Peartree Hill Solar Farm

Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at the Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2)

Application Document Ref: EN010157/APP/8.21

October 2025

Contents

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

1.1.1 This document summarises the oral submissions made on behalf of RWE Renewables UK Solar and Storage Limited (the **Applicant**) at the ISH2 on 23 October 2025 in relation to the Applicant's application for development consent for the Peartree Hill Solar Farm (the **Proposed Development**).

1.1.2 This document does not purport to summarise the oral submissions made by other parties at the ISH2 and references to submissions made by other parties are only included to give context to the Applicant's submissions in response. Where the comment is a post-hearing comment submitted by the Applicant, this is indicated.

1.1.3 This document uses the headings for each item in the agenda published for ISH2 by the Examining Authority on 16 October 2025 [**EV6-002**]. Noting that the agenda was adjusted on the day so that Agenda item 8 (Transport and access) was dealt with first.

1.2 Agenda item 1 – Welcome, introductions and arrangements for the hearing

1.2.1 The Applicant was represented at ISH2 by Mustafa Latif-Aramesh, TLT LLP, Partner and Parliamentary Agent (**MLA**) and Sophie Reese, TLT LLP, Managing Associate (**SR**). Further persons were introduced to the Examining Authority (**ExA**) under each agenda item.

1.3 Agenda item 8 – Transport and Access

Consideration of the use of Park Lane for construction access to Creyke Beck substation, the potential for highway safety related issues and the potential for further mitigation measures.

1.3.1 The ExA sought clarification on if it would be ten heavy good vehicles (**HGVs**) equating to 20 HGV movements per day using Park Lane for construction purposes in particular whether Table 14-5 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Transport and Access [REP2-081] is correct.

1.3.2 MLA introduced Calum Gill-Quirke, SCP Transport, Senior Consultant (**CGQ**).

1.3.3 CGQ confirmed that it is 10 HGVs, equating to 20 HGV movements and that the figure in Table 14.5 of **[REP2-081]** is incorrect.

1.3.4 The ExA sought clarification as to whether this affected any assessments in the Environmental Statement in terms of the use of Park Lane. CGQ confirmed that for the grid connection works such as those using Park Lane, these are outside of the study area in the Environmental Statement due to the low vehicle numbers and temporary nature. The assessments in the Environmental Statement focus on land areas with a higher number of HGVs which would require a more detailed assessment. CGQ confirmed that there would be no difference in effects If there was 5 or 10 HGVs using Park Lane on a daily basis.

1.3.5 **Action 1**: Update Table 14-5 of ES Chapter 14: Transport and Access [REP2-081] to refer to the correct number of heavy goods vehicle (HGV) movements associated with Park Lane (grid connection cable route works).

1.3.6 **Post-hearing note:** The Applicant has updated Table 14-5 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Transport and Access [EN010157/APP/6.2 Revision 4]** to refer to 10 HGVs/20 HGV movements associated with Park Lane for the grid connection cable route works. A copy of the updated chapter is submitted at Deadline 4.

1.3.7 The ExA sought views from the Applicant on East Riding of Yorkshire Council's (**ERYC**) proposed restriction on the use of Park Lane during the hours of 9.30am to 3pm.

1.3.8 MLA noted that the **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan** (**CTMP**) **[REP3-034]** includes a commitment at paragraph 6.1.8 requiring school hours to be considered. As part of the development of the final CTMP (to be approved by ERYC), the Applicant would consult EYRC on these and work out exactly when these hours would fall. The Applicant does not consider it is appropriate at this stage to specify anything further than what is in the outline plan.

Consideration of the potential for any alternatives to the use of Park Lane, such as the use of an access proposed directly off the A1079 associated with an unrelated planning application for works at Creyke Beck substation.

1.3.9 The ExA sought confirmation from the ERYC on the status of the planning applications for the works at Creyke Beck substation.

1.3.10 ERYC confirmed that there are three pending planning applications in the vicinity of the Creyke Beck substation which are around two months from determination. ERYC clarified that the planning applications should be determined before conclusion of the examination but there is no certainty that this will be the case.

1.3.11 The ExA queried whether the access proposed directly off the A1079 was being used by the Hornsea Four Development Consent Order 2023.

1.3.12 MLA confirmed that the promoter behind Hornsea Four has publicly confirmed that they are not pursuing use of this access track and there has been no recent evidence to suggest otherwise.

1.3.13 The ExA queried whether the Applicant has had any contact with any of the parties submitting the above planning applications to discuss the use of the proposed access.

1.3.14 MLA confirmed that the Applicant has had discussions with these parties but given the uncertainty of the pending applications and the absence of land rights to use the proposed access, it is not consistent nor sensible to rely on the access as a feasible alternative.

1.3.15 The ExA requested confirmation from the Applicant that it will commit to exploring the use of any future constructed access directly off the A1079 as an alternative to using Park Lane. MLA confirmed that the Applicant would consider this and committed to including a commitment in the **Outline CTMP [REP3-034]** that it will explore potential alternative access points if they become available in the future, and if the Applicant feels comfortable relying on third party delivery.

