



National Infrastructure
Planning
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Customer
Services: 0303 444 5000
e-mail: peartreehillsolarfarm@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

The applicant

Your Ref:

Our Ref: EN010157

Date: 12 August 2025

To the applicant,

The Planning Act 2008 – section 89 and The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 – rule 9

Application by RWE Renewables UK Solar and Storage Limited for an order granting development consent for Peartree Hill Solar Farm (EN010157)

Notice by the applicant of an intention to submit a request for changes to the application

Thank you for your letter dated 6 August 2025 [[AS-015](#)] which gives notice of the intention of RWE Renewables UK Solar and Storage Limited (the applicant) to submit a request to make changes to the Peartree Hill Solar Farm (proposed development) application. This has been published on the [project webpage](#) of the Find a National Infrastructure Project website. The applicant is seeking advice from the ExA on the procedural implications of the proposed changes.

The change notification is the applicant's second notification, with the first, and subsequent change request having been dealt with by the ExA under [[PD-007](#)] (which involved two changes/ corrections to the application). The applicant's letter sets out seven further proposed changes to the application, detailed as follows:

- a) **Change 3** – a minor alteration to the Order limits to enable the creation of a revised access point on the western side of the A165 to aid the laying of the B-B cable route between the solar array areas in Land Area B and for maintenance of that cable during operation.
- b) **Change 4** – a minor alteration to the Order limits to improve access for construction of the grid connection cable route on Hull Road/ Williams Way A1174 and for maintenance during operation. A change to the Order limits is required to ensure that this access would provide adequate visibility and manoeuvring space for vehicles entering and exiting the site.

- c) **Change 5** – a minor alteration to the Order limits to improve access for construction of the grid connection cable route on Long Lane and for maintenance during operation. A change to the Order limits is required to ensure that this access would provide adequate visibility and manoeuvring space for vehicles entering and exiting the site.
- d) **Change 6** – a minor alteration to the Order limits to improve access for construction of the grid connection cable route on the approach to National Grid Creyke Beck substation and to facilitate future access to the grid connection cable route during operation for maintenance. A change to the Order limits is required to provide additional space for manoeuvring of vehicles.
- e) **Change 7** – the construction of an additional permanent bridge connecting fields C5/ C8. This is required as the existing track and bridge used to cross Monk Dike are not suitable for construction access. No change to the Order limits is required in connection with this change.
- f) **Change 8** – a minor alteration to the Order limits to the north of the Beverley South Western Bypass (A1079) to provide greater flexibility in the placement of the grid connection cable.
- g) **Change 9** – alterations to the Order limits to accommodate a new permanent access route directly off the A1035 and the removal of the internal access track off the west of Meaux Lane shown indicatively on sheet 2 of the Environmental Statement (ES) Figure 4.3: Indicative Environmental Masterplan [APP-058]. This change would remove any potential impacts on veteran tree T381 and reduce the level of traffic using Meaux Lane during construction of the proposed development.

Materiality of the proposed changes

In the applicant's view, each of the proposed changes would not be material. This is because the applicant considers no materially new or materially different environmental effects beyond those reported in the ES submitted with the application are anticipated for any environmental factors.

The applicant advises that the effect of all the changes, with the exception of Change 7, is that the applicant would be seeking further powers of compulsory acquisition/ temporary possession over land within, and in some cases outside, the Order limits. The applicant has sought the consent of those persons to include such further powers of compulsory acquisition/ temporary possession within the application for development consent. If consent cannot be obtained from all parties, the applicant sets out that it would comply with the procedural requirements set out in the Infrastructure Planning (Compulsory Acquisition) Regulations 2010 (CA Regulations).

The applicant further advises that, as a minimum, the requirements of the CA Regulations are likely to apply to Change 6, as it has not been possible to identify the owner of proposed Plot 16-11. However, the ExA notes that the applicant also identifies that some additional plots (such as those relating to Change 9) include some persons with an interest in the land who are not included in the Book of Reference [[PDA-016](#)].

The applicant states that it is consulting with persons with an interest in land affected by the proposed changes, as well as prescribed consultees and local authorities.

The ExA has considered the [Planning Inspectorate's advice page 'Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Changes to an application after it has been accepted for examination'](#) and the CA Regulations and makes the following comments.

