



# Pear tree Hill Solar Farm

## Response to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions (ExQ2)

Document Ref: EN010157/APP/8.15

October 2025

Contents

1 Introduction..... 1

1.1 Purpose of this document ..... 1

2 Responses to the Examining Authority’s Second Written Questions ..... 2

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 The purpose of this document is to provide the responses of RWE Renewables UK Solar and Storage Ltd (the Applicant) to the Examining Authority's second written questions (ExQ2) issued on 24 September 2025, relating to Peartree Hill Solar Farm (the Proposed Development).
- 1.1.2 The response to questions directed to the Applicant can be found in Table 1 below. Where the responses refer to other documentation, these are provided separately as part of the Deadline 3 submission.

## 2 Responses to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions

**Table 1: Applicant's response to the Examining Authority's second written questions**

ExQ2	Question to	Question	Applicants Response
<b>1. General and cross-topic</b>			
1.1.1	The applicant	<p><b>Planning history</b></p> <p>The ExA notes your response to ExQ1.1.5 [REP1-073]. However, the question was intended to understand whether, in your view, the proposed development would have any effect on/ implications for the implementation of or ongoing use of any of the projects/ applications listed (the ExA notes that East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) considers not [REP1-094]). Please address this and also consider whether Table 2 of the Planning Statement [REP2-073] requires any updates noting the table at section 5.2</p>	<p>The Applicant agrees with East Riding of Yorkshire Council's response that there is not considered to be any implications for the already consented development within and adjacent to the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Considering whether Table 2 of the <b>Planning Statement [EN010157/APP/5.5 Revision 3]</b> requires updating, the Applicant notes that the <b>Local Impact Report (LIR) [REP1-086]</b> table refers to the Dogger Bank South Offshore Wind Farms project with reference number EN010125, whereas Table 2 of the <b>Planning Statement</b> refers to three reference numbers: 20/01589/STPLF, 20/01590/STPLF and 20/01592/STPLF. These three reference numbers refer to alterations to the Dogger Bank Offshore Wind Farm subsurface cable route</p>

		of ERYC's Local Impact Report (LIR) [REP1-086].	that intersects with the Proposed Development's Order Limits. Similarly, while the LIR table refers to the Hornsea Four Offshore Wind Farm with reference EN010098, Table 2 of the <b>Planning Statement</b> refers to reference number 24/30260/CONDET which refers to the discharge of requirement for a Written Scheme of Investigation for Hornsea Four Offshore Wind Farm. While differing reference numbers are used between both the <b>Planning Statement</b> and <b>LIR</b> , it is considered that both tables are consistent. As such, an update to the Planning Statement with respect to the point is not considered to be necessary.
1.1.2	The applicant	<p><b>Statement of common ground (SoCG)</b></p> <p>The ExA notes that no SoCG has been submitted in respect of the Humberside Fire and Rescue Service. Please explain the reason for this and specify when a SoCG can be expected.</p>	<p>The Applicant was engaging with Humberside Fire and Rescue pre DCO Submission, as set out in the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan [REP1-058]</b>. Following the request by the Examining Authority for a SoCG in the <b>Rule 6 letter [PD-006]</b> the Applicant reached out to this contact and was informed that they were no longer in that role.</p> <p>The Applicant has been attempting to engage with another member of Humberside Fire and Rescue in the absence of the previous contact but has not received a response to date, as such, we have not been able to progress a SoCG. The Applicant continues to reach out to</p>

			<p>Humberside Fire and Rescue and hopes to submit a SoCG before the close of examination, if Humberside Fire and Rescue choose to engage. The Applicant will provide any progress updates within any future revisions of the <b>Statement of Commonality [EN010157/APP/9.1 Revision 3]</b>.</p>
1.1.3	East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC)		
1.1.4	The applicant	<p><b>Supply chains and tackling modern slavery/ forced labour</b></p> <p>The Examining Authority (ExA) notes the response to ExQ1.1.3 [REP1-073] (which is also cited in [REP2-038]) in respect of this matter. However, for completeness, should the relevant information also be included in the Commitments Register [REP2-125] and relevant management documents, such as the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [REP2-138] and the outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [REP2-138]?</p>	<p>The <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [EN010157/APP/7.2 Revision 5]</b> includes a commitment to using locally sourced materials where practicable.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that its membership of the Solar Stewardship Initiative, and signatory to the United Nations Global Compact, as well as policies against unethical supply chains and forced labour are sufficient in committing to best practice procurement and supply chain management. Clauses will be written into delivery and procurement contracts to ensure all contractors and subcontractors are compliant with these policies.</p>

<b>2. Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) and other consents</b>			
<b>Note: Questions/ comments relate to dDCO revision 6 [REP2-062] (clean)/ [REP2-063] (tracked)</b>			
<b>General</b>			
2.2.1	The applicant	<b>Contents page</b> <p>Whilst your response to ExQ1.2.1 [REP1-073] suggested the change had been actioned, it does not appear to have been. Please address this by adding an 's' to '45. Trees subject to tree preservation orders<u>s</u>'.</p>	<p>The requested amendment has been made to the <b>Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [EN010157/APP/3.1 Revision 7]</b> submitted at Deadline 3.</p>
2.2.2	The applicant	<b>Explanatory note</b> <p>Please provide an update regarding ExQ1.2.6(b).</p>	<p>The Applicant has liaised with ERYC regarding the deposit location for certified documents. The Council has advised that the Beverley Library, Champney Road, Beverley, HU17 8HE would be a more suitable deposit location. The Applicant has liaised with the library who has confirmed it agrees to holding the specified documents. The Applicant has also reflected on the documents to be held at the library and in line with recently made DCOs (for example the Byers Gill Solar Development Consent Order 2025 and the Oaklands Farm Solar Park Development Consent Order 2025) has amended the certified documents to be held to</p>

			be only the "Order plans and book of reference".
2.2.3	The applicant, ERYC	<p><b>Requirements</b></p> <p>The ExA notes the difference of opinion of the parties in response to ExQ1.2.7 (and in [REP2-038] regarding whether there is a need for a requirement relating to biodiversity net gain (BNG). Please liaise on the matter and provide an update at the next deadline or an update to the SoCG [REP1- 076] in this respect (noting that Natural England (NE) appears to indicate that a requirement in this regard is not necessary [REP1-093]).</p>	<p>The Applicant has liaised with ERYC regarding this matter who has confirmed they are satisfied that that BNG is appropriately secured through Requirement 9 in the <b>Draft DCO [EN010157/APP/3.1 Revision 7]</b> through the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan. The <b>Draft Statement of Common Ground with East Riding of Yorkshire Council [EN010157/APP/9.2 Revision 3]</b> has been updated to reflect this.</p>
2.2.4	ERYC	<p><b>Requirements</b></p> <p>The ExA notes your response to ExQ1.2.7 [REP1-094] and that you make no reference to any need for a requirement relating to an employment and skills plan. Please confirm your position on this, having regard to Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (NPS EN-1) paragraph 5.13.12 and the applicant's response to ExQ1.2.7 in this regard [REP1-073].</p>	



