combination with other developments), should not normally be permitted. The only exception is where the benefits of the development in the location proposed clearly outweigh both its likely impact on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest, and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest; c) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists; and d) development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity or enhance public access to nature where this is appropriate.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** sets out that there are several low magnitude residual effects on biodiversity and nature conservation identified during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. This does not include the operation and maintenance phase given the low level of activity that will occur on Site. Mitigation for these residual effects is set out within the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** which is secured by a requirement of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. As a result of embedded and residual mitigation measures, during the operational and maintenance phase there are eight direct residual significant beneficial effects as a result of the Proposed Development, which are anticipated in relation to the following ecological features: • Brampton Common Local Wildlife Site • Priority Habitats – Native Hedgerow • Priority Habitats – Wet Woodland • Priority Species – Bat • Priority Species – Reptile • Breeding Bird Assemblage • Barn Owl • Hobby Owl As presented in the **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Baseline Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]ES Volume 3, ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Baseline Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, the ecological mitigation and enhancement areas will deliver a net gain of: • Area habitat units = 28% • Hedgerow units = 30% • Watercourse units = 10% as set out in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** which is secured via a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1].**
Paragraph 196	Planning policies and decisions should ensure that: a) a site is suitable for its proposed use taking account of ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability and contamination. This includes risks arising from natural hazards or former activities such as mining, and any proposals for mitigation including land remediation (as well as potential impacts on the natural environment arising from that remediation); b) after remediation, as a minimum, land should not be capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990; and	Section 9.3 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** sets out that preliminary risk assessments in relation to land contamination have been undertaken in **ES Volume 3, Appendices 9.7 – 9.12: Phase 1 Coal Mining Risk Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. The reports identify potential source-pathway-receptor pollutant linkages in the context of the Proposed Development. The potential for land contamination identified in this preliminary risk assessment has been incorporated into the assessment of effects. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** concludes that there are not any risks associated with land instability and contamination as a result of former activities. Mitigation is proposed as set out in the outline SMP which is provided as part of the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** to reduce the effects of soils as a result of the Proposed

	c) adequate site investigation information, prepared by a competent person, is available to inform these assessments.	Development. The Chapter concludes that there would be no significant effect on land use across the Proposed Development.
Paragraph 198	Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should: a) mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life b) identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason; and c) limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]** considers the noise impact of the Proposed Development. It concludes that with the implementation of mitigation measures, significant adverse noise and vibration effects during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Proposed Development will be avoided at sensitive receptors. The embedded mitigation measures are documented within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**, and the **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** and are secured via requirements in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The **Statutory Nuisance Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.2]** concludes that only matters addressed by the Environmental Protection Act 1990 which have been assessed as potentially being significant for the Proposed Development are those associated with noise, dust, health, light and vibration. It draws upon the assessment conclusions from **ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]** to establish that the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development would not constitute a statutory nuisance, provided that the identified mitigation measures are implemented. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]** sets out that pole mounted internal facing closed-circuit television (CCTV) systems installed at a height of up to 4m will be deployed around the perimeter of the Site. Section 5.4 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]** sets out that lighting is not required within the solar arrays. However, it would be installed in the primary and satellite substation compounds and the BESS location(s) and would be used only as needed for maintenance and security purposes. Lighting would be operated either by PIR sensors or manually and directed into the compounds, avoiding hedgerows, tree lines, woodland blocks, watercourses, ponds, and other areas to minimise impact on nocturnal or crepuscular fauna and potential sensitive residential receptors where possible.
Paragraph 199	Planning policies and decisions should sustain and contribute towards compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives for pollutants, taking into account the presence of Air Quality Management Areas and Clean Air Zones, and the cumulative impacts from individual sites in local areas. Opportunities to improve air quality or mitigate impacts should be identified, such as through traffic and travel management, and green infrastructure provision and enhancement. So far as possible these opportunities should be considered at the plan-making stage, to ensure a strategic approach and limit the need for issues to be reconsidered when determining individual applications. Planning decisions should ensure that any new development in Air Quality Management Areas and Clean Air Zones is consistent with the local air quality action plan.	Section 12.4 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]** outlines that a total of 36.2 ha of the Site is located within the Rotherham Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). The Sheffield Citywide AQMA, Doncaster AQMA 2 and AQMA5 are also considered in the assessment due to their proximity. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]** discusses the potential air quality impacts arising as a result of the Proposed Development. With the measures set out in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]**, and the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**, **ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12], ES Volume 2, Chapter 18: Summary of Significant Effects [EN0110020/APP/6.18]** concludes that there are no residual effects identified.

Section 16: Proposals affecting heritage assets **Paragraph 207**	In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** provides an assessment of the Proposed Development's impact on the historic environment, both above and below ground assets, within the Order limits, or that will be impacted by the Proposed Development. The Chapter describes the heritage assets within the Study Area for the Proposed Development and their significance, and the significance of their contribution to the setting. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** concludes that, with embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant residual adverse heritage related effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. The embedded mitigation measures are documented within **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**, **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]**, and the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and are secured via requirements in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
Paragraph 213	Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional; b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.	**ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Baseline [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** outlines the baseline conditions of heritage assets. Section 8.2 of **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Baseline [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** sets out various designations, historic landscape character records, relevant Historic Environment Records, and equivalent resources which are within or surrounding the Proposed Development, but this does not change the overall impact that there are no significant residual effects identified during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Proposed Development.
Paragraph 216	The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** provides an assessment of the Proposed Development's impact on the historic environment, both above and below ground assets, within the Order limits, or that will be impacted by the Proposed Development. The Chapter describes the heritage assets within the Study Area for the Proposed Development and their significance, and the significance of their contribution to the setting. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** concludes that, with embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant residual adverse heritage related effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. The embedded mitigation measures are documented within **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**, **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]**, and the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and are secured via requirements in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.

TABLE 5: NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (AUGUST 2026) – TABLE OF COMPLIANCE

Policy	Policy Text	Assessment
4. Achieving sustainable development		
S5: Principle of development outside settlements	5. This policy does not apply to development proposals in the Green Belt or on land designated as Local Green Space, which should instead be determined in accordance with policies HC8, GB6, GB7 and/or GB8 (as appropriate). However, where development is not inappropriate in these locations (through the application of policies HC8 and GB7), proposals should also be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework, and applying paragraph 2 of this policy.	Urgent and unprecedented actions are required on a global scale to halt climate change. A rapid increase in the supply of low carbon electricity is needed for the UK to meet its legally binding climate change targets. Solar generation is a critical part of the UK's strategy to achieve net zero by 2050, a key step towards which is the Government's national mission for 'Clean Power by 2030'. This is further explained within Chapter 3 of the **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]**. As demonstrated within NPS EN-1, there is a clear urgent need for the type of development that this application will provide. Paragraph 3.2.1 of NPS EN-1 highlights that solar infrastructure is a core part of meeting the Clean Power 2030 Mission given it is 'secure, reliable, affordable, and consistent with net zero emissions in 2050'. The **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** also explains why the Proposed Development is urgently needed at the scale proposed, why the proposed location is highly suitable for such a scheme, and how the Proposed Development also addresses all relevant aspects of established and emerging government energy and climate change policy and commitments. As per part 5 of Policy S5, the Proposed Development is located on Grey Belt land. **Appendix 2: Green Belt Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** sets out that the Proposed Development meets the tests for being not inappropriate within the Grey Belt. The tests were as follows: • The development would utilise Grey Belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan • There is demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed • The development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of the NPPF (December 2024) • Where applicable the development proposed meets the 'Golden Rules' requirements sets out in paragraphs 156-157 of the NPPF (December 2024) The Proposed Development is not inappropriate in the Grey Belt because it will not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan, there is a demonstrable need for the development established in NPS EN 1, and the site is in a sustainable location with respect to transport.

		The Applicant considers that the Proposed Development is critical national priority (CNP) development as defined in paragraph 4.2.17 of NPS EN-1, and NPS EN-1 paragraph 4.2.30 states that the Secretary of State will take as the starting point for decision-making that, where a proposal is CNP Infrastructure, this is to be treated as meeting the very special circumstances test set out in paragraph 153 of the NPPF (December 2024), which states that *"inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances".*
5. Meeting the challenge of climate change		
CC2: Mitigation of climate change	1. In order to contribute to climate change mitigation and the transition to net zero, development proposals should, where relevant to the proposal: a. Accord with policies TR3 and TR4 so that sustainable patterns of movement are prioritised, opportunities are taken to improve walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport, and infrastructure is provided to support the transition to zero-emission vehicles; b. Support good access to facilities to limit the need to travel, whether through the development's location, through development densities which improve catchment populations for local services, or by incorporating community facilities and premises to support local employment opportunities; c. Use design approaches which conserve energy and other resources in accordance with policy DP3(2)(b); d. Take advantage of opportunities to re-use existing structures and materials, including by re-using non-contaminated excavated soil and hardcore within the site; e. Take advantage of opportunities to draw low carbon energy from decentralised networks (such as district heat networks), where these are available, and to co-locate energy and heat generators and users, especially to take advantage of suppliers of surplus heat and energy; f. Contribute to the creation or restoration of habitats which can act as carbon stores, such as through woodland planting and peatland restoration, while avoiding harm to habitats which can act as important carbon stores, including peatland and salt marsh; and g. Not involve the extraction of fossil fuels unless it is in accordance with policy M5.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** assesses the anticipated transport and access effects of the Proposed Development's construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning, in accordance with the draft NPPF. Section 13.3 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** provides a summary of the Applicant's engagement regarding transport and access. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** concludes that with the mitigation measures in place, there are no residual transport and access-related effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operational and maintenance and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. By securing the mechanisms for the embedded mitigation measures as outlined in Section 13.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]**, which are detailed in the **OCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9], OCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12], OOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10], OPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** and **OCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** and are secured via requirements in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**, it is concluded that there are no residual effects identified for this Proposed Development. The **OPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** outlines the measures to limit disruption and ensure that the PRoW network can continue to be used throughout the construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development, while minimising the impact on PRoW users. The Proposed Development includes opportunities for advancement, including the proposed approximately 14.58km of permissive path within the Order Limits. The **OPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** is secured via a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The **OCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** sets out the Applicant's worker travel plan which is to encourage sustainable modes of transport, especially car sharing. As set out in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, to minimise the impacts of waste on the surrounding environment, the following measures would be implemented: • Agreements with material suppliers to reduce the amount of packaging or to participate in a packaging take-back Proposed Development;

		• Implementation of a 'just-in-time' material delivery system to avoid materials being stockpiled, which increases the risk of their damage and disposal as waste; • Attention to material quantity requirements to avoid over-ordering and generation of waste materials; • Re-use of materials (e.g. excavated soil) where feasible; • Segregation of waste at source where practical; and • Re-use and recycling of materials offsite where re-use onsite is not practical (e.g. through use of an offsite waste segregation facility and re-sale for direct re-use or re-processing). The **OLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** sets out the landscaping and ecological mitigation and enhancement measures for the Proposed Development. The overarching aim of the **OLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** is to set out prescriptions for habitat creation and management in order to provide ecological enhancements, strengthen the green infrastructure within the local area and provide landscape and visual mitigation through the use of screening where required. The proposed mitigation measures will assist in contributing to the overall improvements to the local biodiversity and nature conservation as a result of the Proposed Development.
CC3: Adaptation to climate change	1. Development proposals should take into account the current and potential impacts of climate change over the lifetime of the scheme, and in order to minimise vulnerability to these impacts should, where relevant to the proposal: a. Be located where the risk of flooding is minimised, or can be managed and the development made safe without increasing risk elsewhere, in accordance with policies F4, F5, F6, F7 and F8; b. Comply with policy F9 where development would be located in an area vulnerable to coastal change, as specified in that policy; c. Incorporate sustainable drainage systems to manage surface water flow rates and reduce volumes of runoff in accordance with policy F8; d. Use design approaches which minimise risks from overheating in accordance with policy DP3(2)(b), and include green infrastructure and suitable tree planting in accordance with policies DP3(2)(c) and N3; and e. Incorporate proportionate measures to mitigate against wildfires, where opportunities to do so exist and wildfires pose a particular risk (for example as a result of the combined effect of topography, prevailing wind direction and being located within or adjacent to heavily vegetated areas). Such measures should be designed to limit fuel loads for fires, and to create defendable spaces, such as by avoiding timber panel fences and incorporating firebreaks into development layouts and planting schemes.	Sections 11.6 and 11.7 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** set out that critical electrical infrastructure within the Proposed Development will be located within Flood Zone 1. PV arrays will be located within Flood Zone 1 wherever feasible. Where panels are to be located in Flood Zone 2 or 3, they will be in areas where flood levels for the 1 in 100-year event are 300 mm below the lower edge of panels. PV arrays will be installed on metal frames driven into the ground, reducing their footprint within the floodplain. All sensitive and electrical equipment on the solar panel will be elevated by legs or mounted on raised frames. Alternative solutions will be assessed and appropriately mitigated as required. Section 11.3 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** sets out that the potential effect of sea level rise has been scoped out in agreement with the Planning Inspectorate given that the Proposed Development is not located in a coastal area. As set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **OSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** surface water runoff from the Solar PV will be managed through Rural SuDS and Natural Flood Management techniques such as grassland/wildflower areas, which will act to bind soils, slow surface water, and increase water quality compared to the baseline scenario. The **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/ EN0110020/APP/5.10]** sets out the following measures to minimise risks from overheating:

	2. Substantial weight should be given to the benefits of improving the resilience of existing buildings and public spaces to anticipated climate change impacts where this would be achieved through proposals for development.	• Emergency response and incident management (such as fire response), will be implemented through the OEMP and relevant supporting plans, including the BSMP • Water required for cooling of BESS and substations will be managed through closed-loop systems to minimise abstraction requirements and enhance resilience during drought conditions. Responsibilities for maintaining biodiversity value during periods of water stress will be implemented through the approved OEMP and related management plans. The **OLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** sets out the landscaping and ecological mitigation and enhancement measures for the Proposed Development. The overarching aim of the **OLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** is to set out prescriptions for habitat creation and management in order to provide ecological enhancements, strengthen the green infrastructure within the local area and provide landscape and visual mitigation through the use of screening where required. The proposed mitigation measures will assist in contributing to the overall improvements to the local biodiversity and nature conservation as a result of the Proposed Development. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** concludes that with the embedded measures in place, there are no likely significant effects from climate hazards, such as wildfires, that would impact receptors within the Order Limits of the Proposed Development. The embedded mitigation measures are documented within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, the **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]** and the **outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** and secured via requirements in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
10. Securing clean energy and water		
W1: Planning for energy and water	1. The development plan should be informed by early engagement between the relevant plan-making authority, utility providers, regulators and network operators, so that there is a clear understanding of energy supply and network capacity, water supply, drainage and wastewater capacity, and associated requirements for additional infrastructure provision. This engagement should consider the impacts of planned growth, changing consumption patterns and climate change, as well as relevant strategic infrastructure plans, and be used to address potential constraints to development arising from current or anticipated infrastructure shortfalls.2. The development plan should reflect this at the most appropriate level by: a. Taking these factors into account in the location and phasing of planned growth; b. Making provision for development which is required for new or enhanced renewable and low carbon energy development, electricity network infrastructure, water supply, drainage and wastewater infrastructure, whether as part of wider development proposals or as stand-alone developments; and c. Setting out any measures to avoid constraints on the operation or future expansion of renewable and low carbon energy development and electricity network	As set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **OSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** surface water runoff from the Solar PV will be managed through Rural SuDS and Natural Flood Management techniques such as grassland/wildflower areas, which will act to bind soils, slow surface water, and increase water quality compared to the baseline scenario. The **OSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** sets out how surface water runoff from the Site will be managed in line with the national, regional and local requirements regarding flood risk and drainage. As the Proposed Development does not have a detailed layout, a detailed drainage strategy cannot be provided at this stage, with the principles and design criteria presented in this document. These criteria will be applied during the detailed design phase, and the detailed SuDS will be secured in a part of the OSWDS pursuant to a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** includes the adoption of project level design principles to guide decision making and embed good design outcomes into the Proposed Development. Table 3, Section 4.3, sets out that whilst pockets of potential flood areas are present, the majority of land would not be impacted.

	infrastructure and water supply and wastewater infrastructure as a result of neighbouring (or nearby) development.	
W3: Renewable and low carbon energy development and electricity network infrastructure	1. In considering proposals for renewable and low-carbon energy development and electricity network infrastructure, substantial weight should be given to: a. The benefits of such development for improving energy security, supporting economic development and moving to a net zero future; b. In the case of applications for the re-powering and life-extension of existing sites, the additional benefit of utilising an established site for this purpose; and c. The contribution that small-scale and community-led renewable and low carbon energy projects can make to reducing emissions, along with their associated economic and social benefits.	Urgent and unprecedented actions are required on a global scale to halt climate change. A rapid increase in the supply of low carbon electricity is needed for the UK to meet its legally binding climate change targets. Solar generation is a critical part of the UK's strategy to achieve net zero by 2050, a key step towards which is the government's national mission for 'Clean Power by 2030'. This is further explained within Chapter 3 of the **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]**. As demonstrated within NPS EN-1, there is a clear urgent need for the type of development that this application will provide. Paragraph 3.2.1 of NPS EN-1 highlights that solar infrastructure is a core part of meeting the Clean Power 2030 Mission given it is 'secure, reliable, affordable, and consistent with net zero emissions in 2050'. The **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** also explains why the Proposed Development is urgently needed at the scale proposed, why the proposed location is highly suitable for such a scheme, and how the Proposed Development also addresses all relevant aspects of established and emerging government energy and climate change policy and commitments.
	2. Applicants should not be required to demonstrate the need for renewable or low carbon energy development and electricity network infrastructure. Where proposals for this form of development come forward outside areas which have been identified as suitable for them in the development plan, their acceptability should be assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework, taken as a whole.	The **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** and the **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** set out that the Proposed Development will deliver a significant amount of low-carbon, low-cost and UK-located solar electricity generation capacity connecting to the National Electricity Transmission System, anticipated to be from 2029. In addition to meeting the urgent national need for secure and affordable low-carbon energy infrastructure and its associated environmental and societal benefits, the Proposed Development delivers wider benefits to the environment and the local community. The Proposed Development would contribute towards the UK Government meeting the overarching key national policy aims of: • Achieving Net Zero by 2050 • Increasing the security of energy supply • Lowering the cost and increasing the affordability of generate electricity; and • Contributing to sustainable development and economic opportunities. This would help the UK diversify its energy supply, increase energy resilience, and support local and national carbon emission reduction targets. It would provide a reliable supply of electricity that seeks to help address the needs of the UK power market. The Proposed Development would also help the UK to meet carbon reduction commitments by significantly increasing the proportion of electricity supplied by renewable sources, which is reported as a significant beneficial effect in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [APP/6.11]**.
	3. Where development is expected to be time-limited, applications should be accompanied by proposals for decommissioning and site restoration, including details of how these measures are expected to be implemented.	

		The Proposed Development is mostly temporary and reversible in nature and therefore will have a low magnitude affect on the long-term agricultural resource. When the operational phase ends, the Solar PV Site would be decommissioned and the land returned to its original use and condition as far as practicable and returned to the landowner. The decommissioning measures are set out in the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** and secured by a requirement in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
12. Making effective use of land		
L2: Making effective use of land	1. Substantial weight should be given to the benefits where a development proposal would achieve one or more of the following: a. Remediating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land; b. Making better use of vacant and under-utilised land and buildings (such as by bringing back into residential use empty homes and other suitable buildings; converting space above shops; redeveloping under-utilised retail sites; and building on or above service yards, lock-ups, car parks and other transport infrastructure which are no longer required); c. Making effective use of previously developed land and buildings through temporary uses, in situations where alternative development is anticipated within a reasonable period (including as a result of the land being allocated for an alternative purpose in the development plan); or d. Creating additional homes within settlements by using the airspace above existing residential and commercial premises, or through sensitive redevelopment or additional development within existing plots (including, but not limited to, the addition of mansard roofs, proposals to fill gaps in the existing roof line, the introduction of higher buildings at street corners and additional units within residential curtilages). Such proposals should: i. Be consistent with the overall street scene, other than where: it is appropriate to have larger buildings (such as at street corners, or where building upwards would not cause substantial harm to the character of the building and its surroundings); the development would not be visible from the street frontage; or where specific changes are provided for through a design code which forms part of a development plan; ii. Maintain safe access and egress for occupiers and users, and acceptable living standards for residents and neighbours in terms of access to daylight, sunlight, privacy and external amenity space; and iii. Where the development would involve the use of residential curtilages, not occupy more than twice the footprint of all the existing buildings on the site, would retain at least 50% of the non-developed area within the curtilage of the existing buildings; unless additional development can be accommodated without harm to the overall character of the area, and taking into account the availability of	As set out in Section 4.5 of **Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]**, the Applicant reviewed the brownfield registers for the relevant local planning authorities in whose administrative areas the Proposed Development is located to determine if there was suitable brownfield/previously developed land that was adequate for accommodating the Proposed Development. From these brownfield sites reviewed, there were no brownfield sites from the register which would individually or cumulatively provide an adequate area to facilitate the Proposed Development. The brownfield sites were also discounted for reasons including environmental designations, topography, proximity to settlements and landowner availability. The Applicant considers that the Proposed Development's use of land is acceptable and is supported, in principle, by the needs and critical national priority case which weights in favour of the Proposed Development.

	infrastructure and the importance of locating development in sustainable locations (in accordance with policy TR3). 2. A condition of simultaneous development should not be imposed on an application for multiple upward extensions unless there is a clear justification.	
L3: Achieving appropriate densities	1. Development proposals should make efficient use of land, taking into account the identified need for different types of housing and other development, local market conditions, the availability of infrastructure (including that supporting sustainable transport modes) and its scope for improvement, a site's connectivity and the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places.	The Applicant considers that the Proposed Development's use of land is acceptable and is supported, in principle, by the needs and CNP case which weights in favour of the Proposed Development. The **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** and **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** set out the need for the Proposed Development and note the established need for low-carbon infrastructure as a CNP and that such projects should be brought forward with urgency.
13. Protecting Green Belt land		
GB2: Assessing existing Green Belt land	1. The preparation of spatial development strategies should be informed by an assessment of the strategic role of Green Belt land within the strategy area. This strategic Green Belt assessment should take into account the five purposes of the Green Belt, which are to: a. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; b. Prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; c. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; d. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and e. Assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. 2. The strategic assessment should be used to help develop the spatial development strategy and to identify whether there are areas where Green Belt boundaries may require further consideration through the preparation of local plans. 3. The preparation of local plans should be informed by an assessment, conducted in accordance with the process at Annex E, which identifies grey belt and informs any Green Belt boundary alterations which accord with policy GB3.	**Appendix 2: Green Belt Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** sets out that the Proposed Development is located on Grey Belt land and meets the tests for being not inappropriate within the Grey Belt. 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.
GB6: Control of development in the Green Belt	1. Development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless it falls within one of the categories in policy GB7. 2. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Such circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm resulting from the proposed development, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In making this assessment, substantial weight should be given to the harm to the Green Belt which would be caused, including harm to its openness.	**Appendix 2: Green Belt Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** sets out that the Proposed Development is located on grey belt land and meets the tests for being not inappropriate within the Grey Belt. However, if this is not agreed, it is considered that the significant need for low carbon electricity generation infrastructure to meet the Government's decarbonisation objectives, along with the wider environmental benefits of the Proposed Development, including the significant increase in BNG and creation of new permissive paths locally, would outweigh any harm identified to the Green Belt.

	3. In the case of proposals for renewable and low carbon energy development, very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources.	The **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** and **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** set out the need for the Proposed Development and note the established need for low-carbon infrastructure as a CNP and that such projects should be brought forward with urgency.
GB7: Development which is not inappropriate in the Green Belt	1. The following categories of development are not inappropriate in the Green Belt, and therefore should not be regarded as harmful to the Green Belt or required to demonstrate very special circumstances: a. Development which is for agriculture, horticulture and forestry, or which is solely for nature conservation, restoration and/or enhancement; b. The re use, extension, alteration or replacement of an existing building, provided that the existing building is of permanent and substantial construction; is lawful in planning terms, and the extension or alteration will not result in a disproportionate increase in size over and above the size of the original building. In the case of proposals for a replacement building, it is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces. c. Limited infilling in villages lying within the Green Belt; d. Limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in this Framework or the development plan (for instance, on a rural exception site); e. The redevelopment of previously developed land (including a material change of use to residential or mixed-use including residential), which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt; f. Certain other forms of development provided the impact on the openness of the Green Belt is minimised, and there would not be a significant conflict with the Green Belt purposes. These are: i. Mineral extraction engineering operations, and transport, electricity network and water infrastructure required in a Green Belt location; ii. Development brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order; iii. Material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation, or for cemeteries and burial grounds); and iv. The provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use), including buildings, for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments. g. Development where all of the following apply: i. The development would utilise grey belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan; ii. There is an evidenced unmet need for the type of development proposed;	

	iii. The development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to policy TR3 of this Framework; and iv. In the case of major development involving the provision of housing, the development proposed complies with policy GB8. h. Residential or mixed-use development which would: i. Be within reasonable walking distance of a well-connected station (applying the definitions in the glossary at Annex B); ii. Be physically well-related to the station or the settlement within which the station is located; iii. Be of a scale which can be accommodated taking into account the existing or proposed availability of infrastructure; iv. Not prejudice any proposals for long-term comprehensive development in the same location; and v. In the case of proposals for major development, comply with policy GB8.	
14. Achieving well-designed places		
DP3: Key principles for well-designed places	1. Development proposals should respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting), so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings; such as through the arrangement of development plots and buildings, the use of materials and architectural features, and the restoration, reuse and integration of heritage assets. This should not preclude innovation or change where appropriate, especially where an increased scale or density of development is justified in accordance with policies L2 and L3. 2. To create well-designed places, development proposals should also reflect relevant aspects of the following principles, as appropriate to the nature of the development and its location: a. Liveability: support healthy, mixed, vibrant and integrated communities, which will function well over the lifetime of the development, by incorporating a range of uses and tenures, employing features which promote social interaction, and which are robust, durable and easy to look after; b. Climate: contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation and the transition to net zero, by using building layouts, building orientation, massing, landscaping and materials which conserve energy and other resources, and which minimise risks from the impacts of climate change including overheating; c. Nature: incorporate and/or connect to a network of high quality, accessible, multifunctional green infrastructure to provide opportunities for recreation and healthy living, strengthen habitats, improve climate resilience and improve air and water quality. This should include maintaining and enhancing tree cover and incorporating sustainable drainage systems in accordance with policies NE3 and F8;	As detailed in section 5 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]**, good design has been a fundamental consideration from the outset of the Proposed Development. The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** demonstrates how the design of the Proposed Development has been developed in accordance with a clear design framework, based on the criteria for good design set out in NPS EN-1. This has included the adoption of **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]** to guide decision making and embed good design outcomes to the Proposed Development. The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** has been prepared in accordance with the Planning Inspectorate's guidance titled 'Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Good Design' and sets out the design decisions taken at each step of the Proposed Development, and the rationale for these decisions, as well as the mechanisms by which good design will be secured post consent. Section 2.4 of the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** sets out the following project specific design principles: Climate: mitigate greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to climate change • Maximise the amount of renewable energy provided to the National Grid • Craft a project that is resilient to climate change • Limit the amount of embodied carbon across the project where reasonable People: reflect what society wants and share benefits widely

	d. Movement: provide transport infrastructure and choices which support the design vision for the site, provide good connections to the wider settlement (or those nearby), and prioritise walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport; e. Built Form: use the pattern of buildings to define the arrangement of streets, squares and other spaces, promote compact forms of development to optimise the site's potential, distinguish between public and private areas, create focal points and, where appropriate, enhance views into and out of the scheme; f. Public Space: include spaces that are safe, secure, inclusive, and accessible for all ages and abilities, including for groups such as women and girls; and which facilitate and encourage social interaction, play and healthy lifestyles (for example by providing high quality, clear and legible pedestrian and cycle routes, a variety of recreational spaces and places to meet, integrating lighting and making building entrances and windows face onto streets and other public spaces to provide natural surveillance); and g. Identity: create visually attractive, distinctive and characterful development to establish or maintain a strong sense of place and pride, including through the use of a coherent palette of materials, design features and planting.	• Engage with stakeholders to develop the design • Find out what is important to people about the local area and seek to incorporate feedback • Consider how people engage with their local environment and retain these patterns Place: provide a sense of identify and improve our environment • Enhance recreational access across the landscape • Respect landscape character and cultural heritage • Minimise visual impact Value: achieve multiple benefits and solve problems well • Support local ecology and enhance biodiversity, enriching ecosystems where possible • Support research and development Throughout the design process, the Applicant maintained an interdisciplinary approach to design and considered both the opportunities and constraints of the Proposed Development. This included analysis of the existing physical, environmental, social and cultural context of the Site by a broad range of technical disciplines (including landscape and visual, noise, ecology and heritage) as set out and assessed by the **Topic Chapters of the ES [EN0110020/APP/6.6 – 6.16]**. This approach has enabled the Applicant to understand the complexities of the Site and identify where multiple opportunities and constraints have the potential to stack up with one another to provide a good design response and allow for co-existence and co-location with other terrestrial uses. There are a number of Public Rights of Way (PRoWs) within the Order Limits, as set out within **Outline Public Right of Way Management Plan (OPRWMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.14]**. The existing PRoWs and proposed Permissive Paths, which pass through or run adjacent to the Order Limits are expected to be unaffected during the operation phase, aside from Aston Footpath no.16 that will be permanently diverted. All PRoWs will be maintained during the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development to ensure that they are safe for users. Local design policies are considered in Tables 5 – 8 of the **Policy Compliance Document [EN0110020/APP/5.5]**.
	4. The principles set out in the Design and Placemaking planning practice guidance should be used to inform how this policy is applied in the absence of locally-produced design policies, guides, codes or masterplans.	The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** has been prepared in accordance with the Planning Inspectorate's guidance titled 'Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Good Design' and sets out the design decisions taken at each step of the Proposed Development, and the rationale for these decisions, as well as the mechanisms by which good design will be secured post consent.

