



Pear tree Hill Solar Farm

Response to Deadline 3 Submissions and Other Submissions

Application Document Ref: EN010157/APP/8.18
October 2025

Contents

1	Introduction.....	2
2	Response to Interested Parties.....	3
2.2	The Coal Authority	3
2.3	East Riding of Yorkshire Council.....	3
2.4	Albanwise Limited.....	25
2.5	Historic England.....	26
2.6	Beverley and North Holderness Internal Drainage Board.....	27
2.7	Environment Agency.....	28
2.8	Natural England.....	29
2.9	National Grid Electricity Transmission plc.....	30
2.10	National Gas Transmission plc.....	32
2.11	Network Rail Infrastructure Limited.....	35
2.12	Robertson James Wade	37
3	Response to REP1-084 and REP1-085	39

1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This report responds to submissions at Deadline 3 by interested parties as well as providing additional information as necessary. It responds to the key topics raised by each of the following interested parties:
- The Coal Authority **[REP3-051]**
 - East Riding of Yorkshire Council **[REP3-052]**, **[REP3-055]**, **[REP3-057]** and **[REP3-058]**
 - Albanwise Limited **[REP3-053]**
 - Historic England **[REP3-054]**
 - Beverley and North Holderness Internal Drainage Board **[REP3-058]**
 - Environment Agency **[REP3-059]**
 - Natural England **[REP3-060]** and **[REP3-063]**
 - National Grid Electricity Transmission plc **[REP3-061]**
 - National Gas Transmission plc **[REP3-062]**
 - Network Rail Infrastructure Limited **[REP3-062a]**
 - Robertson James Wade **[REP3-062b]**
- 1.1.2 Section 3 of this document also provides a response to matters raised within Issue Specific Hearing 1 DCO Agenda [EV4-001].

2 Response to Interested Parties

- 2.1.1 Sections 2.2 to 2.12 below provide the Applicant's response to all relevant interested parties submissions at Deadline 3.

2.2 The Coal Authority

- 2.2.1 Table 1 below provides the Applicant's response to key topics raised within The Coal Authority's (The CA) **Comments on the deadline 3 [REP3-051]** document submitted at Deadline 3.

Table 1: Applicant's Response to points raised by the CA at Deadline 3

CA Response Summary	Applicant Response
Further to the notification received from the applicant on 25th September 2025 seeking the views of the Coal Authority on the above, I have checked the site location plan against the information held by the Coal Authority and can confirm that the proposed development site is located outside of the defined coalfield. On this basis, the Planning team at the Coal Authority have no comments to make.	The Applicant notes The CA's response.

2.3 East Riding of Yorkshire Council

- 2.3.1 Table 2 below provides the Applicant's response to key topics raised within the East Riding of Yorkshire Council's (ERYC's) **Response to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions (ExQ2) [REP3-052], [REP3-055], [REP3-057] and [REP3-058]** documents submitted at Deadline 3.
- 2.3.2 Within the ERYC Response Summary column in Table 2 below, the ExA's original question contained within the **Examining Authority's Written Questions 2 (ExQ2) [PD-014]** is written in black, and the ERYC's response as contained within **Response to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions (ExQ2) [REP3-055]** is written in blue.

Table 2: Applicant's Response to points raised by ERYC at Deadline 3

Reference	ERYC Response Summary	Applicant Response
2.1.3	<p>Local Impact Report (LIR) The ExA notes that Appendix 1, as cited in the LIR [REP1-086], is missing from the LIR. The applicant has provided details of this towards the end of [REP2-037]. Do you intend to resubmit the LIR in full or can the ExA rely on the information provided in [REP2-037]?</p> <p>Whilst ERYC are satisfied that the ExA can rely on the information provided by the Applicant in REP2-037, ERYC will resubmit the LIR for Deadline 3.</p>	The Applicant notes this response.
2.2.3	<p>Requirements 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>Having liaised with the applicant ERYC's Ecologist is satisfied that BNG is appropriately secured through</p>	The Applicant notes this response and confirms that this is reflected in item ERYC28a of the Draft Statement of Common Ground with East Riding of Yorkshire Council [REP3-043] that was submitted at Deadline 3.

Reference	ERYC Response Summary	Applicant Response
	Requirement 9 in the Draft DCO [REP2-062] through the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan.	
2.2.4	<p>Requirements 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> <p>ERYC note that the NPS-EN1 advises that the Secretary of State may wish to include a requirement that specifies the approval by the local authority of an employment and skills plan. Whilst an additional requirement for such document would be welcomed, ERYC are satisfied with the applicant's response to ExQ1.2.7 [REP1-073] and would therefore defer to the ExQ on this matter.</p>	The Applicant notes this response.
2.2.11	Sch 2, Part 2, 21(2) – ERYC requested that the cited period of ten business days in a previous version of the dDCO be extended to allow a total of 21 days from receipt of a valid application for further information to be	The Applicant notes this response.

Reference	ERYC Response Summary	Applicant Response
	<p>requested. The applicant has amended this to '15 business days'. Are you satisfied with this?</p> <p>ERYC are satisfied with the amended period of 15 business days.</p>	
2.8.1	<p>Church of St. Margaret Please confirm whether you are content with the applicant's response [REP2-038] to concerns detailed in your response to ExQ1 [REP1-094] regarding the need to consider the impact of the proposed development in relation to the Church of St. Margaret, a grade II* listed building.</p> <p>ERYC raised in our previous comments that there would be a benefit to an additional assessment of the potential impact on the development on the Church of St. Margaret in Long Riston, but that we did not have concerns with the assessment of no impact on the significance of the Long Riston Conservation Area. The applicant has referred back to their initial heritage assessment (APP-118 and APP-119) and their assessment that there would be no impact on the significance of the church. While it is appreciated that we did not raise initial concerns in relation to this asset, following the previous round of questions we did give this asset additional thought.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this response and confirms that this item has been agreed and reflected in new item ERYC06a of the Draft Statement of Common Ground with East Riding of Yorkshire Council [EN010157/APP/9.2 Revision 4] submitted at Deadline 4.</p>

