

Dean Moor Solar Farm

Applicant Written Summary of Oral Submissions (OFH)

on behalf of FVS Dean Moor Limited

25 November 2025 Prepared by: Stantec UK Ltd PINS Ref: EN010155

Document Ref: D5.9

Deadline 5 Revision: 1





DEAN MOOR SOLAR FARM APPLICANT WRITTEN SUMMARIES OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS MADE AT OFH PLANNING INSPECTORATE REFERENCE EN010155 PREPARED ON BEHALF OF FVS DEAN MOOR LIMITED

Project Ref:	EN010155/ Applicant Written Summaries of Oral Submissions made at OFH
Status	Final
Issue/ Rev:	1
Date:	25 November 2025
Deadline:	5
Document Reference:	D5.9



Contents

1	Introduction	
	1.1	Overview1
	1.2	Overview and Structure of Response1
2	Open F	loor Hearing (OFH)



1 Introduction

1.1 Overview

- 1.1.1 This Applicant Written Summary of Oral Submissions made at Open Floor Hearing (OFH) document (AWSOS-OFH) and has been produced for FVS Dean Moor Limited (the Applicant) to support the DCO application for the Dean Moor Solar Farm ('the Proposed Development') which is located between the villages of Gilgarran and Branthwaite in West Cumbria (the 'Site') and situated within the administrative area of Cumberland Council ('the Council').
- 1.1.2 Specifically, this document has been produced in response to the OFH held by the Examining Authority (ExA) on 13 November 2025.

1.2 Overview and Structure of Response

1.2.1 Table 2.1 lists the agenda items from OFH followed by the Applicant's written summary to oral submissions at the OFH.



2 Open Floor Hearing (OFH)

Table 2.1: Applicant written summaries of oral submissions made at OFH

No. Applicant written summaries of oral submissions made at OFH

1(a) **Hearing Item:** N/A - Interested Party (IP) Mr. Malcom Fulton (Mr. Fulton) representing both himself and Ms. Susan Carling (Ms. Carling) as residents of Dean Cross Cottage and the owners of a mixed commercial-residential plot adjoining the southeastern most boundary of Area C.

Applicant Written Summary:

Following oral submissions by Mr. Fulton regarding the proximity of the Proposed Development to his property and issues relating to noise, glint and glare and visual impact, the ExA asked for any Applicant feedback that could be provided in the OFH after noting that Applicant responses were expected to be primarily in writing.

Mr. Lee Tearle (Mr. Tearle) on behalf of the Applicant confirmed that that the Applicant would respond in writing to the points raised by Mr Fulton. On the topic of noise, Mr Tearle reiterated to the ExA that the Applicant had carried out a Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) [REP4-017] as part of its application and that there are controls regarding operational noise provided through DCO Requirements including Requirement 12 – Operational Noise.

Mr Tearle then pointed to the Cumberland Council's Response to the ExA's Second Written Questions [REP4-030] for question Q2.3.4 which covers topics which the Council considered related to residential amenity, including noise impacts. It was noted that in this response the Council affirmed the Applicant's approach to assessment and mitigation for residential amenity impacts.

Regarding the points raised by Mr Fulton, Mr. Tearle referred the ExA to the Applicant Response to the ExA's First Written Questions (AREQ-1) [REP2-010], in particular, the Applicant's response to Q6.0.3 (starting on page 52) which considers visual impacts on Dean Cross Cottage. Mr Tearle advised that the review undertaken for that question confirms that Mr Fulton's property includes both a dwelling and commercial buildings, with commercial buildings and landscaping between the dwelling and the Proposed Development Site.

Mr Tearle also noted that the response included details of the nearest distance of the generating station infrastructure to the dwelling while acknowledging a fuller response on this topic would be made in association with an ISH Action Point (AP).



No. | Applicant written summaries of oral submissions made at OFH

Mr. Tearle concluded by stating that following direct engagement as part of the statutory consultation, the Applicant had created an extensive exclusion of area to the north of the property, removing Work No. 1 infrastructure to a boundary that follows the topographic contour within the Site. This was requested by the IP as the location where they wanted a setback and the Applicant agreed to accommodate this in a meeting at their property during the statutory consultation.

Mr. Tearle confirmed to the ExA that the Applicant's oral submissions would be expanded on in written submissions to be provided for D5.

Post Hearing Notes:

- The Applicant notes that the ExA did not request a formal AP for a D5 written submission from the Applicant. However, that it would do so was a commitment made by the Applicant's oral submissions, and the Applicant anticipates that Mr. Fulton will expect a response beyond what the Applicant was able to provide at the OFH. Therefore, the Applicant is treating this like as an AP.
- Some of Mr. Fulton's oral submissions touched on matters of distance and visual impact which were raised in oral submissions by Ms.
 Carling on Agenda Item 6(d) of the Issue Specific Hearing (ISH). This led to AP being assigned to the Applicant based on those comments. A response to these matters is provided at AP 30 and AP 31 in the Applicant Response to ISH Action Points (ARAP-ISH) [D5.10];
- The matters of noise and glint and glare raised by Mr. Fulton in the OFH are provided in AP1 in the Applicant Response to OFH Action Points (ARAP-OFH) [D5.12].
- 1(b) **Hearing Item:** N/A Interested Party (IP) Mr. James Christopher Howell (Mr. Howell) representing himself as a member of the local community.

Applicant Written Summary:

Mr. Tearle sought clarification from the ExA that, while Mr. Howell has a range of interests as a local resident, at the OFH he was not acting as official spokesperson for these interests but only speaking for himself as an Interested Party. This was subsequently confirmed as an accurate understanding.

Mr. Tearle agreed with the ExA that, due to the range and detail of the various matters raised by Mr. Howell it was appropriate for the Applicant to respond in writing to the written submission that Mr Howell would submit at Deadline 5.



No. Applicant written summaries of oral submissions made at OFH

The ExA made a recommendation to Mr. Howell that he provide a further written submission of his OFH oral submissions at D5. Following this Mr. Tearle advised that, while the Applicant would endeavour to provide a written response to some of his oral submissions for D5, as Mr Howell would be making a detailed written representation at D5, a fuller response could be provided by the Applicant at D6.

Post Hearing Notes:

- The Applicant notes that the ExA did not request a formal AP for a D5 written submission from the Applicant. However, that it would do so was a commitment made by the Applicant's oral submissions, and the Applicant anticipates that Mr. Howell will expect a response beyond what the Applicant was able to provide at the OFH. Therefore, the Applicant is treating this like an AP.
- In advance of a written representation Mr. Howell may make for D5 the Applicant is providing a response to some matters raised by Mr. Howell in AP2 of the Applicant Response to OFH Action Points (ARAP-OFH) [**D5.12**].