DP4: The Design process	1. Design quality should be considered throughout the evolution, assessment and delivery of development proposals, including through any pre-application engagement; as outlined in Part 2 of the Design and Placemaking planning practice guidance.	Section 2.4 of the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** sets out project specific design principles, one of which is titled 'People: reflect what society wants and share benefits widely' and includes the following elements: • Engage with stakeholders to develop the design • Find out what is important to people about the local area and seek to incorporate feedback • Consider how people engage with their local environment and retain these patterns
15. Promoting sustainable transport		
TR1: Vision-led approach to planning for transport	2. Spatial development strategies and local plans may set out thresholds for what constitutes a significant amount of movement arising from new development, based on the circumstances of their areas, for the purposes of applying policies TR3 and TR6.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** concludes that with the mitigation measures in place, there are no residual transport and access effects associated during the Proposed Development's construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. Section 13.8 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** sets out the potential cumulative traffic and transport effects of the Proposed Development. Table 13.26 notes that it is unlikely that the peak construction period associated with the other developments in the Study Area will overlap with the peak construction period of the Proposed Development as the applications are at different stages in the planning process and each development has varying lengths of construction period. However, as a worst case scenario, where there could be some overlap in construction activity, the magnitude of cumulative traffic increases would remain low.
TR3: Locating development in sustainable locations	1. So that development is located where it can support sustainable patterns of movement, enable good accessibility for different users and make the most of existing and proposed transport infrastructure, development proposals should reflect the following principles, taking into account the vision for the site, the type of development and its location: a. Development proposals which could generate a significant amount of movement, in the context of the area within which they would be situated, should be in locations that are sustainable (or which can be made so, taking into account planned improvements, including any provided for as part of the development itself). This means the location should limit the need to travel, particularly by private car, and offer a genuine choice of transport modes for residents and users, unless the nature of the use makes this impractical; b. Opportunities should be taken to utilise existing or proposed transport infrastructure in optimising the amount or density of development which can be accommodated in different locations, especially where this can support more walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport use; c. Any significant adverse impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, should be mitigated to an acceptable degree using a vision-led approach;	As noted within section 3.2 of the **ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, the Proposed Development is situated in close proximity to three roads that form part of the Strategic Road Network. In terms of vehicle routing, these roads will be the origins of trips to the Proposed Development. The three roads of relevance that form part of the Strategic Road Network include – • **A1** - spans approximately 410 miles (660 km) from London to Edinburgh, passing through major towns and cities such as Peterborough, Doncaster, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and Berwick-upon-Tweed. The A1 includes sections that are designated as A1(M), which are upgraded to motorway standards. Junction 1 of the A1 (M) will be utilised to provide SRN routing onto the local highway network for Whitestone 1. • **M18** - The M18 motorway is a key route in Yorkshire, stretching approximately 26 miles (42 km) from the east of Rotherham to Goole in a north-east to south-west direction. It connects several major motorways, including the M1, A1(M), M180, and M6212. Junction 1 of the M18 motorway will be utilised to provide SRN routing onto the local highway network for Whitestone 1 and 2. • **M1** - The M1 motorway connects London to Leeds and spans approximately 193 miles (311 km). The motorway passes through several counties, including Greater London, Hertfordshire, Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire,

	d. The environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure should be identified, assessed and taken into account – including taking opportunities to avoid or mitigate any adverse environmental effects, and to secure net environmental gains such as reductions in air pollution; and e. In rural areas, opportunities to improve wheeling, cycling and public transport and enhance the connectivity of an area should be taken where they exist and can be supported by the development proposed.	Northamptonshire, Leicestershire, Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire, and Yorkshire. It also intersects with other major motorways such as the M25, M6, M69, M18, M62, and M62112. Junction 31 of the M1 motorway will be utilised to provide SRN routing onto the local highway network for Whitestone 2 and 3. Junction 33 will also provide routing to Whitestone 2. As set out within section 4.2 of **Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]**, one of the key site selection principles that assisted in determining a suitable location for the Proposed Development was to ensure it would be situated in an appropriate location to access motorways and other major road infrastructure corridors for construction purposes. As demonstrated within the **Location Plans [EN0110020/APP/2.1]**, the Proposed Development is well connected to the local motorways, including the M18 and M1 but also the wider major road infrastructure and Local Road Network. This enables the chosen site to be accessed from all necessary road networks for construction, operation (and maintenance) and decommissioning phases. The **OPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** outlines the measures to limit disruption and ensure that the PRoW network can continue to be used throughout the construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development, while minimising the impact on PRoW users. The Proposed Development includes opportunities for advancement, including the proposed approximately 14.58km of permissive path within the Order Limits. The **OPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** is secured via a requirement in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** sets out project specific design principles which have influenced the design of the Proposed Development. The project design principles of relevance to sustainable transport include the following – • Find out what is important to people about the local area and seek to incorporate feedback • Consider how people engage with their local environment and retain these patterns • Enhance recreational access across the landscape These project design principles set out how the Proposed Development will consider the experience of the people using the Public Rights of Way during the operational phase of the Proposed Development.
TR6: Assessing transport impacts	1. Development proposals that are likely to generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by: a. A transport statement or transport assessment (depending on the extent and significance of the transport issues involved), proportionate to the nature and scale of the development, so that the likely impacts of the proposal for transport can be assessed and monitored; and	The Application is supported by **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]**, **ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and **OCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** which set out the assessment undertaken by the Applicant in regard to the Proposed Development during the construction, operational and maintenance and decommissioning phases.

	b. A travel plan, indicating how sustainable transport objectives will be delivered, monitored and manged over time. 2. Transport assessments and statements, and travel plans, should reflect the transport vision for the development and how it is intended to be achieved (including, in the case of Travel Plans, identifying fallback options if initial measures do not deliver the expected outcomes). 3. In assessing movement patterns and potential impacts, including whether they are considered to be severe, reasonable future scenarios should be considered, taking into account impacts at relevant times of the day, potential cumulative impacts, multimodal trip generation and the promotion of sustainable modes of travel, and realising the transport vision for the development itself. Development proposals should be considered having regard to these potential impacts and the other policies in this Framework which are relevant (including TR3, TR4 and DP3(2)(d)). 4. Development proposals should be refused if they would have a severe adverse impact on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion, including cumulative impacts), or an unacceptable impact on highway safety; taking into account any mitigation measures proposed as well as any wider network improvements, including measures to support sustainable patterns of movement. This applies both during the construction phase and following completion.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** concludes that with the mitigation measures in place, there are no residual transport and access effects associated during the Proposed Development's construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. Section 13.8 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** sets out the potential cumulative traffic and transport effects of the Proposed Development. Table 13.26 notes that it is unlikely that the peak construction period associated with the other developments in the Study Area will overlap with the peak construction period of the Proposed Development as the applications are at different stages in the planning process and each development has varying lengths of construction period. However, at worst case where there could be some overlap in construction activity the magnitude of cumulative traffic increases would remain as low. Section 4.6 of the **OCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** sets out that a Worker Travel Plan will be developed to manage the arrival and departure profile of workers on Site and to encourage sustainable modes of transport, such as car-sharing. The Worker Travel Plan will be administered by the CTMP Co-ordinator and would be a contractual requirement as part of the Principal Contractor's contract with the Applicant.
TR8: Public rights of way	1. Development proposals should: a. Protect and enhance the network of public rights of way, including through suitable diversions agreed with the highway authority; and b. Take opportunities to extend, link or improve the quality of existing routes where this enables one or more of the following: i. Improved access to green spaces and the countryside; ii. New direct and circular routes and connections between local and long-distance footpaths, bridleways and cycle routes; iii. The provision of accessible, safe and convenient links to services and facilities; and iv. Improved connections with public transport stops and interchanges.	By securing the mechanisms for the embedded mitigation measures as outlined in Section 13.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]**, which are secured in the **OCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9], OCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12], OOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10],** and **OPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** and are secured via the requirements in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**, it is concluded that there are no residual effects identified for this Scheme. The **OPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** outlines the measures to limit disruption and ensure that the PRoW network can continue to be used throughout the construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development, while minimising the impact on PRoW users. The Proposed Development includes opportunities for enhancement, including the proposed approximately 14.58km of permissive path within the Order Limits, as set out within the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]**. The **OPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** is secured via a requirement in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** sets out project specific design principles which have influenced the design of the Proposed Development. The project design principles of relevance to sustainable transport include the following – • Find out what is important to people about the local area and seek to incorporate feedback • Consider how people engage with their local environment and retain these patterns

		• Enhance recreational access across the landscape These project design principles set out how the Proposed Development will consider the experience of the people using the Public Rights of Way during the operational phase of the Proposed Development. The **OPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** confirms that during the construction phase of the Proposed Development, there will be approximately 30 PRoWs that are to be temporarily diverted for approximately 2-3 weeks. Section 4 of the **OPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** confirms that the existing PRoWs and proposed Permissive Paths, which pass through or run adjacent to the Order Limits are expected to be unaffected during the operation phase. Minimum widths have been incorporated into the design to enable a suitable distance between any PRoWs and proposed infrastructure. In all cases, the PRoW will see perimeter fencing being installed a minimum distance from the centreline of the PRoW of 10m to either side (creating a 20m corridor) if Solar PV Arrays lie on both sides of the PRoW, and 15m if Solar PV Arrays are to one side only. This will help avoid the perception of being channelled into narrow passages between Solar PV Arrays.
16. Promoting healthy communities		
HC3: Community facilities and public service infrastructure serving new development	1. Proposals for housing, employment or other development which would give rise to significant numbers of additional people living in, working in or visiting an area should: a. Be informed by an understanding of the need for any associated improvements to community facilities and public service infrastructure, whether on or off-site; and b. Provide for community facilities and improvements to public service infrastructure which are necessary for the development to be acceptable in planning terms, whether by direct provision or a contribution to off-site improvements (which may be through Community Infrastructure Levy payments, where applicable). 2. Where the development plan does not set out locally-specific standards for green space provision, all development proposals should use relevant national standards and best practice to identify improvements in the quantity and quality of provision which should be provided or contributed towards, as appropriate to the nature of the development and taking into account existing levels of provision in the area. 3. Planning conditions and obligations should be used to secure the timely delivery of community facilities and public service infrastructure required to serve new development, so that these facilities are available for use when the development (or an agreed proportion of the development) is first occupied or comes into use.	The Proposed Development is not anticipated to impact any local services and community facilities as these are not situated within the Order Limits. However, the idea of Open Space will be impacted but through the creation of relevant mitigation and enhancement strategies this is expected to be limited. While not considered within the planning balance case, the Applicant is proposing a Community Benefit Fund, the details of which are still to be confirmed, but which will be announced in due course, following discussions with the host local authorities. This fund is envisaged by the Applicant that it would be managed by an independent third party and delivered in partnership with the local community. Members of the local communities would be able to advise on the fund strategy and spend, to prioritise issues that are important to the local area. The total amount of Community Fund would be based on the final installed capacity of the Proposed Development. Based on the information presented at statutory consultation, the Applicant would look to offer a community benefit fund of £400 per MW per year. The final figure would be based on the operational MW output, the lifetime of the Proposed Development, and the outcomes of this consultation. The final total amount of Community Benefit Fun would be based on the final installed capacity of the Proposed Development. Compliance with relevant national standards and best practice is set out in Tables 1 to 4 of the **Policy Compliance Document [EN0110020/APP/5.5]**.
HC4: Proposals for new and improved community facilities and public service infrastructure and	1. Substantial weight should be given to the benefits where: a. New or improved public service infrastructure or community facilities would be provided; and b. Development proposals would make a demonstrable contribution towards promoting good health, preventing ill-health, reducing health inequalities or	The Applicant is proposing a Community Benefit Fund, the details of which are still to be confirmed, but which will be announced in due course, following discussions with the host local authorities. This fund is envisaged by the Applicant that it would be managed by an independent third party and delivered in partnership with the local

development providing public health benefits	supporting social interaction in the local community (such as, but not limited to, the provision of new recreation facilities, meeting places and opportunities to grow or purchase healthier food).	community. Members of the local communities would be able to advise on the fund strategy and spend, to prioritise issues that are important to the local area. A detailed human health impact assessment was scoped out of the ES at the EIA Scoping stage. However, it is acknowledged that the Proposed Development has the potential to impact human health via ground / water contamination, air quality, noise, and through changes to the surrounding landscape and views. However, while it was scoped out of assessment Human Health has been considered throughout all of the **ES Topic Chapters [EN0110020/APP/6.6 – 6.16]** and specifically within section 17.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects EN0110020/APP/6.17]**.
	2. Local planning authorities, developers and public service providers should collaborate in a positive and proactive manner to identify and resolve key planning issues before applications for community facilities and public services infrastructure are submitted. Where appropriate local communities should be engaged in the design of proposals, including children and families where new or improved facilities for play are involved so that developments care inclusive and reflect user needs.	
17. Pollution, public protection and security		
P1: Planning for clean and safe places	1. To support efforts to avoid and mitigate risks from natural and man-made hazards, minimise levels of pollution and create clean, liveable and safe places for people to live, work and visit, development plans should: a. Allocate land for development where, taking into account the potential for mitigation: i. Opportunities can be taken to improve local environmental conditions, such as by remediating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land; ii. Ground conditions will not inhibit or pose a risk to the nature of the development proposed (such as due to land instability), and occupiers and users will not be put at risk from, or be adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of pollution; iii. Development proposals will not themselves cause unacceptable levels of pollution, either alone or in combination with other developments, taking into account communities which may be particularly vulnerable to its effects, such as children and older people; and iv. the intended uses will not place unreasonable restrictions on the operation of existing businesses, community facilities, public services, defence and security activities. b. Consider any wider opportunities to reduce air, water, soil and noise pollution, and contribute to compliance with national and local environmental targets and objectives, through the spatial strategy and policies for specific parts of the plan area (such as by identifying opportunities for strategic nature-based solutions); c. Identify whether restrictions on certain types or forms of development are necessary as a consequence of consultation zones around hazardous substances sites, safeguarding areas around aerodromes, technical sites or military explosives storage areas, and consultation zones around nuclear sites (and reflect the implications of these areas in any allocations of land within the plan); d. Identify other locations where natural or man-made hazards may influence the way in which land is allocated or developed. This includes (but is not limited to) town	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** concludes that risks associated with land instability or contamination are of minor or negligible significance. Embedded mitigation measures are documented within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, the **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]** and the **outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** and secured via a requirement in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. A detailed human health impact assessment was scoped out of the ES at the EIA Scoping stage. However, it is acknowledged that the Proposed Development has the potential to impact human health via ground / water contamination, air quality, noise, and through changes to the surrounding landscape and views. However, while it was scoped out of assessment Human Health has been considered throughout all of the **Environmental Statement Topic Chapters [EN0110020/APP/6.6 – 6.16]** and specifically within section 17.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects EN0110020/APP/6.17]**. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** describes the existing levels and assesses the anticipated soil effects of the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases, in accordance with this policy. The construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Proposed Development is not anticipated to have any significant residual effects on soil resources. Section 14.7 and 14.8 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]** assess the noise and vibration effects and residual effects, respectively, on receptors arising from the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development at particular times of the day and at night on the noise environment. With embedded mitigation measures in place, the Proposed Development, together with the cumulative Proposed Developments assessed, the effects from noise and vibration are not considered to be negligible or minor and therefore not significant. The majority of the Order limits are within Flood Zone 1, with a small proportion of land located within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Where there are areas of flood zones 2 and 3, no

	centres and other locations where large numbers of people are expected to congregate, and Coastal Change Management Areas (policy F3); and e. Assess whether land needs to be allocated for development which is required to maintain public safety and security, including for the purposes of flood management in accordance with policy F2(1)(b) and national defence.	sensitive electrical infrastructure has been placed within these areas, only solar panels and mitigation.
P2: Ground Conditions	1. Sites proposed for development should be suitable for their proposed use taking account of: a. Ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability or contamination (whether due to natural hazards or current and former activities such as mining or fuel storage); and b. The extent to which any such risks can be mitigated, and the potential impacts on the natural environment arising from remediation.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** concludes that risks associated with land instability or contamination are of minor or negligible significance. Embedded mitigation measures are documented within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, the **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]** and the **oDEMP[EN0110020/APP/5.11]** and secured via a requirement in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. Compliance with the Environmental Protection Act 1990 is set out in full in Section 9.2 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]**.
	2. Where land is remediated it should, as a minimum, not be capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990.	
	3. Adequate site investigation information, prepared by a competent person, should be available to inform these considerations.	
	4. Where a site is affected by contamination or land stability issues, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner.	
P3: Living conditions and pollution	1. Development proposals should be appropriate for their location, taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, whether these effects are on or off-site; and whether this is as a result of the development itself or the product of preexisting conditions in its vicinity. In assessing the potential effects of pollution, consideration should be given to the potential sensitivity of the site, and its intended occupiers and users, as well as that of the environment and population in the surrounding area (including where certain groups could be particularly vulnerable to its effects, such as children and older people).	The Applicant prepared and submitted a substantial Environmental Assessment with the Application, noting consideration of both the local environmental receptors but also residential receptors. The Applicant's **Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** sets out the thorough site selection process that was undertaken which deemed the location as the most appropriate for the Proposed Development.
	2. Within this context development proposals should: a. a. Provide healthy living conditions for occupiers and users in terms of adequate access to light and avoiding exposure to levels of air, noise, artificial light or other sources of pollution which could have an unacceptable adverse effect on health and the quality of life. Where necessary suitable mitigation measures should be incorporated to secure acceptable living conditions; b. Not give rise to, or contribute to, an unacceptable level of access to daylight and sunlight for neighbouring residents and occupiers, or unacceptable levels of air, noise, artificial light, water, soil or other forms of pollution on or beyond the site. Adverse impacts of this nature should be avoided where possible, or else mitigated to an acceptable degree. Where possible, opportunities should be taken to reduce	The Applicant has prepared and submitted a **Statutory Nuisance Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.2]** as is required under APFP Regulation 5(2)(f) and Paragraph 4.15.5 of NPS EN-1. The **Statutory Nuisance Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.2]** draws upon the assessment conclusions from **ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]** and **ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]** to set out that the construction, operational and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development would not cause a statutory nuisance. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]** identifies 'The Environment Targets (Fine Particulate Matter) (England) Regulations 2023' as

	pollution affecting the wider area (such as through traffic and travel management or improved external lighting); c. Sustain and contribute to compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives and targets for air pollutants including PM2.5. Development proposals should take account of Air Quality Management Areas and be consistent with the objectives of relevant Air Quality Action Plans, Clean Air Plans and Local Air Quality Strategies; d. Mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise, not result in levels of noise exposure which would have a significant observed adverse effect, and maintain the character of tranquil areas (those areas that have remained relatively undisturbed by noise from human sources and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason); e. Limit any adverse impact from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes (those entirely, or largely, uninterrupted by artificial light) and nature; and f. Assess and mitigate impacts where the development could have an unacceptable adverse effect on water quality, especially where this concerns sensitive water bodies such as chalk streams.	important and relevant legislation to the assessment and confirms that the assessment has considered the Regulations. In 2023, the Environmental Improvement Plan (EIP) outlined updates to the PM2.5 Air Quality Objective for future years. These are the long-term targets of 10 µg/m3 by 2040 and the interim targets of 12 µg/m3 by 2028. In 2028, the first anticipated year of operation, Defra predicted background concentrations of PM2.5 were between 7.9 – 8.2 µg/m3 across the Order Limits, which is comfortably below the 12 µg/m3 interim target. No future projections have been made by Defra past 2030, so it is not possible to consider concentrations up to 2040 when the long-term target of 10 µg/m3 should be achieved; however, there are not expected to be significant sources of PM2.5 during the Proposed Development's operational phase. At the time of writing, there had been no further updates to relevant Air Quality Objectives for other pollutants considered in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]**. Article 10 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]** deals with defence to proceedings in respect of statutory nuisance. It provides that no person is able to bring statutory nuisance proceedings under the EPA 1990 in respect of noise, if the noise is created in the course of carrying out construction, maintenance or decommissioning of the authorised development and for which notice has been given under section 60 or consent obtained under section 61(9) of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 or which cannot be reasonably avoided as a consequence of the authorised development. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]** considers the noise impact of the Proposed Development. It concludes that with the implementation of mitigation measures, significant adverse noise and vibration effects during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Proposed Development will be avoided at sensitive receptors. The embedded mitigation measures are documented within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**, and the **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** and are secured via requirements in Schedule 2 of the **dDraft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. A landscape and visual impact assessment is included within **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7].** The assessment considers impacts of the Proposed Development on character visual receptors, landscape fabric and designations during construction, operation and decommissioning. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** assess the impacts of the Proposed Development on water quality, water bodies or protected areas, and concludes that with embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse water effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operational and decommissioning phases on water quality, water bodies or protected areas.
	3. In applying this policy, it should not be assumed, unless there is clear evidence to the contrary, that separate regulatory regimes for the control of pollution will operate effectively, as set out in policy DM7. This means that it will be appropriate to take into account emissions limits set through those other regimes.	

P5: Maintaining public safety and security	1. Development proposals should anticipate and address possible malicious threats and other hazards (whether natural or man-made) in relation to: a. Their occupiers and users, by identifying potential safety risks and proportionate mitigation opportunities which can be addressed through the design of the scheme. This applies especially where particular groups may be vulnerable to crime, or to the fear of crime – such as women and girls – or would be at risk from physical hazards (such as children where open water or transport infrastructure is present or planned); b. Locations where large numbers of people are expected to congregate, such as transport hubs, night-time economy venues, cinemas and theatres, sports stadiums and arenas, shopping centres, health and education establishments, places of worship, hotels and restaurants, visitor attractions and commercial centres. Proposals for major development in such locations should be informed by the most up-to-date information available from the police and other relevant agencies about the nature of potential threats and their implications, and appropriate and proportionate steps that can be taken to reduce vulnerability, increase resilience and ensure public safety and security; c. Uses which could pose a potential hazard to the surrounding area. Development proposals for new major hazard sites, changes to existing major hazard sites and new development in the vicinity of major hazard sites and major accident hazard pipelines (as identified within Health and Safety Executive consultation zones) should proceed only if it can be demonstrated that the development would not increase the risk of a major accident; and d. Consultation zones around major accident hazard sites, major accident hazard pipelines and Health and Safety Executive licensed explosives sites, safeguarded areas around civilian aerodromes or technical sites and Outline Planning Zones or Detailed Emergency Planning Zones around nuclear sites. Development proposals within these areas should only be supported where, having consulted the relevant consultation bodies, it is clear that the development will be safe for occupiers and users and will not impose constraints on the operation of the facility or facilities to which the safeguarded area or consultation zone relates.	Safety is a key consideration in the management plans which set out all mitigation measures that are outlined in all of the environmental statement chapters. The management plans include: • **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** • **Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.10]** • **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** • **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** • **Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** • **Outline Public Right of Way Management Plan Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** • **Outline Battery Safety Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.15]** • **Outline Written Scheme of Investigation [EN0110020/APP/5.16]** • **Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** • **Outline Skills and Supply Chain Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.18]** • **Outline Cable Construction Method Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.19]** Operational battery safety and security of the Proposed Development is covered by mitigation measures set out through the **oBSMP [EN0110020/APP/5.15]**. The plan concludes that, as far as reasonably practicable and for this planning stage of the Proposed Development, that currently foreseeable hazards associated with the equipment have been identified, and these will be developed and managed throughout the life of the installation and added to as necessary as the Proposed Development develops and will be reported on regularly.
18. Managing flood risk and coastal change		
F4: Assessing flood risk for decision-making	1. To inform the assessment of flood risk and, where relevant, appropriate mitigation, a site-specific FRA should accompany all development proposals in Flood Zones 2, 3a, and 3b as defined in Annex F, table 1.	The majority of the Order limits are within Flood Zone 1, with a small proportion of land located within Flood Zones 2 and 3. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** to the **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]**, and Chapter 8 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** advises how the Sequential Test has been met. However, it should be noted that where there are areas of flood zones 2 and 3, no sensitive electrical infrastructure has been placed within these areas, only solar panels and mitigation. As set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **OSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** surface water runoff from the Solar PV will be
	2. In Flood Zone 1, a site-specific FRA should inform and accompany all development proposals involving: a. Sites of one hectare or more; b. Land which has been identified by the Environment Agency as having critical drainage problems; and	

	c. Land identified in a strategic flood risk assessment or the Flood Map for Planning as being at increased risk of flooding from any source, whether now or in the future. 3. Site-specific flood risk assessments should be appropriate to the scale, nature, and location of development and should, where relevant, support an assessment of whether a development proposal satisfies the sequential and exception tests set out in policies F5 and F6.	managed through Rural SuDS and Natural Flood Management techniques such as grassland/wildflower areas, which will act to bind soils, slow surface water, and increase water quality compared to the baseline scenario. The depth of flooding and reasonable assumptions for the impacts of climate change on flood depths have been assessed as part of a FRA using the data available on flooding. A Surface Water Drainage Strategy (which will form part of a detailed CEMP(s)) will include details of pre-construction, construction, and post-construction water quality monitoring. These measures are set out in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and the **OSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** submitted with the DCO Application.
F5: The sequential test	1. The aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Where the test applies, development proposals should not be located in areas at risk of flooding where alternative sites, appropriate for the development, are reasonably available in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The area to which the test is applied should not be greater than the anticipated catchment of the development in terms of its likely occupiers or users. 2. The sequential test should be used in areas known to be at risk now or in the future from any form of flooding, other than for: a. Sites allocated in the development plan which were subject to the sequential test during plan preparation; b. Sites where a site-specific flood risk assessment demonstrates clearly that: i. No built development within the site boundary, including access or escape routes, land raising or other potentially vulnerable elements, would be located on an area that would be at risk of flooding from any source, now and in the future (having regard to potential changes in flood risk); or ii. Where the site would be at risk of surface water flooding only, the proposed layout, design, and mitigation measures would ensure that occupiers and users would remain safe from current and future surface water flood risk for the lifetime of the development without increasing flood risk elsewhere in accordance with policy F7. c. For the following types of development: i. Householder development; ii. Small non-residential extensions (with a footprint of less than 250m2); and iii. Changes of use, other than changes of use to a caravan, camping or chalet site, or to a mobile home or park home site.	The majority of the Order limits are within Flood Zone 1, with a small proportion of land located within Flood Zones 2 and 3. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** to the **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]**, and Chapter 8 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** advises how the Sequential Test has been met. However, it should be noted that where there are areas of flood zones 2 and 3, no sensitive electrical infrastructure has been placed within these areas (including flood zone 3b), only solar panels and mitigation. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** outlines the Proposed Development's evidence and compliance with the sequential test at both the site selection and site-level stages. The assessment relies on controls established within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.110]**, and **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**. These outline management plans and the **OSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** set out the water related measures to manage any potential water effects that may arise from the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases.
F6: Development in areas at risk of flooding from rivers or the sea	1. In areas falling within flood zones 2, 3a, or 3b (as defined in Annex F, table 1): a. Development proposals should be refused if the use is incompatible with the risk from river or sea flooding, as set out in Annex F, table 3; and b. In certain other circumstances shown in Annex F, table 3, in addition to satisfying the sequential test in policy F5 where applicable, development will only be	The **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** set out that following the completion of the Sequential Test and in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 5.8.9 of EN-1, the Applicant has applied the Exception Test to the proposed Solar PV arrays and infrastructure within Flood Zones 2 and 3.

	appropriate where an 'exception test' is satisfied. The exception test involves demonstrating that the development would meet all the following criteria: i. Provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk; and ii. Be safe for its anticipated lifetime in accordance with policy F7; and iii. Not increase flood risk elsewhere and, where possible, reduce flood risk overall. 2. The application of the exception test should be informed by a site-specific FRA. The exception test does not need to be applied: a. To those forms of development, or in those circumstances, where the sequential test is not required, as set out in policy F5; or b. Where development is proposed on a site allocated in the development plan to which the exception test was applied at the plan-making stage, unless there has been a significant increase in the risk of flooding to the site subsequently, or the nature of the development itself has changed significantly from that which was allocated so as to introduce a more vulnerable use (having regard to Annex F, table 2).	**ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** sets out that in the NPPF the Exception Test needs to be passed in order for essential development to be considered acceptable in Flood Zones 2 and 3. EN-1 paragraph 5.8.11 further replicates the tests set out in Paragraph 178 of the NPPF which state that: • the development that has to be in a flood risk area will provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk; and • the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall. Section 8.7 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** sets out that in relation to the first bullet point, above, the Applicant considers that the substantial benefits that the Proposed Development would deliver, as set out in Section 3 of this Planning Statement and considered further in the planning balance at Section 9, would clearly outweigh the flood risk. As documented within the **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]**, these are considered to be sustainability benefits to the wider community because significant renewable energy schemes at this scale are required to be able to meet the legal binding commitment to Net Zero and make energy more affordable and reliable for all. The Proposed Development also delivers local community benefits through the additional proposed permissive paths, biodiversity net gain and environmental enhancements. Socio-economic benefits are also anticipated to be available for the local communities as documented within **ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Socio-Economics and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15]** and managed within the **Outline Skills and Supply Chain Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.18]**. The Proposed Development is to introduce various mitigation measures, including: • Management of Chemical Pollution - 10 m watercourse buffers will be in place for construction works with the exception of watercourse crossings for access tracks and cable crossings. This is to reduce the risk of direct spills to watercourses. • Management of Sediment and Erosion - 10 m watercourse buffers will be in place for construction works with the exception of watercourse crossings for access tracks and cable crossings. This is to reduce the risk high influxes of sediment into watercourses. • Water Consumption and Wastewater - A Water Consumption Plan will be developed prior to construction to fully identify the water consumption needs, where water will be sourced from, the relevant licences needed, and to ensure no impacts to water quantity for licenced EA abstractions and / or PWS. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** concludes that the Proposed Development will not increase flood risk from any sources. The Applicant therefore considers that the Proposed Development complies with the Exception