Reference	ERYC Response Summary	Applicant Response
	<p>It is noted from a desk-based analysis that there will likely be long views from the A165, looking south-east, where there will be some intervisibility with the solar panels in the foreground and the church in the background- albeit one offset from the other. While it is appreciated that intervisibility does not intrinsically equate to harm, and that the panels would be offset rather than directly intervening, it is suggested that a further consideration of the impact would be beneficial. In particular, the longer views of the church do allow its presence and its architectural sophistication to be appreciated, as well as having a functional reason- by providing a landmark in the wider landscape, emphasising the centrality of faith in medieval and early modern life, and serving to emphasise the importance of the Church in the social hierarchy. It is, however, noted that the impact of any solar panels would affect one element that contributes to the significance of the church, its setting. Within this, it would only affect one element of its setting, and would not alter its immediate setting, or the contribution that its setting makes to illustrating the church's relationship with the rest of the village. Any harm would therefore need to be assessed as part of this cumulative significance, and it is accepted that this impact would be low and would have a</p>	

Reference	ERYC Response Summary	Applicant Response
	cumulatively minimal effect on the overall impact of the development.	
2.8.2	<p>Abbey Cottage</p> <p>Please confirm whether you are content with the applicant's response [REP2-037] to concerns detailed in the LIR [REP1-086] regarding the need to consider the impact of the proposed development in relation to Abbey Cottage, a grade II listed building.</p> <p>The applicant has provided additional information in relation to why this has been scoped out. It is noted that the site is outside the development limit and that the likely quantum of effect will be none or negligible, particularly if the existing landscaping around the listed building remains. While we flagged that it would be positive if some thought were to be given to the potential for the works to allow any heritage benefits which would be accrued from the removal of the existing surrounding landscape, it is accepted that this goes beyond what can be controlled under the Development Order. As such we are happy to accept this asset being scoped out.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this response and confirms that this item has been agreed and reflected in item ERYC06b of the Draft Statement of Common Ground with East Riding of Yorkshire Council [EN010157/APP/9.2 Revision 4] submitted at Deadline 4.</p>
2.9.2	<p>Soils assessment methodology</p> <p>Please confirm whether you are satisfied with the applicant's response [REP2-037] and updated</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this response.</p>

Reference	ERYC Response Summary	Applicant Response
	<p>documents relating to concerns raised in the LIR [REP-086] regarding ES Chapter 10 [REP2-077].</p> <p>ERYC are satisfied with the updated Agriculture and soils element of the ES chapter. Which includes a much better consideration to the soils and agriculture as separate resources. The changes are therefore considered sufficient with enough care taken.</p>	
2.10.1	<p>Residential visual amenity</p> <p>a) Are you satisfied with the applicant's response on page 17 of [REP2-037] to your concern in LIR paragraph 7.64 of [REP1-086] relating to the Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) [APP-132] and potential for cumulative effects for residents of Woodhouse and Meaux Decoy Farm as a result of Carr Farm Solar Farm; and</p> <p>Yes, the response is satisfactory and we are grateful for the clarification that there are two Carr House Farms, which does lead to some confusion.</p> <p>b) Regarding paragraph 7.64 of your LIR [REP1-086] relating to the RVAA [APP-132] and potential for cumulative effects as a result of Carr Farm Solar Farm, the ExA notes there are two properties named 'Carr House Farm', the closest of which to the site of Carr</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this response, however we wish to point out that the response to point b) should state 'former' and not 'latter' i.e. no significant effects have been identified for Carr House Farm (Weel); whereas significant effects have been identified on Carr House Farm (Long Riston) as per ES Volume 2, Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual [APP-047].</p>

Reference	ERYC Response Summary	Applicant Response
	<p>Farm Solar Farm being Carr House Farm (Weel), with Carr House Farm (Long Riston) being remote from it. While the RVAA identifies potential for a significant visual effect for the residents of Carr House Farm (Long Riston), this is not the case for Carr House Farm (Weel). The applicant also notes this to be the case in [REP2-037]. Please thus clarify your concern in this regard.</p> <p>The distinction between Carr House Farm (Weel) and Carr House Farm (Long Riston) is noted and we acknowledge that there is no anticipated significant effect upon the latter.</p>	
2.10.3	<p>Effects</p> <p>The applicant addresses [REP2-037] matters raised in your LIR at paragraph 7.47 (landscape character area) and 7.55 (lighting). Please confirm whether you are satisfied with the response, and if not, explain why.</p> <p>LCAs: We are grateful to the applicant for pointing out the specific LVIA reference para 11.4.12 and note the subsequent information at paras 11.5.20/21.</p> <p>Lighting: we acknowledge the OOEMP [APP-154] statement at para 4.3.1 “During operation (including maintenance), no part of the Proposed Development will be continuously lit; infra-red security lighting will be</p>	<p>Regarding LCAs the Applicant notes this response.</p> <p>Regarding construction lighting a meeting was held between the Applicant and the East Riding of Yorkshire Council landscape consultants on 28 October 2025. During the meeting both parties acknowledged that any effects of construction lighting on landscape character and visual amenity would be not significant. East Riding of Yorkshire Council were referred to the measures within the Outline CEMP [REP3-026] that details the general principles in</p>

Reference	ERYC Response Summary	Applicant Response
	<p>utilised for operational and security purposes.” This being the case, we accept that Operational nighttime and lighting effects are appropriately scoped out of the LVIA. What is less clear is what the Construction phase effects would be, and what would be the (temporary landscape and visual) effects of the lighting described in the OCEMP [APP-153] at para 4.4. Whilst effects might be minor, the extent, duration and visibility of this lighting is not clearly described. Effects of vehicular lighting (in winter months) might also be usefully considered. These matters could be addressed as part of the examination.</p>	<p>place to limit impacts from construction lighting; that construction in any one location should occur over a maximum of one winter season (when lighting impacts would be greater) and that consultation would continue with the Council on construction processes, including lighting.</p> <p>This agreement has been captured within new item ERYC36a of the Draft Statement of Common Ground with East Riding of Yorkshire Council [EN010157/APP/9.2 Revision 4] submitted at Deadline 4.</p>
2.10.4	<p>Mitigation</p> <p>The applicant has responded [REP2-037] to the LIR (including paragraphs 7.185, 7.189, 7.295) in respect of ERYC’s suggestion for additional planting along the southern boundary of field F13 to address effects for users of ‘Swine PROW’ (which the ExA understands refers to footpath SWINF07). The applicant notes there is already a hedge in this location and in other fields and due to this, and distances involved, views of the proposed development from this PROW, and one to the south (which the ExA understands to be WAWNB10)</p>	<p>A meeting was held between the Applicant and the East Riding of Yorkshire Council landscape consultants on 28 October 2025. It was agreed that the minimum heights of screening hedgerows (as set out in the Outline LEMP [EN010157/APP/7.5 Revision 7]) would be maintained when they are trimmed, so they would be maintained in the region of 3-3.5m in height. This agreement has been captured in new item ERYC36b of the Draft Statement of Common Ground with East Riding of</p>