<b>Questions/ comments relating to articles (A)</b>			
2.2.5	The applicant	<p>A2 “permitted preliminary works” - the ExA notes your response to ExQ1.2.9 [REP1-094]. However, it would appear to the ExA that as currently written, this article, along with requirement 13 (Archaeology) would allow for certain ‘permitted preliminary works’ to commence (such as the diversion or laying of apparatus, contamination remediation and the making of boreholes) which could affect archaeology, prior to a written scheme of investigation (WSI) being submitted and approved. The ExA also notes that in the Oaklands Farm Solar Park Order 2025 cited by the applicant, the relevant requirement relating to archaeology appears to prevent any ‘site preparation works’ (the definitions of which are similar to those of the ‘permitted preliminary works’ in the dDCO) from commencing prior to the submission and approval of a WSI. Please address this matter further.</p>	<p>To address this matter the Applicant has amended Requirement 13 of the <b>Draft DCO [EN010157/APP/3.1 Revision 7]</b> submitted at Deadline 3 to read:</p> <p>(4) <u>Unless otherwise agreed in writing by Historic England and the local planning authority</u>, For the purposes of sub-paragraph (1) “commence” includes any <u>permitted preliminary works which involve the breaking or disturbing of groundintrusive archaeological surveys (including trenching)</u>.</p>
2.2.6	The applicant	<p>A2 “environmental statement” – the ExA’s understanding is that the</p>	<p>The Applicant has considered this further and can confirm that updated ES documents</p>

		environmental statement addendum cited in (b) is intended to be temporary, with the information/ amendments contained within it to be transposed into the main ES documents which would then be submitted during the course of the examination as tracked and clean versions. On this basis, is (b) necessary?	referred to in the Environmental Statement Addendum will be submitted at Deadline 5. Therefore the references to the Environmental Statement Addendum in the <b>Draft DCO [EN010157/APP/3.1 Revision 7]</b> submitted at Deadline 3 have been removed.
2.2.7	The applicant	A33(10) – the ExA notes the changes made to this article in response to ExQ1.2.26. However, it was the intention of the ExA for the article to be worded: 'The undertaker may not compulsorily acquire, acquire new rights over or impose restrictive covenants over, the land referred to in paragraph (1)(a)(i) under this Order.', to preclude the acquisition of both land and rights.	The requested amendment has been made to the <b>Draft DCO [EN010157/APP/3.1 Revision 7]</b> submitted at Deadline 3.
2.2.8	The applicant	A44(1) – the ExA notes your response to ExQ1.1.28. However, by specifying trees 'near the Order limits' (that is, near to the red line boundary), would this have the effect of precluding any necessary tree works within the Order land but not 'near' to the Order limits,	The Applicant acknowledges the ExA's concern and to address this has amended the <b>Draft DCO [EN010157/APP/3.1 Revision 7]</b> submitted at Deadline 3 so that article 44(1) reads: [...] fell or lop any tree or shrub <u>near or within</u> the Order limits, or cut back its roots, if it reasonably believes it to be necessary to do so

		given the extent of the Order land. Please give further consideration as to whether more appropriate wording should be '[...] any tree or shrub within or encroaching on land within the Order limits [...]'.  	to prevent the tree or shrub from [...]". This drafting maintains the near wording for the reasons set out in the Applicant's response to ExQ1.1.28 <b>[REP1-073]</b> .
2.2.9	The applicant	A45(1) – should this also be made subject to '[...] any tree within or encroaching on land within the Order limits [...]'?  	The requested amendment has been made to the <b>Draft DCO [EN010157/APP/3.1 Revision 7]</b> submitted at Deadline 3.
<b>Questions/ comments relating to Schedule (Sch) 2, Part 1 - requirements (R); and Sch 2, Part 2 – procedure for discharge of requirements</b>			
2.2.10	The applicant	R15 – a) should there be a comma between the words 'local planning authority' and 'no later than' in R15(2); and b) notwithstanding this, and notwithstanding the response in [REP2-038] in please further address ERYC's comment relating to R15 in response to ExQ1.10.6 [REP1-094], which raise a similar matter to the ExA's ExQ1.2.48(a), noting that the ExA is not wholly convinced that R15(2) would  	a) The requested amendment has been made to the <b>Draft DCO [EN010157/APP/3.1 Revision 7]</b> submitted at Deadline 3. b) The Applicant considers that it is not proportionate or reasonable for an undertaker to have to decommission a scheme of this size and scale in the event of non-generation, nor is it in keeping with the themes of National Policy Statements (EN-1, EN-3 and EN-5) and the notion of national security.

		adequately address the matter as suggested by the applicant.	<p>As set out in <b>Response comments on Relevant Representations and additional submissions, response to Written Representations and response to Examining Authority Written Questions 1 responses [REP2-038]</b> a cessation of electricity export could be as a result of matters outside of the Applicant's control such as a grid transformer failure which can take a significant time to repair (with lead times for procurement of a new transformer being well over a year). As such the Applicant does not consider it is appropriate to fix a timeframe in which the Proposed Development is required to be decommissioned if it ceases use/ceases to export electricity.</p> <p>The Applicant considers adequate controls are already provided for in the DCO and within the requirements (of which it would be a criminal offence to breach under s161 of the Planning Act 2008) and should the Applicant determine it is appropriate to decommission the Proposed Development prior to the end of its operational lifetime then it is required under sub-paragraph (2) to submit a</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan for approval 3 months prior to the intended decommissioning date.</p> <p>The Applicant also notes the requested drafting is not contained in any of the following recently made solar DCOs: The Byers Gill Solar Order 2025, The East Yorkshire Solar Farm Order 2025, The Heckington Fen Solar Park Order 2025, The West Burton Solar Project Order 2025, The Cottam Solar Project Order 2024 and The Sunnica Energy Farm Order 2024.</p> <p>Further, the Applicant is an established solar developer and no evidence has been presented that there is a risk of the Applicant walking away from the Proposed Development, particularly in the context of the size and scale of the investment required to build a solar DCO scheme of this magnitude. The Applicant would be doing all it could to fix any faulty parts rather than have to decommission a project of this size early.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the Applicant has amended the <b>Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan</b></p>
--	--	--	--