		Test requirements set out in paragraphs 177 – 179 of the NPPF as well as paragraph 5.8.11 of EN-1.
F7: Ensuring development is safe from flooding	1. Development proposals should not present a risk from flooding to potential occupiers, users, or visitors, and should not increase flood risk elsewhere.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** assess the impacts of the Proposed Development on water quality, water bodies or protected areas, and concludes that with the embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse water effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases on water quality, water bodies or protected areas. This includes the risk from flooding to potential occupiers, users, or visitors and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** sets out that is it not considered that the Proposed Development would contribute to an increase in flood risk elsewhere.
	2. Where development is proposed in a location known to be at risk from any form of flooding, now or in the future, it should be refused unless: a. Within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, unless there are overriding reasons which justify a different arrangement; b. The development will be safe throughout its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users; c. Any residual risk can be safely managed, and safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate, as part of an agreed emergency plan; d. The development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient such that, in the event of a flood, it could be quickly brought back into use without significant refurbishment; and e. It can be demonstrated that flood risk will not be increased elsewhere.	The majority of the Order limits are within Flood Zone 1, with a small proportion of land located within Flood Zones 2 and 3. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** to the **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]**, and Chapter 8 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** advises how the Sequential Test has been met. However, it should be noted that where there are areas of flood zones 2 and 3, no sensitive electrical infrastructure has been placed within these areas, only solar panels and mitigation. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** assess the impacts of the Proposed Development on water quality, water bodies or protected areas, and concludes that with the embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse water effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases on water quality, water bodies or protected areas.
F8: Sustainable drainage systems and watercourses	1. Development proposals which could affect drainage on or around the development site should incorporate sustainable drainage systems to control flow rates and reduce volumes of runoff, in ways which are proportionate to the nature and scale of the proposal. The systems employed should provide multifunctional benefits wherever possible, facilitating improvements in water quality, biodiversity and amenity.	As set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **OSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** surface water runoff from the Solar PV will be managed through Rural SuDS and Natural Flood Management techniques such as grassland/wildflower areas, which will act to bind soils, slow surface water, and increase water quality compared to the baseline scenario. The **OSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** sets out how surface water runoff from the Site will be managed in line with the national, regional and local requirements regarding flood risk and drainage. As the Proposed Development does not have a detailed layout, a detailed drainage strategy cannot be provided at this stage, with the principles and design criteria presented in this document. These criteria will be applied during the detailed design phase, and the detailed SuDS will be secured in the DCO through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
	2. Sustainable Drainage Systems should: a. Be designed in accordance with the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems; b. Have maintenance arrangements in place to ensure an acceptable standard of operation for the anticipated lifetime of the development; and	

	c. In the case of proposals for major development, take account of advice from the Lead Local Flood Authority. 3. Development proposals should not enclose existing watercourses where this is not already the case, unless there are compelling reasons to do so; and should where possible remove existing culverts and re-naturalise existing river channels, unless to do so would increase flood risk, result in other environmental harm or cause harm to heritage assets.	Section 10.3 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** sets out that the Applicant has been in consultation with Severn Trent, Yorkshire Water, the Environment Agency, Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council, City of Doncaster Council, and North East Derbyshire Council in relation to water resources. The Applicant has considered the advice and taken account of the feedback received through consultation.
19. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment		

N2: Improving the natural environment	1. To contribute positively to the natural environment and support nature's recovery development proposals should:
	
	a. Consider the environmental qualities of land proposed for development, including habitats, landscape character and the natural beauty of the countryside, and identify opportunities for those qualities to be conserved or enhanced (including through requirements for biodiversity net gain where these apply);
	
	b. Take into account the quality of agricultural land (including that classified as best and most versatile agricultural land, and its grade), and if significant development of agricultural land is necessary, use areas of poorer quality land where possible;
	
	c. Take suitable opportunities to connect to and strengthen ecological networks that extend beyond the site, drawing on the measures proposed by Local Nature Recovery Strategies, National Forest Strategies and Community Forest Plans, where present, and other relevant assessments;
	
	d. Conserve and enhance existing natural features of visual, historic or nature conservation value (such as established trees and hedgerows) wherever possible; and use appropriate landscaping to help create a well-designed place and integrate the development into its surroundings;
	
	e. Use green infrastructure provided as part of the scheme and nature-based solutions to secure multiple benefits: such as for biodiversity; surface water and pollution management (including maintaining flow rates and water quality); climate change mitigation and adaptation, and recreation;
	
	f. Minimise any impacts on biodiversity and include features for species which support priority or threatened species such as swifts, bats and hedgehogs. Development proposals should incorporate integrated nest boxes (commonly known as swift bricks) into their construction unless there are compelling technical reasons which prevent their use, or would make them ineffective; and
	
	g. Ensure that green infrastructure and other features to support nature are located and designed to minimise risk of future failure, and that appropriate measures are in place for any necessary long-term management.
		ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6] sets out that the design of the Proposed Development has evolved to avoid impacts and effects on ecology and biodiversity as far as practicable. The Proposed Development incorporates a number of enhancements resulting in a number of significant beneficial effects, including (but not limited to):
		
		• New habitats would be created within the Site, and existing habitats would be enhanced for biodiversity and secured through **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and managed and maintained for at least 30 years. The habitat enhancement and creation would mature, and soils would recover as a result of the reduction or cessation of fertiliser and insecticide inputs. It is expected that biodiversity at all levels of the ecosystem would benefit, with the abundance and richness of flora and fauna expanding over time.
		
		• Hedgerow loss during construction would be compensated for by improving the quality of existing hedgerows within the LWS (e.g. gapping up or addition of trees, use of optimum management practices) or the planting of new connecting hedgerows with the Site.
		
		• The Proposed Development will achieve a minimum of 10% BNG. However, the Applicant anticipates delivering substantially more than this, as evidenced by the BNG Assessment, which demonstrates what is likely to be proposed. The **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]** secures:
		
		  • Area habitat units = 28%
		  • Hedgerow units = 30%
		  • Watercourse units = 10%
		
		The design of the Proposed Development incorporates nature-based solutions, where practicable, such as developing biodiversity enhancement measures ad considering factors related to hydrology, flood risk, landscape and ecology. As part of the EIA process, an iterative approach has been adopted where significant environmental effects have been avoided where possible through design refinements and iterations.
		
		The Applicant has developed the design of the Proposed Development to minimise the land take of BMV land, where practicable. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** describes the existing levels and assesses the anticipated soil effects of the Proposed Development's construction,

		operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases, in accordance with this policy. Agricultural land quality was a key consideration in the Applicant's site selection process. As set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]**, the Applicant has sought to identify non-BMV agricultural land in its site selection for the Proposed Development. **Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** provides an overview of the site evaluation process, which sets out that the Site's suitability is due to it being located away from key environmental related designations where possible, limited residential receptors, the absence of BMV on the published "provisional" ALC maps, and accessibility from a major highway network. The Applicant has now undertaken a soil classification survey and a subsequent detailed ALC survey, as set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.6: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20],** and it is concluded that only 20.1% of the Site is BMV (ALC grades 1, 2, and 3a). **Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** outlines that the Applicant considered factors, including but not limited to the site area, topography, access, and the absence of designations, when determining the suitability of the available land. The Applicant concluded that the land found was suitable. As set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **OSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** surface water runoff from the Solar PV will be managed through Rural SuDS and Natural Flood Management techniques such as grassland/wildflower areas, which will act to bind soils, slow surface water, and increase water quality compared to the baseline scenario. The Proposed Development also includes nature-based solutions as set out in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**. This consists of targeted planting of trees, shrubs, and grassland as well as the management of them to improve biodiversity in and around the Proposed Development. Similar measures to the construction phase will be developed prior to the decommissioning phase for the use of lower-carbon and more climate change resilient methods, as highlighted in the **OSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]**.
N3: Trees in new development	1. In recognition of the benefits which trees can provide for biodiversity, climate change mitigation and adaptation, and the character and quality of the built environment, development proposals should: a. Make new streets tree-lined (unless there are strong reasons why this would be inappropriate in specific streets), and incorporate trees in other suitable locations, such as in parks and through the provision of community orchards; b. Ensure that the selection of species and their placement is compatible with highways and other infrastructure requirements and the needs of different users of public spaces; and will be effective in helping to adapt to the effects of climate change and delivering other environmental benefits. Suitable arboricultural advice	As secured within the **OLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**, tree planting measures to be implemented include: • Over 6km of species-rich native hedgerow with trees (including existing hedgerow enhancement); • Approximately 34km of species-rich native hedgerow; • Approximately 1ha of native tree belts; and • Approximately 980ha of species-rich grassland accounted for across the Order Limits in hedgerow and field margins, riparian zones, wildflower meadows and tussock mixes beneath solar panels.

	should be sought, and proposals discussed with highways and trees officers where necessary, so that the right trees are planted in the right places; and c. Make provision for the long-term maintenance of both existing and newly-planted trees which form part of the development.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** confirms that, as relevant, legislation and guidance have been used to inform the Proposed Development's consideration of improvements and impacts on species.
N6: Areas of particular importance for biodiversity and geodiversity	1. To support the conservation of important habitats, species and sites of geodiversity value, development proposals affecting: a. A site of international importance, which for the purpose of this policy is a habitats site, should be refused unless: i. An appropriate assessment has concluded that the proposal will not adversely affect the integrity of the site (either individually or in combination with other developments), or the proposal can satisfy the derogation tests; and/or ii. The impact of development on the relevant protected feature of the protected site is being addressed through an Environmental Delivery Plan which has been made and the developer has committed to paying the nature restoration levy. b. A site of national importance, which for the purpose of this policy is one designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest, should only be supported if: i. There would be no adverse effect (either individually or in combination with other developments) on the site's features of special scientific interest; or ii. The benefits of the development in the location proposed clearly outweigh both the likely impact on the features of special scientific interest, and any broader impact on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest; or iii. The impact of development on the relevant protected feature of the protected site is being addressed through an Environmental Delivery Plan which has been made and the developer has committed to paying the nature restoration levy. c. A site of local importance, which for the purpose of this policy is one designated as a Local Nature Reserve or identified as a local wildlife site, local geological site or equivalent in the development plan, should only be supported if: i. There would not be a significant adverse effect on the integrity of the site; or ii. The benefits of development in the location proposed clearly outweigh the likely impact on the features which make the site valuable for nature conservation.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** sets out that there are no sites of national or internal importance within the Order Limits of the Proposed Development. Regarding Locally Designated Sites, Brampton Common LWS lies partially within the Site and will be directly affected by the Proposed Development. Ulley Country Park LWS and Firsby Reservoir Local Nature Reserves (LNR) are adjacent to the Site (see **Statutory and Non-Statutory Designated Ecological Sites [EN0110020/APP/2.6]**). As set out in section 6 of the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**, Brampton Common LWS is designated in recognition of the following qualifying features: • Species rich hedgerows, including ancient hedgerows which are considered irreplaceable; and • Breeding skylark population. The Proposed Development aims to secure the long-term protection, enhancement, and favourable management of Brampton Common Local Wildlife Site, introducing solar panels and associated features whilst safeguarding its species rich hedgerows and breeding skylark population and delivering high quality habitat that contributes to biodiversity net gain. This is set out in further detail within the **OLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**, including the strategy to ensure long-term benefits for this wildlife site are delivered. The strategy to ensure long-term benefits for the Brampton Common Local Wildlife Site, as set out within the **OLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** will be secured as part of the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan to be prepared under a requirement in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The Applicant commits to the following: • Long-term management of the proposed and existing habitats supporting skylark and wading birds will extend across the LWS within the Order Limits. Long-term operational monitoring across the LWS within the Order Limits will be undertaken annually during the peak breeding time for five years, to better understand habitat improvements and biodiversity.
20. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment		
HE4: Securing the conservation of heritage assets	1. Heritage assets, as an irreplaceable resource, should be conserved and enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance. To achieve this, development proposals which would affect the significance of heritage assets, including any contribution made by their setting should:	The following embedded mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Proposed Development for the construction phase, detailed within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**:

	a. Maintain or secure a use consistent with their conservation, taking into account the importance of maintaining the assets, the positive contribution they can make to sustainable communities including local economies, and the positive contribution they can make to local character and distinctiveness; b. Avoid (or if that is not possible, minimise) harm to the significance of heritage assets, and instead preserve and enhance this significance.	• Where practicable, construction activities will be planned to avoid unnecessary disturbance to buried archaeological remains. Measures will include implementation of **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7: Archaeological Preservation Strategy (APS) [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, incorporation of exclusion zones, micrositing of infrastructure and adoption of non-intrusive construction methods where required. These measures will be secured and implemented through the CEMP in coordination with the Archaeological Preservation Strategy. • Areas identified as having heightened archaeological sensitivity will be protected through avoidance-led measures, including exclusion zones with no ground disturbance, micrositing of infrastructure and, where necessary, alternative construction methods that allow installation above or below archaeological remains without truncation. The identification and protection of Heightened Archaeological Sensitivity areas and the requirement for implementation of avoidance is secured through **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7: APS [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]**. • Where avoidance of archaeological remains is not practicable, controlled archaeological investigation and recording will be undertaken in advance of or during construction to preserve the archaeological resource by record. These measures will be implemented in accordance with the **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7: APS [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]** and coordinated through the CEMP. • Archaeological monitoring will be undertaken during defined construction activities where there is potential for impacts to below-ground archaeology, including monitoring of soil stripping where required. Procedures for archaeological supervision and monitoring will be secured through the CEMP in accordance with the **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]**. • Standard pollution prevention and construction management measures will be implemented to reduce the risk of contamination or degradation of archaeological remains. This will include compliance with relevant Construction Design and Management (CDM) requirements, safe handling and storage of fuels and hazardous materials, provision of spill kits on site and incident response procedures, all secured through the CEMP. • Procedures will be in place to manage the discovery of previously unknown archaeological remains during construction, including measures to halt works in affected areas and implement appropriate archaeological responses. These procedures will be set out within the CEMP. The following embedded mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Proposed Development for the operation and maintenance phase, detailed within the **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**: • The layout of the Proposed Development (see **Volume 3, ES Figure 5.1: Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/6.19]**) has been informed by the need to locate above ground infrastructure outside the setting of sensitive heritage receptors where practicable, or within areas of the landscape where
	2. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (including from development within its setting) should have a clear and convincing justification in accordance with the policies in this chapter.	
	3. Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the asset should not be taken into account in any decision relating to the asset.	
	4. Proposals for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with other policies in this Framework but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, should be considered on the basis of whether the conservation benefits outweigh the disbenefits of departing from the policies concerned.	

		effects on setting are minimised. Where additional mitigation is required during operation, landscape screening (see **ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1: Illustrative Mitigation Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/6.19]**) may be used to reduce the visibility of infrastructure in views that contribute to the setting and significance of heritage assets. Screening measures, where appropriate, will be delivered through landscape planting and managed in accordance with the approved **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**. The following embedded mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Proposed Development for the operation and maintenance phase, detailed within the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**: • No additional mitigation specific to the decommissioning phase is proposed beyond that already defined and secured for the construction phase of the Proposed Development. Decommissioning activities will be undertaken in a sensitive manner and will apply the same principles, controls and avoidance measures established for construction. • Decommissioning activities within areas of archaeological sensitivity will be undertaken in accordance with the sensitive decommissioning strategy set out in the **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7: Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [APP EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and secured by the **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]**. This includes the application of appropriate archaeological controls, mitigation and monitoring measures equivalent to those established for construction, where relevant. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** concludes that, with embedded mitigation measures outlined in the management plans above, there are no significant residual adverse heritage related effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. There are no heritage assets identified in the Study Area where evidence was found of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, the asset.
HE5: Assessing effects on heritage assets	1. Development proposals affecting heritage assets should be accompanied by an assessment of the significance of the assets affected (including any contribution made by their setting) and of the potential effect of the proposal on their significance. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is necessary to understand the potential effect of the proposal on their significance. The relevant historic environment record should be consulted as a minimum, and appropriate expertise employed where necessary.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** provides an assessment of the Proposed Development's impact on the historic environment, both above and below ground assets, within the Order limits, or that will be impacted by the Proposed Development. The chapter describes the heritage assets within the Study Area for the Proposed Development and their significance, and the significance of their contribution to the setting. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Baseline [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** sets out the existing cultural heritage baseline conditions, with further details presented in the following appendices: • **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.1: Legislation, Policy and Guidance [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**
	2. Assessments of the potential effects of development proposals on heritage assets and their setting should identify whether proposals would be likely to: a. Have a positive effect, which is where a heritage asset would be enhanced, or its significance better revealed; or b. Have no effect on the significance of the asset; or	

	c. Result in harm to the significance of the heritage asset, either from work affecting the asset itself or from development within its setting. The degree of harm should be identified: substantial harm would occur where the development proposal would seriously affect a key element of the asset's significance; or d. Cause the total loss of the significance of the heritage asset. 3. In making this assessment it is the effect on an asset's significance rather than the scale of the development which should be considered.	• **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.3: Sieving Exercise [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.5: Geoarchaeological Desk Based Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.6: Geophysical Survey [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7: Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Baseline [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** outlines the baseline conditions of heritage assets. Section 8.2 of **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Baseline [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** sets out various designations, historic landscape character records, relevant Historic Environment Records, and equivalent resources which are within or surrounding the Proposed Development, but this does not change the overall impact that there are no significant residual effects identified during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** concludes that, with embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant residual adverse heritage related effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. The embedded mitigation measures are documented within **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**, **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]**, and the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and are secured via requirements in Schedule 2 of the **dDraft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
	5. Where a development proposal involves, or has the potential to involve, a heritage asset with archaeological interest, an appropriate desk-based assessment should be undertaken and, where necessary, a field evaluation. These should be used to help understand the asset's significance and the potential effect of the proposal on this, which should inform the design, mitigation and implementation of the development.	**ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Baseline [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** sets out the existing cultural heritage baseline conditions, with further details presented in the following appendices: • **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.1: Legislation, Policy and Guidance [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.3: Sieving Exercise [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.5: Geoarchaeological Desk Based Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.6: Geophysical Survey [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** • **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7: Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**

		ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8] concludes that there are no significant residual effects identified during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Proposed Development.
HE6: Proposals affecting designated heritage assets	1. When considering the potential effect of a development proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, substantial weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential effect amounts to a positive effect, harm, substantial harm, or total loss of its significance.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** provides an assessment of the Proposed Development's impact on the historic environment, both above and below ground assets, within the Order limits, or that will be impacted by the Proposed Development. The chapter describes the heritage assets within the Study Area for the Proposed Development and their significance, and the significance of their contribution to the setting. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** concludes that, with embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant residual adverse heritage related effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. The embedded mitigation measures are documented within **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**, **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]**, and the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and are secured via requirements in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
	4. Where a development proposal would harm the significance of a designated heritage asset the effect on the asset and its significance should be weighed against any public benefits resulting from the proposal. Important public benefits can include securing the long-term re-use of a vacant or underused listed building and enabling energy efficiency and low carbon heating measures to be employed.	
	5. Where a development proposal would cause harm to, or the total loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset, consent should be refused unless it can be demonstrated that the harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh the harm or loss, or if all of the following apply: a. The nature of the heritage asset would otherwise prevent all reasonable uses of the site; b. No suitable use for the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; c. Conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is not possible; and d. The harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the asset back into use.	
HE9: Conservation areas	1. Development proposals within or affecting the significance of conservation areas should: a. Retain and restore buildings and other features which make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area wherever possible; and b. Consider the area's special architectural or historic interest (as identified as part of the designation of the conservation area) in the design of development.	**ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Baseline [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** notes that there are 13 Conservation Areas within the 1km Study Area. Of this, the Barlborough and Ulley Conservation Areas as moderate adverse and minor adverse significant effects, but with the embedded mitigation in place these are determined as not significant residual effects on the setting of the Conservation Areas in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]**.
	2. Not all elements of a conservation area will necessarily contribute to its significance. Where a development proposal would result in the loss of a building or other element which contributes to the character or appearance of a conservation area that is desirable to preserve or enhance, the assessment of impact should take into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the conservation area as a whole, and the effects of this considered in accordance with policies HE5 and HE6.	

HE10: Loss of removal of heritage assets	1. Where a development proposal would not result in the loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset (whether designated or not): a. The development should not be approved without all reasonable steps being taken to ensure that the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred, including through the use of planning conditions and planning obligations to secure the development against the loss of the asset: and b. The applicant should record and advance understanding of the significance of the asset to be lost in a manner proportionate to its importance and the potential impact upon it; and should make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible by depositing it in the relevant Historic Environment Record, and any archives with a local museum or other public depository. The ability to record evidence of our past should not be a decisive factor in deciding whether such loss should be approved.	The following embedded mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Proposed Development with regard to archaeological heritage assets. They are detailed within **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**: • Where practicable, construction activities will be planned to avoid unnecessary disturbance to buried archaeological remains. Measures will include implementation of **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7: Archaeological Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, incorporation of exclusion zones, micrositing of infrastructure and adoption of non-intrusive construction methods where required. These measures will be secured and implemented through the CEMP in coordination with the Archaeological Preservation Strategy. • Areas identified as having heightened archaeological sensitivity will be protected through avoidance-led measures, including exclusion zones with no ground disturbance, micrositing of infrastructure and, where necessary, alternative construction methods that allow installation above or below archaeological remains without truncation. The identification and protection of Heightened Archaeological Sensitivity areas and the requirement for implementation of avoidance is secured through **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7: APS [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]**. • Where avoidance of archaeological remains is not practicable, controlled archaeological investigation and recording will be undertaken in advance of or during construction to preserve the archaeological resource by record. These measures will be implemented in accordance with the **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7: APS [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]** and coordinated through the CEMP. • Archaeological monitoring will be undertaken during defined construction activities where there is potential for impacts to below-ground archaeology, including monitoring of soil stripping where required. Procedures for archaeological supervision and monitoring will be secured through the CEMP in accordance with the **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]**. • Standard pollution prevention and construction management measures will be implemented to reduce the risk of contamination or degradation of archaeological remains. This will include compliance with relevant Construction Design and Management (CDM) requirements, safe handling and storage of fuels and hazardous materials, provision of spill kits on site and incident response procedures, all secured through the CEMP. • Procedures will be in place to manage the discovery of previously unknown archaeological remains during construction, including measures to halt works in affected areas and implement appropriate archaeological responses. These procedures will be set out within the CEMP.

TABLE 6: ROTHERHAM METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN – TABLE OF COMPLIANCE

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted 2014)		
Policy	**Policy Text**	**Assessment**
Policy CS 2: Delivering Development on Major Sites	Detailed master planning and the preparation of appropriate Design Codes will be required prior to the submission of any planning application, to bring forward the strategical location and broad location for growth in a coherent way to ensure that all new development meets the aims of the borough Spatial Strategy. Masterplanning will ensure that the phasing and delivery of essential infrastructure will enable the creation of sustainable communities. It will minimise the impact of new development on existing services and facilities, ensure the delivery of new social infrastructure to meet the requirements of the development and minimise harm to, and maximise benefits for, the environment. Detailed masterplanning will also been courage on all large-scale major sites for new development to meet these broad aims. The Council will expect masterplans to demonstrate an appropriate level of community engagement in their preparation.	As detailed in section 5 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]**, good design has been a fundamental consideration from the outset of the Proposed Development. The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** demonstrates how the design of the Proposed Development has been developed in accordance with a clear design framework, based on the criteria for good design set out in NPS EN-1. This has included the adoption of **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]** to guide decision making and embed good design outcomes to the Proposed Development. The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** has been prepared in accordance with the Planning Inspectorate's guidance titled 'Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Good Design' and sets out the design decisions taken at each step of the Proposed Development, and the rationale for these decisions, as well as the mechanisms by which good design will be secured post consent. Throughout the design process, the Applicant maintained an interdisciplinary approach to design and considered both the opportunities and constraints of the Proposed Development. This included analysis of the existing physical, environmental, social and cultural context of the Site by a broad range of technical disciplines (including landscape and visual, noise, ecology and heritage) as set out and assessed by the **Aspect Chapters of the ES [EN0110020/APP/6.6 – 6.16]**. This approach has enabled the Applicant to understand the complexities of the Site and identify where multiple opportunities and constraints have the potential to stack up with one another to provide a good design response and allow for co-existence and co-location with other terrestrial uses. Section 2.4 of the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** sets out the following project specific design principles: Climate: mitigate greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to climate change • Maximise the amount of renewable energy provided to the National Grid • Craft a project that is resilient to climate change • Limit the amount of embodied carbon across the project where reasonable People: reflect what society wants and share benefits widely

		• Engage with stakeholders to develop the design • Find out what is important to people about the local area and seek to incorporate feedback • Consider how people engage with their local environment and retain these patterns Place: provide a sense of identify and improve our environment • Enhance recreational access across the landscape • Respect landscape character and cultural heritage • Minimise visual impact Value: achieve multiple benefits and solve problems well • Support local ecology and enhance biodiversity, enriching ecosystems where possible • Support research and development
Policy CS 4: Green Belt	Land within the Rotherham Green Belt will be protected from inappropriate development as set out in national planning policy. In line with Policy CS1, land within the Strategic Allocation at Bassingthorpe Farm is removed from the Green Belt, as shown in Map 3 'Strategic Allocation Policies Map'. A comprehensive review of the remaining boundaries of the Green Belt will be undertaken and shown on the Policies Map to accompany the Sites & Policies document. This Review will assess land against the national purposes of Green Belt and, together with sustainability and constraints considerations, will identify sufficient land to meet housing, employment and other development needs in the borough. Changes to the Green Belt will be considered in the following locations: • The wider Rotherham Urban Area • Principal Settlements for Growth • Principal Settlements • Thurcroft • A broad location for growth is identified at Dinnington East, which will be removed from the Green Belt; the detailed Green Belt boundaries will be defined in the Sites and Policies document and accompanying Policies Map. • Consideration will be given to a limited review of the Green Belt in other locations, as necessary, to deliver the spatial growth strategy established in CS1 and to ensure the long-term sustainability of all communities.	**Appendix 2: Green Belt Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** sets out that the Proposed Development is located on grey belt land and meets the tests for being not inappropriate within the grey belt. If this is not agreed, 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. The **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** and **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** set out the need for the Proposed Development and note the established need for low-carbon infrastructure as a CNP and that such projects should be brought forward with urgency.