1.3.16 **Action 2**: Update the **Outline CTMP [REP3-034]** to specify that the use of a potential direct access route from the A1079 for construction purposes as opposed to Park Lane would be explored by the applicant further and used if feasible.

1.3.17 **Post-hearing note:** The Applicant has updated the **Outline CTMP** [**EN010157/APP/7.7 Revision 5]** at paragraph 4.1.6 to include the following commitment:

"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 the construction programme of the Proposed Development and subject to all necessary agreements and rights being able to be obtained to use the access."

1.3.18 The ExA queried if there are Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) restrictions on Park Lane and ERYC confirmed that currently there are no HGV restrictions.

1.3.19 ERYC read out a statement from their road safety principal engineer containing evidence as to why Park Lane is not an acceptable access route to the site. The statement includes the number of injuries, collisions and casualties, involving vulnerable road users, that have occurred on this section of the route. The statement also suggested that additional HGV use on the road would not be recommended.

1.3.20 MLA confirmed that personal injury collision reports are contained in **ES Volume 4, Appendix 14.4: Personal Injury Collision Reports [REP2-027]**. MLA clarified that the Applicant takes public safety very seriously and will continue to assess access route alternatives in line with the changing landscape as the aforementioned planning applications are decided. The Applicant considers that the post-DCO process for the approval of the CTMP provides appropriate safeguards, noting that the Proposed Development cannot commence until such time as it is approved by EYRC.

Consideration/ clarification of maintenance access to Fields E15 to E17, including for any replacement infrastructure, and potential for effects.

1.3.21 The ExA asked for clarification on how Fields E15 to E17 would be accessed for maintenance during the operational phase.

1.3.22 CGQ explained how during the operational phase, Fields E15 to E17 will be accessed for maintenance purposes via Carr Lane, Weel. The majority of the operational trips will be LGVs with an occasional requirement for HGV movements for repair and replacement of parts. An example of an anticipated replacement is battery replacement which is expected to be required in 20 years. This would require one HGV per battery replacement. It is anticipated that approximately 12 BESS units will need to be replaced in 20 years of operation which amounts to 12 HGVs approximately. CGQ explained that the assessments therefore do not anticipate this to have significant effects which is why Carr Lane, Weel was not scoped into the transport and access assessment.

1.3.23 The ExA questioned whether the justification for being scoped out is set out in the relevant application document and MLA confirmed that the position would be set out in writing following the hearing.

1.3.24 **Action 3**: Regarding deliveries of replacement solar panels or other infrastructure by HGV to Field E15 to E17 during the operation of the proposed development, address any need to travel though Weel village and Carr Lane (Weel), and provide details of any subsequent effects in a written submission and/ or an update to **ES Chapter 14 [REP2-081**].

1.3.25 **Post-hearing note:** The Applicant has amended Table 14-3 in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Transport and Access [EN010157/APP/6.2 Revision 4]** to scope out Carr Lane, Weel.

Consideration of potential construction traffic/ routing and implications for the implementation of Field House Solar Farm.

1.3.26 MLA clarified further points following the discussion of Field House Solar Farm in the Issue Specific Hearing 1 and further engagement with Albanwise, in relation to noise impacts between the option of the access track being further away into plot A5 or over the existing track. MLA explained that conclusions have shown that there is no significant change in the context of noise over either option. There would be some improvements nonetheless. The Applicant

has contacted the tenants of the properties in question and the reason for seeking increased separation from the properties is due to [redacted]. Therefore, references to further separation are not primarily in the context of noise, rather it is in terms of health and safety. The Applicant confirmed that subject to a response from Albanwise, the Applicant will be liaising with the tenants of the properties in question further, to propose further interface arrangements to address concerns. The Applicant has submitted a Summary of Applicant's position in relation to Albanwise as **Appendix 1** of the **Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing [EN010157/APP/8.20].**

1.4 Agenda item 2 – Noise and vibration

Clarification regarding the applicant's response to the ExA's written question ExQ2.11.2.

1.4.1 The ExA queried whether the Applicant's response to the ExA's written question ExQ2.11.2 includes the HGV movements which will drive past the Field House Farm properties as a result of the second change request application.

1.4.2 CGQ confirmed that the noise impacts on Field House Farm properties are only as a result of the second change request application and that this would include 19 HGVs which would equate to 38 movements per day which would drive past Field House Farm properties during construction if the existing track is used rather than the field.

1.4.3 MLA introduced Jonathan Mart, RSK Acoustics, Director (**JM**).

1.4.4 JM explained that calculations have been undertaken for HGV movements along the access track with resulting noise levels predicted to be less than 60 dB which will result in a low, and not significant magnitude of impact.

1.4.5 ERYC confirmed that they are happy with this additional information.

1.4.6 East Riding Against Solar Expansion (**ERASE**) queried whether a request for updated noise modelling associated with the impact on birdlife had been refused to be carried by the Applicant. MLA explained that this was not the case and that updated assessments had been carried out in light of the second change request application, in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration [REP2-079]** and **ES Volume 4, Appendix 12.3: Construction Noise Assessment Details [REP2-131]**, and this approach had been agreed by Natural England.