Reference	ERYC Response Summary	Applicant Response
	<p>would be limited. Please confirm whether this alleviates your concerns, and if not, explain why.</p> <p>The detailed local knowledge of the applicant is appreciated in respect of identifying existing hedgerow cover. We also note the proposed approach in [REP2-037] “as a hedgerow on the site boundary the height of the hedgerow would be allowed to grow by reduced hedgerow flailing” which is confirmed in LVIA [APP-048] para 11.4.32 “It has been assumed that, where necessary and appropriate for the mitigation of landscape and visual effects, any existing hedgerows adjoining the Site would be repaired/improved with new planting to infill gaps. It has also been assumed that any existing hedgerows adjoining the Site would be maintained at a minimum of 3.5m in height...”. This commitment is confirmed in the LEMP [REP2-140] which states (Table 6.1) “Existing hedgerow trimmed to desired height: Generally existing hedgerows will be allowed to grow to a height of 3.5m. Hedgerows adjacent to Monk Dike will be allowed to grow to a height of 4m. All will be cut on a two- or three-year rotation (different sections of hedgerow being cut each year).” Presumably, this will have the same result as stated for new hedgerows, Table 10- 3 “The established ... hedge is to be maintained at 3- 3.5m high and 2-3m wide.” Given the proposed maximum panel height of 3m, this</p>	<p>Yorkshire Council [EN010157/APP/9.2 Revision 4] submitted at Deadline 4.</p>


Reference	ERYC Response Summary	Applicant Response
	approach would, in most instances, be sufficient to effectively screen the panels.	
2.10.5	<p>Mitigation The applicant has responded to ERYC's other suggestions in the LIR relating to additional mitigation planting (including at paragraphs 7.63, 7.251, 7.293, and 7.298 of the LIR) to further reduce adverse visual effects. Please confirm whether you are satisfied with the response, and if not, explain why.</p> <p>Carr House Farm, Long Riston: It seems likely that more tree/scrub planting could be carried out in the field immediately south of Carr House Farm to enhance mitigation, with no effect on the overall capacity of the Proposed Development to produce energy. 'Off-site' planting, to the south and west boundaries, could be explored with the property owner.</p> <p>Meaux Decoy Farm: there appears to be scope for more hedgerow/scrub/tree planting within the proposed biodiversity mitigation area, or within the garden area.</p> <p>Woodhouse: there appears to be scope for more hedgerow/scrub/tree planting within/adjacent to the proposed biodiversity mitigation area, to benefit the approach to the property.</p>	<p><u>Carr House Farm, Long Riston:</u></p> <p>The planting suggested by East Riding of Yorkshire Council would impact biodiversity measures. This area provides mitigation for ground nesting birds and as such scrub and tree planting would reduce the mitigation offering for ground nesting birds and therefore would not be appropriate. In addition, planting of trees and hedgerows has been deliberately avoided away from the boundaries of this field to avoid sterilising agricultural land. Finally, the introduction of tree planting in these locations is unlikely to noticeably reduce effects on the residents at Carr House Farm; the distance from the proposed infrastructure, existing hedgerow and proposed mitigation mean that views southwards from ground level of the Proposed Development are already heavily screened. Whilst views would remain possible from upper floor windows, any additional proposed mitigation is unlikely to provide significant screening benefits from the upper floor.</p>


Reference	ERYC Response Summary	Applicant Response
	<p>Planting within or adjacent to property boundaries obviously has to be secured with the approval of the property and/or landowner. Does the applicant have capacity to implement planting outside the DCO boundary?</p>	<p><u>Meaux Decoy Farm:</u></p> <p>This proposed planting would impact the biodiversity measures. This area provides mitigation for ground nesting birds; an exception is the area marked for scrub vegetation which could, alternatively, be planted with trees but it is not considered this would make a large difference to screening visual effects from the property.</p> <p><u>Woodhouse:</u></p> <p>The closest area of mitigation measures to Woodhouse includes hedgerow screening to the periphery of Fields E3 and E4 which provides screening of the panels in that location, and an area of biodiversity mitigation for ground nesting birds, which for the reasons already discussed, for the other areas would not be appropriate as it would reduce the mitigation for ground nesting birds.</p> <p><u>Planting Outside Order Limits:</u></p> <p>The Applicant is committed to introducing a high level of new planting, and has also taken into account other factors including biodiversity mitigation measures and not wishing to sterilise</p>

Reference	ERYC Response Summary	Applicant Response
		<p>arable fields. In these circumstances it would not be appropriate to introduce planting outside the Order Limits given what is included in the Order Limits is proportionate, and meets the legal and policy requirements.</p> <p>A meeting between the Applicant and East Riding of Yorkshire Council Landscape Officer took place on 28 October 2025. As set out in item ERYC34 of the updated Draft Statement of Common Ground with East Riding of Yorkshire Council [EN010157/APP/9.2 Revision 4], which is submitted at Deadline 4, it was agreed that new hedgerows would be planted on the eastern boundary of Field E1 and western boundary of Field E2 either side of the access track to Meaux Decoy Farm and Woodhouse to help soften the impacts for residents of those properties as they used the access track. The Applicant will also explore the feasibility of increasing the separation between the permissive path and the solar PV modules at the southern extent of Field D17 to allow for hedgerow planting and will continue to liaise with East Riding of Yorkshire Council on this matter. It was agreed that no further mitigation</p>