	Land will also be removed from the Green Belt and identified as Safeguarded Land available for longer term development beyond the Plan period. Opportunities to support and enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt will be pursued in the future through compensatory measures including the creation or enhancement of Green Infrastructure.	
Policy CS 10: Improving Skills and Employment Opportunities	The Council will work with its partners to improve skills in all of Rotherham's communities through the promotion of access to training, education and local employment opportunities. Where appropriate and viable the Council will seek to enter into a local labour agreement with applicants and developers to improve the links between local communities, developers and employers by: a) Ensuring that new developments contribute to the provision of education and training b) Promoting local employment opportunities, and securing construction training experience through employment on site, through financial contributions or through other training programmes	The Applicant has engaged with the LPAs on socio-economic matters, to better understand the socio-economic fabric of the area to assist both the **ES Chapter 15: Socio-Economics and Land Use [EN0110020/APP/6.15]** and also the **Outline Skills and Supply Chain Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.18]**. Details on the feedback received from the statutory consultation, including the response to each matter raised and how it has been addressed, are provided in the **Consultation Report Appendices [EN0110020/APP/5.1]**.
Policy CS 14: Accessible Places and Managing Demand for Travel	The Council will work with partners and stakeholders to focus transport investment on making places more accessible and on changing travel behaviour. Accessibility will be promoted through the proximity of people to employment, leisure, retail, health and public services by: a) Locating new development in highly accessible locations such as town and district centres or on key bus corridors which are well served by a variety of modes of travel (but principally by public transport) and through supporting high density development near to public transport interchanges or near to relevant frequent public transport links. b) Enabling walking and cycling to be used for shorter trips and for links to public transport interchanges. c) Reducing car parking provision in town centre and other accessible sites if public transport and other sustainable modes can accommodate travel but not to an extent where the town centre is unattractive when compared to out of town shopping centres. d) Set thresholds where existing and future employers and institutions will need to adopt Travel Plans or Area Travel Plans aspart of a programme of sustainable transport promotion. e) The use of maximum parking standards for non-residential developments aimed at reducing the number of car trips to and from them. f) Adopting car parking policies for vehicles and bicycles in accordance to national guidelines that support and complement public transport and the introduction of sustainable travel modes.	As noted within section 3.2 of the **ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, the Proposed Development is situated in close proximity to three roads that form part of the Strategic Road Network. In terms of vehicle routing, these roads will be the origins of trips to the Proposed Development. The three roads of relevance that form part of the Strategic Road Network include – • **A1** - spans approximately 410 miles (660 km) from London to Edinburgh, passing through major towns and cities such as Peterborough, Doncaster, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and Berwick-upon-Tweed. The A1 includes sections that are designated as A1(M), which are upgraded to motorway standards. Junction 1 of the A1 (M) will be utilised to provide SRN routing onto the local highway network for Whitestone 1. • **M18** - The M18 motorway is a key route in Yorkshire, stretching approximately 26 miles (42 km) from the east of Rotherham to Goole in a north-east to south-west direction. It connects several major motorways, including the M1, A1(M), M180, and M6212. Junction 1 of the M18 motorway will be utilised to provide SRN routing onto the local highway network for Whitestone 1 and 2. • **M1** - The M1 motorway connects London to Leeds and spans approximately 193 miles (311 km). The motorway passes through several counties, including Greater London, Hertfordshire, Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Northamptonshire, Leicestershire, Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire, and Yorkshire. It also intersects with other major motorways such as the M25, M6, M69, M18, M62, and M62112. Junction 31 of the M1 motorway will be utilised to provide SRN routing onto the local highway network for Whitestone 2 and 3. Junction 33 will also provide routing to Whitestone 2. As set out within section 4.2 of **Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]**, one of the key site selection principles that assisted in determining a suitable location for the Proposed Development was to

	g) The use of Transport Assessments for appropriate sized developments, taking into account current national guidance on the thresholds for the type of development(s) proposed. h) The safeguarding of suitable land for the provision of transport infrastructure. i) Prohibiting development where this is prejudicial to projects outlined in the Local Transport Plan or for any other transport proposals. Land to be safeguarded will be contained in specific transport proposals, the Sites and Policies document or other Local Development Plan Documents as appropriate. j) Implementing the Public Rights of Way Improvement Plan and maximising the use of the Public Rights Of Way network and other routes such as canal towpaths and disused railway lines for local transport connections on foot and by bicycle. k) Not allowing new development in Air Quality Management Areas unless traffic and air quality impacts are appropriately mitigated. l) Promoting Park and Ride where other sustainable travel choices cannot deliver similar benefits. m) Maintaining and improving School Travel Plans to manage demand for travel to and from schools and colleges.	ensure it would be situated in an appropriate location to access motorways and other major road infrastructure corridors for construction purposes. As demonstrated within the **Location Plans [EN0110020/APP/2.1]**, the Proposed Development is well connected to the local motorways, including the M18 and M1 but also the wider major road infrastructure and Local Road Network. This enables the chosen site to be accessed from all necessary road networks for construction, operation (and maintenance) and decommissioning phases. As set out within section 4.7 of the **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]**, the overall management and implementation of the Construction Traffic Management Plan will be the responsibility of the Applicant. The Applicant will appoint a Traffic Safety Control Officer to develop, implement and management the CTMP with one of the controls being to demonstrate any need for measures and areas of the proposed road structure to be improved. Work No. 5, as set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]** is regarding the highway works associated with the Proposed Development. Highways Works refer to the creation of access points, visibility splays, and any localised upgrades to roads required to accommodate the delivery of Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs) and other traffic associated with the Proposed Development. Regarding the interaction between the Proposed Development and the local Public Rights of Way, the **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** outlines the measures to limit disruption and ensure that the PRoW network can continue to be used throughout the construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development, while minimising the impact on PRoW users. The Proposed Development includes opportunities for advancement, including the proposed approximately 14.58km of permissive path within the Order Limits, as set out within the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]**. The **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** is secured by a requirement of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
Policy CS 15: Key Routes and the Strategic Road Network	The Key Route and Motorway network will provide efficient access between the main Rotherham Urban Area, Principal Settlements and the regional and national road network. This will be achieved by: a) Concentrating through traffic on Motorways and ‘A’ Roads with best use being made of the existing road capacity to enable this. b) Improving specific Key Routes to manage congestion including traffic management measures, bus priority and facilities for cyclists and pedestrians. c) Integrating Park and Ride projects into bus priority schemes where they create a demonstrable reduction in vehicle mileage and are proven to be self financing. d) Concentrating road based freight onto those key routes where it would not have an unacceptable impact on local communities. Investment in key routes will be complemented by improved links for public transport, walking and cycling into the communities they serve. Where a key route passes	As noted within section 3.2 of the **ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, the Proposed Development is situated in close proximity to three roads that form part of the Strategic Road Network. In terms of vehicle routing, these roads will be the origins of trips to the Proposed Development. The three roads of relevance that form part of the Strategic Road Network include – • **A1** - spans approximately 410 miles (660 km) from London to Edinburgh, passing through major towns and cities such as Peterborough, Doncaster, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and Berwick-upon-Tweed. The A1 includes sections that are designated as A1(M), which are upgraded to motorway standards. Junction 1 of the A1 (M) will be utilised to provide SRN routing onto the local highway network for Whitestone 1. • **M18** - The M18 motorway is a key route in Yorkshire, stretching approximately 26 miles (42 km) from the east of Rotherham to Goole in a north-east to south-west direction. It connects several major motorways, including the M1, A1(M),

	through a community or acts as the main transport link between communities, it will be modified to reflect the needs of local people with priority given to accommodating vulnerable road users.	M180, and M6212. Junction 1 of the M18 motorway will be utilised to provide SRN routing onto the local highway network for Whitestone 1 and 2. • **M1** - The M1 motorway connects London to Leeds and spans approximately 193 miles (311 km). The motorway passes through several counties, including Greater London, Hertfordshire, Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Northamptonshire, Leicestershire, Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire, and Yorkshire. It also intersects with other major motorways such as the M25, M6, M69, M18, M62, and M62112. Junction 31 of the M1 motorway will be utilised to provide SRN routing onto the local highway network for Whitestone 2 and 3. Junction 33 will also provide routing to Whitestone 2. As set out within section 4.2 of **Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]**, one of the key site selection principles that assisted in determining a suitable location for the Proposed Development was to ensure it would be situated in an appropriate location to access motorways and other major road infrastructure corridors for construction purposes. As demonstrated within the **Location Plans [EN0110020/APP/2.1]**, the Proposed Development is well connected to the local motorways, including the M18 and M1 but also the wider major road infrastructure and Local Road Network. This enables the chosen site to be accessed from all necessary road networks for construction, operation (and maintenance) and decommissioning phases. As set out within section 4.7 of the **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]**, the overall management and implementation of the Construction Traffic Management Plan will be the responsibility of the Applicant. The Applicant will appoint a Traffic Safety Control Officer to develop, implement and management the CTMP with one of the controls being to demonstrate any need for measures and areas of the proposed road structure to be improved.
Policy CS 19: Green Infrastructure	Rotherham's network of Green Infrastructure assets, including the Strategic Green Infrastructure Corridors will be conserved, extended, enhanced, managed and maintained throughout the borough. Green Infrastructure will permeate from the core of the built environment out into the rural areas. A net gain in Green Infrastructure will be realised through the protection and enhancement of existing assets and the creation of new multi functional areas, assets and linkages to include promoting: recreation and tourism, public access (including walking and cycling), green education, biodiversity (incorporating the promotion of ecological networks and habitat connectivity), public health and wellbeing, water management, the protection and enhancement of the local and national landscape character area and historic assets, the mitigation of climate change, green economic uses and sustainable land management. Action will be targeted to the safeguarding and enhancement of functions and assets of the Strategic Green Infrastructure Corridors and any future refinement work and the delivery of objectives and actions identified in local and sub-regional Green Infrastructure Strategies. This will include long term management and maintenance of these assets.	The Proposed Development would also provide benefits to the local community via an enhanced green infrastructure network including a better-connected footpath and cycle network and access to open space and recreational spaces. The Proposed Development incorporates a series of permissive paths proposed across the Order Limits, as secured in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**, as set out in the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]**. The overarching aim of the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** is to set out prescriptions for habitat creation and management in order to provide ecological enhancements, strengthen the green infrastructure within the local area and provide landscape and visual mitigation through the use of screening where required. The proposed mitigation measures will assist in contributing to the overall improvements to the local biodiversity and nature conservation as a result of the Proposed Development. Permissive paths will be open for the operational and maintenance phase of the Proposed Development and be open to equestrians, cyclists and pedestrians. The extent and location of the paths is as follows: • Approximately 2.92 km of permissive paths proposed across Whitestone 1 to provide additional equestrian routes that link with the existing bridleways.

	Developer contributions will be used to facilitate improvements through quality, robustness, establishment, enhancement, and the ongoing management of Rotherham's Green Infrastructure, investing in enhancement and restoration where opportunities exist and the creation of new resources where necessary. Proposals will be supported which make an overall contribution to the Green Infrastructure network based upon the principles set out below: a) Securing provision, either on or off site, of an appropriate size, shape, scale and type and having regard to the nature of the development, its impact on the wider network and contribution to the overall quality of the area. b) Avoiding damage to or loss of Green Infrastructure assets. Where loss is unavoidable and the benefits of the development outweigh the loss, appropriate mitigation and compensation measures should be included as part of development proposals. c) Investment in Green infrastructure will be prioritised to increase functionality of individual assets and safeguard existing functions, such as habitats for wildlife. d) Improving connectivity between new developments and the Strategic Green Infrastructure network and providing buffering to protect sensitive sites. e) Supporting ecosystem services, including the use and management of Green Infrastructure areas to reduce the impacts of climate change, using vegetation to cool the environment provision of new open space to remedy the need for natural and semi natural flood storage and managing surface water to ensure landscape change impacted by climate change has long term benefits. f) Promoting design which replicates or incorporates natural processes for river morphology and water storage along the regionally important rivers Don, Rother and Dearne. g) Promoting innovative development which manages quantifiable risks such as flooding. h) Assisting with the integration of new development into the natural and historic environment.	• Approximately 10.8 km of permissive paths are proposed across Whitestone 2. To the north, two permissive paths provide access around King's Pond Plantation. To the west, the proposed permissive path follows Ulley Brook to connect with the existing footpath to the north and Treeton Lane to the south. To the south of Upper Whiston, a permissive path links Suilthwaite Common Lanlee and Field Lane. To the east of Ulley, a permissive path forms a circular route that begins at Carr Lane, follows the field boundaries north, along Penny Hill Lane, then turns south to rejoin Carr Lane. Permissive paths link with the existing PRoW to create a circular route across Brampton Common. To the east, the permissive path offers an alternative route away from the A57, connecting the A57 sidewalk to Anston Brook and the existing footpath near North Anston. • Approximately 0.86 km long permissive path across Whitestone 3, begins in Woodal, crosses Stone Hill and joins the existing footpath at Harthill Reservoir. If consent is given, these design outcomes will be secured and implemented post-consent, in accordance with the various management plans and **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]** secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The approach also ensures the conclusions of the Environmental Statement are upheld, and the appropriate flexibility is provided. The **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** outlines the mitigation measures proposed to protect green infrastructure users during necessary works: • Provision of banksmen to hold vehicles when PRoW users are present, and to advise PRoW users of potential vehicle movements • Wider access tracks to create more room for PRoW users when vehicles pass them • Drivers will stop and give-way to any PRoW user that they encounter • Appropriate signage will be installed to make PRoW users aware of construction activity The **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** notes the creation of 14.58km of permissive paths throughout the Order Limits to provide new connections to extend options and routes for pedestrians, equestrians and cyclists. The majority of the Order limits are within Flood Zone 1, with a small proportion of land located within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Where there are areas of flood zones 2 and 3, no sensitive electrical infrastructure has been placed within these areas, only solar panels and mitigation. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** concludes that, with embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant residual adverse heritage related effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases.

Policy CS 20: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	The Council will conserve and enhance Rotherham's natural environment. Biodiversity and geodiversity resources will be protected and measures will be taken to enhance these resources in terms of nationally and locally prioritised sites, habitats and features and protected and priority species. Priority will be given to: a) Protecting the integrity of European and nationally designated sites for nature conservation, biodiversity and geodiversity, from in appropriate development; b) Supporting the positive management and protection of nationally, regionally and locally designated sites for nature conservation; c) Conserving and enhancing populations of protected and identified priority species by protecting them from harm and disturbance and by promoting recovery of such species populations to meet national and local targets; d) Conserving and enhancing sites and features which have demonstrable biodiversity and geodiversity value, including woodland, important trees, hedgerows, watercourse, caves, crags and structures, but which are not included in designated sites; e) Supporting the delivery of objectives set out in the Rotherham Biodiversity Action Plan and the Yorkshire and Humber Biodiversity Strategy and Delivery Plan, f) Supporting the production of further relevant biodiversity and ecological network strategies identified by local partnerships, to deliver the restoration and expansion of priority habitats, including within identified biodiversity opportunity areas; g) Supporting the delivery of objectives set out in the UK Geodiversity Action Plan, other relevant geodiversity strategies; h) Encouraging the inclusion of natural environment assets, networks and opportunity areas in Green Infrastructure development; i) Supporting the maintenance of nature conservation evidence bases to ensure that adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence on environmental characteristics and prospects is available; j) Managing land use sympathetically, understanding the naturally functioning processes of habitat succession, flood & water management and climate change adaptation; contributing to landscape-scale and green infrastructure delivery; k) Protecting soil resources and managing the release of the best and most versatile agricultural land, taking into account it's economic and other benefits and releasing only areas of poorer quality in preference to that of a higher quality;	Regarding Locally Designated Sites, Brampton Common LWS lies partially within the Site and will be directly affected by the Proposed Development. Ulley Country Park LWS and Firsby Reservoir Local Nature Reserves (LNR) are adjacent to the Site (see **Statutory and Non-Statutory Designated Ecological Sites [EN0110020/APP/2.6]**). The Proposed Development aims to secure the long-term protection, enhancement, and favourable management of Brampton Common Local Wildlife Site, introducing solar panels and associated features whilst safeguarding its species rich hedgerows and breeding skylark population and delivering high quality habitat that contributes to biodiversity net gain. This is set out in further detail within the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**, including the strategy to ensure long-term benefits for this wildlife site are delivered. The strategy to ensure long-term benefits for the Brampton Common Local Wildlife Site, as set out within the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** will be secured as part of the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan to be prepared in accordance with the relevant requirement in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The Applicant commits to the following: • Long-term management of the proposed and existing habitats supporting skylark and wading birds will extend across the LWS within the Order Limits. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Baseline [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** notes that there are 13 Conservation Areas within the 1km Study Area. Of this, the Barlborough and Ulley Conservation Areas as moderate adverse and minor adverse significant effects, but with the embedded mitigation in place these are determined as not significant residual effects on the setting of the Conservation Areas in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]**. The Applicant has developed the design of the Proposed Development to minimise the land take of BMV land, where practicable. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** describes the existing levels and assesses the anticipated soil effects of the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases, in accordance with this policy. The Proposed Development incorporates a number of enhancements resulting in a number of significant beneficial effects, including (but not limited to) long-term beneficial effects at the local level in relation to hedgerow and woodland habitats, as a result of the proposed hedgerow, woodland and tree planting set out in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**. Section 9.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** includes an outline SMP which is provided as part of the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, this includes: • Details of relevant guidance relating to soil resources and their management

	l) Ensuring that development decisions will safeguard the natural environment and will incorporate best practice including biodiversity gain, green construction, sustainable drainage and contribution to green infrastructure	• Relevant background information, including climate, geology, altitude, topography, soil type and land use, and descriptions of the soil resources identified in the survey work undertaken across the Proposed Development • Appropriate soils handling methods for stripping, stockpiling and reinstatement of soils; and • Monitoring procedures The objective of the outline SMP is to identify the importance and sensitivity of the soil resource and to provide specific guidance to ensure that there is no significant adverse effect on the soil resource as a result of the Proposed Development. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]**, sets out that the design of the Proposed Development has evolved to avoid impacts and effects on ecology and biodiversity as far as practicable. The Proposed Development incorporates a number of enhancements resulting in a number of significant beneficial effects, including (but not limited to) long-term beneficial effects at the local level in relation to hedgerow and woodland habitats, as a result of the proposed hedgerow, woodland and tree planting set out in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**. As set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** surface water runoff from the Solar PV will be managed through Rural SuDS and Natural Flood Management techniques such as grassland/wildflower areas, which will act to bind soils, slow surface water, and increase water quality compared to the baseline scenario.
Policy CS 21: Landscape	New development will be required to safeguard and enhance the quality, character, distinctiveness and amenity value of the borough's landscapes. This will be achieved through the principles set out below: a) All new development proposals will be required to respect and enhance the character and distinctiveness of the relevant National Character Areas and the Local Landscape Character Areas identified for Rotherham. b) Within Areas of High Landscape Value, development will only be permitted where it will not detract from the landscape or visual character of the area and where appropriate standards of design and landscape architecture are achieved. c) Significant landscape features, important views including landmarks and skylines will be safeguarded and enhanced. Proposals that reduce the negative visual impact of landscape detractors will be encouraged d) Development will respect the setting of neighbouring settlements. e) Where opportunities exist, the Council, and its partners, will support landscape enhancement, restoration, reclamation and other environmental improvements to enhance the quality, appearance and attractiveness of the borough and encourage future investment, development and tourism.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]** explains that the Order Limits fall within two National Character Areas (NCAs) including: • National Character Area 30: Southern Magnesium Limestone. This covers the eastern part of the Study Area; and • National Character Area 38: Nottingham, Derbyshire and Yorkshire Coalfield. This covers the western part of the Study Area. While NCAs inform the wider landscape context, their broad geographical scale is not appropriate for assessing site specific landscape effects. For this reason, they have been considered but have been scope out from the detailed effects assessment. The local published landscape character assessments that cover the Study Area and which has been reviewed as part of the landscape and visual impact assessment include: • Doncaster Landscape Character Assessment and Landscape Capacity Study (2007); • Rotherham Landscape Character Assessment and Landscape Capacity Study (2010);

	f) Landscape works shall be appropriate to the scale of the develop. g) Developers will be required to put in place effective landscape management mechanisms including long term landscape maintenance for the lifetime of the development. h) Support will be given to initiatives, strategies and projects working towards or contributing to landscape scale conservation, implementing an integrated approach to managing the environment and all its functions.	• Sheffield Preliminary Landscape Character Assessment (2023, submitted for examination as part of the Draft Plan submission); and • The Landscape Character of Derbyshire (Fourth Edition) (2014). The Order Limits is located in the following LCAs: • W1 is predominantly located within Doncaster LCA: A1: Conisbrough and Denaby Coalfield Farmlands; • W2 is predominantly located within Rotherham LCA 8: Central Rotherham Coalfield farmland, with the western extents within Rotherham LCA 5b: Coalfield Tributary Valleys – Treeton and Rotherham LCA 6: Rother Valley Floor; and • W3 is located within Rotherham LCA 8: Central Rotherham Coalfield Farmland, with the southern extents within Derbyshire LCA A – Limestone Farmlands and western extents within Derbyshire LCA B – Wooded Farmlands and Rotherham LCA 7: Rother Valley Reclaimed Woodland and a small part of the northern extent within Rotherham LCA 9a: East Rotherham Plateau. **ES Volume 3, Figures 7.3.1 and 7.3.2 Landscape Character Areas [EN0110020/APP/6.19]** set out the landscape character areas in conjunction with **ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.3: Landscape Character Baseline and Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** which sets out the landscape baseline and sensitivity. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]** provides an overview of the embedded mitigation and enhancement measures in the Proposed Development that would be adopted in order to mitigate potential adverse effects on the landscape and to views and visual amenity. These measures are presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1: Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/6.19]** and the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13].**
Policy CS 22: Green Space	The Council will seek to protect and improve the quality and accessibility of green spaces available to the local community and will provide clear and focused guidance to developers on the contributions expected. Rotherham's green spaces will be protected, managed, enhanced and created by: a) Requiring development proposals to provide new or upgrade existing provision of accessible green space where it is necessary to do so as a direct result of the new development b) Having regard to the detailed policies in the Sites and Policies document that will establish a standard for green space provision where new green space is required	The Proposed Development would also provide benefits to the local community via an enhanced green infrastructure network including a better-connected footpath and cycle network and access to open space and recreational spaces. The Proposed Development incorporates a series of permissive paths proposed across the Order Limits, as secured in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**, as set out in the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]**. Permissive paths will be open for the operational and maintenance phase of the Proposed Development and be open to equestrians, cyclists and pedestrians. The extent and location of the paths is as follows: • Approximately 2.92 km of permissive paths proposed across Whitestone 1 to provide additional equestrian routes that link with the existing bridleways. • Approximately 10.8 km of permissive paths are proposed across Whitestone 2. To the north, two permissive paths provide access around King's Pond Plantation. To the west, the proposed permissive path follows Ulley Brook to connect with the existing footpath to the north and Treeton Lane to the south.

	c) Protecting and enhancing green space that contributes to the amenities of the surrounding area, or could serve areas allocated for future residential development d) Considering the potential of currently inaccessible green space to meet an identified need e) Putting in place provision for long term management of green space provided by development f) Requiring all new green space to respect and enhance the character and distinctiveness of the relevant National Character Areas and the Local Landscape Character Areas identified for Rotherham. g) Links between green spaces will be preserved, improved and extended by: i. Retaining and enhancing green spaces that are easily accessible from strategically important routes as identified in the Public Rights of Way Improvement Plan, and those that adjoin one or more neighbouring green spaces to form a linear feature ii. Creating or extending green links where feasible as part of green space provision in new developments	To the south of Upper Whiston, a permissive path links Suilthwaite Common Lanlee and Field Lane. To the east of Ulley, a permissive path forms a circular route that begins at Carr Lane, follows the field boundaries north, along Penny Hill Lane, then turns south to rejoin Carr Lane. Permissive paths link with the existing PRoW to create a circular route across Brampton Common. To the east, the permissive path offers an alternative route away from the A57, connecting the A57 sidewalk to Anston Brook and the existing footpath near North Anston. • Approximately 0.86 km long permissive path across Whitestone 3, begins in Woodal, crosses Stone Hill and joins the existing footpath at Harthill Reservoir. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** sets out proposed improvements to Brampton Common LWS to enhance the green space: • Plant new hedgerow networks within the site where hedgerows may have been present historically and promote hedgerow planting beyond the site's limits. • Manage hedgerows sensitively for wildlife through reducing the extent of hedgerow cutting on a 3 yearly rotational basis to ensure hedgerows have sections that are at least 2m in height (or 3m with trees). • Strengthen habitat connectivity features through the addition of tree planting within hedgerows and thicken hedgerows through additional hedgerow species planting. • Assess potential for improve community benefits by increasing access for the local population, particularly for school age children and vulnerable adults, to include upgraded and maintained access points and defined accessible footpath routes. • Focal point areas where there are enhanced habitats for outdoor learning and provision of seating and benches should be explored. • Working alongside landowners to improve habitats, the planting, design and access of space for community use could be led through local community involvement, with the support of conservation charities. The **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** outlines the mitigation measures proposed to protect green infrastructure users during necessary works: • Provision of banksmen to hold vehicles when PRoW users are present, and to advise PRoW users of potential vehicle movements • Wider access tracks to create more room for PRoW users when vehicles pass them • Drivers will stop and give-way to any PRoW user that they encounter

		• Appropriate signage will be installed to make PRoW users aware of construction activity
Policy CS 23: Valuing the Historic Environment	Rotherham's historic environment will be conserved, enhanced and managed, in accordance with the principles set out below: a) Proposals and initiatives will be supported which conserve and enhance the heritage significance and setting of the borough's heritage assets, specifically those elements which contribute to the distinct identity of the borough. These include: i. The Roman Ridge, Roche Abbey, motte and bailey castles, historic houses and historic parks and gardens. ii. The borough's industrial past with particular regard to Catcliffe Glassworks, Swinton Pottery and the Chesterfield Canal. iii. The historic grain of the town centre and historic village cores, including street layout and plot sizes. iv. Early 20th century developments including planned colliery villages. v. Encouraging suitable new uses for vacant, under-used and derelict historic buildings. b) The character and setting of Rotherham Minster and the Chapel on the Bridge will be conserved and enhanced. Proposals will be supported which respect and enhance key views and vistas to both these and other significant buildings such as the Church of All Saints at Laughton en le Morthen. c) The character and setting, including key views to and from the historic buildings and designated landscape, of the Wentworth Woodhouse Estate will be conserved, enhanced and protected from inappropriate development. d) Proposals will be supported which protect the heritage significance and setting of locally identified heritage assets such as buildings of local architectural or historic interest, locally important archaeological sites and parks and gardens of local interest.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** provides an assessment of the Proposed Development's impact on the historic environment, both above and below ground assets, within the Order limits, or that will be impacted by the Proposed Development. The chapter describes the heritage assets within the Study Area for the Proposed Development and their significance, and the significance of their contribution to the setting. The chapter concludes that there are no significant residual effects identified during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [EN0110020/APP/6.8]** has been informed by the Historic Environment Record (HER). A landscape and visual impact assessment is included within **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7].** The assessment considers impacts of the Proposed Development on character visual receptors, landscape fabric and designations during construction, operation and decommissioning.
Policy CS 24: Conserving and Enhancing the Water Environment	Proposals will be supported which: a) Do not result in the deterioration of water courses and which conserve and enhance: i. The natural geomorphology of watercourses, ii. Water quality; and iii. The ecological value of the water environment, including water course corridors;	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** assess the impacts of the Proposed Development on water quality, water bodies or protected areas, and concludes that with the embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse water effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases on water quality, water bodies or protected areas. Sections 11.6 and 11.7 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** set out that critical electrical infrastructure within the Proposed Development will be located within Flood Zone 1.

	b) Contribute towards achieving 'good status' under the Water Framework Directive in the borough's surface and groundwater bodies c) Manage water demand and improve water efficiency through appropriate water conservation techniques including rainwater harvesting and grey-water recycling; d) Improve water quality through the incorporation of appropriately constructed and maintained Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems or sustainable drainage techniques as set out in Policy CS25 Dealing with Flood Risk, e) Dispose of surface water appropriately according to the following networks in order of preference: i. To an infiltration based system wherever possible (such as soakaways) ii. Discharge into a watercourse with the prior approval of the landowner and navigation authority (to comply with part a. this must be following treatment where necessary or where no treatment is required to prevent pollution of the receiving watercourse.) iii. discharge to public sewer	PV arrays will be located within Flood Zone 1 wherever feasible. Where panels are to be located in Flood Zone 2 or 3, they will be in areas where flood levels for the 1 in 100-year event are 300 mm below the lower edge of panels. PV arrays will be installed on metal frames driven into the ground, reducing their footprint within the floodplain. All sensitive and electrical equipment on the solar panel will be elevated by legs or mounted on raised frames. Alternative solutions will be assessed and appropriately mitigated as required. As set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **OSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** surface water runoff from the Solar PV will be managed through Rural SuDS and Natural Flood Management techniques such as grassland/wildflower areas, which will act to bind soils, slow surface water, and increase water quality compared to the baseline scenario. The depth of flooding and reasonable assumptions for the impacts of climate change on flood depths have been assessed as part of a FRA using the data available on flooding. A Surface Water Drainage Strategy (which will form part of a detailed CEMP(s)) will include details of pre-construction, construction, and post-construction water quality monitoring. These measures are set out in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and the **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** submitted with the DCO Application.
Policy CS 25: Dealing with Flood Risk	Proposals will be supported which ensure that new development is not subject to unacceptable levels of flood risk, does not result in increased flood risk elsewhere and, where possible, achieves reductions in flood risk overall. 1) Proposals should demonstrate that development: a) has been directed to areas at the lowest probability of flooding by demonstrating compliance with the sequential approach as follows: i) Sites are within flood risk zone 1; or ii) Sites within flood zone 2 are considered only when it can be demonstrated that there are no reasonably available sites within flood zone 1; or iii) Sites within flood zone 3 are considered only when it can be demonstrated that there are no reasonably available sites with flood zones 1 or 2; and iv) Proposed uses are appropriate within the flood risk zone having regard to Table 10 'Flood Risk Vulnerability of Uses'; and v) Where Table 10 'Flood Risk Vulnerability of Uses' indicates the exception test is required proposals must demonstrate that the development: (a) provides wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk; and	The **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** sets out how surface water runoff from the Site will be managed in line with the national, regional and local requirements regarding flood risk and drainage. As the Proposed Development does not have a detailed layout, a detailed drainage strategy cannot be provided at this stage, with the principles and design criteria presented in this document. These criteria will be applied during the detailed design phase, and the detailed SuDS will be secured in the DCO through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.