			<b>(OEMP) [EN010157/APP/7.3 Revision 3]</b> to include the process to apply in the event of an extended operational outage and specified circumstances where a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan must be submitted for approval in the case of an extended outage.
2.2.11	ERYC		
<b>Questions/ comments relating to other schedules</b>			
2.2.12	The applicant	Sch 1, Work No. 1 – the ExA notes the changes made in respect of ExQ1.2.56. However, should this rather read as 'and associated development within the meaning of section 115(2) of the 2008 Act in connection with Works Nos. 1B to 1F comprising-' (instead of reference to 'Work Nos. 1A and 1F')?	The requested amendment has been made to the <b>Draft DCO [EN010157/APP/3.1 Revision 7]</b> submitted at Deadline 3.
2.2.13	The applicant	Sch 1, Work No. 4(a)(ii) – remove the dash in 'switch-gear'.	The requested amendment has been made to the <b>Draft DCO [EN010157/APP/3.1 Revision 7]</b> submitted at Deadline 3.
2.2.14	The applicant	Sch 1, Work No. 6(b) – notwithstanding your response to ExQ1.2.62(b), please provide a more detailed response, addressing NPS EN-5 paragraphs	Notwithstanding the Applicant's previous response to ExQ1.2.62 the Applicant has undertaken further work and investigation on this matter and is able to commit to the use of

		2.9.59 to 2.9.64, 2.10.14, 2.10.15 and 2.11.17 in depth and in turn.	<p>non SF6 switchgear. The <b>Design Parameters Document [EN010157/APP/5.8 Revision 4]</b> has been updated to reflect this. The Applicant is therefore compliant with the tests set out in paragraph 2.11.17 of NPS EN-5.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Applicant is only able to make such commitments where it is the owner and operator of the switchgear. Switchgear within National Grid Creyke Beck Substation is outwith the Applicant's control and will be determined by the engineering requirements of the DNO.</p>
2.2.15	The applicant	<p>Sch 1, Work No. 6(h) – your response to ExQ1.2.63 does not appear to clarify what 'structures and buildings' are envisaged, nor their permanency. The ExA is thus unclear what these would be. In addition, noting your response, it is unclear to the ExA where in ES Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [REP2-075] the parameters of such structures and buildings are highlighted. There is also no reference to any aspect of Work No. 6 in the Design Parameters Document [REP2-012]. It is thus unclear on what basis an assessment, such as from a landscape and visual perspective, has been</p>	<p>The Applicant has reflected on what "structures and buildings" may be required and is of the view that other than noise attenuation works there are no structures or buildings that need to be captured in Work No. 6(h). The Applicant has therefore amended Schedule 1 of the <b>Draft DCO [EN010157/APP/3.1 Revision 7]</b> to remove the words "structures and buildings" from Work No. 6(h).</p> <p>Assessment parameters for Sch 1, Work No. 6(h) (works proposed to the existing Creyke Beck substation) have not been identified as the work would be carried out within the existing envelope of National Grid Creyke Beck</p>

		undertaken. Please respond to these points.	<p>Substation which Sch 1, Work No. 6(h) would fall within.</p> <p>Work No. 6(h) would not result in significant effects on landscape and visual receptors due to all works being confined to within the footprint of the existing substation, and there being minimal change to the existing landscape and visual baseline and no change in the use of the landscape.</p>
2.2.16	The applicant	Sch 4 – the entry for 'A1035' makes reference to 'SW/02a/01 to SW/02a/02' on sheet 2A of the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans. However, on this plan [REP2-051] the references are SW/2a/01 and SW/2a/02. Please ensure consistency between references on plans and within the dDCO.	The requested amendment has been made to the <b>Draft DCO [EN010157/APP/3.1 Revision 7]</b> submitted at Deadline 3.
2.2.17	The applicant	<p>Sch 5, Part 2 –</p> <p>a) the ExA notes your response to ExQ1.2.66 [REP1-073]. However, please review the information given in ES Chapter 13 paragraph 13.9.1 [APP-049], noting that the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans [REP2-051], the outline Rights of Way and Access Management Plan Table 3-1 [REP2-144] and Sch 5,</p>	<p>a) Schedule 5 Part 2 of the <b>Draft DCO [EN010157/APP/3.1 Revision 7]</b> has been updated to remove reference to Riston Footpath No. 2 and Wawne Footpath No. 1 to align with <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Population [APP-049]</b> paragraph 13.9.1 which was updated at Deadline 2 via the <b>Environmental Statement Addendum [EN010157/APP/8.2 Revision 5]</b> to reflect that</p>



		<p>Part 2 of the dDCO refer to measures the three cited footpaths would be subject to; and</p> <p>b) remove the additional spaces between the words 'Temporarily' and 'restricted' for Riston Footpath No. 2 and Wawne Footpath No. 1.</p>	<p>there will be no temporary restrictions to these PRoW. <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Population</b> will be re-submitted at Deadline 5.</p> <p>b) The requested amendment has not been made as per the response to part (a) of this question, this text in relation to Riston Footpath No. 2 and Wawne Footpath No. 1 has been removed from Schedule 5 Part 2 of the the <b>Draft DCO [EN010157/APP/3.1 Revision 7]</b> which has been submitted at Deadline 3.</p>
2.2.18	The applicant	Sch 6 - the entry for 'A1035' makes reference to 'A/02a/01 and A/02a/02' on sheet 2A of the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans. However, on this plan [REP2-051] the references are A/2a/01 and A/2a/02. Please ensure consistency between references on plans and within the dDCO.	The requested amendment has been made to the <b>Draft DCO [EN010157/APP/3.1 Revision 7]</b> submitted at Deadline 3.
2.2.19	The applicant	Sch 7, Part 1 – amend reference to 'TTM/02/a/01' so it reads 'TTM/02a/01' to reflect the refence on the Traffic Measures Plan.	The requested amendment has been made to the <b>Draft DCO [EN010157/APP/3.1 Revision 7]</b> submitted at Deadline 3.
2.2.20	The applicant	Sch 13 and EM paragraph 5.1.35 [REP2-064] – the ExA notes your response to ExQ1.2.75 [REP2- 057]. However, the hedgerow numbering	The Applicant will update <b>ES Volume 4, Appendix 7.11: Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) [REP2-127]</b> to include the hedgerow number referencing used in