1.5 Agenda item 3 – Land, soil and groundwater

To what extent the Environment Agency's outstanding concerns have been addressed

1.5.1 The ExA requested an update from the Applicant in relation to whether the Environment Agency's (**EA**) outstanding concerns have been addressed.

1.5.2 MLA introduced Patrick Goodey, Calibro Consultants, Consultant (**PG**).

1.5.3 PG spoke on behalf of the Applicant and explained that the majority of issues raised by the EA have now been addressed and the only outstanding issues remaining relate to watercourse crossings. The Applicant's position is that the design of watercourse crossings cannot be confirmed until detailed surveys of existing crossings has been undertaken. **ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Water Framework Directive Screening and Scoping Report [REP1-030]** sets out the approach which is to reuse existing crossings wherever possible and then use new crossings only where absolutely necessary. However, this will not be known until the detailed surveys have been carried out. PG explained that until they are undertaken, the approach is to agree new crossings with the EA through the Protective Provisions in the **draft DCO [REP3-005]**. A meeting has been scheduled for the week after the hearing to progress these discussions and come to agreement on the detailed design of the watercourse crossings. PG explained the EA's concerns in relation to the impact of crossings on the morphology of rivers and watercourses. The hydraulic modelling exercise, supporting **ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.6: Flood Risk Assessment [REP1-046]**, has demonstrated that the impact of additional water crossings would not be significant. In terms of assessing the environmental impact of new crossing, this will happen on a case by case basis when knowledge of required new crossings is available but it is likely that existing activities within the watercourse such as watercourse cutbacks and internal drainage board activities within the watercourses, could have a more detrimental impact that the new crossings. This will be subject to more detailed investigations as the need for additional water courses progresses.

1.5.4 PG explained another concern of the EA was in relation to the impact of fire effluent from the BESS which are proposed. Detailed, industry best practice assessments have been undertaken and found that the source of pollution is very low and the risk of fire occurring is very low so the potential method for pollutants to be released is very limited. This is set out in section 3.4 of the **ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Water Framework Directive Screening and Scoping Report [REP1-030]**.

1.5.5 The EA confirmed that it is happy with the Applicant's summary of outstanding issues. However, the EA also queried whether modelling has been undertaken by the Applicant in relation to the accumulation of multiple culvert crossings in one area. The Applicant agreed that this would be taken away to confirm in the post hearing submission.

1.5.6 **Action 4**: Update the **Flood Risk Assessment [REP1-032 to REP1-049]** with culvert modelling as requested by the Environment Agency, or signpost to where this information can be found in the FRA or its appendices.

1.5.7 **Post-hearing note:** The Applicant can confirm that specific model scenarios have been completed, which test the impact of adding or amending watercourse crossings. The results of these model scenarios are described in Section 3 (Missing Structures) of the **Hydraulic Modelling Addendum,** which is **Appendix F** of the **Hydraulic Modelling Report [REP1-046]**. The modelling report forms **Appendix C** of **ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.6 [REP1-039]**. The model tests conclude that the impact of adding or amending structures is not significant, specifically, paragraph 3.1.5 states that 'Given the very minor changes experienced in flood levels across the site it is concluded that the definition of these structures has no material impact on the flood levels, the mitigation (a freeboard of 300mm has been applied), or the layout.'

1.5.8 The EA also confirmed that their Protective Provisions have now been agreed and so has the application under the environmental permitting regulations in regard to flood risk activities only and also the Water Resources Act in respect to the byelaws.

1.5.9 The EA explained that another outstanding issue is in relation to the drainage for the BESS, in particular the EA's request for impermeable drainage based on internal guidance requiring the EA to follow the National Fire Chiefs Council **(NFCC)** guidance. The EA also requested further information from the Applicant in relation to the receptor of the principal aquifer not being particularly sensitive and that at least half of the proposed BESS units are sited on a Source Protection Zone three which are vital areas for providing groundwater supplies to large abstractions locally. The EA requests more information about how the drainage will be prevented from reaching the groundwater environment.

1.5.10 MLA responded to this, highlighting that table 5.1 of the **Outline Battery Safety Management Plan** (**BSMP**) **[REP1-058]** contains the Applicant's consideration and compliance with the NFCC guidance. The Applicant committed to continuing to address the EA's concern on this point.

1.5.11 PG explained on behalf of the Applicant that the Source Protection Zones are assessed in section 3.3. of the **ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Water Framework Directive Screening and Scoping Report [REP1-030]** and reiterated that the risk of fires occurring on a BESS is extremely low, with empirical evidence presented in **REP1-030** to demonstrate this. PG also explained that the pathway for pollutants exiting the BESS is low, therefore, following an industry standard source-pathway-receptor the risk of danger to the water environment is low.