Reference	ERYC Response Summary	Applicant Response
		measures were practical and feasible, when all issues are taken into account.
2.11.1	<p>Noise mitigation measures</p> <p>Please confirm that you are content with the applicant's response [REP2-037] to the LIR [REP1-086], regarding whether there is a need for more robust mitigation measures in relation to residential properties where the noise impact/ rating level of the proposed development is predicted to be in excess of +10dB taking into account mitigation.</p> <p>ERYC's Environmental Control Officer is satisfied with the Applicants response and the recommendation of exploring additional or more robust mitigation measures to lower the noise impact on these properties as far as is reasonably practicable.</p>	The Applicant notes this response.
2.13.1	<p>Use of Park Lane during construction The applicant has responded (on pages 19 and 20 of [REP2-037] and pages 71 to 74 of [REP2- 038]) to your concerns regarding the use of Park Lane during construction (and has committed to the restriction of the use of this route around school drop off and pick up times (oCTMP paragraph 6.1.8 [REP2-142])). You will also note the</p>	<p>The Proposed Development will require access to the area within the Order Limits adjacent to National Grid Creyke Beck Substation for a short period (approximately 3 months) whilst the cable grid connection works are undertaken. It is anticipated that this will require approximately a peak of 10 HGVs (20 HGV movements) and 10 LGVs (20 LGV movements) per day. As set</p>

Reference	ERYC Response Summary	Applicant Response
	<p>observations in the note of the ExA's unaccompanied site inspection (USI2 [EV1-002])). Please:</p> <p>a) Confirm whether the applicant's response addresses your concerns, and if not, the reasons for this;</p> <p><i>The response does not address or satisfy the council in terms of its concerns regarding the use of Park Lane and the PROW.</i></p> <p>b) If it does not address your concerns, clarify, with supporting evidence your views on the severity of any impact/ effect, noting that the LIR states at paragraph 7.74 that '[...] the use of Park Lane could have significant impact [...]' whereas paragraph 7.114 states 'It is considered it would have a negative impact on highway safety and residential amenity [...]', and is thus not clear on the matter; and</p> <p><i>The most recent seven-day traffic count that has been undertaken by ERYC located near on Park Lane near Henson Drive in September 2020 which identified an HGV rate of 0.2% of average daily trips of 1154. This equates to an average of less than 3 two-way HGV movement per day. Therefore, any increase that may be considered modest along Northgate would be considered fairly significant along this section of Park</i></p>	<p>out in the Outline CTMP [EN010157/APP/7.7 Revision 5], the Applicant would restrict HGVs to routing on Park Lane, Harland Way and Northgate outside of local school drop-off and pick-up times. the Applicant would restrict HGVs to routing on Park Lane, Harland Way and Northgate outside of local school drop-off and pick-up times.</p> <p>The Outline CTMP [EN010157/APP/7.7 Revision 5] sets out measures which are proposed to be implemented in order to mitigate potential highway safety related issues as a result of construction traffic routing via Park Lane.</p> <p>The CTMP will confirm the details of traffic measures.</p> <p>Additionally, measures are set out in the Outline Rights of Way and Access Management Plan (RoWAMP) [REP2-144] for the careful management of PROW (including Riston Footpath 17 which is located on Park Lane) using temporary closures and bankspeople. The RoWAMP will confirm the</p>

Reference	ERYC Response Summary	Applicant Response
	<p>Lane. The traffic count information is submitted as Appendix A.</p> <p>The Visibility at the Junction with Park lane and Northgate is very limited due to existing dwellings and the tight radii (See figure 1). The Departure side (left is acceptable and complies with Manul for Streets, however the arrival side (right) is very restricted and only has 2.4 x 18m visibility splay to the nearside kerb and does not comply with the 2.4 x 43m for a 30mph speed limit. An OS based drawing showing the visibility splay is shown in Appendix B.</p>  <p>Figure 1: Arrival side junction visibility looking west along Northgate from Park Lane</p>	<p>details of measures for managing PRow users and construction traffic.</p> <p>It is understood that Park Lane will be used for construction vehicle routing associated with the consented Creyke Beck Battery Storage and Solar Farm site (23/03926/STPLF) with a total of 2,004 HGV movements anticipated across the construction phase (as set out in their CTMP) which equates to an anticipated daily maximum of 40 HGV movements along Park Lane (comprising 20 HGV arrivals and 20 HGV departures).</p> <p>Following ongoing discussions with East Riding of Yorkshire Council, including as part of item 8 of the Issue Specific Hearing 2 [EV6-002], the Outline CTMP [EN010157/APP/7.7 Revision 5] has been updated to state the following: “The Applicant will explore the use of an alternative access which is planned to be created off the A1079 and is associated with the construction of the Wanlass Beck substation as an alternative to the proposed access on Park Lane, should the access off the A1079 have been constructed and made operational, at an appropriate time to avoid disruption or delay to</p>

Reference	ERYC Response Summary	Applicant Response
	<p>The junction is so constrained that limited number of HGVs that typically use this junction over run the footpath due to the tight radii on the western side of the junction, see figure 2.</p>  <p>Figure 2: Damage to Kerbing and footpath due to HGV overrun on Park Lane Junction</p> <p>Park lane itself is heavily populated and at times can become constrained due to resident parking and the horizontal alignment of the road, an example of this is shown in Figure 3. There are also access points to King George V Playing fields, where young children enter and exit Park Lane.</p> <p>Following discussion with the PROW team it was acknowledge that the Park Lane PROW is one of the Councils heaviest utilised PROWS especially for those</p>	<p>the construction programme of the Proposed Development and subject to all necessary agreements and rights being able to be obtained to use the access.” The updated Outline CTMP [EN010157/APP/7.7 Revision 5] is submitted at Deadline 4.</p>