		<p>within Table 2 of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) [REP2-127] does not appear to correlate with the hedgerow numbering in Sch 13 (or on the Tree Preservation Order and Hedgerow Plan [PDA-007]). This makes cross referencing difficult and thus the ExA does not consider that the matter raised under ExQ1.2.75 has been suitably addressed. Please address the matter further.</p>	<p>Schedule 13 of the <b>Draft DCO [EN010157/APP/3.1 Revision 7]</b> and the <b>Tree Preservation Order and Hedgerow Plans [REP2-057]</b>.</p> <p>The <b>ES Volume 4, Appendix 7.11: AIA</b> will be resubmitted at Deadline 4.</p>
<b>3. Compulsory acquisition (CA), temporary possession (TP) and related matters</b>			
2.3.1	The Applicant	<p><b>Rights sought/ inconsistencies</b></p> <p>The ExA notes your response to ExQ1.3.3 [REP1-073]. However, please address the following apparent inconsistencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) rights shown as being sought in Plot 2-8 in Part 3 of the Book of Reference (BoR) [REP2-151] compared to rights shown as being sought over this plot in Parts 1 and 2; and</li> <li>b) rights shown as being sought in Plot 4-10 in Part 2 of the BoR compared with the rights shown as being</li> </ul>	<p>The Applicant has investigated the inconsistencies in the <b>Book of Reference [REP2-068]</b> and has submitted an updated version <b>[EN010157/APP/4.2 Revision 7]</b> at Deadline 3.</p>

		sought over this plot in Parts 1 and 3 of the BoR.	
2.3.2	The Applicant	<p><b>Rights sought/ inconsistencies</b></p> <p>There appear to be inconsistencies between relevant schedules of the dDCO and the Land Plans [including REP2-052]/ Statement of Reasons [REP2-066]/ BoR [REP2-068]/ Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker [REP2-070] insofar as powers sought over Plots 1-10, 1-12, 2-7, 2-8, 2-12b, 4- 4, 4-5, 4-8, 4-9, 4-10. Please clarify the powers sought and update relevant documents as necessary.</p>	<p>The Applicant has investigated the inconsistencies and has made the necessary amendments to the <b>Draft DCO [EN010157/APP/3.1 Revision 7]</b> and the <b>Land Plans [EN010157/APP/2.4 Revision 5]</b> submitted at Deadline 3 to correct them.</p>
2.3.3	The Applicant	<p><b>Figham Common</b></p> <p>The ExA notes that you highlight an error in the Planning Statement [REP2-073] regarding horizontal directional drilling (HDD) under Figham Common, in response to ExQ1.3.9(a). Should the Planning Statement be updated to address this error?</p>	<p>The <b>Planning Statement [EN010157/APP/5.5 Revision 3]</b> has been updated at Deadline 3 to address this error.</p>
2.3.4	The Applicant	<p><b>Community accessible land</b></p> <p>The ExA notes your response to ExQ1.13.14(b). However, the ExA</p>	<p>The Applicant will seek further engagement and input from the Community Liaison Group regarding the Community accessible land proposals, and is open to feedback about how</p>

		remains uncertain as to whether all three areas of land shown as being under consideration for community accessible land (on sheets 3, 8 and 12 of the Indicative Environmental Masterplan [REP2-091]), would be used for such a purpose. Please clarify this and also clarify, should any area not be used for such a purpose, the areas shown as being under consideration for community accessible land would still serve another purpose associated with the proposed development.	best it could serve a functional community purpose and if all three parcels of land are required. If one of the designated areas is not used for specific community purposes (e.g. an orchard) it would be retained as mitigation for nesting birds.
2.3.5	The Applicant	<p><b>Funding for decommissioning</b></p> <p>The ExA notes your response to ExQ1.3.16. However, please provide your view as to whether arrangements for funding for decommissioning and restoration works (that is, those under R15 of the dDCO) should be made subject to a separate requirement of the dDCO, in the interests of certainty.</p>	<p>The Applicant considers the imposition of a requirement in this regard to be unnecessary. Decommissioning is already a requirement of the <b>Draft DCO [EN010157/APP/3.1 Revision 7]</b> and a breach of this would be an offence. This approach is consistent with Secretary of State's position on the Oaklands DCO whereby the SoS notes in its decision letter that "<i>the Secretary of State notes there is no policy requirement for a decommissioning fund to be imposed as paragraphs 2.10.146 to 2.10.151 of NPS EN-3 set out the considerations for the Secretary of State in relation to project lifetime and decommissioning of solar developments</i>".</p>

			The Applicant considers that, in addition to the detail it has provided in response to ExQ 1.3.16 within <b>Response to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions (ExQ1) [REP1-073]</b> to provide certainty around the funding of decommissioning, that the lack of justification in policy terms should give comfort to the ExA that it would not be necessary nor correct for a separate requirement to be added.
2.3.6	The Applicant	<b>BoR and Land Plans</b> Should the key in the Land Plans [REP2-052] fully reflect the information provided in Table 5-1 of the BoR (that is, should the key reflect that land proposed to be permanently acquired may also be used temporarily)?	The Applicant has updated the <b>Land Plans [EN010157/APP/2.4 Revision 5]</b> to reflect the comments and has submitted them at Deadline 3.
2.3.7	The Applicant	<b>Funding Statement (FS)</b> FS paragraph 7.1.1 [APP-024] cites that 183 plots would be subject to CA of land or rights and 16 plots would be subject to TP. These figures should be updated to accord with any changes which have occurred after the submission of the FS (note also the inconsistency matters outlined in ExQ2.3.1/2.3.2 above).	The Applicant has updated the <b>Funding Statement [EN010157/APP/4.3 Revision 2]</b> with the latest number of plots sited at paragraph 7.1.1 and has submitted this at Deadline 3.

2.3.8	Leonards Property on behalf of TS Caley, MC Caley, TH Caley & Sons Ltd		
2.3.9	The Applicant	<b>Clarification</b> Please provide any updates in light of ExQ2.3.8, as necessary.	The Applicant has updated the <b>Statement of Reasons Appendix B: Land and Rights Negotiation Tracker [EN010157/APP/4.5 Revision 3]</b> to reflect that plot 2-6 is not part of the agreement for the wider land holding and has submitted this at Deadline 3.
2.3.10	Environment Agency, Network Rail Infrastructure Limited, National Gas Transmission plc, National Grid Electricity Transmission plc, Northern Powergrid (Yorkshire) plc, Yorkshire		

	Water Services, Beverley and North Holderness Internal Drainage Board		
2.3.11	The Applicant	<b>Crown Land</b> Please provide an update regarding Crown land and s135(1) and 135(2) of PA2008.	The Applicant is continuing to liaise with the Crown Estate's solicitors to obtain the necessary consents under s135(1) and 135(2) of PA 2008. The Applicant remains confident that these will be forthcoming prior to the close of the examination.
<b>4. Need, site selection and alternatives</b>			
2.4.1	Robertson James Wade		
2.4.2	The Applicant	The applicant might wish to confirm the above/ respond to [REP2-155] to further clarify the matter.	The Applicant can confirm its connection agreement is to the existing Creyke Beck GSP (132kv) substation, as set out in paragraph 2.1.2 of the <b>Grid Connection Statement [APP-152]</b> .
<b>5. Air Quality</b>			