1.5.12 MLA added to this that the Applicant's approach on this point is in line with paragraph 5.16.16 of National Policy Statement EN-1 which sets out that the Secretary of State should consider proposals to mitigate adverse effects on the water environment and attach enhancement measures to the development consent order which are necessary. This is demonstrated by paragraph 5.7.1 of the **Outline BSMP [REP1-058]** which assesses the low risk as set out above and provides empirical evidence of that position.

1.6 Agenda item 4 – Health and safety

Consideration of health and safety matters around the proposed BESS.

1.6.1 The ExA asked the Applicant to briefly summarize the mitigation measures set out in the **Outline BSMP [REP1-058]** and also explain how these will be secured through the **draft DCO [REP3-005]** and any final DCO. SR explained that the Outline BSMP is secured by requirement 8 of the **draft DCO [REP3-005]**, which requires a detailed plan to be approved by the local planning authority following consultation with Humberside Fire and Rescue Service and the Environment Agency. SR then introduced Jim Tough, Principal Consultant, Abbott Risk Consulting (**JT**).

1.6.2 JT set out that the Outline BSMP details the safety management arrangements and approach for the site. Assessment against the recommendations in the NFCC Planning Guidance for BESS installations has been conducted. The alignment of the site and the site services with NFCC Planning Guidance is contained in Table 5-1 of the **Outline BSMP [REP1-058]**. JT noted that the Outline BSMP is the start of the process and once further information on the infrastructure that is to be employed on the site is known, the detailed Battery Safety Management Plan is prepared. This is followed by a site safety audit.

Clarification of reasons for a dispersed BESS arrangement rather than clustered.

1.6.3 SR introduced Jonathan Harris, DCO Project Manager, RWE (**JH**). JH set out that the choice of a dispersed BESS arrangement rather than clustered is informed by the preference to have a DC coupled site rather than an AC coupled site. Having the BESS dispersed around the site is inherent of a DC co-located site, whereby the BESS units are in the solar array areas adjacent to the inverters. On a DC coupled scheme, BESS and solar are connected on the same DC bus (a power distribution system) and use the same inverter with a DC/DC Converter added to match the battery DC voltage with the DC bus voltage. In simpler terms the battery is charged directly from the panels. This is different from an AC coupled scheme where solar and BESS are connected to separate inverters. At AC coupled schemes the BESS would usually be located in a clustered compound adjacent to the main substation.

1.6.4 JH set out the benefits of a DC coupled scheme, namely these are:

1.6.5 More efficient as there is less power lost as only a single conversion is required in comparison to AC coupled sites. This can be up to 1-3% more efficient which, on a utility scale site for the time period proposed, is significant;

1.6.5.1. It requires less infrastructure when compared to AC co-location (no extra inverter/transformer station needed)

1.6.5.2. There are less clipping losses. Solar DC generation in excess of export connection capacity is utilised to charge batteries. The BESS can be charged by these unlike in AC co-location.

1.6.6 JH noted that RWE's solar portfolio (5GW) (with the exception of Tween Bridge Solar Farm) follows a DC coupled approach, with two sites now exporting, and a further 11 sites currently under construction as well as sites in design. Byers Gill, which was granted a DCO in July 2025, is also an RWE DC coupled solar scheme.

1.6.7 ***To what extent the applicant has liaised with Humberside Fire and Rescue Service over the oBSMP and what further steps can/ will be taken***

1.6.8 JH provided an update that the Applicant has received a response from the new station manager at Humberside Fire and Rescue Service. The Applicant provided him with latest copy of the **Outline BSMP [REP1-058]** and an example statement of common ground. JH noted that the Applicant intends to continue engagement and will provide an update at Deadline 4.

1.6.9 In response to a question by ERASE, regarding whether the dispersed BESS arrangement could make emergency response more difficult, JT set out that details of the locations of the units will be contained in the emergency response plan with detailed 'what three words' locations of each of them. At the entrance to the site, a box will contain a document which details the locations of all the units and this is also provided to Humberside Fire and Rescue Service. JT noted that a further advantage of the dispersed nature is that as there are less BESS containers in each location, it is easier to identify which is under stress.

1.6.10 Mr George Swallow asked about the effectiveness of the fire suppression system, the release of chemicals during a fire event, and queried the percentage of the battery system in the total 320MW development.

1.6.11 In relation to the effectiveness of the fire suppression system, JT set out that suppression is not the only means of mitigation in these systems and that internal to the BESS units are off-gas sensors. When a cell is stressed, it will off-gas which is picked up by the sensors, and the system isolates that BESS unit so that they don't accept any charge or discharge. The operational control room is also alerted. JT noted that additionally the battery management system senses the temperature for each individual cell and balances the charge to the cells and monitors these, altering the operational control room of any deviation outside of the accepted parameters to enable the unit to be switched off and repaired. JT explained that the in terms of the fire suppression system, this can be gas or aerosol based (or both).