	(b) will be safe, without increasing flood risk elsewhere and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall b) within each flood zone is located where there is the lowest probability of flooding and that uses with higher vulnerability are located on parts of the site with the lowest probability of flooding c) Is in accordance with the recommendations set out in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment level 1 and level 2 documents; d) Is supported by a detailed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) having regard to the guidance in national planning policy 2) Within the Rotherham Regeneration Area the Council will support proposals which demonstrate that they have assessed, and, where necessary, mitigated flood risk in accordance with the Flood Risk Tool Kit. Proposals will not be supported where the risk cannot be satisfactorily mitigated. Proposals within flood zones 2 and 3 will be required to demonstrate that other sites in lower flood risk zones within the Rotherham Regeneration Area have been assessed and can be shown to be unable to accommodate the proposed development. Applicants must also set out the flood risk mitigation measures incorporated into the design and demonstrate how these reduce flood risk to an acceptable level and maintain safe access both to the site and its surroundings during times of flood. Any flood risk management measures implemented through development must be compatible with the requirements of the Council's community wide Rotherham Renaissance Flood Alleviation Scheme. 3) The extent and impact of flooding will be reduced by: a) Requiring all development proposals on brownfield sites to reduce surface water run-off by at least 30% and development on greenfield sites to maintain or reduce existing surface water runoff rates, unless it can be demonstrated to be impractical or unfeasible. b) Requiring the use of appropriately constructed and maintained Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems or sustainable drainage techniques on all sites where practical and feasible taking account of the location and the scale of the development proposed. c) Encouraging the removal of culverting. Building over a culvert or culverting of watercourses will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that it is necessary. d) Protecting areas of functional floodplain as shown in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment level 1 and level 2 documents and not increasing, and where possible reducing, the building footprint within the developed floodplain and where necessary designing new buildings to take into account flood risk e) Identifying new areas of natural flood storage	

	f) Requiring appropriate mitigation and construction methods for developments in areas with known surface water flooding issues as well as not increasing the likelihood or extent of surface water flooding	
Policy CS 26: Minerals	1 Mineral Safeguarding Areas Mineral Safeguarding Areas will be defined around all deposits of coal, aggregate limestone (in the south-eastern part of the borough between Thorpe Salvin and Maltby), and brick clay (between Hellaby and Maltby), that are considered to be of current or future economic importance. The purpose of Mineral Safeguarding Areas is to ensure resources are protected beyond the plan period, therefore in Mineral Safeguarding Areas there is no presumption that safeguarded resources will be worked but any potentially incompatible development should not sterilise underlying or adjacent mineral resources. All non-mineral development proposals within the Mineral Safeguarding Areas will be encouraged to extract any viable mineral resources present in advance of construction where practicable, and where this would not have unacceptable impacts on neighbouring uses. Proposals for non-mineral development within the Mineral Safeguarding Areas (except for householder development and conversions/changes of use which do not involve any new building or excavation works) will be supported where it can be demonstrated that: a. the proposal incorporates the prior extraction of any minerals of economic value in an environmentally acceptable way; or; b. mineral resources are either not present or are of no economic value; or c. it is not possible to extract the minerals in an environmentally acceptable way or this would have unacceptable impacts on neighbouring uses or the amenity of local communities; or d. the extraction of minerals is not feasible; or e. the need for the development outweighs the need to safeguard the minerals for the future; or; f. the development is minor or temporary in nature; or g. Development would not prevent the future extraction of minerals beneath or adjacent to the site. Where prior extraction is proposed supporting information should provide details of the extraction scheme. In addition, Mineral Safeguarding Sites will be identified which are used for or have the potential to be used for mineral transport or processing facilities, or for safeguarding against sensitive development which might constrain its continued or future use. 2 Limestone Aggregates	For W1, Section 9.5 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** outlines the inclusion of the Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs) included within the Doncaster Local Plan Policies Map. The safeguarded area of Cadeby Formation (Magnesian Limestone MSA) intersects with W1 over approximately 8 hectares along outcrop of the thin basal deposits, while the sand and gravel safeguarded area intersects for approximately 3 hectares. Nearly all of the area of W1 which overlaps with these MSAs is currently planned as mitigation land. A MSA for shallow coal is present across the entirety of W1. Section 9.5 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** sets out that the entire RMBC district is part of an MSA for shallow coal, fireclay, and brick clay, which includes all of W2. The same applies to W3, with the addition of the basal outcrop of the Cadeby Formation MSA in the south-east of W3. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** concludes that with the embedded mitigation in place, there will be no significant residual effects on minerals. Harrycrofts Quarry is around 750m east of the closest part of the Cable Corridor and there is a development boundary extending to 520m east of the corridor. This proximity and the quality of deposits near the surface mean that the impact from the Proposed Development is minor. Effects arising during the construction stage will be temporary, limited to the construction period only and reversible. Decommissioning is anticipated to commence 60 years after final commissioning. The effects to all identified heritage assets during the decommissioning phase are likely to be similar to construction effects, including being temporary and reversible.

	Provision will be made to ensure an appropriate contribution towards the sub regional apportionment figure for crushed rock (identified in the Local Aggregate Assessment) for the plan period and jointly with Doncaster Council will aim to maintain a minimum land bank equivalent to ten years' sales. Preferred Areas for the future working of limestone aggregates will be suitable extension(s) to the existing Harry Crofts Quarry. Proposals for new quarries or extensions to existing quarries will be considered with regard to the need to maintain the landbank in accordance with national policy, and whether they are necessary to maintain apportioned provision for South Yorkshire.		
	3 Other Minerals a. Brick Clay – Areas of extant planning permission for the extraction of remaining brick clay resources adjacent to the former Maltby Brickworks will be protected from inappropriate development that could result in their sterilisation. b. Natural Building Stone – Proposals for the extraction of building or roofing stone for notable building conservation and restoration projects will be considered on their merits in accordance with national planning policy. Applications for development within a former building or roofing stone quarry will be required to demonstrate that the mineral is not of sufficient quantity or quality to justify extraction or make provision for the removal of the mineral before development takes place. c. Energy Minerals – Proposals for underground coal mine extensions (including colliery spoil disposal) and surface mining in addition to proposals for the exploration, appraisal and production of onshore oil and gas, including the gasification of coal, coal mine methane and coal bed methane will be assessed on their merits against all material planning considerations including national planning policy. d. Efficient use of minerals, substitutes and recycled materials - Proposals for the recycling of aggregates, recovery of materials from waste tips, use of surplus soil making material from mineral workings and locally sourced fill materials from borrow pits will be supported where: i. Recovered materials assist in avoiding the use of primary minerals and the reduction of unnecessary transportation movements, and ii. Recovery operations are of limited scale and duration with no adverse amenity or environmental impacts and are subject to suitable site management and timely restoration measures The use of surplus fill or soil making materials from mineral workings will normally be utilised in situ for restoration purposes. Proposals involving the importation and utilisation of such material on other sites will be subject to the assessment of separate planning applications. Proposals for sites for the blending, processing and distribution of substitute and secondary materials will be supported in appropriate locations where adverse amenity and environmental impacts can be mitigated and where transport by rail and canal can be optimised.		

Policy CS 27: Community Health and Safety	Development will be supported which protects, promotes or contributes to securing a healthy and safe environment and minimises health inequalities. Development should seek to contribute towards reducing pollution and not result in pollution or hazards which may prejudice the health and safety of communities or their environments. Appropriate mitigation measures may be required to enable development. When the opportunity arises remedial measures will be taken to address existing problems of land contamination, land stability or air quality. Proposals within Coal Mining Development Referral Areas must be accompanied with a risk assessment. New development should be appropriate and suitable for its location. Proposals will be required to consider the following factors in locating and designing new development: a) Whether proposed or existing development contributes to, or is put at unacceptable risk from pollution, natural hazards or land instability b) Public safety and health risks directly arising from in-situ operations, past mining activity, and/or from potential indirect or cumulative impacts on surrounding areas, sensitive land uses, and the maintenance of healthy functioning ecosystems. c) The impact of existing sources of pollution and the potential for remedial measures to address problems of contamination, land stability or air quality. d) Potential adverse effects of additional development near to hazardous installations and upon Air Quality Management Areas.	A detailed human health impact assessment was scoped out of the ES at the EIA Scoping stage. However, it is acknowledged that the Proposed Development has the potential to impact human health via ground / water contamination, air quality, noise, and through changes to the surrounding landscape and views. However, while it was scoped out of assessment Human Health has been considered throughout all of the **ES Topic Chapters [EN0110020/APP/6.6 – 6.16]** and specifically within section 17.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects EN0110020/APP/6.17]**. The **ES Topic Chapters [EN0110020/APP/6.6 – 6.16]** 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. The Proposed Development is no within a Coal Mining Development Referral Area. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** concludes that risks associated with land instability or contamination are of minor or negligible significance. Embedded mitigation measures are documented within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, the **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]** and the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** and secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]** confirms that the Proposed Development would not lead to a breach of any relevant statutory air quality thresholds or affect the ability of a non-compliant area to achieve compliance.
Policy CS 30: Low Carbon & Renewable Energy Generation	**1 Energy** Developments should seek to reduce carbon dioxide emissions through the inclusion of mitigation measures in accordance with the following energy hierarchy: a) Minimising energy requirements through sustainable design and construction; b) Maximising Energy Efficiency; c) Incorporating low carbon and renewable energy sources. Developments will be supported which encourage the use of renewable, low carbon and decentralised energy. All development should achieve, as a minimum, the appropriate carbon compliance targets as defined in the Building Regulations. **2 Developments that produce renewable energy** Proposals for the development of renewable and low carbon sources of energy, particularly from community owned projects, will be encouraged provided that there are no unacceptable adverse effects on: a) Residential living conditions, amenity and quality of life	The **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** and **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** set out that the Proposed Development will deliver a significant amount of low-carbon, low-cost and UK-located solar electricity generation capacity connecting to the National Electricity Transmission System, anticipated to be operational from 2029. The Proposed Development would contribute towards the UK Government meeting the overarching key national policy aims of: • Achieving Net Zero by 2050 • Increasing the security of energy supply • Lowering the cost and increasing the affordability of generate electricity; and • Contributing to sustainable development and economic opportunities. This would help the UK diversify its energy supply, increase energy resilience, and support local and national carbon emission reduction targets. It would provide a reliable supply of electricity that seeks to help address the needs of the UK power market. The Proposed Development would also help the UK to meet carbon reduction commitments by significantly increasing the proportion of electricity supplied by

	b) Character and appearance of the landscape and surrounding area c) Biodiversity, geodiversity and water quality d) Historical, archaeological and cultural heritage assets e) Highway safety and infrastructure Careful consideration will be given to the capacity of the landscape to accommodate renewable energy developments, the ability to mitigate visual intrusion and the cumulative impact of individual sites. Any proposals will be accompanied by supporting information to clearly show how the surrounding environment will be protected and how site restoration will be carried out when production ends.	renewable sources, which is reported as a significant beneficial effect in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [APP/6.11]**. As set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]**, the Proposed Development is for the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of more than 100 MW of solar photovoltaic (PV) arrays, Battery Energy Storage System (BESS), onsite substations and supporting infrastructure, and grid connection infrastructure. The grid connection infrastructure would connect the Proposed Development to the National Grid at the new National Grid substation Brinsworth (Long Lane 400kV Substation), located east of Long Lane, Rotherham. As the Proposed Development would have a generating capacity in excess of 100MW, it is considered to be a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) under the Planning Act 2008. The **ES [EN0110020/APP/6.1 – 6.20],** confirms that sufficient assessments have been conducted for specific topics to ensure there is adequate mitigation incorporated into the design to reduce any impact upon the local environment (including residential living conditions, amenity and quality of life; character and appearance of the landscape and surrounding area; biodiversity, geodiversity and water quality; historical, archaeological and cultural heritage assets; and, highway safety and infrastructure) as a result of the Proposed Development.
Policy CS 32: Infrastructure Delivery and Developer Contributions	It is essential to have in place a strong mechanism to ensure the monitoring and delivery of the strategy and the timely provision of the infrastructure on which it depends. For that reason, the Council has appointed a lead officer to head the Infrastructure Delivery Group of officers, members and service providers. Its functions will include assessing the progress of the strategy, identifying risks and priorities and the resolution of any problems. This approach will focus on actual and potential departures from the strategy and recommending to the Council any actions needed to keep the strategy on track, and/or bringing it back on track. The lead officer will liaise with the external Infrastructure Delivery Forum, setting up meetings on a regular basis to promote the effectiveness and implementation of the Core Strategy. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure timely delivery of infrastructure is provided to support growth. An assessment of the infrastructure required to support the delivery of the growth strategy is set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule contained in Appendix A. The Schedule will be subject to regular review and update by the Council through liaison with providers reflecting the capacity and requirement at any point in time. Development will be required to contribute to funding all or part of the items of infrastructure listed in the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule, through a combination of mechanisms such as a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and S106 Planning obligations. The Infrastructure Delivery Schedule is indicative and final requirements will be assessed based on the specific requirements stemming from each development, taking account of capacity and legislation concerning developer contributions. It is acknowledged that in some instances there may be a need for negotiation and prioritisation of the overall developer contribution requirements (based on what is	The **Funding Statement [EN0110020/APP/4.2]** submitted with the DCO application demonstrates how the Proposed Development will be funded by the Applicant. The DCO sought for the Proposed Development includes powers for the compulsory acquisition of land and interests in land, including the creation of new rights and the temporary possession of land. Therefore, the Applicant is required to demonstrate that adequate funding is available to deliver the Proposed Development and to meet all liabilities arising from the exercise of compulsory acquisition powers, including statutory compensation. The following management plans set out all mitigation measures which include monitoring and delivery mechanism as outlined in the environmental statement chapters. In the case of the Proposed Development, the residual significant adverse effects during the operational and maintenance phase are limited to effects on landscape and visual, as confirmed in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 18: Summary of Significant Effects [EN0110020/APP/6.18]**. The management plans include: • **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** • **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]** • **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** • **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** • **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** • **OPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]**

	needed to make the development acceptable and what the development can afford to contribute). Any negotiation will need to take account of all policy requirements stemming from this plan, including requirements such as affordable housing and renewable energy generation. Where there is a need to negotiate on the level of developer contribution, the onus will be on the developer to fund and submit an independent viability appraisal and valuation of costs. The appraisal should set out the residual land value based on policy compliant requirements, and additional scenarios should demonstrate the variations in contributions to achieve a neutral and positive residual land value. This viability appraisal will be based on jointly agreed input assumptions (agreed by the Council and the developer). The developer will need to submit evidence of the amount paid for the land – noting that any abnormal payments beyond current market values will not be accepted. All assumptions will be based on current market conditions as at the date of the grant of planning permission.	• **oBSMP [EN0110020/APP/5.15]** • **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]** • **OSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** • **Outline Skills and Supply Chain Management Plan [EN0110020/APP/5.18]** • **Outline Cable Construction Method Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.19]**
Sites and Policies Document (adopted 2018)		
Policy SP 2: Development in the Green Belt	A Green Belt whose boundaries are defined on the Policies Map will be applied within Rotherham Borough. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. In considering planning applications for new development, including improvements to essential infrastructure such as operational Waste Water Treatment Works, and mineral workings within the Green Belt and to ensure proposals minimise the impact of the development on the openness of the Green Belt particular regard will be had to the following factors: the size, scale, volume, height, massing, position, lighting and any proposed enclosures of the proposals; or screen banks. All new buildings should be well-related to existing buildings, where relevant, and should be of a size commensurate with the established functional requirement. Effective siting, screening and high standards of design appropriate to the setting of the proposals can minimise the impact of future development on the openness of the Green Belt. Where possible proposals should reflect the architectural style of original buildings, and/or the vernacular styles in the locality. All proposals for development should satisfy other relevant policies of the Local Plan and National Guidance.	**Appendix 2: Green Belt Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** sets out that the Proposed Development is located on Grey belt land and meets the tests for being not inappropriate within the grey belt. If this is not agreed, 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. The **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** and **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** set out the need for the Proposed Development and note the established need for low-carbon infrastructure as a CNP and that such projects should be brought forward with urgency.
Policy SP 26: Sustainable Transport for Development	Development proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated that: a) As a priority, the proposals make adequate arrangements for sustainable transport infrastructure; promoting sustainable and inclusive access to the proposed development by public transport, walking and cycling, including the provision of secure cycle parking, and other non-car transport and promoting the use of green infrastructure networks where appropriate; b) local traffic circulation, existing parking and servicing arrangements are not adversely affected;	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** assesses the anticipated transport and access effects of the Proposed Development's construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning, in accordance with this policy. Section 13.3 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** provides a summary of the Applicant's engagement regarding transport and access. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** concludes that with the mitigation measures in place, there are no residual transport and access-related effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operational

	c) the highway network is, or can be made, suitable to cope with the traffic generated in terms of the number, type and size of vehicles involved, during construction and after occupation; d) schemes take in to account good practice guidance published by the Council including transport assessment, travel plans and compliance with local Residential and Commercial Parking Standards to ensure there is a balance struck between access for motor vehicles and the promotion of sustainable access. The Council expects that other measures to increase and encourage sustainable travel and movement habits through travel plan incentives, such as: bus service enhancements, bus priority schemes, improved or additional bus services, better information and subsidised ticketing, multi modal multi operator, cross boundary travel, are provided. Improvements to existing and new infrastructure, ensuring that any public transport stops are easily accessible by active means, and that opportunities to further enhance walking, cycling and appropriate measures to promote inclusive access, will be sought as appropriate.	and maintenance and maintenance and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. By securing the mechanisms for the embedded mitigation measures as outlined in Section 13.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]**, which are secured in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9], oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12], oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10],** and **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** and are secured via the requirements in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**, it is concluded that there are no residual effects identified for this Scheme. The **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** outlines the measures to limit disruption and ensure that the PRoW network can continue to be used throughout the construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development, while minimising the impact on PRoW users. The Proposed Development includes opportunities for advancement, including the proposed approximately 14.58km of permissive path within the Order Limits. The **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** sets out project specific design principles which have influenced the design of the Proposed Development. The project design principles of relevance to sustainable transport include the following – • Find out what is important to people about the local area and seek to incorporate feedback • Consider how people engage with their local environment and retain these patterns • Enhance recreational access across the landscape These project design principles set out how the Proposed Development will consider the experience of the people using the Public Rights of Way during the operational phase of the Proposed Development. Finally the **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** at section 4.6 notes that a Worker Travel Plan will be developed to manage the arrival and departure profile of workers on Site and to encourage sustainable modes of transport, such as car-sharing. The Worker Travel Plan will be administered by the CTMP Co-ordinator and would be a contractual requirement as part of the Principal Contractor's contract with the Applicant.
Policy SP 28: Development Affecting Key Routes and the Strategic Road Network	Careful consideration will be given to any potential adverse impacts of development on the Key Transport Routes and the Strategic Road Network, having regard where relevant to guidance in Circular 02/2013 or any subsequent replacement. Where a proposal is likely to have transport implications, applicants must set out suitable mitigation measures in their Transport Assessment.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** concludes that with the mitigation measures in place, there are no residual transport and access effects associated during the Proposed Development's construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. Section 13.8 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** sets out the potential cumulative traffic and transport effects of the Proposed Development. Table 13.26 notes that it is unlikely that the

		peak construction period associated with the other developments in the Study Area will overlap with the peak construction period of the Proposed Development as the applications are at different stages in the planning process and each development has varying lengths of construction period. However, at worst case where there could be some overlap in construction activity the magnitude of cumulative traffic increases would remain as low.
Policy SP 32: Green Infrastructure and Landscape	The Council will require proposals for all new development to support the protection, enhancement, creation and management of multi-functional green infrastructure assets and networks including landscape, proportionate to the scale and impact of the development and to meeting needs of future occupants and users. Within the most sensitive landscape character areas (identified as high or moderate to high landscape sensitivity), development will only be permitted where it will not detract from the landscape or visual character of the area and where appropriate standards of design and landscape architecture are achieved. In preparing planning applications developers will be expected to consider: a) the location and function of existing green infrastructure assets in relation to the development, and the potential to contribute to wider green infrastructure networks and initiatives; b) sensitively managing change in the landscape and contributing, where appropriate, to the enhancement of the urban fringe and other degraded areas having regard to identified Landscape Character Area management strategies. Further detail is provided in the Landscape Character Assessment and Landscape Capacity Study 2010, the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 2015, and the Landscape Capacity Assessment Addendum No 1 2015. Map 4 'Landscape Character Area Sensitivity' and Table 14 'Landscape Sensitivity Matrix' illustrate the Landscape Character Areas and their sensitivity to change. Where development proposals will most likely result in a significant impact on the borough's green infrastructure, landscape and visual amenity, the proposals should assess the potential impact and propose how any negative effects will be minimised. In doing so consideration should be given to: c) the incorporation of suitable mitigation measures or; where suitable mitigation measures are not achievable on site, then development should provide appropriate compensation off site For major development of more than 10 dwellings, or more than1,000 square metres of floorspace applicants are expected to demonstrate how they have considered the elements listed below, and to clearly set out appropriate enhancement, mitigation and/or compensation measures as appropriate: d) topography and geology; e) the type, location and composition of wildlife habitats and ecological networks;	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]** evaluates the likely significant effects of the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Proposed Development on the landscape as a resource and the views and visual amenity of people. Relevant landscape designations within the Study Area are presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 7.3: Landscape Designations [EN0110020/APP/6.19]**. National Landscape Character Areas are presented on **ES Volume 3, Figure 7.3.1: National Landscape Character Areas [EN0110020/APP/6.19]** and Local Landscape Character Areas presented on **ES Volume 3, Figures 7.3.2: Local Landscape Character Areas [EN0110020/APP/6.19]**. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has undertaken an assessment of effects on Landscape and Visual receptors which is set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.3: Landscape Character Baseline and Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Representative Viewpoint Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20].** Potential landscape mitigation and enhancement areas are illustrated and described in **ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1: Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/6.19]** and **ES Volume 3, Figure 5.2: Illustrative Mitigation Plan [EN0110020/APP/6.19]**. As detailed in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** the Proposed Development includes management of existing planting, new native planting, hedgerow enhancement, and planting of suitable seed mixes amongst the solar PV arrays. Indigenous planting would also be used to provide natural screening of the Proposed Development.

	f) the creation of new and enhancement of existing green infrastructure to enhance links, increase function, and to address deficits, priorities, needs and opportunities; g) the presence, pattern and composition of existing historic landscape features including hedgerows, field boundaries, ancient and semi-natural woodland and veteran trees, and disused quarries; h) the pattern, distribution and relationship of footpaths, cycleways, including Public Rights of Way and national trails, and roads to settlements; i) the special qualities and landscape features which contribute to landscape character, local distinctiveness and the setting of neighbouring settlements; and where relevant, adjacent landscape character areas; j) provision for sustainable long term maintenance and management including climate change adaptation. This policy should be read in conjunction with Core Strategy Policies CS 19 'Green Infrastructure' and CS21 ‘Landscape’. Where the prime function of green infrastructure is for recreational open space, development proposals will be primarily considered by Policy SP 37 'New and Improvements to Existing Green Space', Policy SP 38 'Protecting Green Space', and Policy SP 39 'Design and Location of Green Space, Sport and Recreation' as appropriate.	
Policy SP 33: Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment	Development should conserve and enhance existing and create new features of biodiversity and geodiversity value. Where it is not possible to avoid negative impact on a feature of biodiversity or geodiversity value through use of an alternate site, development proposals will be expected to minimise impact through careful consideration of the design, layout, construction or operation of the development and by the incorporation of suitable mitigation measures. Where, despite mitigation, there will be residual adverse impact on biodiversity or geodiversity value or on wider ecological networks, development should provide an adequate level of compensation. The aim of mitigation and compensation should be to respond to impact or loss with something of greater value; the minimum requirement will be to maintain ‘no net loss’. Planning permission will not be granted for development that is likely to, directly or indirectly, result in the loss or deterioration of sites, habitat or features that are considered to be irreplaceable due to their age, status, connectivity, rarity or continued presence unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss. The presumption in favour of sustainable development will not apply where development requiring appropriate assessment under the Birds or Habitats Directives is being considered, planned or determined. Development will be expected to enhance biodiversity and geodiversity on-site with the aim of contributing to wider biodiversity and geodiversity delivery including, where	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** sets out that the design of the Proposed Development has evolved to avoid impacts and effects on ecology and biodiversity as far as practicable. The Proposed Development incorporates a number of enhancements resulting in a number of significant beneficial effects, including (but not limited to): • New habitats would be created within the Site, and existing habitats would be enhanced for biodiversity and secured through **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and managed and maintained for at least 30 years. The habitat enhancement and creation would mature, and soils would recover as a result of the reduction or cessation of fertiliser and insecticide inputs. It is expected that biodiversity at all levels of the ecosystem would benefit, with the abundance and richness of flora and fauna expanding over time. • Hedgerow loss during construction would be compensated for by improving the quality of existing hedgerows within the LWS (e.g. gapping up or addition of trees, use of optimum management practices) or the planting of new connecting hedgerows with the Site. • The Proposed Development will achieve a minimum of 10% BNG. However, the Applicant anticipates delivering substantially more than this, as evidenced by the BNG Assessment, which demonstrates what is likely to be proposed. The **Draft DCO [XX]** secures:

	appropriate, direct contribution to Ecological Networks, the Green Infrastructure network, Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, Nature Improvement Areas and Living Landscapes (see Map 5 'Rotherham Biodiversity Opportunity Areas' for details). Development that contributes to the preservation, restoration and creation of priority habitats or geological features, ecological networks, ecosystem services and the protection and recovery of priority species populations, will be supported. The Council can protect individual and groups of trees by the declaration of Tree Preservation Orders where it is important in the interest of amenity and there is reason to believe that trees are under specific threat.	• Area habitat units = 28% • Hedgerow units = 30% • Watercourse units = 10% The design of the Proposed Development incorporates nature-based solutions, where practicable, such as developing biodiversity enhancement measures ad considering factors related to hydrology, flood risk, landscape and ecology. As part of the EIA process, an iterative approach has been adopted where significant environmental effects have been avoided where possible through design refinements and iterations. The overarching aim of the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** is to set out prescriptions for habitat creation and management in order to provide ecological enhancements and strengthen the green infrastructure within the local area. The proposed mitigation measures will assist in contributing to the overall improvements to the local biodiversity and nature conservation as a result of the Proposed Development. The Proposed Development incorporates a number of enhancements resulting in a number of significant beneficial effects, including (but not limited to) long-term beneficial effects at the local level in relation to hedgerow and woodland habitats, as a result of the proposed hedgerow, woodland and tree planting set out in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**. As presented in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Baseline Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, the ecological mitigation and enhancement areas will deliver: • Area habitat units = 285% • Hedgerow units = 30% • Watercourse units = 10% which aligns with the commitment set out in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. Trees and hedgerows will be retained and avoided wherever possible within the Cable Corridor. An arboriculture survey, and Tree Constraints Plan (TCP) has been provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.14: Arboriculture Survey and Tree Constraints Plan [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** the scope of which covered access points to the Proposed Development. Further arboricultural surveys will be undertaken prior to construction and mitigation measures within the CEMP (secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**) will be provided to ensure trees and woodland are protected during construction, operation and decommissioning in compliance with BS5837:2012. Most woodlands are being retained entirely, with individual trees being lost from the Proposed Development within non-TPO woodlands where avoidance measures cannot be applied and there is no satisfactory alternative. Reference is made to the **Vegetation Removal Plan [EN0110020/APP/2.9]** for location of tree losses. Hedgerows will be avoided wherever possible, with existing gateways used to reduce hedgerow losses to a minimum. Measures are being proposed to compensate, create or enhance the Order Limits with tree planting to hedgerows and within connected perimeter habitats. Ancient and Veteran trees are to be retained with appropriate buffers. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** confirms

		that there are no ancient woodlands contained within the Order Limits. The application of protective buffers around habitats from the developed areas within the Order Limits will be applied to prevent adverse effects on habitat function and quality. These are stated in the **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]** and would include: • Ancient and semi-natural woodland - a buffer zone of at least 15m from the boundary of the ancient or broadleaved woodland edge boundary to avoid root damage (known as the root protection area). Ancient/veteran trees, a minimum buffer zone of at least 15 times larger than the diameter of each tree in an ancient or broadleaved woodland edge or per individual ancient or veteran tree. The buffer zone should be 5 metres from the edge of the tree's canopy if that area is larger than 15 times the tree's diameter.
Policy SP 36: Soil Resources	Development will be required to demonstrate the sustainable use of soils during construction and operation stages, where appropriate and to be determined in discussion with the Local Planning Authority. Applicants should demonstrate, in their proposals, that there are feasible and appropriate methods, locations and receptors for the temporary storage and reuse of high quality soils. Built development should be designed and sited with an appreciation of the relative functional capacity of soil resources and threats to soils with the aim of preserving or enhancing identified soil functions. Measures to incorporate green space and sustainable drainage elements that retain permeable surfaces, allow water infiltration, reduce soil erosion and maintain natural soil functions will be supported. Measures that waste soil resource, reduce soil quality, compact or pollute soils or that create a predominantly impermeable surface should be avoided. Where development is proposed on the best and most versatile agricultural land it should, as far as possible, use the lowest grade of land suitable for the development and should demonstrate adequate measures to conserve the soil resource and functions in agreement with the Local Planning Authority. Where appropriate, developers should provide up-to-date detailed assessment to determine the quality of soils and to identify sustainable re-use for soils which are to be translocated. Proposals that promote careful management practises to conserve the character of the borough's soils will be supported. The use of imported soil and aggregates in development proposals should be avoided where possible. Where use is necessary consideration will need to be shown of the impact on local geodiversity and associated biodiversity.	An outline SMP has been provided as part of the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**. The SMP which will be included in the CEMP, and is likely to include the following measures for soil protection to be implemented during the construction period: • Wherever possible, areas designated for landscaping, through enhancement and BNG, should remain undisturbed and be clearly fenced off from active work zones to protect soil quality; • 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; • Temporary placement of material into windrows if it is not possible to strip topsoil when it is below the plastic limit. Once it has dried sufficiently, it can then be lifted and placed into its final position; • Storage of stripped soils in designated bunds, ideally located near their intended area of reuse and sited outside of floodplains. The bunds should be a maximum of 3 m in height and in place for the least amount of time practicable in order to minimise damage to the soil or site. All bunds which will be in place for more than 6 months should be sown with a low maintenance grass seed mix; • Restoration of soils in areas of temporary disturbance to the pre-existing condition, as far as reasonably practicable. Restoration activities should begin at the furthest point from each site exit to ensure that reinstated soils are not compacted by subsequent earth-moving machinery. Upon completion soil structure should be stabilised and a vigorous, well-rooted crop should be established to maximise the likelihood of successful and sustainable restoration;

		• Reinstatement of soil should be monitored by a suitably qualified and competent person, such as an ECoW or Geotechnical Engineer; and • Permanent post-construction drainage may be required as part of land reinstatement. Any existing drainage systems damaged during the works will be repaired or replaced to ensure continued functionality. Where existing drains are cut or disrupted by construction activities, they should be diverted into local drainage traps to minimise sediment release and maintain effective water management. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** sets out the following mitigation for soils during the operation and maintenance phase: • Measures to maintain land quality throughout the operational phase of the Proposed Development, which will be outlined and secured through implementation of the operational phase of the SMP. The SMP will identify areas within the Site that may be more vulnerable to damage (such as steep slopes), as well as conditions under which soil handling would be inappropriate (for example, when the soil is wet or following periods of heavy rainfall or strong winds). It will also set out best practice soil management measures aimed at preserving the physical properties of the soil, ensuring the land retains its capacity to support its intended function throughout the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development; • Maintenance works will be subject to appropriate method statements, detailing, amongst things, use of PPE, management of (unexpected) contamination, soil management and polluting substance storage and handling; and • Although potential impacts on soils during the operational phase are expected to be minimal, good practice will be applied to ensure that any activities, such as the maintenance and management of land beneath the solar PV modules, are carried out in a way that avoids damage and encourages regeneration of the soil resource, as far as reasonably practicable. These measures will also contribute to BNG by supporting soil health and enhancing habitat quality across the Site. The Applicant has developed the design of the Proposed Development to minimise the land take of BMV land, where practicable. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** describes the existing levels and assesses the anticipated soil effects of the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases.
Policy SP 47: Understanding and Managing Flood Risk and Drainage	The Council will expect proposals to: a) demonstrate an understanding of the flood route of surface water flows through the proposed development in an extreme event where the design flows for the drainage systems may be exceeded, and incorporate appropriate mitigation measures;	As set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **OSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** surface water runoff from the Solar PV will be managed through Rural SuDS and Natural Flood Management techniques such as grassland/wildflower areas, which will act to bind soils, slow surface water, and increase water quality compared to the baseline scenario.