No further questions at this time

**6. Biodiversity (including Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA))**

2.6.1	The Applicant	<p><b>Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) crossings of the River Hull</b></p> <p>The ExA notes ongoing discussions with the EA as outlined in the SoCG [REP1-077], regarding the commitment to complete HDD crossings of the River Hull between April to September in order to avoid noise and vibration impacts during the peak lamprey migration period, and for this to be secured through the CEMP. Please provide an update regarding this matter, including whether amendments to the oCEMP [REP2-138] in relation to this matter are proposed.</p>	<p>As set out in their <b>Comments on the deadline 1 submissions [REP2-153]</b>, the Environment Agency confirmed that their concerns relating to potential impacts on river lamprey from HDD works under the River Hull had been suitably addressed in the updated HRA that was submitted at Deadline 1 – <b>Habitats Regulations Assessment - Information to inform Appropriate Assessment [REP1-015]</b>. The Environment Agency acknowledges that while the Applicant cannot commit to undertaking the works between April and September, they will adhere to these timings wherever possible, and that further information provided within the updated <b>Habitats Regulations Assessment - Information to inform Appropriate Assessment [REP1-015]</b> demonstrated that effects would not be significant even outside of these times, due to the depths and short-term nature of the works.</p> <p>Therefore, no further amendments to the <b>Outline CEMP [EN010157/APP/7.2 Revision 5]</b> are proposed in relation to this matter.</p>
-------	---------------	---	--



2.6.2	The Applicant	<p><b>Mitigation areas – disturbance</b></p> <p>The ExA notes concerns in ERYC's LIR [REP1-086] regarding the potential for disturbance to wildlife in and around mitigation areas 9 and 11, due to the proposed presence of permissive paths/ recreational activity within the vicinity and the applicant's response [REP2-037]. Please provide an update regarding this matter, including whether any potential disturbance could be overcome through the rerouting of areas, or the use of additional mitigation, for example.</p>	<p>The applicant acknowledges the potential for dogs off the lead from permissive path usage to potentially cause disturbance to proposed mitigation areas, particularly mitigation areas 9 and 11. As a result, the Applicant is proposing changes to relevant sections of permissive paths. The changes to the permissive paths to prevent problems with dogs in and around mitigation areas 9 and 11 have been developed in consultation with Natural England and are set out in the <b>Third Notification of Proposed Changes to the DCO Application [AS-017]</b>. The Applicant is currently consulting with Natural England and East Riding of Yorkshire Council on these proposed changes as detailed within <b>Draft Statement of Common Ground with ERYC [EN010157/APP/9.2 Revision 3]</b> and <b>Draft Statement of Common Ground with Natural England [EN010157/APP/9.4 Revision 2]</b>.</p> <p>Should the proposed changes to permissive paths be accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, relevant documents would be updated and submitted at subsequent deadlines to reflect the relevant changes.</p>
2.6.3	The Applicant	<b>HRA</b>	<p>Section 7.3.5 of the <b>Habitats Regulations Assessment – Information to inform</b></p>

		<p>Please confirm that, with regards to noise disturbance, specifically paragraph 7.3.5 of the HRA [REP2-071] whether the assessment is based on guidance that is supported by NE, in response to concerns raised in ERYC's LIR [REP1-086].</p>	<p><b>Appropriate Assessment [EN010157/APP/5.3 Revision 4]</b> discusses that the level of noise from construction activities is likely to be in the range of 101.9 dB(A) to 124.3 dB(A) at source (refer to <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration [REP2-079]</b>) and that taking account of guidance within Waterbird Disturbance and Mitigation Toolkit, a noise of 101.9 dB(A) would be expected to dissipate to an 'acceptable dose' level of 70 dB(A) or below at a distance of approximately 20- 25m, whilst a noise of 124.3 dB(A) would be expected to dissipate to an 'acceptable dose' level of 70 dB(A) or below at a distance of approximately 150-200m. Therefore, behavioural responses from birds in relation to construction noise would not be expected beyond 200m from the source of the noise.</p> <p>Consultation with Natural England indicate that they have some concern in regards to the use of the Waterbird Disturbance and Mitigation Toolkit. The Applicant acknowledges these concerns, and has only used the information within the Waterbird Disturbance and Mitigation Toolkit to provide contextual information over the sort of distances in which noise disturbance might manifest itself. The assessment made within <b>Habitats Regulations Assessment – Information to inform Appropriate</b></p>
--	--	---	--

			<p><b>Assessment [EN010157/APP/5.3 Revision 4]</b> has not relied on information within the Waterbird Disturbance and Mitigation Toolkit and the precautionary approach in regard to noise and disturbance is set out below.</p> <p>In paragraph 7.125 of ERYC's <b>Local Impact Report (LIR) [REP1-086]</b> ERYC question this stating: "Impacts from the cable corridor would be temporary however construction impacts such as noise and visual disturbance should also be considered up to 300m from source and be assessed in consideration of baseline scenarios, including identification of any further mitigation that may be required to minimise disturbance on protected species".</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the specific distance from the source at which disturbance to birds may occur, whether 200 metres or even 300 metres, would not alter the conclusions in <b>Habitats Regulations Assessment – Information to inform Appropriate Assessment [EN010157/APP/5.3 Revision 4]</b> for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Winter birds are highly mobile and make use of farmland over a wide area;</li> </ol>
--	--	--	---

			<p>2) The construction works are temporary in nature albeit over a longer duration than the cabling works;</p> <p>3) The pattern of bird activity within and adjacent to the Order Limits was for relatively small numbers of birds being widely distributed with no particular hotspots. An exception to this is geese. During the 2024/25 bird surveys, pink-footed goose were seen flying over on four occasions and were only recorded twice within the Order Limits, more specifically within the grid connection cable route. Although the numbers recorded within the Order Limits were more than 1% of the SPA population, the Order Limits are therefore not considered to constitute functionally linked land for pink-footed goose given that they were not regularly recorded, no Wetland Bird Survey alerts have been triggered for this species on the Humber Estuary, and their numbers within the Humber have shown increases in recent years (following the national trend).</p> <p>4) The <b>Habitats Regulations Assessment - Information to inform Appropriate Assessment [EN010157/APP/5.3</b></p>
--	--	--	---