Reference	ERYC Response Summary	Applicant Response
	<p>commuting from Beverley and Cottingham on bicycle and a high number of leisure users. The recent use of the PROW has been limited due to the works at Jocks lodge upgrade. This has also coupled with a section of the PROW subject to a temporary closure due to the PROW upgrades associated with the Hitachi substation. This was reopened in early September which could further explain the limited number of users during the inspectors visit. The use of the PROW has started to pick back up now this section has been reopened.</p>  <p>Figure 3 – Constrained nature of Park Lane at the first bend due to parked cars</p> <p>Northgate itself also has its constraints both sides of the Park Lane Junction, where often due to park cars in</p>	

Reference	ERYC Response Summary	Applicant Response
	<p>narrowed to single width allowing only one HGV/bus to pass at a time, sometimes this also restrict private vehicles to single lane. The constrained areas in question are in very close proximity with the junction and these can be seen in Figures 4 and 5.</p>  <p>Figure 4: Constrained nature of Northgate to the East</p> 	

Reference	ERYC Response Summary	Applicant Response
	<p>Figure 5: Constrained nature of Northgate to the west of the access</p> <p>It is understood that the applicants consultants have recommended that HGVs do not deliver or depart the site during the school pick up and drop off time, however the only school likely to be affected is over one mile away from the site entrance on Park Lane and on a busy B classified road (B1233). The school facilitates an area off the road for drop offs and pick up, although there are often drop offs and picks up outside the area, whilst the council welcome the idea of avoiding these times, the grave concern is more in relation to the Park Lane and its junction with Northgate.</p> <p>c) Provide your view, noting NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.14.21, as to whether there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety?</p> <p>Para 5.14.21 states 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.</p>	

Reference	ERYC Response Summary	Applicant Response
	<p>It is the Local Highway Authorities opinion that give the details outlined above the development could have an unacceptable impact on highway safety. This is specifically in relation to the use of the Park lane/Northgate Junction and the sue of the PROW as a haulage route.</p> <p>If the inspector is minded to allow the use of Park Lane for construction the council would like to see further restrictions such as construction traffic along park lane is only permitted between 09:30- 15:00, avoiding the school and network traffic peaks.</p>	
2.13.2	<p>Personal injury data</p> <p>Further to your LIR, are you satisfied with the updates in ES Appendix 14.4 [REP2-027] and ES Chapter 14 [REP2-017] (carried forward into [REP2-081]) in respect of updated personal injury data?</p> <p>The additional information with the additional 2023 Personal Injury Collision data is satisfactory to provide the assessment required.</p>	This response is noted.
2.13.3	<p>Agreements, notices, licences and details</p> <p>Regarding concerns in LIR paragraphs 7.110 to 7.112 [REP1-086] around the necessity for s278 and/ or s184 agreements and the concern regarding the waiver of</p>	The matter of the maintenance period was discussed at Issue Specific Hearing 1 – DCO on 21 October 2025. Following this discussion, the Applicant has contacted ERYC via email on 29

Reference	ERYC Response Summary	Applicant Response
	<p>some clauses of the New Roads Street Works Act 1991, the applicant responded to this on pages 32 to 35 of document [REP2-037]. Please clarify whether the response alleviates your concerns and, if not, the reasons for this.</p> <p>Applicant's answer is considered acceptable in principle, however there are standards the Council will accept in terms of street/road works. Our S278 agreements often are reflective of the location and number of msa's over the area subject to a S278. The Council would welcome the maintenance period is reflective of the works scheduled end date or at least a minimum 24-month post construction period to be covered.</p>	<p>October 2025 confirming the Applicant's position and is yet to receive a response. The Applicant will provide an update on this matter in the Statement of Common Ground with ERYC submitted at Deadline 5.</p>

2.4 Albanwise Limited

- 2.4.1 Albanwise Limited's submission, **Comments on the deadline 3 submissions [REP3-053]**, sought clarification with regards to the Issue Specific Hearing 1 and Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (CAH1) which took place on 22 October 2025.
- 2.4.2 The matters contained within the letter were discussed at those hearings and no further response is proposed by the Applicant for this deadline.
- 2.4.3 The Applicant is seeking further engagement with Albanwise Limited following CAH1 and will provide updates to the ExA as necessary and relevant.

2.5 Historic England

- 2.5.1 Historic England's submission, **Comments on the deadline 3 submissions [REP3-054]**, relates to the Proposed Provision for the Compulsory Acquisition of Additional Land. The Applicant notes that Historic England does not have any objection to the proposed changes to the application and has no comments on this submission.

2.6 Beverley and North Holderness Internal Drainage Board

- 2.6.1 Table 3 below provides the Applicant's response to key topics raised within the Beverley and North Holderness Internal Drainage Board **Response to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions (ExQ2) [REP3-058]** document submitted at Deadline 3.

Table 3: Applicant's Response to points raised by the Beverley and North Holderness Internal Drainage Board at Deadline 3

Beverley and North Holderness Internal Drainage Board Response Summary	Applicant Response
<p>Following on from the Board's response to the ExA first written questions, the Board has now reviewed the updated Draft DCO and can confirm that the Board accepts the changes made in relation to the definition of "specified work". This has also been communicated to the applicant in order for them to update the draft Statement of Common Ground.</p> <p>Generally, the Board does not own any land, or watercourses – these are all riparian owned. The Board has a drainage district, which the Land Drainage Act 1991 and the Board's byelaws apply to. In this instance, the protective provisions will apply instead of the usual regulatory framework with respect to works regarding the proposed development. Any compulsory acquisition or temporary possession of land should not interfere with the way the protective provisions apply.</p> <p>The Board would wish to clarify that this response is strictly in relation to the issues of the protective provisions, compulsory acquisition, and temporary possession. The Board remains in discussions with the applicant regarding the separate issues as laid out in the Statement of Common Ground.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes Beverley and North Holderness Internal Drainage Board's response.</p>

2.7 Environment Agency

- 2.7.1 Table 4 below provides the Applicant's response to key topics raised within the Environment Agency's **Response to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions (ExQ2) [REP3-059]** document submitted at Deadline 3.
- 2.7.2 Additionally, it is noted that Appendix A to the Environment Agency's **Response to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions (ExQ2) [REP3-059]** reflects the updates to the **Draft Statement of Common Ground with the Environment Agency [EN010157/APP/9.4 Revision 3]** submitted at Deadline 4.