1.6.12 Regarding the release of chemicals, JT set out that there have only been four incidents, with the plume in the Carnegie Road incident in Merseyside in 2020 assessed to have negligible contamination. Studies were also undertaken during a fire at Moss Landing in the United States, where the Environmental Protection Agency found no elevated levels of contaminants. JT also

confirmed that there are no residential or occupied buildings within 25 metres of any of the BESS units and vegetation is cleared around the units and this is laid with gravel.

1.6.13 Regarding the percentage of the BESS as part of the overall output, SR clarified that it has been designed as a 320MW symmetrical system and that any further detailed can be provided in writing.

1.6.14 **Action 5**: Clarify the battery energy storge system megawattage as requested by George Swallow.

1.6.15 **Post-hearing note:** The Applicant confirms the BESS output is 320MW symmetrical.

1.6.16 In response to a further query by ERASE regarding whether the remote monitoring relies on a dependable internet service, JT confirmed that it used 4G and 5G but this is backed up by a cable.

1.6.17 The Environment Agency asked the Applicant to explain how they intend to manage rainwater in the event that a BESS container loses integrity during or subsequent to a fire. PG explained that during a fire event any rainwater would be vapourised due to the heat. However, the overriding consideration is that the units are self-contained so that the pollutants would not be able to leach out the sides. Following a fire, should there be any spillage (although this is unlikely given that the units are self-contained), then the gravel base below the unit would act as mitigation. PG explained that the gravel would be specified to be limestone which neutralises acid, followed by a sand layer and a permeable geotextile, both of which are effective at absorbing pollutants. Regarding leaching to the aquifer, PG noted that the depth of the aquifer is quite significant and these deep soils are overlying superficial geological layers, which provide further protection to the chalk aquifer.

1.7 Agenda item 5 – Landscape and visual

1.7.1 ***Consideration of potential effects of construction lighting.***

1.7.2 The ExA requested ERYC to expand on its concerns with regard to construction lighting effects and the extent to which it considers proposed mitigation measures could manage any potential effects.

1.7.3 ERYC explained that their concerns relate to temporary lighting on site, in particular longer lighting requirements during the winter months and the added impact of lights from vehicular movements.

1.7.4 MLA clarified that prior assessments carried out have been robust and in accordance with best practice and the potential effects of construction lighting have not been found to be significant. Construction aspects on the landscape and visual effects of construction lighting have been scoped out as set out in

the **ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual [APP-047]**. Despite this, mitigation measures are still proposed. These are set out in the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [REP3-026].**

1.7.5 MLA confirmed that the Applicant agreed to continue to liaise with ERYC on this point and update the **Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) [REP3-043]** with the progress of discussions.

1.7.6 **Action 9:** Liaise on matters relating to the potential for effects from construction lighting and update the **SoCG [REP3-043]** as necessary.

1.7.7 **Post-hearing note**: The Applicant and East Riding of Yorkshire Council landscape officer had a meeting on 28 October 2025. It was explained that the anticipated construction period for any single Land Area was a maximum of nine months and that therefore any single area would only have construction works over a single Winter. The East Riding of Yorkshire Council landscape officer was content with this and this has been reflected in the updated **Statement of Common Ground with East Riding of Yorkshire Council [EN010157/APP/9.2 Revision 4**] submitted at Deadline 4.

Consideration of the scope/ opportunity for additional planting and advance planting to further reduce potential effects.

1.7.8 The ExA noted that ERYC's **Local Impact Report [REP1-086]** makes reference to potential for advanced planting to assist in reducing the timescale for effects and that article two of the **draft DCO [REP3-005]** relating to the permitted preliminary works includes advanced planting to allow for early screening. The ExA requested the Applicant explain where advanced planting would be undertaken and where this is shown on plans or documents.

1.7.9 MLA explained that paragraph 6.6.2 of the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan** (**LEMP**) **[REP3-032]** sets out the reinforcement of gaps in hedgerows and a commitment that the planting of new hedgerows and hedgerow trees will be undertaken within the earliest feasible timescales. These timescales take into account the needs of construction traffic and seasonal restrictions dependent upon what time of year the construction starts. This commitment is made in writing without reference to a visual plan in the **Outline LEMP**.

1.7.10 ERYC noted that it is happy with this approach but queried whether the "earliest feasible" phrase applies to all planting or to specific areas.

1.7.11 MLA explained that this refers to the type of planting involved which relates primarily to providing screening. Therefore rather than being area based it is based on the specific type of planting to provide the mitigation at the earliest feasible time to mitigate the impact that the planting is trying to mitigate.

1.7.12 ERYC noted that this made sense and was happy with the approach.

1.7.13 **Post-hearing note:** The Applicant and East Riding of Yorkshire Council landscape officer had a meeting on 28 October 2025. East Riding of Yorkshire Council landscape officer clarified that their concern was with respect to the volume of mitigation planting being proposed and requested clarification on how the Applicant proposes to sequence planting, in terms of which areas would be prioritised, assuming that not all will be implemented in the first available planting season. As set out in the **Outline LEMP [EN010157/APP/7.5 Revision 7]**, reinforcement of defunct and gappy hedgerows and the planting of new hedgerows and hedgerow trees will be undertaken within the earliest feasible timescales taking into account needs of construction traffic. The sequencing of planting will be determined by factors such as seasonality of planting, the final construction phasing plan and the need to provide sufficient ecological mitigation. Further details will be provided at the detailed design stage and set out in the detailed LEMP, which is secured by Requirement 9 of the **draft DCO [EN010157/APP/3.1 Revision 8]** and requires approval by East Riding of Yorkshire Council.