			<p><b>Revision 4]</b> has been highly precautionary and considered that the agricultural land within the Order Limits constitute functionally linked land for golden plover, lapwing, mallard, teal, and black-headed gull and that on a precautionary basis, construction noise could cause disturbance/ displacement of these species.</p> <p>5) An appropriate bird days calculation has been undertaken to inform the quantum of mitigation required and Natural England have agreed this (see item number NE1f in Natural England's written representation – <b>Written representation/ comments on the deadline 1 submissions [REP2-154]</b>). The mitigation areas would be constructed in advance of construction works and within Fields E4, E5, E15, E17 and D17 (adjacent to the Humber SPA/Ramsar species mitigation areas), the Applicant will avoid completing the most disturbing activities (e.g. loud activities such as piling, installing access tracks, laying cables, etc.) during winter (October to March). Only less disturbing activities would take place in these fields during winter, if necessary. Should this not be possible, acoustic fencing would be installed for the construction period to</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>provide a noise and visual barrier, as well as hedgerow screening already in place. This approach was agreed in principle during a meeting with Natural England on 19 June 2025 and, as stated for item number NE2a in Natural England's written representation – <b>Written representation/ comments on the deadline 1 submissions [REP2-154]</b>, Natural England consider that the issue of potential noise and visual disturbance to the mitigation areas is now resolved.</p> <p>6) Therefore, wintering birds, should they be displaced by construction activities, have alternate foraging habitat to use that will be safeguarded from construction noise.</p> <p>The above is set out in the updated <b>Habitats Regulations Assessment - Information to inform Appropriate Assessment [EN010157/APP/5.3 Revision 4]</b>, which is submitted at Deadline 3. The <b>Outline CEMP [EN010157/APP/7.2 Revision 5]</b> secures relevant commitments.</p> <p>The Applicant is not proposing to undertake any additional noise monitoring.</p>
2.6.4	The Applicant	<b>HRA</b>	Please refer to the Applicant's <b>Response to Deadline 2 submissions and additional</b>

		NE's deadline 2 submission [REP2-154] updates its position following the submission of the applicant's updated HRA [REP1-015] (superseded by [REP2-071], Grid Connection Bird Survey Report [REP1-072] and the outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [REP1-056] (superseded by [REP2-032] and subsequently by [REP2-140]). NE identifies remaining concerns at item numbers NE1a, NE1b, NE1c, NE1d, NE1e, NE1g, NE2a and NE5. Please provide an update on each of these matters, including amended versions of the HRA, oLEMP, oCEMP and ES Chapter 7 as appropriate.	<b>information [EN010157/APP/8.14]</b> , which is submitted at Deadline 3 and includes a detailed response to item numbers NE1a, NE1b, NE1c, NE1d, NE1e, NE1g, NE2a and NE5. For brevity the responses have not been repeated here.
2.6.5	The Applicant	<p><b>HRA</b></p> <p>Noting concerns and outstanding matters in relation to biodiversity/ HRA matters, please respond in detail to the points raised in ERYC's LIR [REP1-086] and the matters remaining under discussion in the draft SoCG [REP2-042].</p>	<p>The Applicant has provided a detailed response to all of the HRA and biodiversity points raised in ERYC's <b>LIR [REP1-086]</b> within the <b>Response to Local Impact Report [REP2-037]</b>. For brevity the responses have not been repeated here. The <b>Draft Statement of Common Ground with East Riding of Yorkshire Council [EN010157/APP/9.2 Revision 3]</b> has been updated to reflect the parties' latest positions on matters and is submitted at Deadline 3, which includes</p>

			updating a number of previously 'under discussion' matters to now be marked as 'agreed'
2.6.6	NE		
<b>7. Climate</b>			
2.7.1	The applicant	<p><b>Carbon reduction plans</b></p> <p>The ExA notes your response to ExQ1.7.7 and an update to the oDEMP. However, please further justify your response regarding the oOEMP [REP1-052], noting that ES Chapter 8 paragraph 8.7.9 and Table 8-13 [APP-044] identify that the highest percentage of emissions would occur during operation.</p>	<p>The <b>Outline OEMP [EN010157/APP/7.3 Revision 3]</b> has been updated to include a commitment that members of the supply chain will provide a carbon reduction plan where necessary. The updated document is resubmitted at Deadline 3.</p>
2.7.2	The applicant	<p><b>Greenhouse gas technical note</b></p> <p>Please clarify:</p> <p>a) whether the inclusion of paragraph 1.3.4 in Appendix 3 of [REP1-073] is a typo or if there is missing information;</p> <p>b) regarding Table 3, what 'Solar – utility' refers to;</p>	<p>a) There is a formatting error between paragraphs 1.3.4 and 1.3.6 of Appendix 3 of the <b>Response to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions [REP1-073]</b>. However all content is present, and there is no missing information.</p> <p>b) 'Solar – utility' within Table 3 of <b>Response to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions (ExQ1) REP1-073</b> refers to utility-scale solar installations, such</p>



		<p>c) regarding Table 3, how the 'GHG Intensity' single figure and the figures which follow in brackets relate to each other; and</p> <p>d) whether any information can be provided in respect of the GHG intensity figure(s) for the proposed development compared with the GHG intensity figure(s) of other recently consented solar farms.</p>	<p>as the Proposed Development, which are large, grid-connected solar developments that generate substantial amounts of electricity directly to the electricity grid.</p> <p>c) The values are as taken from the source presented. Where there is a single GHG intensity value followed by brackets, the single value represents the median, and those in brackets the minimum and maximum values from the range of literature sources assessed by the referenced study.</p> <p>d) There is no one standard methodology to undertake GHG assessments for solar developments and different assessments will rely on varying assumptions, data sources and emissions factors. As a result, comparing outcomes across assessments prepared by different third parties can be misleading, since methodological differences may drive significant variations in the projected results. As such, it is difficult to provide like-for-like comparisons of the GHG intensity figure(s) of other recently consented solar farms.</p>
<b>8. Cultural heritage</b>			
2.8.1	ERYC		

2.8.2	ERYC		
<b>9. Land, soil and groundwater</b>			
2.9.1	The applicant	<p><b>Infrastructure height surrounding BESS</b></p> <p>As outlined in the EA's response to ExQ1 [REP1-095] please provide the height of infrastructure in the areas surrounding BESS infrastructure in metres above Ordnance Datum within the flood risk assessment.</p>	<p>Drawings showing the mitigation levels for each Land Area have been produced, with the levels summarised in Table 2 and Appendix A provided in the <b>Response to Deadline 2 submissions and additional information [EN010157/APP/8.14]</b></p> <p>However, the provision of mitigation levels to meters above Ordnance Datum (mAOD) does not alter the conclusions of the <b>ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.6: Flood Risk Assessment [REP1-031]</b> and as such a revision to the document has not been deemed necessary. However, drawings showing the mitigation levels for each Land Area have been produced, with the levels summarised in Table 2 provided in the <b>Response to Deadline 2 submissions and additional information [EN010157/APP/8.14]</b></p>
2.9.2	ERYC		
<b>10. Landscape and visual (including good design)</b>			
2.10.1	ERYC		