Table 4: Applicant's response to points raised by the Environment Agency at Deadline 3

Environment Agency Response Summary	Applicant Response
<p>a) identify any outstanding key concerns or impediments with regard to reaching agreement with the applicant on CA/ TP matters and protective provisions; and</p> <p>We confirm that we have come to an agreement with the Applicant in regard to the Protected Provisions for the Environment Agency.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes the Environment Agency's response.</p>
<p>b) clarify whether you are confident of reaching agreement with the applicant before the close of the examination, and if not, any implications for this?</p> <p>Not applicable, as the provisions have now been agreed.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes the Environment Agency's response.</p>

2.8 Natural England

2.8.1 Table 5 below provides the Applicant's response to key topics raised within the Natural England's **Response to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions (ExQ2) [REP3-060]** document submitted at Deadline 3.

Table 5: Applicant's response to points raised by the Natural England at Deadline 3

ExA Question	Natural England Response Summary	Applicant Response
<p>HRA</p> <p>An update to the HRA [REP2-071] was provided to reflect the Change Request. Please confirm if you agree with the applicant's conclusions regarding the effects of the Change Request on European sites from all phases of the proposed development, including in-combination effects.</p>	<p>Natural England has reviewed the proposed changes and confirms that they do not substantially affect the conclusions of the assessments presented in the shadow HRA submitted at Deadline 2.</p> <p>Please refer to our Deadline 2 response [REP2-154] for our outstanding comments regarding the shadow HRA and associated documents.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes Natural England's response.</p>

2.9 National Grid Electricity Transmission plc

2.9.1 Table 4 below provides the Applicant's response to key topics raised within the National Grid Electricity Transmission plc **Response to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions (ExQ2) [REP3-061]** document submitted at Deadline 3.

Table 6: Applicant's Response to points raised by the National Grid Electricity Transmission plc at Deadline 3

ExA question	National Grid Electricity Transmission plc Response Summary	Applicant Response
<p>Protective provisions</p> <p>Please review the applicant's deadline 2 (including change request) submissions and:</p> <p>a) identify any outstanding key concerns or impediments with regard to reaching agreement with the applicant on CA/ TP matters and protective provisions; and</p> <p>b) clarify whether you are confident of reaching agreement with the applicant before the close of the examination, and if not, any implications for this?</p>	<p>NGET seeks to ensure any interaction between the Applicant works and its apparatus is sufficiently protected through the inclusion of its standard protective provisions as appended to [REP1-103] (NGET Protective Provisions).</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt, NGET note that the interactions between NGET's apparatus and the Applicant's works are not affected by the change request.</p> <p>NGET respond to parts (a) and (b) as follows:</p> <p>The Applicant's Response to comments on RR and additional submissions, response to WR and response to ExA Written Questions 1 responses [REP2-038] responds to NGET's Written Representation [REP1-103] and NGET's</p>	<p>The Applicant is in discussions with NGET regarding bespoke protective provisions and will continue to engage to reach agreement where possible.</p> <p>The Applicant has included in the latest iteration of the draft DCO [EN010157/APP/3.1 Revision 8] the Applicant's preferred protective provisions.</p> <p>The Applicant has also submitted at Deadline 4, Justification for the Applicant's preferred Protective Provisions at Appendix 1 to the Written Summary of Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearing 1 - DCO [EN010157/APP/8.21].</p> <p>This document sets out the Applicant's position in relation to those protective provisions that are not yet agreed as well as the</p>

	<p>responses to the Examiner's First Written Questions [REP1-096] respectively as follows:</p> <p><i>"The Applicant is in discussions with NGET regarding bespoke protective provisions and once agreed these will be included in the draft DCO. Whilst hopeful that an agreement can be reached, to the extent that no agreement has been reached by Deadline 5 the Applicant will set out the outstanding issues to the Examining Authority."</i></p> <p><i>"The Applicant is in discussions with NGET regarding bespoke protective provisions and once agreed these will be included in the draft DCO"</i></p> <p>Negotiations between the parties remain ongoing but there remain outstanding points between the parties and as such NGET maintains that the NGET Protective Provisions must be included in the draft Order for the reasons set out in full in [REP1-103]. Only the NGET Protective Provisions can provide adequate protection for NGET.</p>	<p>reasoning for the Applicant's proposed drafting.</p>
--	--	---

2.10 National Gas Transmission plc

2.10.1 Table 5 below provides the Applicant's response to key topics raised within the National Gas Transmission plc **Response to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions (ExQ2) [REP3-062]** document submitted at Deadline 3.

Table 7: Applicant's Response to points raised by the National Gas Transmission plc at Deadline 3

ExA question	National Grid Electricity Transmission plc Response Summary	Applicant Response
<p>Protective provisions</p> <p>Please review the applicant's deadline 2 (including change request) submissions and:</p> <p>a) identify any outstanding key concerns or impediments with regard to reaching agreement with the applicant on CA/ TP matters and protective provisions; and</p> <p>b) clarify whether you are confident of reaching agreement with the applicant before the close of the examination, and if not, any implications for this?</p>	<p>The Applicant's Change 4 change request (Enhanced access to grid connection cable route via Hull Rod / Williams Way A1174) includes the temporary possession of land and permanent acquisition of rights over plots 14-16 and 14-17.</p> <p>Feeder 29 – Ganstead to Asselby (being apparatus of NGT) runs through plots 14-16 and 14-17. This apparatus is shown in the plan appended to NGT's Written Representation [REP1-099]. NGT therefore seeks to ensure any interaction between the Applicant works and its apparatus is sufficiently protected through the inclusion of its standard protective provisions as appended to [REP1-099] (NGT Protective Provisions).</p>	<p>The Applicant is in discussions with NGT regarding bespoke protective provisions and will continue to engage to reach agreement where possible.</p> <p>The Applicant has included in the latest iteration of the draft DCO [EN010157/APP/3.1 Revision 8] the Applicant's preferred protective provisions.</p> <p>The Applicant has also submitted at Deadline 4, Justification for the Applicant's preferred Protective Provisions at Appendix 1 to the Written Summary of Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearing 1 - DCO [EN010157/APP/8.21].</p> <p>This document sets out the Applicant's position in relation to those protective provisions that are not yet agreed as well as the</p>