1.7.14 The ExA requested clarification from ERYC on what their **Local Impact Report [REP1-086]** suggests for additional planting associated with Carr House Farm, Long Riston and Woodhouse and whether ERYC is satisfied with additional planting proposals.

1.7.15 ERYC stated that this point would be taken away and a response will be given in writing.

1.7.16 **Action 6:** ERYC to liaise with the applicant to clarify matters around the acceptability of all planting proposals as suggested in SoCG entry **ERYC34 [REP3-043]** and to liaise with the applicant around any further opportunities for planting or constraints as appropriate.

1.7.17 **Post-hearing note:** The Applicant and East Riding of Yorkshire Council landscape officer had a meeting on 28 October 2025. The planting around these properties was discussed in detail during the meeting, 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. It was accepted that no further mitigation measures were practical and feasible, when all considerations were taken into account and this has been reflected in the updated **Statement of Common Ground with East Riding of Yorkshire Council [EN010157/APP/9.2 Revision 4]** submitted at Deadline 4. As set out in item ERYC34 of the **Draft Statement of Common Ground with East Riding of Yorkshire Council [EN010157/APP/9.2 Revision 4]**, the Applicant is exploring 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.

Consideration of cumulative effects and the applicant's conclusions.

1.7.18 The ExA briefly summarised the concerns from Interested Parties about the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development including cumulatively with other consented solar schemes in the area. The ExA highlighted paragraph 5.10.26 of National Policy Statement EN-1 which recognises that reducing the scale of a project can assist with reducing landscape and visual effects, despite the potential knock-on effect of significantly reducing electricity generation. The ExA requested the Applicant expand on responses given previously on this area, explaining whether there could be any significant mitigation benefits from a small reduction in function or whether to further minimise significant adverse effects will not be possible without resulting in significant operational constraints.

1.7.19 Building on the response already given by the Applicant in response to ExQ1.10.25 [**REP1-073],** MLA explained that in following the mitigation hierarchy, the Applicant has continually refined the Order limits including removal of field E18 or land area A and has also undertaken walkovers with ERYC's assistance to identify new areas where additional mitigation could be added to consider if it would have an impact on the power output. The Applicant's view is that further changes could introduce operational constraints which are not proportionate to the benefits that are to be achieved through them.

1.7.20 MLA introduced Zachary Ford, Stephenson Halliday, Associate Director (**ZF**).

1.7.21 ZF covered the second submission on this point, referencing EYRC's comment that with regards to Meaux Decoy Farm, there appears to be scope for more hedgerows and tree planting within the biodiversity area. He explained that new hedgerows have been proposed to the south of Fields E3 and E4 to provide screening for both Meaux Decoy Farm and Woodhouse following the walkover with ERYC. ZF noted that replacing the proposed planting with trees, despite possibly helping screening, would actually impact the biodiversity measures because this area provides mitigation for ground nesting birds.

1.7.22 After a further query on the same point from the ExA, MLA concluded that whilst landscape and visual effects would be significantly reduced if large swathes of land were removed from the proposed site, removing Area A already put the Proposed Development at its upper limit and further smaller reductions are not possible and would not have significant benefits.

1.7.23 The ExA requested that the Applicant and ERYC consider and discuss this point further outside of the hearing.

1.7.24 ERASE expressed further concerns about cumulative effects of the Proposed Development with other solar development in the local area from a landscape and visual impact perspective, particularly in relation to light pollution.

1.7.25 MLA introduced Ben Twiss, RSK, Associate Director (**BT**).

1.7.26 BT explained that the Applicant has considered all known solar farms in the area in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects [REP2-083]** and **ES**

Volume 4, Appendix 15.2: Detailed Cumulative Landscape and Visual Impacts Assessment [REP3-024]., including the information known to date in relation to Molescroft Solar Farm. MLA directed ERASE to the **Outline CEMP [REP3-026]** including the references to the community liaison groups which are proposed and secured under that document as part of the proposed implementation of the Proposed Development.

Consideration of the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy paragraph 5.10.26, and for the applicant to expand on its response to the ExA's written question ExQ1.10.25 in this regard.

1.7.27 This agenda point was covered above at 1.7.13.

1.8 Agenda item 6 – Heritage

To what extent East Riding of Yorkshire Council's (ERYC) outstanding concerns have been addressed, including:

- ***The effect on the setting of the Church of St. Margaret (grade II* listed).***

1.8.1 Following a discussion with ERYC in the morning MLA wished to clarify that while there are slight differences in how the Applicant and ERYC have arrived at the conclusions, both parties agree on the overall conclusions on the significance of the impacts. In response to a request for clarification by the ExA as to what had actually been agreed, MLA added that while there were differences in level of harm, these do not necessarily affect the final conclusions on whether there is a significant impact. MLA introduced Emma Ings, Senior Consultant, Headland Archaeology (**EI**).