2.10.2	The applicant	<p><b>Residential visual amenity</b></p> <p>An area of the proposed solar array was reduced in size in field B4 to the north of Carr House Farm as part of the first change request [PD-007]. Please clarify whether the distance of 190 metres as cited in the first row of Table A11.5-2 (page 19) of the RVAA [APP-132] remains accurate.</p>	<p>Following acceptance by the Examining Authority of the Applicant's first proposed change/correction to the Proposed Development <b>[PD-007]</b>, the closest solar PV module to Carr House Farm in Field B4 is now 217m north-east of the residential building.</p> <p>Table A11.5-2 in <b>ES Volume 4, Appendix 11.5: Residential Visual Amenity Assessment [APP-132]</b> has been updated accordingly. Given the minor nature of the amendment, the updated document will be submitted at Deadline 5, with the change captured within the updated <b>Environmental Statement Addendum [EN010157/APP/8.2 Revision 5]</b>, which is submitted at Deadline 3.</p>
2.10.3	ERYC		
2.10.4	ERYC		
2.10.5	ERYC		
2.10.6	The applicant	<p><b>Design</b></p> <p>ERYC's LIR [REP1-086] suggests the use of an Environmental Colour Assessment with regard to colour selection for components of the proposed development. Would the</p>	<p>The Applicant will use the Environmental Colour Assessment guidance when selecting which colour is most appropriate for the components of the Proposed Development. The Applicant is limited in colour choices for components (such as the BESS) as this will be dependent on supplier options and changing colour post</p>

		applicant be willing to adopt this approach and make provision for this within relevant documents, such as the Design Parameters Document [REP2-012] and R3 of the dDCO?	procurement may impact the warranty and performance of the component.  The Applicant does not consider it necessary to add further commentary into the <b>Design Parameters Document [EN010157/APP/5.8 Revision 4]</b> as the colour of the BESS and other components is not confirmed at this stage and will be agreed with ERYC at detailed design stage pursuant to requirement 3 of the <b>Draft DCO [EN010157/APP/3.1 Revision 7]</b> .
2.10.7	The applicant	<p><b>Parameters/ layout plans</b></p> <p>The ExA notes your response to ExQ1.10.11 and updates to the Indicative Layout and Cross Section Plan [REP1-004]. However, please clarify:</p> <p>a) whether the number and sizes of 'spares containers' should be defined in the Design Parameters Document [REP2-012] and shown on the Indicative Operational Layout Plan [REP2-088];</p> <p>b) which other application documents make reference to 'spares containers'; and</p>	<p>a) The <b>Design Parameters Document [EN010157/APP/5.8 Revision 4]</b> has been updated to include the number and sizes of spares containers and will be submitted at Deadline 3. There will be up to 79 spares containers located across the Land Areas, which will be up to 3m in height, 12.5m in length and 2.5m in width. <b>ES Volume 3, Figure 3.1: Indicative Operational Layout Plan [EN010157/APP/6.3 Revision 3]</b> has been updated to include the location of spares containers and switchgear and submitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p>b) The location of switchgear and spares containers is shown on <b>ES Volume 3, Figure 3.4: Indicative Environmental Masterplan [REP2-091]</b>. 'Spares</p>

		c) whether the locations of the seven switchgears, as cited in the Design Parameters Document, should be shown on the Indicative Operational Layout Plan?	containers' are listed as associated development within the <b>Draft DCO [EN010157/APP/3.1 Revision 7]</b> .  c) <b>ES Volume 3, Figure 3.1: Indicative Operational Layout Plan [EN010157/APP/6.3 Revision 3]</b> has been updated to include the location of the seven switchgear and submitted at Deadline 3.
<b>11. Noise and vibration</b>			
2.11.1	ERYC		
2.11.2	The applicant	In relation to Change 9 of the Change Request [REP2-149], it is predicted that there would be short term, temporary adverse noise impacts on properties at Field House Farm during construction, which are assessed as not significant. The ExA notes that limited justification has been provided to support this conclusion. Please provide further details regarding how this conclusion has been reached and, where necessary, supply further details of noise impacts on these receptors, including the results of any relevant monitoring.	Elevated noise levels are predicted to occur during construction of the proposed access track, including during activities such as vegetation clearance, resurfacing and compaction works. Predicted noise levels are likely to occur for a short period of time, due to the transient nature of the activities proposed and limited works area adjacent to Field House Farm. The temporal extent of the proposed construction across the limited area would render the short-term impact not significant in this case.  Notwithstanding, Best Practicable Means, as defined by the Control of Pollution Act 1974, will

			<p>be implemented throughout the construction activity, which will serve to minimise the noise and vibration impacts at receptors (as detailed in and secured by the <b>Outline CEMP [EN010157/APP/7.2 Revision 5]</b>). This would include both organisational and technical measures, including monitoring as and when required.</p> <p>No further monitoring is required. The assessment criteria, as stated in Table 12-7 of the <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration [REP2-079]</b> would not have changed as a result of additional baseline noise monitoring.</p>
<b>12. Population</b>			
No further questions at this time			
<b>13. Transport and access</b>			
2.13.1	ERYC		
2.13.2	ERYC		
2.13.3	ERYC		
2.13.4	The applicant	<b>Access</b>	<b>ES Volume 3, Figure 3.5: Indicative Construction Layout Plan</b>