	<p>NGT responds to parts (a) and (b) as follows:</p> <p>The Applicant's Response to comments on RR and additional submissions, response to WR and response to ExA Written Questions 1 responses [REP2-038] responds to [REP1-099] and NGT's responses to the Examiner's First Written Questions [REP1-091] respectively as follows:</p> <p><i>"The Applicant is in discussions with NGT regarding bespoke protective provisions and once agreed these will be included in the draft DCO. Whilst hopeful that an agreement can be reached, to the extent that no agreement has been reached by Deadline 5 the Applicant will set out the outstanding issues to the Examining Authority."</i></p> <p><i>"The Applicant is in discussions with NGT regarding bespoke protective provisions and once agreed these will be included in the draft DCO"</i></p> <p>Negotiations between the parties remain ongoing but there remain outstanding points between the parties and as such NGT maintains that the NGT Protective Provisions must be included in the draft Order for the reasons set out in</p>	<p>reasoning for the Applicant's proposed drafting.</p>
--	---	---

	full in [REP1-099]. Only the NGT Protective Provisions can provide adequate protection for NGT.	
--	---	--

2.11 Network Rail Infrastructure Limited

2.11.1 Table 6 below provides the Applicant's response to key topics raised within the Network Rail Infrastructure Limited's **Responses to the ExA's second written questions (ExQ2) [REP3-062a]** document submitted at Deadline 3.

Table 8: Applicant's Response to points raised by the Network Rail Infrastructure Limited at Deadline 3

ExA question	Network Rail Infrastructure Limited Response Summary	Applicant Response
<p>Protective provisions</p> <p>Please review the applicant's deadline 2 (including change request) submissions and:</p> <p>a) identify any outstanding key concerns or impediments with regard to reaching agreement with the applicant on CA/ TP matters and protective provisions; and</p> <p>b) clarify whether you are confident of reaching agreement with the applicant before the close of the examination, and if not, any implications for this?</p>	<p>(a) Network Rail have been actively engaging with the Applicants solicitors throughout the life of the scheme so far. The parties have made good and substantial progress to date and are continuing to address concerns that relate to the safety and operational integrity of the railway.</p> <p>(b) Network Rail are confident that an agreement could be reached on or before the close of examination, if not shortly thereafter. As noted in the Relevant Representations submitted 30 May 2025, in order for Network Rail to be in a position to withdraw its objection, Network Rail will require adequate protective provisions to be included within the Order, if made (and as amended) (the form of which is noted at Appendix 1 below) and an agreement with the</p>	<p>The Applicant is in discussions with Network Rail regarding bespoke protective provisions and will continue to engage to reach agreement where possible.</p> <p>The Applicant has included in the latest iteration of the draft DCO [EN010157/APP/3.1 Revision 8] the Applicant's preferred protective provisions.</p> <p>The Applicant has also submitted at Deadline 4, Justification for the Applicant's preferred Protective Provisions at Appendix 1 to the Written Summary of Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearing 1 - DCO [EN010157/APP/8.21].</p> <p>This document sets out the Applicant's position in relation to those protective provisions that are not yet agreed as well as the reasoning for the</p>

	Promoter to ensure that the new rights sought are exercised in regulated manner to prevent adverse impacts to the Railway.	Applicant's proposed drafting.
--	--	--------------------------------

2.12 Robertson James Wade

2.12.1 Table 7 below provides the Applicant's response to key topics raised within the Robertson James Wade's **Response to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions (ExQ2) [REP3-062b]** document submitted at Deadline 3.

Table 9: Applicant's Response to points raised by the Robertson James Wade at Deadline 3

Robertson James Wade Response Summary	Applicant Response
I accept that the Applicant has received an offer from Northern Power Grid on the 8th June 2021 and accepted that offer on the 15th July 2021 thus allowing connection to the existing 132kV Creyke Beck substation.	The Applicant notes this response.
<p>In answer to ExQ1 at 1.1.6 the Applicant states "When the Applicant secured its Grid Connection Offer, capacity existed within the existing NG Creke Beck Substation and the Applicant has had no indication from NGET that there is or will be insufficient capacity to accommodate the Proposed Development."</p> <p>The NGET representations appear to contradict this unless the Grid Connection Agreement is an absolute commitment. I believe a copy should be placed in the Examination Library. It is presumably dependant on the undertaking of material operations as defined by S.155 of the Planning Act 2008</p> <p>The Agreement seems to specify the earliest start date for</p>	<p>The Applicant has already set out that its current connection date is May 2033. However, it has sought an accelerated connection date by way of a 'Gate 2' submission, the outcome of which is not expected until 2026 pending NESO consideration of all Gate 2 submissions.</p> <p>There is no incentive for the Applicant to construct the Proposed Development if it cannot export electricity. Construction phasing will be optimised on the basis of commencing export at the agreed connection date.</p> <p>A Grid Connection Agreement contains commercially sensitive information and the Applicant does not consider it appropriate for it to be submitted. All information that is relevant to the Application for Development Consent is contained with the Grid Connection Statement [APP-152].</p>

connection as 2033 and the backstop date of 2035.

The Applicant appears to have submitted a “Gate 2” application but has yet to state the outcome and states that it is able to deliver the project in advance of 2030. Whether it fully meets the criteria is a matter for NESO presumably but I am unsure that the option agreements or issues with Crown Land have been finalised.

I accept that it is a commercial risk to be considered by the Applicant as to whether a connection to the National Grid can be made, but irrational to allow the project to proceed if causes only planning blight and the sterilisation of useful agricultural resources over a number of years through a failure so to connect.

