

Supplementary note to my Deadline 7 submission (reference S073B59AF). My attention has been drawn to Table 17.4 of Chapter 17 of the Environmental Statement, which shows that the Applicant's own assessment found Moderate-Major Adverse (Significant) cumulative effects from the concurrent construction of East Park Energy and High Wood Solar Farm, before dismissing that finding on timeline assumptions that are now being realised. This note addresses both the landscape finding in Table 17.4 and the cumulative B645 traffic assessment in paragraph 17.4.62, both of which rest on the same construction timeline assumptions that the observation of High Wood construction signs on 22 August 2026 confirms are the current position, not a future contingency.

EAST PARK ENERGY (EN010141)

Supplementary Note to Deadline 7 Submission (Reference S073B59AF)

Table 17.4 of Chapter 17: Confirmation That the Applicant's Own Assessment Supports a Finding of Significant Cumulative Effects

Submitted by: M T Benford

Interested Party Reference:

Date: 1 September 2026

1. Purpose of this Note

1.1 Following the filing of my Deadline 7 submission (reference S073B59AF) on 26 August 2026, my attention was drawn to Table 17.4 of Chapter 17 of the Environmental Statement (document reference EN010141-000189), which sets out the Applicant's inter-project cumulative effects assessment for landscape and visual impact during the construction phase. I am filing this short supplementary note because Table 17.4, read carefully, does not undermine the argument in my Deadline 7 submission — it confirms and strengthens it.

2. What Table 17.4 Actually Shows

2.1 Table 17.4 assesses the cumulative construction phase landscape effects on the Southern Wolds LCA arising from East Park Energy and High Wood Solar Farm together. The Applicant's own assessment in that table identifies a cumulative effect of Moderate-Major Adverse (Significant) — the Applicant's own words, in the Applicant's own document. This is not a disputed conclusion; it is what the Applicant found when it assessed the two schemes together.

2.2 The Applicant then sought to dismiss any additional cumulative significance on the basis of two timeline assumptions. First, that 'the construction of the Scheme would not occur until 2027 at the earliest.' Second, that 'High Wood Farm must have commenced by 2027 at the latest.' On the basis of these assumptions, the Applicant concluded that whilst there could be some cross-over in construction, any additional cumulative visual effects over and above those identified for East Park in isolation would not be significant.

2.3 Both of these timeline assumptions are now visibly in play. Construction signs for High Wood Solar Farm were directly observed on 22 August 2026 — consistent with the Applicant's own assessment that High Wood must have commenced by 2027 at the latest, and suggesting that commencement is imminent or already underway. The second assumption — that East Park's own construction will not occur until 2027 at the earliest — means that the two construction phases are now converging on exactly the overlap scenario that Table 17.4 identified as producing Moderate-Major Adverse (Significant) cumulative effects.

3. The Significance of This for the Examination

3.1 The Applicant's only basis for dismissing the Moderate-Major Adverse (Significant) finding in Table 17.4 was the argument that 'there would be no significant additional cumulative visual effects over and above those identified for the Scheme in isolation' — relying on the large-scale nature of the Southern Wolds LCA and woodland blocks between the two developments. That argument has already been directly challenged by the host authorities' landscape expert, Rebecca Condillac of AECOM, who told ISH3 on 9 June 2026 that the Applicant's LVIA under-represents significant effects and that screening of views has generally been assessed as an improvement to magnitude rather than as a potentially

adverse change. The Applicant's dismissal of the Table 17.4 finding rests on the same methodology that AECOM has challenged.

3.2 The Examining Authority is asked to note that the Applicant's own cumulative assessment — Table 17.4 of Chapter 17 — identifies the concurrent construction of East Park Energy and High Wood Solar Farm as producing Moderate-Major Adverse (Significant) cumulative effects on the Southern Wolds LCA. The construction timeline assumptions on which the Applicant sought to qualify that finding are now being realised. The Examining Authority is asked to require the Applicant to confirm whether it maintains its dismissal of additional cumulative significance in light of: the actual construction timeline now unfolding for High Wood; AECOM's professional challenge to the underlying LVIA methodology; and the observation of construction signs at High Wood on 22 August 2026.

3.3 In short: the Applicant found Moderate-Major Adverse (Significant). The only question is whether its reasons for dismissing that finding hold up. I submit that they do not, for the reasons set out in my Deadline 7 submission and confirmed by Table 17.4 itself.

4. The Same Timeline Logic Applies to the B645 Traffic Assessment

4.1 The same timeline assumptions that underpin the Applicant's dismissal of the Table 17.4 landscape finding also underpin the Chapter 17 cumulative traffic assessment for the B645. Paragraph 17.4.59 assumed that High Wood construction 'will need to commence by December 2027 at the latest,' and paragraph 17.4.62 assessed the cumulative B645 impact of High Wood and East Park construction on that basis, concluding it was 'limited to link 1 of the study area' with a maximum of approximately 40 two-way movements per day during peak High Wood construction. If High Wood is at or approaching construction in August 2026 — consistent with the Applicant's own assessment that it must commence by 2027 at the latest — the concurrent B645 traffic from both schemes will arrive earlier, and overlap more substantially with East Park's own construction traffic, than the Chapter 17 traffic assessment modelled.

4.2 There is a further point that makes the traffic dimension sharper than the landscape one. Whereas Table 17.4 at least identified a Moderate-Major Adverse (Significant) finding before seeking to dismiss it, the Chapter 17 traffic assessment characterised the cumulative B645 impact as merely 'limited to link 1' — an already understated conclusion relative to the landscape finding, drawn from the same superseded timeline assumptions. The B645 between the A1 and the B660 junction is, as I set out in my Deadline 7 submission, the only direct route for an entire cluster of villages. Every additional vehicle — whether from High Wood or East Park — using that corridor during overlapping construction phases falls on a road with no realistic alternative for the communities that depend on it daily.

4.3 The Examining Authority is asked to note that the timeline assumptions on which both the Table 17.4 landscape dismissal and the Chapter 17 B645 traffic conclusion were based are now being realised simultaneously. The construction signs observed at High Wood on 22 August 2026 confirm that both assessment conclusions — already challenged in my Deadline 7 submission — were drawn from assumptions that can no longer be treated as future contingencies. They are the current position.