	b) control surface water run-off as near to its source as possible through a sustainable drainage approach to surface water management (SuDS). The Council will expect applicants to consider the use of natural flood storage/prevention solutions (such as tree planting) in appropriate locations, and the use of other flood mitigation measures such as raised finished floor levels and compensatory storage; and consider the possibility of providing flood resilience works and products for properties to minimise the risk of internal flooding to properties. A maintenance strip should be maintained between proposed development and watercourses. There should be no encroachment into this strip during any stage of development. The width measured from the top of bank should be a minimum of 8 metres for watercourses designated as 'main rivers' or a minimum of 5 metres for ordinary watercourses. Where flood defences exist, the maintenance strip should be 8 metres, measured from the landward toe of any flood defence or the top of bank if closer. Foul water should be disposed of to public sewer wherever possible. Non-mains foul drainage disposal options will only be considered where it is robustly demonstrated that a mains connection is impracticable, unsustainable or too costly, compared against the life time costs/ impacts of the non-mains alternative. Any proposals involving non-mains drainage must be accompanied by a suitable foul drainage assessment. Major developments of more than 10 dwellings, or more than 1,000 square metres of floorspace should comply with Defra Sustainable Drainage Systems Non-statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (March 2015) and the South Yorkshire Interim Local Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (May 2015), or any future documents which supersede them. Floor levels for habitable buildings should normally be a minimum of 600 mm above the 100 year plus climate change flood level. Where development causes a loss of available flood storage capacity adjacent to a watercourse, compensatory capacity should be provided in a suitable location and at the same elevation.	Sections 11.6 and 11.7 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.11]** set out that critical electrical infrastructure within the Proposed Development will be located within Flood Zone 1. PV arrays will be located within Flood Zone 1 wherever feasible. Where panels are to be located in Flood Zone 2 or 3, they will be in areas where flood levels for the 1 in 100-year event are 300 mm below the lower edge of panels.
Policy SP 49: Safeguarding Mineral Infrastructure	Permission for non-minerals development involving, or within 250 metres of existing, planned or potential safeguarded mineral infrastructure sites will be granted where it can be demonstrated that: a. the infrastructure is no longer required or no longer meets the needs of the mineral or construction industry; or b. development will not prejudice the mineral infrastructure's operation or current or future use; or c. an alternative, appropriate, site provides capacity for delivery of the mineral infrastructure; or	Section 9.7 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** sets out that Cable Route L between W3 and W2 runs for about 2.1km along the edge of the Cadeby Formation outcrop (the boundary of the MSA for the Magnesian/Cadeby limestone resource). Most of the land around the 2.1km of Cable Route L crossing the MSA is within 250m of existing residential and commercial properties, roads, railways and the Chesterfield Canal, where the MSA could be considered as already effectively neutralised by these existing developments. However, there are two short stretches, a 240m stretch south of South Anston in the north and a 200m stretch across Ladyfield southeast of Kiveton Park, but erosion and weathering will have thinned the potential limestone resource. Consequently, the area affected by the Proposed Development is considered low due to the thin economically valuable deposits.

	d. the need for the proposed development outweighs the need to safeguard the site for mineral infrastructure. The policy will also apply to sites in use for concrete batching, the manufacture of coated materials, other concrete products and the handling, processing and distribution of substitute, recycled and secondary aggregate material not identified on the Policies Map.	Section 9.5 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** notes that the entire RMBC and CDC are classified as an MSA for coal, fireclay and brick clay. However, based on the district-wide designation and the very low likelihood of coal resources being exploited, and it is not assed further herein. While there is some overlaps with a Magnesian Limestone MSA and a sand and gravel MSA, the effects are considered negligible. The Proposed Development meets the definition of CNP Infrastructure because it is for the development of greater than 50MW capacity of a low carbon source of energy. As CNP infrastructure, the urgent need for the Proposed Development to assist in achieving the UK's energy objectives, together with the national security, economic, commercial, and net-zero benefits, will, in general, outweigh any other residual impacts that cannot be addressed by applying the mitigation hierarchy.
Policy SP 69: Utilities Infrastructure	The Council will seek to ensure the efficient provision of gas, water, drainage, electricity and telecommunication services which avoid or, where this is not possible, minimise any adverse landscape and environmental impacts. In granting planning permission, the Council, in consultation with utility companies, will require that development proposals take into account any existing and new service infrastructure requirements, together with associated apparatus, installations and operational land and the need for access for maintenance and repair purposes. Proposals for development close to overhead power lines should take into account the effect of the transmission towers and cables in the vicinity of the site on the amenity of the occupiers of the proposed development.	Maintenance measures are set out in the **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]** and secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. Section 16.4 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16]** highlights that the low height of the panels and other infrastructure which forms part of the Proposed Development means that there will not be any interference with above ground telecommunications infrastructure. No effects are expected on above ground telecommunications infrastructure during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. The **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** sets out that the design of the Proposed Development will incorporate protective measures agreed with asset owners to safeguard existing utilities and telecommunications infrastructure, including laying cables perpendicularly across existing utilities and maintaining a minimum vertical separation of 0.6 m above or below infrastructure in accordance with relevant guidance, with the CEMP setting out procedures for consultation with statutory undertakers, review of asset records, trial holes where required, agreed standoff distances and controlled excavation in line with HSG47 to prevent accidental damage.
Adopted Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Plan (2012)		
Policy WCS7: Managing Waste in all Developments	A. All development proposals (excluding minor planning applications) must submit a waste management plan as part of the planning application. In particular, such plans will need to include: 1. information on the amount and type of waste that will be generated from the site 2. measures to reduce, re-use and recycle waste within the development, including the provision of on-site separation and treatment facilities (using fixed or mobile plants where appropriate); 3. an assessment of the potential to re-use or adapt existing buildings on the site (if demolished it must explain why it is not possible to retain them);	Waste is considered in Section 16.2 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16]**. The construction of the Proposed Development will be subject to measures and procedures defined within a detailed CEMP and SWMP. These measures will include the implementation of industry standard practice and control measures for material and waste management on-site. These measures are set out in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** submitted with the DCO Application. As set out in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, to minimise the impacts of waste on the surrounding environment, the following measures would be implemented: • Agreements with material suppliers to reduce the amount of packaging or to participate in a packaging take-back scheme;

	4. design and layouts that allow effective sorting and storing of recyclables and recycling and composting of waste and facilitate waste collection operations during the lifetime of the development; 5. measures to minimise the use of raw materials and minimise pollution of any waste; 6. details on how residual waste will be disposed in an environmentally responsible manner and transported during the construction process and beyond; 7. construction and design measures that minimise the use of raw materials and encourage the re-use of recycled or secondary resources (particularly building materials) and also ensure maximum waste recovery once the development is completed; and 8. details on how the development will be monitored following its completion.	• Implementation of a 'just-in-time' material delivery system to avoid materials being stockpiled, which increases the risk of their damage and disposal as waste; • Attention to material quantity requirements to avoid over-ordering and generation of waste materials; • Re-use of materials (e.g. excavated soil) where feasible; • Segregation of waste at source where practical; and • Re-use and recycling of materials offsite where re-use onsite is not practical (e.g. through use of an offsite waste segregation facility and re-sale for direct re-use or re-processing). The Proposed Development has been designed and will be constructed and operated to minimise the creation of waste, maximise the use of recycled materials and assist the collection, separation, sorting recycling and recovery of waste arising from the development during its use. Section 16.2 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16]** also sets out that further actions will be introduced as part of the construction SWMP which will contribute to the general reduction of waste generation at the Site and manage risks associated with waste handling, storage and disposal. These measures include: • Appointment of an environmental co-ordinator (or similar) who will hold overall responsibility for waste management. The role will include co-ordinating all waste or environmental issues associated with construction of the Proposed Development from compiling waste data to identifying training needs. Construction sites with an environmental co-ordinator tend to perform better in managing waste; • Maintaining a good standard of housekeeping, including designated waste storage areas, segregation of different waste streams, signposting and labelling and covering of skips to prevent wind-blown waste. Regular inspections will be undertaken to ensure waste storage areas are kept tidy; • Accurate record-keeping of waste types, volumes and disposal routes and destinations; • Implementation of staff awareness training to ensure all personnel are aware of the correct procedures onsite for waste segregation, disposal and to actively promote recycling onsite through clear signage; • Development of targets and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for waste recycling and reduction; and • Implementation of a suitable management structure which will allow prompt decision making relating to improvements in waste management and recycling initiatives.

TABLE 7: CITY OF DONCASTER COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN – TABLE OF COMPLIANCE

Doncaster Local Plan 2015 – 2035 (Adopted 2021)		
Policy	**Policy Text**	**Assessment**
Policy 12: Strategic Transport Network (Strategic Policy)	Proposals will be supported which: A) Improve key routes and connections to the Strategic Road Network and effectively manage traffic and relieve congestion, in particular at the following locations: 1. Hatfield Link Road. 2. West Moor Link (A630). 3. Improvements to M18. 4. North Nottinghamshire to A631 capacity improvements 5. A1(M) motorway (capacity improvements). B) Improve rail transport, including: <u>Strategic Priorities for New Infrastructure Provision</u> 1. The Community rail station site (on the Lincoln line and as shown on the Policies Map) will continue to be protected for such uses. 2. New rail station at Askern, with the site as shown on the Policies Map being protected, and rail links to towns and communities on the line serving Askern. 3. New, expanded or re-opened lines and stations and rail links to outlying towns and communities where feasible. 4. New high-speed rail opportunities in association with new and expanded interchanges. 5. Developing a tram train network to serve the Borough utilising where possible existing heavy rail network. <u>Shorter-Term Improvements to Existing Infrastructure</u> 6. Improvements to the sustainable access to all 8 of the Borough's local train stations will be implemented. Within the station footprint these will include:	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** both demonstrate that the assessment has been prepared in accordance with the appropriate guidance including the Department for Transport's guidance on Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements of Decision Taking (2014). Section 3.5 of **ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** sets out that to ensure safe integration of Proposed Development traffic; a range of mitigation measures would be explored where necessary. Potential measures to be explored could include enhanced signage and road markings to improve driver awareness, signal timing reviews to reduce congestion and conflict points, and visibility improvements through lighting upgrades and vegetation clearance. These proactive steps would support the safe use of these junctions and demonstrate a commitment to minimising risk as part of the Proposed Development. Finally, the Proposed Development will incorporate highway works for sections of the highway network that will contain localised improvements, such as improvements to road edge where it is deteriorated, or temporary highway and traffic works required to safely accommodate the Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) deliveries. These areas will support the movement of construction vehicles on narrower sections of the local highway network within parts of the construction vehicle routes to the Site. These works are secured via Work No. 5 of the **Works Plans [EN0110020/APP/2.3]**.

	• improved CCTV and lighting; • increased secure cycle parking; • upgraded displays and information; and • improved signage. <u>Longer-Term Improvements to Existing Infrastructure</u> 7. Network Rail enhancements schemes to improve connectivity and capacity. 8. Upgrading of the East Coast Mainline (Leeds and York) and Trans Pennine links (Manchester, Lincoln, Sheffield and Hull), including capacity improvements in the Doncaster Station area. C) Improve bus transport, including: 1. expanding / upgrading key bus routes and improvements to the bus network; and 2. the provision of additional and/or improved park and ride facilities. D) Improve the efficiency of freight transport, and provide opportunities for alternatives to road transport, where possible, including: 1. upgrades to freight lines between Immingham, Scunthorpe and Doncaster / Knottingley; 2. signalling and loading gauge improvements to allow deep-sea containers on key intermodal arteries; 3. navigation and wharf facilities along key waterways; 4. secure lorry parking facilities and roadside service areas along the Strategic Road Network to meet future demand, where appropriate; and 5. increased aviation and rail freight movements, including at the existing rail port at White Rose Way and iPort, Rossington. Developments which generate large volumes of freight traffic or involve the transport of bulk materials should be located close to the strategic transport network, where this can be accommodated within the existing capacity of the network. The network capacity will need to be established through the submission of a Transport Assessment (TA). Routing agreements will be required where deemed appropriate.	
Policy 13: Promoting Sustainable Transport in New	Proposals are required to meet the following requirements:	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** set out the mitigation measures that the Proposed Development will implement in order to encourage the use of

Developments (Strategic Policy)	A) New development shall make appropriate provision for access by sustainable modes of transport to protect the highway network from residual vehicular impact. The Council will work with developers to ensure that: 1. access to the development can be made by a wide choice of transport modes, including walking, cycling, and the private car, and public transport where appropriate; 2. site layouts and the street environment are designed to control traffic speed through an appropriate network and street hierarchy that promotes road safety for all; 3. walking and cycling are encouraged within the development and beyond, through the design of facilities and infrastructure within the site and provision of linkages to the wider network; 4. appropriate levels of parking provision are made in accordance with the standards contained within Appendix 6. A departure from these standards may be justified on a case by case basis, for example reduced parking levels for Town Centre residential developments where accessibility to public transport is more prevalent. Developments should also include provision for electric vehicle charging points, with fast charging infrastructure provided for use by short stay users where appropriate; 5. residential developments should provide dedicated cycle storage for each property. For houses, this could be in adequately sized garages or bike sheds. For flats or apartments, this may be shared dedicated secure facilities. Non-residential developments are required to provide cycle parking spaces to the equivalent of at least 10% of car parking spaces as set out in Appendix 6. Any departure from the standards for car parking provision should not be reflected in the reduction of cycle parking provision and, where appropriate, this should be increased in locations where cycling infrastructure encourages higher levels of cycling; and 6. development does not result in unacceptable impact on highway safety, or severe residual cumulative impacts on the road network. Developers must consider the impact of new development on the existing highway and transport infrastructure. Where necessary, developers will be required to mitigate (or contribute towards) any predicted adverse effects on the highway and the wider transport network. B) New developments will need to provide, as appropriate, Transport Statements, Transport Assessments and Travel Plans to ensure the delivery of travel choice and sustainable opportunities for travel in line with the latest government guidance and best practice. Thresholds for when these documents are required are set out in Appendix 7. New developments that are predicted to have an adverse impact on the transport network will be expected to contribute towards capacity and mitigation measures. Proposals that require new projects will be required to make a proportionate financial contribution.	sustainable transport methods and also minimise any additional travel demand on the local roads. The **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** at section 4.6 notes that a Worker Travel Plan will be developed to manage the arrival and departure profile of workers on Site and to encourage sustainable modes of transport, such as car-sharing. The Worker Travel Plan will be administered by the CTMP Co-ordinator and would be a contractual requirement as part of the Principal Contractor's contract with the Applicant. Some of the measures included within the Worker Travel Plan include: • Provision of public transport information to access where workers will be resident or collected from by buses provided under the Worker Travel Plan, so there is no need for non-local workers to bring cars to the wider area; • Minibus service for transport of non-local construction workers; • Promotion of a car sharing scheme; and • Car parking management. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** considers the capacity of the local highway network to ensure the roads can safely accommodate the anticipated traffic flows associated with the Proposed Development. This is supported by section 13.9 of the **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** which concludes that the additional traffic due to the construction of the Proposed Development would result in temporary increases of traffic flows, including HGVs, on the surrounding highway network. However, the full assessment of the potential environmental effects concludes that the significance of impacts relating to the effect of severance, road user and pedestrian safety, road vehicle driver and passenger delay, and hazardous and large loads are all Negligible or Minor. As such, based on the significance criteria the effects of the temporary traffic generated by the constriction of the Proposed Development on all road links and junctions are considered to be Not Significant. Several mitigation measures have been included as embedded mitigation within **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** and will be implemented to minimise the traffic impacts of the Proposed Development during both the construction and decommissioning phases. Some of these embedded mitigation measures include: • Designing entry / exit points onto the road network in accordance with national road design standards and in consultation with the local highway authority to ensure safety; • Managing interactions with the public road network through visibility splays, signage, and traffic controls, with construction traffic yielding to other road users; • Distributing details of vehicle routes to workers to reduce peak-time congestion in sensitive areas; • Scheduling HGV movements outside of peak traffic hours (08:00–09:00 and 17:00–18:00) to avoid additional congestion;

	In addition, proposals should include details of post-development monitoring of traffic and mitigation measures in the event that traffic levels agreed through the original permission are later exceeded.	• Implementing a delivery management system to regulate HGV arrival times and monitor compliance with routing and scheduling; • Monitoring HGV routes and delivery times to ensure adherence to agreed protocols and address any non-compliance; and • Employing specialised haulage services for abnormal loads, including necessary permits and coordination with relevant authorities.
Policy 18: Development Affecting Public Rights of Way	Proposals will be supported which improve the number and quality of opportunities for walking, cycling and riding and create multi-user routes through development sites, particularly in areas of the Borough where such opportunities are currently deficient. In such cases, the following principles should be considered: A) Where new developments affect public rights of way, the public right of way should be retained and wherever possible be on the legally recorded alignment. Where a public right of way is affected the development should be designed to accommodate the route following the principles outlined in Policy 19. B) Where development leads to the diversion of an existing right of way, a suitable alternative must be established, following the principles outlined in Policies 19 and 20. C) Development will not normally be allowed to lead to the closure of a public right of way unless a suitable replacement can be established. D) Developers will be expected to consider any unrecorded public paths that cross development sites and treat them in the same way as definitive public rights of way. E) Proposals will be supported that enhance the Trans Pennine Trail, particularly those that create off-road sections for all users.	By securing the mechanisms for the embedded mitigation measures as outlined in Section 13.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]**, which are secured in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** , **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12], oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]** , and **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** which are all secured via the requirements in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**, it is concluded that there are no residual effects identified for this Scheme. The **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** outlines the measures to limit disruption and ensure that the PRoW network can continue to be used throughout the construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development, while minimising the impact on PRoW users. The Proposed Development includes opportunities for advancement, including the proposed approximately 14.58km of permissive path within the Order Limits, as set out within the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]**. The **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** is secured via a requirement in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** sets out project specific design principles which have influenced the design of the Proposed Development. The project design principles of relevance to sustainable transport include the following – • Find out what is important to people about the local area and seek to incorporate feedback • Consider how people engage with their local environment and retain these patterns • Enhance recreational access across the landscape These project design principles set out how the Proposed Development will consider the experience of the people using the Public Rights of Way during the operational phase of the Proposed Development. The **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** confirms that during the construction phase of the Proposed Development, there will be approximately 30 PRoWs that are to be temporarily diverted for approximately 2-3 weeks. Section 4 of the **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** confirms that the existing PRoWs and proposed Permissive Paths, which pass through or run adjacent to the Order Limits are expected to be unaffected during the operation phase. Minimum widths have been incorporated into the design to enable a suitable distance between any PRoWs and proposed infrastructure. In all cases, the PRoW will see perimeter fencing being installed a minimum distance from the centreline of the PRoW of 10m to either side (creating a 20m corridor) if Solar PV Arrays lie on both sides of the PRoW, and 15m if Solar PV Arrays are to one side only. This will help avoid the perception of being channelled into narrow passages between Solar PV Arrays.
Policy 19: Access, Design and Layout of Public Rights of Way	Proposals will be expected to meet the following access, design and layout considerations in respect of public rights of way and highways network: A) Developers will be expected to incorporate the principles of least restrictive access in the design and layout of public rights of way as part of the development. B) Wherever possible, any existing or alternative route alignments through development sites should run through open, landscaped areas and should: 1. avoid the use of estate roads; 2. avoid alignments enclosed by fencing with little or no surveillance from adjacent buildings; 3. be free from sharp bends which could provide blind spots and hiding places;	

	4. be suitably surfaced to a specification agreed with highway authority; and 5. be free from barriers. Barriers should be considered as a last resort and will only be authorised where there is clear justification. Agreed structures will need to be the least restrictive and conform to the British Standard for Gaps Gates and Stiles. C) Where paths are not enclosed, minimum widths of 2 metres for footpath and 4 metres for bridleway and restricted byways should be provided. If it is necessary for the path to be enclosed by fencing, hedging or buildings, then minimum widths of 3 metres for footpaths, 5 metres for bridleways and 6 metres for restricted byways should be provided. D) Any new routes or altered alignments through development should link into the surrounding public rights of way network or adopted highway network to maintain and improve connectivity and ease of movement. E) New routes should have formal status and be recorded on the appropriate legal record. This will secure the long-term protection of the route and formalise responsibility for maintenance.	
Policy 21: Telecommunications and Utilities Infrastructure	Proposals to extend or improve access to telecommunication (including broadband services) and utility infrastructure networks and the siting of associated apparatus will be supported subject to meeting the following criteria: A) Essential utilities and telecommunications infrastructure will be protected unless it is no longer required or can be adequately relocated and/or replaced. B) All new housing and commercial developments must provide connectivity to the fastest technically available Broadband network unless it can be clearly demonstrated that this is not possible. C) Utility and telecommunications infrastructure and connections must be designed into, integrated within, and included in, any new development. Works will need to be carefully managed and coordinated between different providers to minimise disruption to highways and residential amenity and ensure the safety of all users. D) Wherever possible, new utility and telecommunications infrastructure such as transmission equipment should be placed underground. E) It has been demonstrated that equipment/site sharing is not feasible and that telecommunications apparatus cannot be sited on an existing building or other appropriate structure where this represents the preferable environmental solution. F) The size of the apparatus is kept to the minimum necessary to achieve their purpose and every effort has been made to minimise the visual impact of the proposal.	Section 16.4 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [EN0110020/APP/6.16]** highlights that the low height of the panels and other infrastructure which forms part of the Proposed Development means that there will not be any interference with above ground telecommunications infrastructure. No effects are expected on above ground telecommunications infrastructure during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. The **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** sets out that the design of the Proposed Development will incorporate protective measures agreed with asset owners to safeguard existing utilities and telecommunications infrastructure, including laying cables perpendicularly across existing utilities and maintaining a minimum vertical separation of 0.6 m above or below infrastructure in accordance with relevant guidance, with the CEMP setting out procedures for consultation with statutory undertakers, review of asset records, trial holes where required, agreed standoff distances and controlled excavation in line with HSG47 to prevent accidental damage.

	G) The telecommunication apparatus is positioned so as to minimise their effect on the external appearance of the building or structure to which they are attached, and is of a suitable colour which minimises visual impact and enables them to merge into the background. H) The apparatus is not used primarily as a means of advertising. I) The apparatus would not harm an element which contributes to the significance of a designated heritage asset. Antennae on listed buildings will be supported provided it can be hidden from public view (subject to adequate screening) and it is small in scale.	
Policy 26: Green Infrastructure (Strategic Policy)	The Council will protect, maintain, enhance and, where possible, extend or create Doncaster's green infrastructure (GI), including landscapes, ecological networks, natural environment, open spaces, public rights of way, geodiversity, biodiversity, navigable river and waterway assets, through the following principles: A) Proposals will be supported which contribute toward green infrastructure and have regard to the latest Council GI audits and strategies. The green infrastructure should principally benefit the development but also connect to the wider network. All major development proposals of 1 hectare or more (see also Policy 42 Part C) will be required to demonstrate how the development: 1. contributes toward delivering identified opportunities, priorities and address local need; 2. creates or enhances green corridors, including rights of way; 3. provides specific and dedicated spaces for wildlife to encourage a more robust and connected network of habitats; 4. considers tranquillity and provide for generous biodiversity rich open spaces; 5. provides well designed and accessible, sport, recreation and children's play space and food growing opportunities; 6. avoids loss or damage or deterioration to green infrastructure assets; 7. defines and softens the edges of settlements to provide a high quality transition between urban and rural areas particularly at urban greenfield extensions; 8. meets the Council's requirements in terms of type, detailed siting, size, shape and design; 9. helps people and wildlife adapt to the impacts of climate change by including naturalised forms of flood storage and/or incorporating additional tree planting within developments; and	An **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** has been submitted as part of the DCO application. The oLEMP sets out the measures proposed to enhance the biodiversity, landscape and green infrastructure value associated with the Proposed Development. Regarding Part A of Policy 26: Green Infrastructure (Strategic Policy), the following elements are to be included as part of the Proposed Development: • Large areas of species-rich grassland will be provided beneath the solar panels and across the broader Solar PV Site in order to boost biodiversity and create new habitats for a range of species including pollinators and ground nesting birds. This will also help to ameliorate soil conditions after long-term agricultural practices. • The proposed mitigation will also increase and enhance the existing hedgerow network, with gapping up and planting of new species-rich native hedgerows with hedgerow trees, providing better connectivity and creating new valuable habitats for a range of species. • New permissive paths will provide new connections to the existing PRoW network, helping to connect villages and provide recreational opportunities for the wider community. • Long-term management of the proposed and existing habitats supporting skylark and wading birds will extend across the Brampton Common Local Wildlife Site within the Order Limits. • Long-term operational monitoring across the Brampton Common Local Wildlife Site within the Order Limits will be undertaken annually during the peak breeding time for five years, to better understand habitat improvements and biodiversity. Regarding Part B of Policy 26: Green Infrastructure (Strategic Policy), the Order Limits also include several waterbodies, including rivers, reservoirs, smaller watercourses and ponds. The interaction between the Proposed Development and these features was a key consideration in the design of the Proposed Development. As confirmed within section 5.3 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]**, the Proposed Development will be situated 10m from waterbodies, watercourses and drainage ditches and this is secured via the **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]**. Regarding the interaction between the Proposed Development and the local Public Rights of Way, the **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** outlines the measures to limit disruption and ensure that the PRoW network can continue to be used throughout the construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development,

	10. provides for long term protection and climate change resilience through smart developments, management and maintenance. B) Proposals adjacent or near to waterways, including those which contribute towards delivering identified opportunities and priorities, such as at the Doncaster Waterfront and Stainforth Marina, will be supported which: 1. take account of the different existing or potential roles, characteristics and functions of waterways such as for sustainable transport for water borne freight; for recreational use for walking or cycling; and/or for value as a wildlife corridor; 2. safeguard and improve environmental quality and amenity; 3. enhance the local environment and access to and along waterway corridors; 4. take into account the needs of all users; and 5. avoid loss, damage or deterioration of waterways assets and ensure they are an integral part of the development.	while minimising the impact on PRoW users. The Proposed Development includes opportunities for advancement, including the proposed approximately 14.58km of permissive path within the Order Limits, as set out within the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]**. The **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** is secured via a requirement of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. Permissive paths will be open for the operational and maintenance phase of the Proposed Development and be open to equestrians, cyclists and pedestrians. The extent and location of the paths is as follows: • Approximately 2.92 km of permissive paths proposed across Whitestone 1 to provide additional equestrian routes that link with the existing bridleways. • Approximately 10.8 km of permissive paths are proposed across Whitestone 2. To the north, two permissive paths provide access around King's Pond Plantation. To the west, the proposed permissive path follows Ulley Brook to connect with the existing footpath to the north and Treeton Lane to the south. To the south of Upper Whiston, a permissive path links Suilthwaite Common Lanlee and Field Lane. To the east of Ulley, a permissive path forms a circular route that begins at Carr Lane, follows the field boundaries north, along Penny Hill Lane, then turns south to rejoin Carr Lane. Permissive paths link with the existing PRoW to create a circular route across Brampton Common. To the east, the permissive path offers an alternative route away from the A57, connecting the A57 sidewalk to Anston Brook and the existing footpath near North Anston. • Approximately 0.86 km long permissive path across Whitestone 3, begins in Woodall, crosses Stone Hill and joins the existing footpath at Harthill Reservoir.
Policy 29: Ecological Networks (Strategic Policy)	Proposals will only be supported which deliver a net gain for biodiversity and protect, create, maintain and enhance the Borough's ecological networks by: a) being of an appropriate size, scale and type in relation to their location within and impact on the ecological network; b) maintaining, strengthening and bridging gaps in existing habitat networks; c) planting native species and creating new, or restoring existing, national and local priority habitats and/or species; and d) working with strategic partnerships to deliver conservation projects at a landscape scale where appropriate.	As presented in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Baseline Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, the ecological mitigation and enhancement areas will deliver a minimum of 10% which aligns with the commitment set out in a requirement in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**, which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**, secures the ongoing management and maintenance measures required for the upkeep of the landscape and ecological mitigation. Requirement 7 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]** sets out that any LEMP submitted must be in accordance with the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and include details of how the plan proposals will contribute to the achievement of a minimum 28% biodiversity net gain for areas based habitat units, 38% biodiversity net gain for hedgerow units and 10% biodiversity net gain for watercourse units. Therefore, the Applicant does not consider there to be a need for the Secretary of State to impose further requirements or conditions in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]** to secure the Proposed Development's Biodiversity Net Gain goals. Details of the engagement carried out by the Applicant in relation to the Proposed Development are set out in the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1].** The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment for the Proposed Development has not been shared with the LPAs or Natural England, principally because surveys to underpin the assessment were ongoing until close to the submission of the DCO Application. An earlier version of the BNG Assessment
Policy 30: Valuing Biodiversity and Geodiversity	The Borough has a range of internationally, nationally, and locally important habitats, sites and species that will be protected through the following principles: A) All proposals shall be considered in light of the mitigation hierarchy in accordance with National Policy. B) Proposals which may harm designated Local Wildlife Sites, Local Geological Sites, Priority Habitats, Priority Species, protected species or	

	non-designated sites or features of biodiversity interest, will only be supported where: 1. they use the DEFRA biodiversity metric to demonstrate that a proposal will deliver a minimum 10% net gain for biodiversity; 2. they protect, restore, enhance and provide appropriate buffers around wildlife and geological features and bridge gaps to link these to the wider ecological network; 3. they produce and deliver appropriate long term management plans for local wildlife and geological sites as well as newly created or restored habitats; 4. they can demonstrate that the need for a proposal outweighs the value of any features to be lost; and 5. if the permanent loss of a geological site is unavoidable, then provision will be made for the site to first be recorded by a suitably qualified expert. C) Proposals which may impact Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas or RAMSAR Sites will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that there will be no likely significant effects and no adverse effects on the integrity of European sites, unless there are no alternative solutions and it is justified by an "imperative reasons of overriding public interest" (IROPI) assessment under the Habitats Directives. D) Proposals that may either directly or indirectly negatively impact Sites of Special Scientific Interest will not normally be supported. Proposals should seek to protect and enhance Sites of Special Scientific Interest and maintain, strengthen, and bridge gaps to link them to the wider ecological network wherever possible. E) In order to ensure development does not negatively impact on nightjar populations, proposals located within 3km of Thorne and Hatfield Moors Special Protection Area, that impact habitats that nightjars may use for feeding on, will only be supported where they deliver a net gain in nightjar foraging habitat.	was not shared either, due to the uncertainty until the final design was established, but the overall concept of Biodiversity Net Gain was discussed As confirmed in Section 6.4 of **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Baseline Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** the assessment presented follows the guidance set out in *British Standard 8683:2021 (Process for Designing and Implementing Biodiversity Net Gain)*. It can be confirmed that the design and application of the mitigation hierarchy for the Proposed Development have followed the *Biodiversity Net Gain: Good Practice Principles for Development (CIEEM, CIRA, IEMA 2016)*. The Proposed Development will meet a minimum of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain and this will be secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The Applicant can confirm that there is no biodiversity net gain set to be delivered off-site, and all details of on-site biodiversity net gain are available in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Baseline Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** sets out that the design of the Proposed Development has evolved to avoid impacts and effects on ecology and biodiversity as far as practicable. The Proposed Development incorporates a number of enhancements resulting in a number of significant beneficial effects, including (but not limited to): • New habitats would be created within the Site, and existing habitats would be enhanced for biodiversity and secured through **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and managed and maintained for at least 30 years. The habitat enhancement and creation would mature, and soils would recover as a result of the reduction or cessation of fertiliser and insecticide inputs. It is expected that biodiversity at all levels of the ecosystem would benefit, with the abundance and richness of flora and fauna expanding over time. • Hedgerow loss during construction would be compensated for by improving the quality of existing hedgerows within the LWS (e.g. gapping up or addition of trees, use of optimum management practices) or the planting of new connecting hedgerows with the Site. • The Proposed Development will achieve a minimum of 10% BNG. However, the Applicant anticipates delivering substantially more than this, as evidenced by the BNG Assessment, which demonstrates what is likely to be proposed. The design of the Proposed Development incorporates nature-based solutions, where practicable, such as developing biodiversity enhancement measures ad considering factors related to hydrology, flood risk, landscape and ecology. As part of the EIA process, an iterative approach has been adopted where significant environmental effects have been avoided where possible through design refinements and iterations. The Proposed Development incorporates a number of enhancements resulting in a number of significant beneficial effects, including (but not limited to) long-term beneficial effects at the local level in relation to hedgerow and woodland habitats, as a result of the proposed hedgerow, woodland and tree planting set out in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**.