		<p>Please clarify your response to [RR-025] on page 369 of [REP1-071] noting that there do not appear to be, according to relevant plans (such as [REP2-091] and Appendix B of [REP2-142]), any proposed internal access tracks in areas E13 and E14 and no private track located between these specific fields</p>	<p><b>[EN010157/APP/6.3 Revision 3]</b> has been amended to show the proposed internal access track between Fields E9-E12 and Fields E15-E17 and is submitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p>Fields E13 and E14 are proposed to be accessed via an existing field access into Field E14. Fields E13 and E14 are proposed to provide environmental mitigation (as shown on <b>ES Volume 3, Figure 3.4: Indicative Environmental Masterplan [REP2-091]</b>) which will require transporting a digger vehicle (or similar plant). This would not be a significant number of trips to require the construction of a dedicated access track within Fields E13 and E14.</p>
2.13.5	The applicant	<p><b>Access</b></p> <p>Regarding fields E15, E16 and E17, please clarify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) how these fields would be accessed for construction purposes; and</li> <li>b) how these fields would be accessed for maintenance purposes (including replacement of parts), noting that there does not appear to be any internal access tracks on relevant plans linking these fields with, for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Fields E15, E16 and E17 are proposed to be accessed via an internal access track from Fields E9, E10, E11 and E12 for construction purposes. <b>ES Volume 3, Figure 3.5: Indicative Construction Layout Plan [EN010157/APP/6.3 Revision 3]</b> has been amended to show the proposed internal access track between Fields E9-E12 and Fields E15-E17 and is submitted at Deadline 3.</li> <li>b) Areas E15 to E17 will be accessed via Carr Lane, Weel, during the operation</li> </ul>

		example, internal access tracks within fields E9 to E12?	<p>phase for occasional maintenance requirements. Vehicles will be restricted to LGVs only through Weel during the operation phase of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The Applicant is exploring opportunities to maintain the temporary construction access for maintenance during operation but this is subject to further discussions with the landowner over potential conflicts in use</p>
2.13.6	The applicant	<p><b>Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP)</b></p> <p>oCTMP appendices B and C [REP2-142] do not appear to reflect Change 9 of the recent change request. Please address this.</p>	<p>Appendices B and C have been updated to reflect Change 9. The updated <b>Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010157/APP/7.7 Revision 4]</b> is submitted at Deadline 3.</p>
2.13.7	The applicant	<p><b>HGVs</b></p> <p>Regarding Link No.7, ES Chapter 14 paragraph 14.9.12 [REP2-081] refers to '39 daily HGV movements'. Please clarify the actual number of daily HGVs?</p>	<p>The '39 daily HGV movements' referenced in paragraph 14.9.12 refers to Traffic Figure 55 in <b>ES Volume 4, Appendix 14.2: Traffic Flow Diagrams [REP2-135]</b> which shows the 'Total Trip Generation AADT' (AADT is an initialism of Annual Average Daily Traffic) for Construction Phase 4 (Grid Connection and Land Areas D and E) which is the worst-case for Link 7.</p>



			Traffic Figure 55 shows 19 HGVs arriving and 19 HGVs departing via the private farm track off the A1035. The 19 HGV arrivals and 19 HGV departures equates to a total of 39 daily HGV movements (note that this is rounded up due to the calculations being based on percentages which does not always result in whole numbers) or 19 daily HGV vehicles.
2.13.8	The applicant	<p><b>Clarification</b></p> <p>ES Chapter 14, Table 14-26, Link No. 7, paragraph 3 [REP2-081] refers to 'Carr Lane'. Should this instead refer to 'private farm track'?</p>	The reference to 'Carr Lane' is a typographical error, which has been corrected to 'private farm track off the A1035'. Given the minor nature of the amendment, the updated document will be submitted at Deadline 5, with the change captured within the updated <b>Environmental Statement Addendum [EN010157/APP/8.2 Revision 5]</b> , which is submitted at Deadline 3.
<b>14. Cumulative</b>			
2.14.1	The applicant	<p><b>Inter-project cumulative effects</b></p> <p>ERYC (LIR paragraph 7.61 [REP1-086]) highlights contradictions in the overlap of construction periods in ES Chapter 15 Table 15-8 [REP2-018]. Please address this and any implications this may have for the assessment.</p>	Specific examples of the contradiction in the overlap of construction periods are not mentioned in paragraph 7.61 of the <b>LIR [REP1-086]</b> , although based on a review of Table 15-8 within <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects [REP2-018]</b> , the Applicant notes that the cases of the contradiction occurring appear to be regarding: ID 5, ID 10, and ID 23.

			<p>Explanations and any potential implications are provided for each other existing and/or approved development in this response below. The Applicant accepts that contradictions are an error in the choice of wording provided for Transport and Access. Updates have been made to <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects [REP2-018]</b> which will be re-submitted at Deadline 5, with the change captured within the updated <b>Environmental Statement Addendum [EN010157/APP/8.2 Revision 5]</b>, submitted at Deadline 3. It is not anticipated that there will be any new significant effects as a result of the changes made, and therefore there are no changes to the overall conclusions of <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects [REP2-018]</b>.</p> <p>In the case of ID 5 and ID 10 in Table 15-8 of <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects [REP2-018]</b> for the other existing and/or approved development it is stated that for Landscape and Visual the anticipated construction dates are unknown. In the absence of known dates it is assumed that it is possible there may be some overlap with the Proposed Development. However, as stated in <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects [REP2-018]</b> <i>"it is not considered that any of the cumulative effects would be considered"</i></p>
--	--	--	--

			<p><i>significant</i>". For Transport and Access, it is assumed that there will not be any overlap between the other existing and/or approved development and the Proposed Development. It is accepted by the Applicant that this assumption contradicts that of the response provided for Landscape and Visual. However, all construction activities will be managed by a Construction Environmental Management Plan and/or Construction Traffic Management Plan. Therefore, it is not considered that any overlaps in construction periods that may occur between the other existing and/or approved development and the Proposed Development will result in significant effects arising.</p> <p>In the case of ID 23 (Drove Lane Solar Farm). There is limited information currently available for other existing and/or approved development. While it is accepted there may be some overlap in the construction programme for Landscape and Visual, as stated in Table 15-8 of <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects [REP2-018]</b>: "<i>it is not considered that any of the cumulative effects would be considered significant, outside of where either development would result in significant effects in their own right</i>". The limited information available for this other existing and/or approved development currently demonstrates that it is unlikely any</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>significant inter-project cumulative effects would arise.</p> <p>As for all other existing/and or approved developments, information is continually being reviewed as part of the examination process to ensure that conclusions provided in <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects [REP2-018]</b> remain valid.</p>
2.14.2	The applicant	<p><b>Intra-project combined effects</b></p> <p>The ExA notes your response to ExQ1.14.7 [REP1-073]. However, please review your response in light of ExQ2.2.17 above.</p>	<p><b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Population [APP-049]</b> paragraph 13.9.1 was updated at Deadline 2 to reflect that there will be no temporary diversions to PRow and will be re-submitted at Deadline 5, with the change instead captured within the updated <b>Environmental Statement Addendum [REP2-147]</b>, which was submitted at Deadline 2.</p>

**RWE Renewables UK Limited**

Windmill Hill Business Park,  
Whitehill Way,  
Swindon,  
Wiltshire,  
England,  
SN5 6PB  
[www.rwe.com](http://www.rwe.com)