The Planning Inspectorate's advice page advises that on receipt of a request to make a change to the application, the ExA must initially consider whether the development being proposed is in substance the same as the development which was originally applied for. In addition, the ExA must also consider if the combined impact of a series of incremental changes may collectively result in a materially different project.

In respect of the proposed changes and based upon the applicant's information provided in its letter, the ExA's initial view is that it does not consider that the proposed changes would be likely to result in materially new or materially different effects to those reported in the ES submitted with the application. Nor does the ExA consider there would be any incremental materially new or materially different effects in this regard following on from the applicant's previous change request. In addition, it is the ExA's initial view that the proposed changes would be unlikely to lead to the proposed development being materially different in nature or substance to that which was initially applied for.

Nevertheless, the ExA notes that the proposed changes, on the basis that they seek additional land, are likely to engage the procedures of the CA Regulations. As such, the ExA is minded not to accept the applicant's view that the proposed changes would not be material. However, the ExA would reach a conclusion on the materiality of the proposed changes once the formal change request is made, with the appropriate supporting information. It would also assist the ExA if the applicant could fully engage with East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) as the local highways authority, with regard to the acceptability or otherwise of proposed Change 9 and related construction and maintenance access directly off the A1035, and provide ERYC's views on this.

Consultation

To assist with the matter of materiality, the ExA requires that the applicant consults all those parties with an interest in the additional land, as identified within the applicant's letter, and provides evidence of this and any responses to the consultation as part of the formal change request. The responses to the consultation must be sent to the applicant, and not to the Planning Inspectorate. If the ExA decides to accept the changes (whether or not considered to be material) into the examination, all interested parties will have an opportunity to make representations on the changed application in writing or orally at any hearings as the examination progresses. Nonetheless, if the ExA is not satisfied with the extent of consultation undertaken by the applicant, the ExA may request that further consultation is carried out to safeguard the interests of and/ or to inform those potentially impacted by the changes who are not already involved in the examination.

Impact on examination timetable

The ExA has considered the potential impact of the proposed changes on the examination timetable and has arrived at the conclusion that the timings may be difficult to accommodate considering the current timetable and intended close date of the examination. The ExA therefore requests that the applicant provides suggestions, in the form of an explanation of how the proposed change request could be accommodated within the current examination timetable, should the ExA accept a formal change request. This should include a breakdown

of 'next steps' and a detailed programme, having regard to the statutory requirements/timescales of regulations 5 to 19 of the CA Regulations, should the ExA use the maximum of 28 days to consider whether to accept the change request.

Next steps

The applicant is asked to ensure that the change request that is intended to be submitted (with any relevant associated revised documents in clean and track changed versions and any revised plans to include a note citing the reason for revisions), is done so no later than **deadline 2 – 10 September 2025**. The change request should respond fully to the points made above and contain sufficient information to enable the ExA to prepare further questions, if necessary. A formal procedural decision will then be issued by the ExA on whether to accept such changes into the examination. The applicant should note that the ExA has a period of 28 days in which to do this, albeit that the ExA would aim to do this sooner should this be possible.

The ExA recognises that the proposed changes are likely to require revisions to many plans and documents as well as the draft Development Consent Order. The ExA requests that the applicant undertakes a thorough check of all plans and documents which would be affected and provides revisions of these. Should there be any need to update any ES chapters and associated appendices, the applicant should consider whether at this stage, an updated addendum to the ES setting out any changes to the assessments/ conclusions may suffice, or whether full revised versions of these documents may be more appropriate.

The ExA notes two typographical errors in the applicant's letter. The first, on page 22, relates to references to 'plots 16-4, 16-6 and 16-6'. This should instead reference 'plots 16-4, 16-5 and 16-6'. The second, on page 23, relates to the sentence under the heading 'Change 9', which states '...in relation to Change 8'. This should instead state '...in relation to Change 9'. The applicant is advised to ensure that these references are correct as part of any formal change request.

Please do not hesitate to contact the case team using the contact details at the head of this letter should you have any queries.

Yours faithfully

Alex Hutson

Lead member of the Examining Authority

This communication does not constitute legal advice.

Please view our ['Privacy Notice'](#) before sending information to the Planning Inspectorate.