		The **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** consistently concludes with NPS EN-1 that the decarbonisation, security of supply and affordability benefits delivered by the Proposed Development to the national urgent need for low-carbon generation should be accorded substantial weight in the planning balance. The Proposed Development meets the definition of CNP Infrastructure because it is for the development of greater than 50MW capacity of a low-carbon source of energy. As CNP infrastructure, the urgent need for the Proposed Development to assist in achieving the UK's energy objectives, together with the national security, economic, commercial, and net zero benefits, will, in general, outweigh any other residual impacts not capable of being addressed by application of the mitigation hierarchy. There are no SSSIs located on the land within the Order Limits, nor is it located immediately adjacent to any. The closest SSSI is Crabtree Wood SSSI which is located 0.9km southeast of Whitestone 3. Given the distance from the Order Limits, there are no direct or indirect impacts anticipated on this SSSI for the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** includes an assessment of the likely significant effects on SSSIs and concludes that, with appropriate mitigation, no significant adverse effects are anticipated. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** sets out that there are several low magnitude residual effects on biodiversity and nature conservation identified during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. Mitigation for these residual effects is set out within the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. As a result of embedded and residual mitigation measures, during the operational and maintenance phase there are eight direct residual significant beneficial effects as a result of the Proposed Development, which are anticipated in relation to the following ecological features: • Brampton Common Local Wildlife Site • Priority Habitats – Native Hedgerow • Priority Habitats – Wet Woodland • Priority Species – Bat • Priority Species – Reptile • Breeding Bird Assemblage • Barn Owl • Hobby Owl The **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** sets out the landscaping and ecological mitigation and enhancement measures for the Proposed Development. The overarching aim of the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** is to set out prescriptions for habitat creation and management in order to provide ecological enhancements, strengthen the green infrastructure within the local area and provide landscape and visual mitigation through the use of screening where required.

		The proposed mitigation measures will assist in contributing to the overall improvements to the local biodiversity and nature conservation as a result of the Proposed Development.
Policy 33: Landscape (Strategic Policy)	Proposals will be supported that take account of the quality, local distinctiveness and the sensitivity to change of distinctive landscape character areas and individual landscape features, in particular Thorne and Hatfield Moors. Development will be permitted provided that it conserves, enhances and, where possible, restores: A) the landscape character and local distinctiveness of the area including its historical, biodiversity, cultural character and its tranquillity; B) the distinctive setting of, and relationship between, settlements and buildings and the landscape including important views; C) the nature conservation value of the area including the pattern of woodland, forests, trees, field boundaries, vegetation and other features; D) the special qualities of rivers, waterways, wetlands and their surroundings; and E) the topography of the area including sensitive skylines, hillsides and geological features. Where development proposals will most likely result in a significant impact on the Borough's landscape the proposals should assess the potential impact (including cumulative impact) and propose how any negative effects will be minimised. In doing so consideration should be given to: F) alternative site selection; G) the scale, massing, design, form, layout, orientation and/ or operation of the development; H) the incorporation of suitable mitigation measures; or I) where suitable mitigation measures are not achievable on site, then development should provide appropriate compensation off site. Landscape works shall be appropriate to the scale of the development in accordance with Policy 48 (Landscaping of New Developments).	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]** explains that the Order Limits fall within two National Character Areas (NCAs) including: • National Character Area 30: Southern Magnesium Limestone. This covers the eastern part of the Study Area; and • National Character Area 38: Nottingham, Derbyshire and Yorkshire Coalfield. This covers the western part of the Study Area. While NCAs inform the wider landscape context, their broad geographical scale is not appropriate for assessing site specific landscape effects. For this reason, they have been considered but have been scope out from the detailed effects assessment. The local published landscape character assessments that cover the Study Area and which has been reviewed as part of the landscape and visual impact assessment include: • Doncaster Landscape Character Assessment and Landscape Capacity Study (2007); • Rotherham Landscape Character Assessment and Landscape Capacity Study (2010); • Sheffield Preliminary Landscape Character Assessment (2023, submitted for examination as part of the Draft Plan submission); and • The Landscape Character of Derbyshire (Fourth Edition) (2014). The Order Limits is located in the following LCAs: • W1 is predominantly located within Doncaster LCA: A1: Conisbrough and Denaby Coalfield Farmlands; • W2 is predominantly located within Rotherham LCA 8: Central Rotherham Coalfield farmland, with the western extents within Rotherham LCA 5b: Coalfield Tributary Valleys – Treeton and Rotherham LCA 6: Rother Valley Floor; and • W3 is located within Rotherham LCA 8: Central Rotherham Coalfield Farmland, with the southern extents within Derbyshire LCA A – Limestone Farmlands and western extents within Derbyshire LCA B – Wooded Farmlands and Rotherham LCA 7: Rother Valley Reclaimed Woodland and a small part of the northern extent within Rotherham LCA 9a: East Rotherham Plateau. **ES Volume 3, Figures 7.3.1 and 7.3.2 Landscape Character Areas [EN0110020/APP/6.19]** set out the landscape character areas in conjunction with **ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.3: Landscape Character Baseline and Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** which sets out the landscape baseline and sensitivity.

		ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7] provides an overview of the potential cumulative Landscape and Visual effects of the Proposed Development which are considered in detail in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN0110020/APP/6.17].** The Proposed Development includes embedded mitigation and enhancement measures that would be adopted in order to mitigate potential adverse effects on the landscape and to views and visual amenity. These measures are presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1: Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/6.19]** and the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13].** **ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]** provides an account of the alternatives that have been studied by the Applicant, once the Site was chosen, in developing the siting and design of the Proposed Development. It sets out the main reasons for the Applicant's choices, including for the site layout and the scale of the Proposed Development, taking into account environmental, social and economic effects as well as technical and commercial feasibility. The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** additionally provides a detailed account of the approach to design, taking into account the existing landscape context and any technical constraints relating to the construction and operation of the required infrastructure. It also details the changes made to avoid and minimise impact on sensitive receptors throughout the design process including the removal of solar panels in certain areas of the Order Limits and provision of additional offsets.
Policy 46: Design of Non-Residential, Commercial and Employment Developments (Strategic Policy)	All non-residential and commercial developments, including extensions and alterations to existing properties, must be designed to be high quality, attractive, and make a positive contribution to the area in which they are located by meeting the following requirements: A) Proposals will be supported where they are designed to: 1. be sympathetic to local character and/or the host property in terms of their layout, siting, height, massing, form, scale, detailing, materials, landscaping or, where appropriate, their heritage significance; 2. have no unacceptable negative effects upon the amenity of neighbouring land uses or the environment; 3. promote accessibility and way-finding for all travel modes through the layout of the movement network, landscape strategy and building design; 4. meet functional requirements, whilst being architecturally appropriate, with interesting and visually attractive elevations which convey a sense of permanence; 5. reduce the scale of bulky buildings and bland elevations by breaking down building mass and using better quality human scale materials and detailing for prominent and heavily used parts of the building; 6. locating parking, servicing and storage areas unobtrusively and reducing their visual impact through landscaping and boundary treatments;	The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** provides a detailed account as to how the Proposed Development delivers good design. It describes the existing landscape context both at the national and local scale and sets out a series of design principles that have informed the design of the Proposed Development in order to retain existing landscape features, minimise impact on landscape character and enhance the existing landscape framework. It also explains how the design of the Proposed Development has sought to minimise visual impact by careful siting of project components and through the introduction of new planting. Throughout the design process, the Applicant maintained an interdisciplinary approach to design and considered both the opportunities and constraints of the Proposed Development. This included analysis of the existing physical, environmental, social and cultural context of the Site by a broad range of technical disciplines (including landscape and visual, noise, ecology and heritage) as set out and assessed by the **Aspect Chapters of the ES [EN0110020/APP/6.6 – 6.16]**. This approach has enabled the Applicant to understand the complexities of the Site and identify where multiple opportunities and constraints have the potential to stack up with one another to provide a good design response and allow for co-existence and co-location with other terrestrial uses. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** assesses the anticipated transport and access effects of the Proposed Development's construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning, in accordance with this policy. Section 13.3 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** provides a summary of the Applicant's engagement regarding transport and access.

	7. ensure parking areas do not reduce building line continuity and/or create large gaps in street frontages to an unacceptable extent; and 8. be well landscaped, include provision of amenity areas for occupiers, visitors or workers, and ensure good quality external works are coordinated across the site. Retail, commercial and mixed use proposals will be supported where they also: 9. respect, and where appropriate enhance, the character and setting of existing street frontages in terms of active frontage, plot widths, established building lines, shop-front proportion and rhythm; 10. consider advertisements, signage, and security measures so they are not overly prominent or dominant and contribute to the visual character and vitality of the street- scene; 11. ensure shop-fronts relate well to the building in which they are located in terms of proportion, elevation design, relationship to upper storeys, fascia height and width, mullion treatment, materials, and colour; and 12. ensure that historic shop-fronts are retained unless their loss can be justified. B) New major non-domestic applications (1000m2 floorspace or more, or a site of 1 hectare or above) must meet the BREEAM rating of at least 'Very Good', or any agreed equivalent standard, and secure at least 10% of their regulated energy from renewable sources (or equivalent carbon emission reductions). Large footprint buildings should ensure roofs are designed to accommodate the potential for solar panel arrays. This should be demonstrated through the submission of preliminary assessments at planning application stage.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** concludes that with the mitigation measures in place, there are no residual transport and access-related effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operational and maintenance and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. A number of Public Rights of Way traverse the Order Limits of the Proposed Development. The Proposed Development also incorporates a series of permissive paths proposed across the Order Limits, as secured via the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** which will be connected to the existing PRoWs. Permissive paths will be open for the operational and maintenance phase of the Proposed Development and be open to equestrians, cyclists and pedestrians. The extent and location of the paths is as follows: • Approximately 2.92 km of permissive paths proposed across Whitestone 1 to provide additional equestrian routes that link with the existing bridleways. • Approximately 10.8 km of permissive paths are proposed across Whitestone 2. To the north, two permissive paths provide access around King's Pond Plantation. To the west, the proposed permissive path follows Ulley Brook to connect with the existing footpath to the north and Treeton Lane to the south. To the south of Upper Whiston, a permissive path links Suilthwaite Common Lanlee and Field Lane. To the east of Ulley, a permissive path forms a circular route that begins at Carr Lane, follows the field boundaries north, along Penny Hill Lane, then turns south to rejoin Carr Lane. Permissive paths link with the existing PRoW to create a circular route across Brampton Common. To the east, the permissive path offers an alternative route away from the A57, connecting the A57 sidewalk to Anston Brook and the existing footpath near North Anston. • Approximately 0.86 km long permissive path across Whitestone 3, begins in Woodal, crosses Stone Hill and joins the existing footpath at Harthill Reservoir. A **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** has been prepared in support of the DCO application. The **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** sets out the mitigation, management and monitoring measures for PRoW affected by construction which may require temporary diversion/closure. The **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** sets out how parking will be managed and monitored throughout the lifetime of the Proposed Development. The Proposed Development does not involve or have an impact on retail, commercial, and mixed-use development.
Policy 48: Landscaping of New Developments	Development will be supported which protects landscape character, protects and enhances existing landscape features, and provides a high quality, comprehensive hard and soft landscape scheme that includes: A) maximising links to wider Green Infrastructure in line with Policy 26; B) the provision of Sustainable Drainage Systems and designs that facilitate floodplain compensation and preservation of flood flow routes where appropriate;	As set out in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7],** the following planting types have been proposed across the Proposed Development to provide visual mitigation and introduce landscape features which are characteristic of the landscape setting in the Study Area. These include: • Creation of woodland belts; • Reinforcement of existing field boundary hedgerows where required; • New hedgerows are proposed across the Order Limits, to improve connectivity; • Areas of ecological mitigation; • Reinforced roadside planting;

	C) generous tree, shrub and hedgerow planting consisting of appropriate species and nursery stock specified for the location, role and prominence of the landscape feature, and to provide year round interest; D) fit for purpose, attractive hard and soft landscaping including; planting, surfacing materials, boundary treatments and street furniture, for all external environments, E) appropriate, robust, low maintenance surfacing materials for public areas and the adoptable highway, which should include more attractive finishes (including block paving) in key focal spaces and lightly trafficked carriageways; and F) a long-term management and maintenance strategy with clear responsibilities and regimes for the upkeep of all external areas.	• Planting of individual trees; and • Species rich grassland and wildflower meadow seed mixes will be integrated across the Order Limits. Detailed enhancement measures are included in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**. During the operational (and maintenance) phase of the life of the Proposed Development, the management of existing vegetation and new planting will be guided by the oLEMP. This will set out the aspirations of the habitats and their management and will include monitoring and review cycles.
Policy 54: Pollution	Development proposals that are likely to cause pollution, or be exposed to pollution, will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that pollution can be avoided, or where mitigation measures (such as those incorporated into the design and layout of development) will minimise significantly harmful impacts to acceptable levels that protect health, environmental quality and amenity. When determining planning applications, the agent of change principle will be applied, and particular consideration will be given to: A) an assessment of the risks to public health and the impact of cumulative effects and where necessary that the provision for mitigation against the total effects has been provided. B) the presence of noise generating uses close to the site, and the potential noise likely to be generated by the proposed development. A Noise Assessment will be required to enable clear decision-making on any relevant planning application. Proposals will need to have regard to the standards identified in Appendix 11 to establish is the proposal is acceptable in noise impact terms. C) the impact on national air quality; especially but not limited to Air Quality Management Areas, areas potentially close to the EU limit value, other sensitive areas and the aims and objectives of the Air Quality Action Plan. An Air Quality Assessment will be required to enable clear decision making on any relevant planning application. D) any adverse effects on the quantity, quality and ecology features of water bodies and groundwater resources, including contamination to Source Protection Zones. E) the impact of artificial lighting. Artificial lighting has the potential to cause unacceptable light pollution in the form of sky-glow, glare or intrusion onto other property and land. Development proposals should ensure that adequate and reasonable controls to protect dwellings and other sensitive property, the rural night-sky, observatories, road-users, and designated sites	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]** presents a noise assessment in accordance with the requirements of this policy, including a description of the noise generating aspects of the Proposed Development. The noise assessment is proportionate to the likely noise impact. Following the implementation of embedded mitigation measures, no significant residual effects are anticipated on any noise sensitive receptors. Section 12.4 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Air Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.12]** sets out that the Proposed Development is approximately 1km southwest of the City of Doncaster Council (CDC) AQMA 5, and 4km southwest of CDC AQMA 2. Traffic accessing the Proposed Development will have to travel through these AQMAs.

	for conservation of biodiversity and protected species are included within the proposals.	
Policy 56: Drainage	Development sites must incorporate satisfactory measures for dealing with their drainage impacts to ensure waste water and surface water run-off are managed appropriately and to reduce flood risk to existing communities. Proposals will be supported therefore in line with the following requirements: A) There is adequate means of foul sewage disposal and treatment or that capacity can be made available in time to serve the development. B) They will not increase flood risk on site and ensure no flooding to land or buildings elsewhere. C) They achieve a reduction in surface water run off on brownfield sites, and no increase on existing rates for greenfield sites. D) They secure the removal of culverting and avoid building over a culvert or new culverting of watercourses and a 10 metre buffer zone is left free from development from the water's edge; E) They make use of Sustainable Drainage Systems unless it can be shown to be technically unfeasible. F) They dispose of surface water appropriately according to the following networks in order of preference: 1. to an infiltration based system wherever possible (such as soakaways). 2. discharge into a watercourse with the prior approval of the landowner and navigation authority (following treatment where necessary). 3. discharge to a public water sewer or highway drain.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** assesses the impacts of the Proposed Development on water quality, water bodies or protected areas, an concludes that with embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse water effects exposed across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases on water quality, water bodies or protected areas. As set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** surface water runoff from the Solar PV will be managed through Rural SuDS and Natural Flood Management techniques such as grassland/wildflower areas, which will act to bind soils, slow surface water, and increase water quality compared to the baseline scenario. The **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** sets out how surface water runoff from the Site will be managed in line with the national, regional and local requirements regarding flood risk and drainage. As the Proposed Development does not have a detailed layout, a detailed drainage strategy cannot be provided at this stage, with the principles and design criteria presented in this document. These criteria will be applied during the detailed design phase, and the detailed SuDS will be secured in the DCO through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The residual effects outlined in the assessment rely on controls established within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**. These outline management plans and the **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** set out the water related measures to manage any potential water effects that may arise from the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. A Surface Water Drainage Strategy (which will form part of a detailed CEMP(s)) will include details of pre-construction, construction, and post-construction water quality monitoring. These measures are set out in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and the **oSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** submitted as part of the DCO Application.
Policy 57: Flood Risk Management	A) All development proposals will be considered against the NPPF, including application of the sequential test and, if necessary, the exception test. B) The extent and detailed boundaries of the functional flood plain (flood zone 3b) are identified through the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, in agreement with the Environment Agency, where national policy will be applied. C) All windfall development proposals outside of Development Allocations in Flood Zones 2 and 3a will be supported as follows: Housing; some commercial, and business and service and general industrial (E(c), E(g) (except for E(g(i)) Offices) & B2 use classes) for proposals at Tiers 1 to 3 of the settlement hierarchy (as defined in Policy 1): will be required to pass a sequential test with an area of search normally confined to elsewhere within the same settlement.	The majority of the Order limits are within Flood Zone 1, with a small proportion of land located within Flood Zones 2 and 3. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** to the **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]**, and Chapter 8 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** advises how the Sequential Test has been met. However, it should be noted that where there are areas of flood zones 2 and 3, no sensitive electrical infrastructure has been placed within these areas, only solar panels and mitigation.

	Office: will be required to pass a sequential test with an area of search normally confined to elsewhere within the Town Centre where the development is being proposed. Retail: will be required to pass a sequential test with an area of search normally confined to: 1. elsewhere within the settlement's town/ district/ local centre; or 2. where a settlement does not have a retail area defined on the Policies Map, elsewhere within the same settlement as per the proposal itself. Mixed use: will need to provide justification that the scheme should be considered as a single proposal or otherwise consider whether it is more appropriate to separate out the individual component proposals of the scheme and assess against the land uses as above. All other proposals: will normally require a borough-wide area of search unless a case can be made to narrow the search area due to certain locational needs of the development or specific catchment requirements. D) The Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment identifies a number of residual flood risk areas and details development planning advice for these which should be considered when looking to develop in these areas. The Council will ensure it keeps its evidence base on flood risk up-to date, including commissioning a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment at the earliest opportunity, so that proposals outside of Development Allocations have the best available evidence on which to prepare their own site specific flood risk assessments and appropriate mitigation and to assist with successful pass of the sequential and exceptions tests.	
Policy 58: Low Carbon and Renewable Energy (Strategic Policy)	The Council aims to increase the supply of low carbon and renewable energy generated in the Borough, in accordance with the principles set out below: A) Proposals will be supported which give priority to: 1. community energy schemes that are in full or part community ownership; 2. biomass and energy crop schemes especially to the north and south east of the main urban area, for example mixed woodland, single species short rotation forestry and large- scale forestry, outside of areas of high quality arable farmland; 3. heat or power generation from light, water, waste and other low carbon heat sources; 4. landfill and sewage gas energy generation schemes; 5. wind power projects which meet the criteria of Policy 59; and	The **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** and **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** set out the need for the Proposed Development and note the established need for low-carbon infrastructure as a CNP and that such projects should be brought forward with urgency. The **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** and **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** set out that the Proposed Development will deliver a significant amount of low-carbon, low-cost and UK-located solar electricity generation capacity connecting to the National Electricity Transmission System, anticipated to be operational from 2029. The Proposed Development would contribute towards the UK Government meeting the overarching key national policy aims of: • Achieving Net Zero by 2050 • Increasing the security of energy supply • Lowering the cost and increasing the affordability of generate electricity; and • Contributing to sustainable development and economic opportunities.

	6. micro-renewable energy technologies and decentralised heat and power systems within new development. B) In all cases, low carbon and renewable energy proposals will be supported where they: 1. have undertaken community engagement and demonstrate how they will deliver environmental, social and economic benefits; 2. have no unacceptable adverse effects on local amenity and air quality, and include appropriate stand-off distances between technologies and sensitive receptors, such as residential areas; 3. allow the continued safe and efficient operation of Doncaster Sheffield Airport; 4. would have no unacceptable adverse effects on highway safety and infrastructure; 5. have no unacceptable adverse impacts, including cumulative impacts, on the built and natural environment (including landscape character, and historic and nature conservation assets, such as Thorne and Hatfield Moors); and 6. reclaim the site to a suitable and safe condition and use (such as agriculture or nature conservation) within a defined and agreed period should the development cease to be operational. C) Proposals will be supported which facilitate the delivery of combined heat and power (CHP), combined cooling, heat and power (CCHP) and district heating networks where there is sufficient heat density/demand or anchor loads. Development within or adjacent to Heat Opportunity Areas will be expected to incorporate infrastructure for district heating where feasible, and to connect to existing systems where available.	This would help the UK diversify its energy supply, increase energy resilience, and support local and national carbon emission reduction targets. It would provide a reliable supply of electricity that seeks to help address the needs of the UK power market. The Proposed Development would also help the UK to meet carbon reduction commitments by significantly increasing the proportion of electricity supplied by renewable sources, which is reported as a significant beneficial effect in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Assessment [APP/6.11]**. As set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]**, the Proposed Development is for the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of more than 100 MW of solar photovoltaic (PV) arrays, Battery Energy Storage System (BESS), onsite substations and supporting infrastructure, and grid connection infrastructure. The grid connection infrastructure would connect the Proposed Development to the National Grid at the new National Grid substation Brinsworth (Long Lane 400kV Substation), located east of Long Lane, Rotherham. As the Proposed Development would have a generating capacity in excess of 100MW, it is considered to be a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) under the Planning Act 2008. The **ES [EN0110020/APP/6.1 – 6.21],** confirms that sufficient assessments have been conducted for specific topics to ensure there is adequate mitigation incorporated into the design to reduce any impact upon the local environment (including cumulative impacts, on the built and the natural environment including landscape character, and historic and nature conservation assets) as a result of the Proposed Development. The Proposed Development is mostly temporary and reversible in nature and therefore will have a low magnitude affect the long-term agricultural resource. When the operational phase ends, the Solar PV Site would be decommissioned and the land returned to its original use and condition as far as practicable and returned to the landowner. The decommissioning measures are set out in the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** and secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
Policy 60: Protecting and Enhancing Doncaster's Soil and Water Resources	Proposals affecting land and water resources will be expected to comply with the following criteria: A) Proposals on non-allocated sites that involve the significant loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2 and 3a) will only be supported where: 1. there are no other suitable alternative locations on lower quality agricultural land (or non- agricultural land) available; or 2. the land can be reinstated back to its previous state (where possible). B) Developers will need to demonstrate through an on-site assessment the actual grading where significant development takes place on agricultural land.	The Applicant has developed the design of the Proposed Development to minimise the land take of BMV land, where practicable. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** sets out in Table 9-7 the ALC survey results which outline that 80% of the Site is non-BMV soils. Section 9.7 of this chapter then outlines that there is a moderate significant effect on 20% BMV soil and a minor not significant effect on the 80% non-BMV, which results in a negligible not significant effect on compaction of soils overall. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** describes the existing levels and assesses the anticipated soil effects of the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases, in accordance with this policy. It is acknowledged that development of ground mounted solar arrays is not prohibited on BMV agricultural land. The Proposed Development is mostly temporary and reversible in nature and therefore will have a low magnitude affect the long-term agricultural resource. When the

	C) Proposals will need to demonstrate that all practicable steps have been taken for soil resources to be conserved and managed in a sustainable way. D) Development which would disturb or damage any soils of high environmental value (e.g. peats and other soils contributing to ecological connectivity, carbon stores such as peatlands and flood risk alleviation etc.) will not normally be permitted. E) Proposals will be supported which will: 1. make positive progress towards achieving 'good' status or potential under the Water Framework Directive in the Borough's surface and ground waterbodies; and 2. promote water efficiency measures which take account of current water availability (e.g. informed by Catchment Abstraction Management Strategies) and future demand. F) Proposals will not be supported which would: 1. have an adverse impact on the ecological status or recreational value of rivers and other water bodies such as flood storage areas; 2. lead to the deterioration in the quality of surface and ground waters; and 3. lead to a reduction in ground water levels (or reduced flows in water courses).	operational phase ends, the Solar PV Site would be decommissioned and the land returned to its original use and condition as far as practicable and returned to the landowner. The Applicant has provided an outline Soil Management Plan (oSMP) within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** which sets out how soil will be handled, monitored, and restored during the lifetime of the Proposed Development. The oSMP which is provided as part of the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. Section 9.4 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** sets out that by following the measures within the oSMP, soils will not be permanently affected. The impacts will be temporary and of low magnitude, resulting in a minor adverse effect which is not significant in EIA terms.
Policy 61: Providing for and Safeguarding Mineral Resources (Strategic Policy)	The extraction and production of aggregate, industrial, building stone and energy minerals that contribute to infrastructure and construction projects will be supported through the following principles: A) The Council will aim to plan for a steady, adequate, efficiently and sustainably sourced minerals during the plan period by: 1. encouraging the use of suitable secondary and recycled material in the first instance, minimising the need for primary extraction; 2. providing for sufficient industrial and energy minerals that balance both the economic and environmental benefits; 3. contributing toward local provision by maintaining, where possible, a landbank of permitted reserves for at least seven years for sand and gravel and, with Rotherham Council, at least ten years for aggregate limestone; 4. monitoring and reviewing the permitted reserves of sand and gravel, and aggregate limestone and producing an annual aggregate assessment; 5. requiring proposals for sand and gravel to demonstrate that the mineral resource includes at least 20% sharp sand and gravel; 6. identifying on the Policies Map existing mineral sites with extant permission (see Table 16 below), new mineral proposals (preferred areas	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** sets out that minerals will not be extracted as part of the Proposed Development. For W1, Section 9.5 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** outlines the inclusion of the Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs) included within the Doncaster Local Plan Policies Map. The safeguarded area of Cadeby Formation (Magnesian Limestone MSA) intersects with W1 over approximately 8 hectares along outcrop of the thin basal deposits, while the sand and gravel safeguarded area intersects for approximately 3 hectares. Nearly all of the area of W1 which overlaps with these MSAs is currently planned as mitigation land. A MSA for shallow coal is present across the entirety of W1. Section 9.5 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** sets out that the entire RMBC district is part of an MSA for shallow coal, fireclay, and brick clay, which includes all of W2. The same applies to W3, with the addition of the basal outcrop of the Cadeby Formation MSA in the south-east of W3. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** concludes that with the embedded mitigation in place, there will be no significant residual effects on minerals. Section 9.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [EN0110020/APP/6.9]** sets out the embedded mitigation, outlined within the outline SMP which is provided as part of the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]** and secured by

	(see Table 17 below)) and 'Areas of Search' (see Table 18 below) (see also Policy 62); 7. identifying on the Policies Map Minerals Safeguarding Areas; 8. identifying on the Policies Map and safeguarding minerals transportation, handling and processing infrastructure from non-minerals development during and beyond the plan period which may adversely impact on the operation of the site in accordance with NPPF paragraph 182 (Table 19). B) Proposals for non-mineral development within Mineral Safeguarding Areas (see Table 21), and the 250m buffer zone, will be supported where it can be demonstrated that: 1. consideration has been given to the long term economic value of the mineral; or 2. non-mineral development can take place without preventing the economically viable mineral resource from being extracted in the future; or 3. the proposal can feasibly incorporate the prior extraction of any minerals of economic value in an environmentally acceptable way; or 4. the need for the development outweighs the need to safeguard the area for future minerals extraction; or 5. the development is permitted, minor or temporary in nature (see safeguarding exemptions in Table 20). C) Development proposals within the sand and gravel Safeguarding Area and Airport Policy Area which comply with Policy 6 (Doncaster Sheffield Airport and Business Park), are exempt from Part B of this Policy for the duration of the Local Plan.	a requirement in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**, during each phase of the lifetime of the Proposed Development to minimise damage to soil structure. Harrycrofts Quarry is around 750m east of the closest part of the Cable Corridor and there is a development boundary extending to 520m east of the corridor. This proximity and the quality of deposits near the surface mean that the impact from the Proposed Development is minor. Effects arising during the construction stage will be temporary, limited to the construction period only and reversible. Decommissioning is anticipated to commence 60 years after final commissioning. The effects to all identified heritage assets during the decommissioning phase are likely to be similar to construction effects, including being temporary and reversible.