3 Response to REP1-084 and REP1-085

- 3.1.1 At item seven of the **Issue Specific Hearing 1 – DCO agenda [EV4-001]** the ExA asked for the Applicant to signpost where it had responded to **Local Impact Report (LIR) - committee resolution [REP1-084]** and **Local Impact Report (LIR) - committee meeting minutes [REP1-085]** as prepared by East Riding of Yorkshire Council. Responses to these documents were not provided within the Applicants **Response to Local Impact Report [REP2-037]**.
- 3.1.2 It is noted that **Local Impact Report (LIR) - committee meeting minutes [REP1-085]** largely repeats the points set out in **Local Impact Report (LIR) - committee resolution [REP1-084]**. As such, specific response to the former document is not proposed as response to the later will suitably address its points.
- 3.1.3 Table 10 below responds to the matters raised within the **Local Impact Report (LIR) - committee meeting minutes [REP1-085]**. The Applicant considers that each of the points raised in Table 10 below were appropriately addressed within the **Response to Local Impact Report [REP2-037]** in responding to **ERYCs Local Impact Report [REP1-086]**, however for completeness the Applicant has responded to each matter below.

Table 10: Applicant's response Local Impact Report (LIR) - committee resolution [REP1-084]

East Riding of Yorkshire Council Summary of Local Impact Report (LIR) - committee resolution [REP1-084]	Applicant Response
The Local Impact was report was considered by the Planning Committee on 14 August 2025. Whilst the report was agreed to be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for consideration, the Committee resolved that the Planning Inspectorate be informed that had the Planning Committee been able to act as determining authority the decision with regard to this proposed would have been to REFUSE this application. The reasons for objection are as follows	The Applicant notes this.
Cumulative impacts. This solar farm would be one of four solar farms within the immediate area. The location of the other surrounding solar farms are shown on the attached plan, this identifies that all four of	The Applicant has responded to the topic of Cumulative Effects at 5.1 of the Response to Local Impact Report [REP2-037] .

<p>these consented solar farms adjoin the proposal at Pear Tree Hill and therefore significantly contribute to the built area, and area of countryside ‘under glass’. Members noted that the development at Carr farm, Carr Lane, Tickton has recently been allowed on appeal on 18 July 2025 reference PP/E2001/W/25/3360978. In that decision the Inspector identifies that ‘ (Pear tree Hill) NSIP process will also take into account the cumulative impacts of other solar farms in the area, which would include the appeal site if consented’. As such in determining this appeal the Inspector has placed the emphasis of the consideration of the cumulative impact firmly with the determination of this NSIP’</p>	<p>The DCO application is supported by ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects [REP2-083] which considers the effects on the Proposed Development alongside other approved and existing developments. This concludes significant adverse cumulative effects in relation to intra-project views from three footpaths and Figham Common by year 10 of operation. These effects are considered within the Planning Balance presented in the Planning Statement [REP3-016].</p>
<p>The scale and extent of this solar farm is vast, and when considered in conjunction the other nearby consented proposals would represent a considerable sprawl across the countryside, stretching from Meaux to Holderness. It is calculated that the area taken up by the Solar Panels within the immediate local area would be the equivalent to 1,200 football pitches and when squared off the overall area taken over would be in the region of 1,227 hectares. This would significantly affect the rural character of the locality changing it from a countryside location which accommodates solar development to one of an area within which solar has become the dominant landform and therefore defines its character.</p>	<p>The effects of the Proposed Development are considered within the Environmental Statement, submitted as part of the DCO Application. This includes assessment of landscape and visual effects within ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual [APP-047] which assesses the potential effects on the landscape character of the area. This concludes residual adverse impacts in relation to LCA 19D: Central Holderness Open Farmland and visual effects from users of some PRoWs. These impacts predominantly occur during construction, up to year 10 of operation, and decommissioning and therefore are not present for the majority of the overall lifetime of the Proposed Development. These effects are considered within the Planning Balance presented in the Planning Statement [REP3-016].</p>

<p>This change in character would also affect the amenity of the area and the way it is enjoyed by residents and visitors. The quiet natural character of the area would be replaced by an industrialised landscape severely affecting the intrinsic character and beauty of this countryside location contrary to Paragraph 187 of the NPPF and Policies EC5 and ENV2 of the East Riding Local Plan. Furthermore paragraph 2.10.157 of EN3 confirms the Secretary of State will consider the effect of development on the landscape character, together with the possible cumulative effect of any existing or proposed development.</p>	<p>As set out above, the consideration of effects on landscape character was set out within ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual [APP-047]. ERYC in [REP1-085] quote policies EC5 and ENV2 of the East Riding Local Plan and paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). These policies are duplicated in Appendix A to this document.</p> <p>The Applicant has assessed each of the aforementioned policies within the Policy Accordance Tables contained in Appendix 1 to the Planning Statement [REP3-016].</p>
<p>Loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p> <p><i>‘The proposal would result in a significant loss of best and most versatile land, approximately 35% of the whole site area, which is a considerable area. The loss of so much Best and Most Versatile land will severely reduce the overall area of quality agricultural land available for farming and therefore to produce food. This would be contrary to Policy EC5, which requires that developments and their infrastructure should be acceptable in terms of the impact on best and most versatile land Para (3 vii), and the Planning Practice Guidance which requires local authorities to consider encouraging the effective use of land by focussing large scale solar farm on previously developed and non-agricultural land. National Policy Statement EN-3 also confirms that</i></p>	<p>The Applicant has provided a response to effects on Best and Most Versatile Land within its Response to the Local Impact Report [REP2-037] and does not consider further response is required.</p> <p>With reference to Policy EC5 and NPS EN-3, the Applicant has assessed these within the Policy Accordance Tables contained in Appendix 1 to the Planning Statement [REP3-016].</p>

<i>applicants should utilise suitable previously developed land.'</i>	
<i>'The impacts of the loss of this area of best and most versatile agricultural land would be exacerbated by the proposed management of the site. Rather than ensure that the land remains in some form of agricultural use, it has been proposed to use the area of land for increased provision of biodiversity rather than to continue to graze the land or use it for alternative methods of agriculture. As such the whole area of high-quality site food producing land would be lost, and as such this proposal would significantly affect the food security and production ability of this part of rural East Riding.'</i>	As above.

RWE Renewables UK Limited

Windmill Hill Business Park,
Whitehill Way,
Swindon,
Wiltshire,
England,
SN5 6PB
www.rwe.com