1.8.2 EI noted that the differences between the Applicant and ERYC come from differences in professional judgment. EI confirmed that both parties agree that there are going to be no significant effects on the significance of these heritage assets, including the Church of Saint Margaret. EI noted that guidance states that there is either less than substantial harm which is a less than significant effect, substantial harm which is a significant effect or total loss and that the graduations of harm within those categories is based on professional judgment. In summary, EI confirmed the parties are in agreement, they just put the graduation of the level of harm at a slightly different level.

1.8.3 The ExA sought clarification on whether the Applicant intends to consider the asset further and if yes, to what extent. EI confirmed that the Applicant does not propose to consider the asset further.

- ***A proposed passing place opposite Meaux Abbey farm (grade II listed).***

1.8.4 The ExA noted that this matter was still shown as under discussion in the statement of common ground submitted at Deadline 3 **[REP3-043]** and sought an update from the parties.

1.8.5 SR noted that while there is a slight difference in the assessment, there is no overall difference in the conclusions. EI confirmed that this has recently been discussed with the conservation officer at EYRC and they have confirmed that this matter can now be stated as agreed because the overall conclusion is agreed.

Discussion regarding differences in view of harm to designated heritage assets between applicant, ERYC and Historic England.

1.8.6 Referencing the **Detailed Setting Assessment [REP1-026]**, the ExA noted in relation to Meaux Abbey Scheduled Monument there is listed to be a slight negative change to the experiential setting of the Abbey. However, the ExA noted that in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [REP1-021]**, paragraphs 9.9.10 to 9.9.15, it states no change and therefore no effect in relation to its setting for residual effects for the construction phase. The ExA asked the Applicant to briefly set out how it goes from harm to no harm.

1.8.7 EI outlined that the Detailed Settings Assessment acknowledges there will be a slight change to the setting, however, in terms of the assessment in the Environmental Statement this does not equate to a change in significance as setting is only one element of an asset that contributes to its significance. Further, EI noted that when you are in the scheduled area itself, the Proposed Development would not be visible. Moreover, the Proposed Development is located outside of the zone of Meaux Abbey Scheduled Monument's setting which contributes to the asset's significance. Rather, it is the wider setting of the asset that is changing, and that is not a part of the asset's setting that contributes to its significance.

1.8.8 In terms of mitigation for the Meaux Abbey Scheduled Monument during the operational phase, the ExA sought clarity regarding the hedgerow to be created in the northern parts of Fields F4 to F6 and where that is located on **ES Volume 3, Figure 3.4: Indicative Environmental Masterplan [REP2-091]**. EI advised that the Applicant would provide confirmation is writing.

1.8.9 **Action 7**: Clarify proposals for hedgerow planting between the site of Meaux Cistercian Abbey scheduled monument and the proposed solar array, given it is noted in the application documents as providing mitigation, and update plans as necessary, including the Indicative Environmental Masterplan [REP2-091] which does not appear to show such planting.

1.8.10 **Post-hearing note:** The proposed new hedgerow for creating additional screening between Meaux Abbey Scheduled Monument and the Proposed Development is shown on **ES Volume 3, Figure 3.4: Indicative Environmental Masterplan [REP2-091]**. As shown on this plan, the new hedgerow is proposed to be established in Field F6 only.

1.8.11 The Applicant has incorrectly stated in **Table 9-7** of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [REP1-021]** that the new hedgerow will be established along the northern edge of Land Area F in Fields F1, F4, F5 and F6.

1.8.12 The establishment of a new hedgerow in Fields F1, F4, F5 and F6 formed part of an early iteration of embedded mitigation measures. Through the iterative design process, this embedded mitigation measure was amended to the establishment of a new hedgerow in Field F6 only due to the potential for impacts on the efficacy of ground nesting bird mitigation areas in Fields F1, F4 and F5. New screening hedgerow is still proposed on the northern boundary of Field F6 to provide screening of the Proposed Development to reduce landscape and visual impacts of the Proposed Development for users of Meaux Lane and residents of the property north-east of Field F6, and because it can connect with the existing hedgerow that runs down the western boundary of Field F6.

1.8.13 Although this element of the embedded mitigation has changed, no significant residual effects to Meaux Abbey Scheduled Monument are anticipated by the Applicant.

1.8.14 The existing hedgerow along the northern edge of Land Area F, beyond Holderness Drain, is of sufficient height and density to blanket any increases to perceived noise levels and to prevent dust ingress into the scheduled area during the construction phase (see paragraph 4.1.27 of **ES Volume 4, Appendix 9.4: Detailed Settings Impact Assessment [REP1-026]** and paragraph 9.9.12 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [REP1-021]**). The additional mitigation measures outlined in the **Outline CEMP [REP3-026]** and **Outline CTMP [REP3-034]** (such as measures to minimise dust creation and increased perceived noise levels) would further reduce the risk of changes to perceived noise levels and dust ingress.