TABLE 8: NORTH EAST DERBYSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN – TABLE OF COMPLIANCE

North East Derbyshire Local Plan 2014 – 2034 (Adopted 2021)		
Policy	**Policy Text**	**Assessment**
Policy SS1: Sustainable Development	In order to contribute to sustainable development in North East Derbyshire, development proposals will: a. Meet development needs within defined settlements or other allocated areas having regard to the defined settlement hierarchy and the need to enhance their role as a focus for new services and facilities (Policy SS2 & Table 4.2); b. Promote the efficient use of land and the re-use of previously developed land (including the remediation of contaminated land) buildings and existing infrastructure in sustainable locations (Policies SS2-4, SS6 & SS10); c. Locate development where there is access to a broad range of jobs, services and facilities which are accessible by foot, cycle or public transport with reduced reliance on the private car (Policy SS2); d. Support the local economy by contributing towards business expansion and growth, attracting and supporting a skilled labour force, and improving skills and access for local people to job opportunities including targeted recruitment and training, and the use of Local Labour Agreements (Policies WC1-3); e. Reduce the need for energy in new development and ensure that it can use energy efficiently through the life time of the development (Policy SDC12); f. Promote the social and economic wellbeing of North East Derbyshire's communities and contribute to reducing social disadvantages and inequalities (Policies LC2-4, LC9, WC1, WC3, WC5 and ID10); g. Create well designed places that are accessible, durable, adaptable and enhance local distinctiveness (Policy SDC12); h. Protect and enhance the character, quality and settings of towns and villages and heritage assets (Policies SS8, SDC1 & SDC5-9); i. Protect and/or enhance the character, quality and diversity of the District's green infrastructure and local landscapes, the wider countryside and ecological and biodiversity assets (Policies SS2, SS11,SDC3-4, ID1 and ID7-10); j. Protect the productive potential of the District's best quality agricultural land, and avoid sterilisation of mineral resources;	As noted within section 3.2 of the **ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.2: Transport Statement [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, the Proposed Development is situated in close proximity to three roads that form part of the Strategic Road Network. In terms of vehicle routing, these roads will be the origins of trips to the Proposed Development. The three roads of relevance that form part of the Strategic Road Network include – • **A1** - spans approximately 410 miles (660 km) from London to Edinburgh, passing through major towns and cities such as Peterborough, Doncaster, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and Berwick-upon-Tweed. The A1 includes sections that are designated as A1(M), which are upgraded to motorway standards. Junction 1 of the A1 (M) will be utilised to provide SRN routing onto the local highway network for Whitestone 1. • **M18** - The M18 motorway is a key route in Yorkshire, stretching approximately 26 miles (42 km) from the east of Rotherham to Goole in a north-east to south-west direction. It connects several major motorways, including the M1, A1(M), M180, and M6212. Junction 1 of the M18 motorway will be utilised to provide SRN routing onto the local highway network for Whitestone 1 and 2. • **M1** - The M1 motorway connects London to Leeds and spans approximately 193 miles (311 km). The motorway passes through several counties, including Greater London, Hertfordshire, Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Northamptonshire, Leicestershire, Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire, and Yorkshire. It also intersects with other major motorways such as the M25, M6, M69, M18, M62, and M62112. Junction 31 of the M1 motorway will be utilised to provide SRN routing onto the local highway network for Whitestone 2 and 3. Junction 33 will also provide routing to Whitestone 2. As set out within section 4.2 of **Appendix 1: Site Selection Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]**, one of the key site selection principles that assisted in determining a suitable location for the Proposed Development was to ensure it would be situated in an appropriate location to access motorways and other major road infrastructure corridors for construction purposes. As demonstrated within the **Location Plans [EN0110020/APP/2.1]**, the Proposed Development is well connected to the local motorways, including the M18 and M1 but also the wider major road infrastructure and Local Road Network. This enables the chosen site to be accessed from all necessary road networks for construction, operation (and maintenance) and decommissioning phases.

	k. Support the provision of essential public services and infrastructure (Policies SS2, ID1-4 and ID10); l. Play a positive role in adapting to and mitigating the effects of climate change, including through the use of sustainable drainage systems, to contribute to the health and wellbeing of communities and the environment through the location, design and operation of development (Policies SDC10-11); m. Take account of any coal-mining related land stability and / or other public safety risks, and where necessary, incorporate suitable mitigation measures to address the risk (Policies SDC14-15).	As set out within section 4.7 of the **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]**, the overall management and implementation of the final construction traffic management plan will be the responsibility of the Applicant. The Applicant will appoint a Traffic Safety Control Officer to develop, implement and management the Construction Transport Management Plan with one of the controls being to demonstrate any need for measures and areas of the proposed road structure to be improved. Work No. 5, as set out in the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]** and summarised in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]** is regarding the highway works associated with the Proposed Development. Highways Works refer to the creation of access points, visibility splays, and any localised upgrades to roads required to accommodate the delivery of Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs) and other traffic associated with the Proposed Development. Regarding the interaction between the Proposed Development and the local Public Rights of Way (PRoW), the **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** outlines the measures to limit disruption and ensure that the PRoW network can continue to be used throughout the construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development, while minimising the impact on PRoW users. The Proposed Development includes opportunities for advancement, including the proposed approximately 14.58km of permissive path within the Order Limits, as set out within the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]**. The **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** is secured via a requirement of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**.
Policy SS9: Development in the Countryside	1. Development proposals in countryside locations outside the Settlement Development Limits will be approved where it can be demonstrated to fall within one or more of the following categories: a. It involves a replacement building for the same use and is not significantly larger than the building it replaces; b. It involves the re-use of buildings and accords with policy SDC1; c. It is necessary for the efficient or viable operation of agriculture, horticulture, forestry and other appropriate land based businesses, including the diversification of activities on an existing farm unit; d. It involves small scale employment uses related to local farming, forestry, recreation, or tourism; e. It involves new visitor accommodation, or extensions to existing visitor accommodation in accordance with Policies WC5 & WC6; f. It involves the change of use, re-use, limited infilling or redevelopment of vacant, derelict or previously developed land which would not have a greater impact on the character of the countryside than the existing development; g. It involves the use for a Traveller Site in accordance with Policy LC9;	The **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** outlines how the Proposed Development achieves the three objectives of sustainable development outlined in Paragraph 8 of the NPPF. The **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** and the **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** set out the critical need for large scale ground mounted solar deployment, as established under national planning policy, specifically NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-3. The Proposed Development would contribute substantially to the need for low carbon energy, in order for the government to meet its objectives and commitments. By generating low carbon energy at a low marginal cost, large-scale solar power reduced the energy generated by more expensive and more carbon intensive forms of generation. The Proposed Development will help to decarbonise the electricity system and lower the market price of electricity. The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** demonstrates how the design of the Proposed Development has been developed in accordance with a clear design framework, based on the criteria for good design set out in the NPSs. This has included the adoption of **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]** to guide decision making and embed good design outcomes to the Proposed Development. Throughout the design process, the Applicant maintained an interdisciplinary approach to design and considered both the opportunities and constraints of the Proposed Development. This included analysis of the existing physical, environmental, social and cultural context of the Site by a broad range of technical disciplines (including landscape and visual, noise, ecology and heritage) as set out and assessed by the **Aspect Chapters of the ES [EN0110020/APP/6.6 – 6.16]**. This approach has enabled the Applicant to understand the complexities of the Site and identify where multiple opportunities and constraints have the potential to stack up with one another to provide

	h. It involves the provision, expansion, or improvement of social infrastructure and accords with Policy ID4, or relates to a development which has a demonstrable community and/or social benefit; or i. It is in accordance with the policies of an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. 2. In all cases, where development is considered acceptable, it will be required to respect the form, scale and character of the landscape, through careful siting, scale, design and use of materials. 3. Where development falls within the Green Belt the provisions of Policy SS10: North East Derbyshire Green Belt apply.	a good design response and allow for co-existence and co-location with other terrestrial uses.
Policy SS10: North East Derbyshire Green Belt	1. Within the North East Derbyshire Green Belt as shown on the Policies Map, inappropriate development will not be approved except in very special circumstances. 2. The construction of new buildings will be regarded as inappropriate development and will not be permitted. Exceptions to this, where they accord with other policies in the Plan are: a. Buildings for the purposes of agriculture or forestry; or b. Provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, and for cemeteries, which preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it; or c. Extension or alteration to a building that does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building; or d. Replacement of a building provided the new building is in the same use and is not materially larger than the one it replaces; or e. Limited affordable housing for local community needs in accordance with Policy LC3; or f. Limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it than the existing development. 3. Other forms of development which may be appropriate in the Green Belt, provided it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with its purposes include: a. Mineral extraction, b. Engineering operations, c. Local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location, d. The re-use or conversion of buildings which are of permanent and substantial construction, and	1.1.1 As confirmed within **Appendix 2: Green Belt Assessment** of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]**, the Proposed Development is located on grey belt land and meets the tests for being not inappropriate within the grey 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 Biodiversity Net Gain and creation of new permissive paths locally, would outweigh any harm identified to the Green Belt.

	e. Development brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order.	
Policy SDC1: Re-use and Conversion of Buildings in the Green Belt and Countryside	Proposals for the re-use and conversion of buildings in the Green Belt and Countryside will be permitted provided that: a. they are of permanent and substantial construction; b. they are structurally sound, and capable of re-use without major alterations, adaptations or re-construction; c. their form, bulk and design is, or can be made to be, in keeping with their surroundings; d. conversion or adaptation will not be detrimental to the character of the building itself or its setting; e. they preserve the openness and character of the Green Belt and Countryside; f. the new use would not result in replacement farm buildings or inappropriate outside storage of any materials, machinery and / or vehicles that would cause harm to the Green Belt and Countryside; and g. provision is made for nesting boxes and roosts for protected species such as barn owls and bats, where appropriate.	
Policy SDC2: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows	1. Proposals for development should provide for the protection and integration of existing trees, woodland and hedgerows for their wildlife, landscape, and/or amenity value. 2. Development that would result in the unacceptable loss of, or damage to, or threaten the continued well-being of protected trees, hedgerows, orchards, veteran trees or woodland (including those not protected but considered worthy of protection), will not be permitted. 3. Where trees, woodland or hedgerows will be lost to development and this is considered to be acceptable, suitable replacement planting on-site where it is practicable to do so, or off-site if not, will be required. 4. New planting which uses species and varieties native to the area, of local provenance wherever possible, and that maximise the benefits to the local landscape, wildlife and air quality will be preferred.	Trees and hedgerows will be retained and avoided wherever possible within the Site. Further arboricultural surveys will be undertaken prior to construction and mitigation measures within the CEMP (secured through a requirement in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**) will be provided to ensure trees and woodland are protected during construction, operation and decommissioning in compliance with BS5837:2012.
Policy SDC4: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	The Council will protect and enhance the District's natural environment and seek to increase the quantity and quality of biodiversity and geodiversity by: a. Protecting designated national and local sites of nature conservation importance and geodiversity value including SSSI's, LNR's, LWS's, and RIGS's as shown on the Policies Map. Development proposals affecting designated sites will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that significant harm can be avoided, mitigated, or as a last resort, compensated for by the development. Any proposed development that would be likely to adversely affect designated SSSI's will not be permitted.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** describes the existing levels and assesses the anticipated ecology and biodiversity effects of the Proposed Development's construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning. The chapter provides an assessment of the potential effects on internationally, nationally, and locally designated sites of ecological or geological importance, on protected species, and on habitats and other species identified as being of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity, including irreplaceable habitats. The chapter concludes that there are no significant residual effects on ecology and biodiversity identified during the construction and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. While some low maintenance

	b. Promoting the qualitative enhancement of all sites of biodiversity and geodiversity value (including designated SSSI's, LNR's, LWS's and RIGS's, and other sites with protected and priority species) by supporting measures that improve wildlife habitat connectivity and create new wildlife habitats. Such measures could include maintaining trees, native vegetation and improving green infrastructure for the benefit of wildlife. c. Not permitting development which would adversely affect the integrity of designated sites of international importance for nature conservation (SPA's and SAC's) located outside of the Plan area; except for imperative reasons of overriding public interest, and only where adequate compensatory measures are provided.	adverse residual effects have been identified, mitigation for these is set out in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** which is secured by a requirement of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The chapter also concludes that there is no harm to protected species and relevant habitats during the construction, operation and maintenance, or decommissioning of the Proposed Development. As a result of embedded and additional mitigation and enhancement measures, there are direct residual significant (in EIA terms) beneficial effects as a result of the Proposed Development, which are anticipated in relation to the following ecological features: • Brampton Common Local Wildlife Site • Priority Habitats – native hedgerow and wet woodland • Priority Species – Bat and Reptile • Breeding Bird Assemblage • Barn Owl • Hobby Owl The expected residual beneficial effects outlined in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** rely on controls established in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9], oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]** and the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**. Section 6.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [EN0110020/APP/6.6]** outlines the mitigation measures relevant to biodiversity that are embedded in the Proposed Development.
Policy SDC10: Decentralised, Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation	1. Proposals for the generation of renewable energy including biomass power generation, combined heat and power, and other micro generation systems will be permitted where either individually or cumulatively with other renewable energy development, there would be no significant adverse effects on: a. The visual amenity and character of the area including landscape and visual impacts; b. The amenity of local residents, in terms of noise, dust, odour, reflected light, traffic or visual intrusion; c. The ecology of the area, in particular in relation to protected species and to any sites of biodiversity value, ancient woodland, and veteran trees; d. The historic environment, including the effect on the significance of heritage assets and their setting and important views associated with valued landscapes and townscapes; and e. Airport radar and telecommunications systems.	The Proposed Development would make a significant contribution to the achievement of both the national renewable energy targets and to the UK's contribution to global efforts to reduce the effects of climate change. The **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** and the **Statement of Need [EN0110020/APP/5.8]** set out that the Proposed Development will deliver a significant amount of low-carbon, low-cost and UK-located solar electricity generation capacity connecting to the National Electricity Transmission System, anticipated to be from 2029. In addition to meeting the urgent national need for secure and affordable low-carbon energy infrastructure and its associated environmental and societal benefits, the Proposed Development delivers wider benefits to the environment and the local community. Given the Proposed Development comprises EIA development as defined by the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, an EIA has been undertaken to assess the environmental impacts of the Proposed Development, with the findings presented in the **ES [EN0110020/APP/6.1 - 6.21].** The mitigation hierarchy has been appropriately applied to avoid, reduce and mitigate wherever practicable any likely significant adverse effects of the Proposed Development. In the case of the Proposed Development, a small number of localised

	2. In determining planning applications for renewable energy generation, significant weight will be given to the achievement of wider environmental and economic benefits. 3. Proposals should include details of associated developments including access roads and ancillary buildings; and transmission lines which should be located below ground wherever possible in order to reduce the impact on the open countryside. Planning applications will also need to include a satisfactory restoration scheme which will be implemented following decommissioning. 4. Major new developments will be expected to connect to or be designed to connect in the future to district or community heating networks where appropriate. Where no district heating scheme exists or is proposed in the proximity of major development the potential for developing a new scheme on site should be explored and pursued where feasible. 5. Developments along water courses will be expected to investigate the feasibility of using small scale hydro power taking into account flood risk.	and short term residual significant adverse effects remain and are limited to effects on landscape and visual. Given the relative large-scale nature of the Proposed Development and the substantial benefits it will provide, it is considered that these residual effects are outweighed.
Policy SDC11: Flood Risk and Drainage	1. All development proposals will be required to consider the effect of the proposed development on flood risk, both on-site and off-site, commensurate with the scale and impact of the development. This should be demonstrated through a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), where appropriate. Development will not be permitted unless: a. If within the functional floodplain (Flood Zone 3b), it is water compatible or essential infrastructure; b. In Flood Zones 2 and 3a, it passes the Sequential Test, and if necessary the Exceptions Test, as required by national policy; c. It can be demonstrated through an FRA46 that the development, including access, will be safe, without increasing flood risk elsewhere and where possible will reduce flood risk overall; d. There is no net increase in surface water runoff for the lifetime of the development on all new development. Surface water runoff should be managed at source wherever possible, avoiding disposal to combined sewers; e. Part of the development site is set aside for surface water management, and uses measures to contribute to flood risk management in the wider area; and f. The development incorporates a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) to manage surface water drainage, in accordance with national SuDS standards, unless it is proven that SuDS are not appropriate in a specific location. Where SuDS are provided, arrangements must be put in place for their whole life management and maintenance. 2. Development will only be permitted where adequate foul water treatment and drainage infrastructure currently exists, or can be made available to serve the development unless the developer can demonstrate acceptable alternative private solutions.	The Proposed Development is located within Flood Zones 1, 2, and 3b. There are solar panels located within flood zones 3b but it is considered essential infrastructure. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]**, and Chapter 8 of the **Planning Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.4]** advises how the Sequential Test has been met. However, it should be noted that where there are areas of flood zones 2 and 3, no sensitive electrical infrastructure has been placed within these areas, only solar panels and mitigation. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Water Resources and Flood Risk [EN0110020/APP/6.10]** assess the impacts of the Proposed Development on water quality, water bodies or protected areas, and concludes that with the embedded mitigation measures in place, there are no significant (in EIA terms) residual adverse water effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases on water quality, water bodies or protected areas. The non-significant residual effects outlined in the assessment rely on controls established within the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**, **oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**, **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**. These outline management plans and the **OSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** set out the water related measures to manage any potential water effects that may arise from the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. The DCO Application is supported by **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** which addresses each requirement of NPS EN-1 Paragraph 5.8.13. As set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: FRA [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **OSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** surface water runoff from the Solar PV will be managed through Rural SuDS and Natural Flood Management techniques such as

	3. The Council will seek opportunities to remove problems from the drainage network and increase the capacity of the floodplain, wherever this can be achieved safely, in connection with new development. 4. Where improvement works are required to ensure that the drainage infrastructure can cope with the capacity required to support proposed new development, developer contributions may be required in accordance with Policy ID1 (Infrastructure Delivery and Developer Contributions).	grassland/wildflower areas, which will act to bind soils, slow surface water, and increase water quality compared to the baseline scenario. The **OSWDS [EN0110020/APP/5.17]** sets out how surface water runoff from the Site will be managed in line with the national, regional and local requirements regarding flood risk and drainage. As the Proposed Development does not have a detailed layout, a detailed drainage strategy cannot be provided at this stage, with the principles and design criteria presented in this document. These criteria will be applied during the detailed design phase, and the detailed SuDS will be included in the Surface Water Drainage Strategy which will be secured through a requirement of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** includes the adoption of project level design principles to guide decision making and embed good design outcomes into the Proposed Development. Table 3, Section 4.3, sets out that whilst pockets of potential flood areas are present, the majority of land would not be impacted.
Policy SDC13: Environmental Quality	1. All development proposals will be assessed in relation to their impact on air, light, noise, ground and water pollution. Planning permission will be refused for any proposal where pollution would pose an unacceptable risk to public health, quality of life or the environment. 2. Development proposals will be expected to contribute positively to the water environment and its ecology, and will only be permitted where they do not adversely affect surface or ground water quality in line with the requirements of the Water Framework Directive. 3. Planning applications for development with the potential to pose a risk of pollution should be accompanied by an assessment of the likely impact of the development on environmental quality. Assessments of the risk of air, light, noise, ground or water pollution should relate to all stages of development.	The Applicant has prepared a **Statutory Nuisance Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.2]** as is required under APFP Regulation 5(2)(f) and Paragraph 4.15.5 of NPS EN-1. The **Statutory Nuisance Statement [EN0110020/APP/5.2]** draws upon the assessment conclusions from **ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN0110020/APP/6.14]** to set out that the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development would not cause a statutory nuisance. No claim against statutory nuisance in respect of noise and vibration, air quality, ground and water pollution is therefore envisaged in respect of a statutory nuisance under Section 79(1)(a), 79(1)(d), 79(1)(e), 79(1)(fb), 79(1)(g) or (ga) of the EPA 1990. The defence to proceedings in respect of statutory nuisance is set out in Article 10(2) of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. As such, the Applicant considers that sufficient assessment and mitigation measures are proposed to be secured to enable the Secretary of State to conclude that no statutory nuisances would arise from the Proposed Development's construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases.
Policy ID3: Sustainable Travel	1. The Council will seek to maximise walking, cycling, and the use of public transport through the location and design of new development, with the aim of reducing congestion, and improving air quality and health. 2. Proposals for major development will be required to promote sustainable travel through necessary interventions as identified through appropriate transport statements or assessments including the following: a. Site specific and area wide travel demand measures; b. Improvements to existing pedestrian, cycle and public transport services and facilities, and provision of new walking and cycling routes. New routes should provide direct links to new or existing footpaths, cycling networks, and local facilities; and c. Optimisation of the existing highway network to prioritise walking, cycling, public transport and other forms of sustainable travel.	**ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** assesses the anticipated transport and access effects of the Proposed Development's construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning, in accordance with this policy. Section 13.3 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** provides a summary of the Applicant's engagement regarding transport and access. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13]** concludes that with the mitigation measures in place, there are no residual transport and access-related effects expected across the Proposed Development's construction, operational and maintenance and maintenance and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. By securing the mechanisms for the embedded mitigation measures as outlined in Section 13.6 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport**

	3. Highway capacity enhancements should deal with residual car demand where the initiatives required in criteria (a) to (c) above are insufficient to avoid significant additional car journeys. 4. In all cases, planning permission will only be refused on transport grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or where the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.	**[EN0110020/APP/6.13]**, which are secured in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9], oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12], oOEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.10],** and **OPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** which are all secured via the requirements of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**, it is concluded that there are no residual effects identified for this Scheme. The **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** outlines the measures to limit disruption and ensure that the PRoW network can continue to be used throughout the construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development, while minimising the impact on PRoW users. The Proposed Development includes opportunities for advancement, including the proposed approximately 14.58km of permissive path within the Order Limits. The **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** is secured via a requirement of the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** sets out project specific design principles which have influenced the design of the Proposed Development. The project design principles of relevance to sustainable transport include the following – • Find out what is important to people about the local area and seek to incorporate feedback • Consider how people engage with their local environment and retain these patterns • Enhance recreational access across the landscape These project design principles set out how the Proposed Development will consider the experience of the people using the Public Rights of Way during the operational phase of the Proposed Development. Finally, the **oCTMP [EN0110020/APP/5.12]** at section 4.6 notes that a Worker Travel Plan will be developed to manage the arrival and departure profile of workers on Site and to encourage sustainable modes of transport, such as car-sharing. The Worker Travel Plan will be administered by the CTMP Co-ordinator and would be a contractual requirement as part of the Principal Contractor's contract with the Applicant.
Policy ID7: Green Infrastructure	1. Development proposals should conserve and where appropriate improve and extend the Green Infrastructure Network running through and beyond North East Derbyshire. 2. Development proposals that would result in the loss or isolation of existing green infrastructure will not be permitted unless: a. The affected site or feature does not have a significant recreational, ecological, landscape or townscape value; or b. The affected site can be demonstrated to be surplus to local requirements, or	The Proposed Development would provide benefits to the local community via an enhanced green infrastructure network including a better-connected footpath and cycle network and access to open space and recreational spaces. The Proposed Development incorporates a series of permissive paths proposed across the Order Limits, as secured in the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**, as set out in the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]**. Permissive paths will be open for the operational and maintenance phase of the Proposed Development and be open to equestrians, cyclists and pedestrians. The extent and location of the paths is as follows:

	c. A compensatory amount of green infrastructure of an equivalent or better quality can be provided in the local area 3. To ensure the quality of new or improved Green Infrastructure, development proposals shall, where appropriate: a. Incorporate Green Infrastructure as an integral part of designs at an early stage in the planning process in line with Policy SDC12; b. Enhance connectivity between green spaces and improve public access to green infrastructure in line with Policy SDC12; c. Contribute to the character and creation of high quality and locally distinctive places and having regard to the landscape, townscape, ecological character of the locality and the setting of heritage assets; d. Protect trees, woodland and hedgerows in line with Policy SDC2; e. Incorporate native species and habitats in line with Policy SDC4; and f. Capitalise on any opportunities provided by rivers, streams, ditches, drains and canals in order to improve their ecological status.	• Approximately 2.92 km of permissive paths proposed across Whitestone 1 to provide additional equestrian routes that link with the existing bridleways. • Approximately 10.8 km of permissive paths are proposed across Whitestone 2. To the north, two permissive paths provide access around King's Pond Plantation. To the west, the proposed permissive path follows Ulley Brook to connect with the existing footpath to the north and Treeton Lane to the south. To the south of Upper Whiston, a permissive path links Suilthwaite Common Lanlee and Field Lane. To the east of Ulley, a permissive path forms a circular route that begins at Carr Lane, follows the field boundaries north, along Penny Hill Lane, then turns south to rejoin Carr Lane. Permissive paths link with the existing PRoW to create a circular route across Brampton Common. To the east, the permissive path offers an alternative route away from the A57, connecting the A57 sidewalk to Anston Brook and the existing footpath near North Anston. • Approximately 0.86 km long permissive path across Whitestone 3, begins in Woodal, crosses Stone Hill and joins the existing footpath at Harthill Reservoir. If consent is given, the design outcomes will be secured and implemented post-consent, in accordance with the various management plans and **Outline Design Parameters [EN0110020/APP/7.3]** secured by requirements to the **Draft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The approach also ensures the conclusions of the Environmental Statement are upheld, and the appropriate flexibility is provided.
Policy ID8: Greenways and Public Rights of Way	1. The Council will seek to protect all existing and proposed Greenways throughout the district as identified on the Policies Map. 2. The Council will liaise with Derbyshire County Council to further develop the existing network through promoting proposed Greenways. 3. Development proposals will be expected to maintain or improve the permeability of the built environment and access to the countryside for walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Proposals that would result in the loss of, or deterioration in the quality of existing Public Rights of Way (PROWs) will not be permitted unless equivalent alternative provision is made. Where diversions are required, new routes should be direct, convenient and attractive, and should not have an unacceptable adverse impact on environmental or heritage assets.	The **OPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** outlines the measures to limit disruption and ensure that the PRoW network can continue to be used throughout the construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development, while minimising the impact on PRoW users. The Proposed Development includes opportunities for advancement, including the proposed approximately 14.58km of permissive path within the Order Limits, as set out within the **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]**. The **OPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** is secured via a requirement of the **dDraft DCO [EN0110020/APP/3.1]**. The **Design Approach Document [EN0110020/APP/5.7]** sets out project specific design principles which have influenced the design of the Proposed Development. The project design principles of relevance to sustainable transport include the following – • Find out what is important to people about the local area and seek to incorporate feedback • Consider how people engage with their local environment and retain these patterns • Enhance recreational access across the landscape These project design principles set out how the Proposed Development will consider the experience of the people using the Public Rights of Way during the operational phase of the Proposed Development. The **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** confirms that during the construction phase of the Proposed Development, there will

		be approximately 30 PRoWs that are to be temporarily diverted for approximately 2-3 weeks. Section 4 of the **oPRoWMP [EN0110020/APP/5.14]** confirms that the existing PRoWs and proposed Permissive Paths, which pass through or run adjacent to the Order Limits are expected to be unaffected during the operation phase. Minimum widths have been incorporated into the design to enable a suitable distance between any PRoWs and proposed infrastructure. In all cases, the PRoW will see perimeter fencing being installed a minimum distance from the centreline of the PRoW of 10m to either side (creating a 20m corridor) if Solar PV Arrays lie on both sides of the PRoW, and 15m if Solar PV Arrays are to one side only. This will help avoid the perception of being channelled into narrow passages between Solar PV Arrays.

WHITESTONE
solar farm

Contact

Whitestone Net Zero Ltd

info@whitestonesolarfarm.co.uk

0800 688 9936