1.8.15 The existing hedgerow along the northern edge of Land Area F, beyond Holderness Drain, is also of sufficient height and density to avoid intervisibility between Meaux Abbey Scheduled Monument and the Proposed Development during the operation phase (see paragraph 4.1.34 of **ES Volume 4, Appendix 9.4: Detailed Settings Impact Assessment [REP1-026]** and paragraph 9.9.36 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [REP1-021]**. The embedded mitigation measure of a 100m buffer between Meaux Abbey Scheduled Monument and Fields F1, F4, F5 and F6 (see **Table 9-7** of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [REP1-021]**) would decrease the risk of intervisibility even further.

1.8.16 The creation of a new hedgerow in Fields F1, F4 and F5 would have served as a third layer of mitigation against changes to perceived noise levels and the prevention of dust ingress to the scheduled area during the construction phase and against visual changes during the operation phase. Nonetheless, the embedded and additional mitigation measures which remain in place are sufficient to secure no impact to the significance of Meaux Abbey Scheduled Monument by the Proposed Development.

1.8.17 This would not result in a change to the conclusions of the Applicant's assessment of no significant residual effects. Therefore, no amended or additional mitigation measures are proposed and no changes to the Applicant's assessment are deemed to be required.

1.8.18 The ExA sought clarification of the use of "much less than substantial harm" in the Environmental Statement and what that term means. EI advised that the term is used to indicate that it is on the lower end of the scale of less than substantial harm.

1.9 Agenda item 7 – Biodiversity

To what extent Yorkshire Wildlife Trust's concerns in its relevant representation/ statement of common ground have been addressed.

1.9.1 SR introduced Mark Lang, Technical Director, RSK (**ML**). ML noted that agreement had now been reached in relation to cattle grazing and infrastructure and that the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust will be consulted on the final Landscape and Ecological Management Plan.

1.9.2 In relation to outstanding concerns, the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust is concerned about the Leven Carrs Wetland Creation Scheme and has asked for it to be considered a receptor, particularly because it is linked to the adjacent SSSIs. ML noted that the Leven Carrs Wetland Creation Scheme has not been considered in the Environmental Statement as it was scoped out on the basis of not identifying any likely impact pathways. ML stated that the design of the Proposed Development was altered and Area A removed, a contributing factor being the potential for adverse effects on Tophill Low and Levens Canal SSSI. As set out within Table 7-3 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [REP1-019]**, Tophill Low SSSI, Puffin Bog SSSI and Leven Canal SSSI have been scoped out of the assessment due to a lack of potential impact pathways including distance from the Site, lack of hydrological linkages to the Proposed Development and intervening features between the Proposed Development and the SSSIs. For example, Puffin Bog SSSI is located over 2km from the Proposed Development and therefore does not fall within the 2km study area for nationally designated sites outlined in the **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [REP1-019]**. ML also noted that in their relevant representations or through later submissions **Natural England [RR-017]** have raised no concerns with these SSSIs nor has the Environment Agency, for example no hydrology impacts have been raised. ML concluded that it is for these reasons no impact pathways are likely to be affected and if the Applicant were to assess the level of impact on the Levens Carr Wetland Creation Scheme it would show no significant effect.

1.9.3 In response to submissions by the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust, ML maintained that the Applicant does not see any potential impact on the Leven Carrs Wetland Creation Scheme as the Applicant's proposals will not affect the hydrological regime of the proposed wetland scheme nor will it affect its functionality.

1.9.4 The ExA sought confirmation that the Applicant is continuing to liaise with the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust regarding the statement of common ground. SR confirmed that the Applicant will continue to liaise with the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust, noting that this is an issue where the two parties have a difference of opinion so it may not be resolvable by the end of the examination.

1.9.5 **Post hearing note:** Yorkshire Wildlife Trust confirmed via email on 30 October 2025 that matter YWT08 (livestock use) in the Statement of Common Ground [**EN010157/APP/9.8 Revision 2**] can be marked as agreed. An updated version has been submitted at Deadline 4.

1.9.6 The ExA also sought clarity on the distance of the Proposed Development from Leven Canal SSSI and whether it was within the 2km study area referred to in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [REP1-019]**. ML confirmed that the Leven Canal SSSI is within 1.5km of the Order Limits, however it has been scoped out within **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [REP1-019]** and the full justification for why it is scoped out and the basis for no impact pathways is set out in that chapter.

1.9.7 ***To what extent Natural England's (NE) outstanding concerns have been addressed.***

1.9.8 In light of Natural England's **Additional submission in lieu of attendance at ISH2 [AS-018]**, the ExA asked the Applicant to outline any matters that they anticipate will not be resolved by Deadline 4. ML confirmed that there are no matters which the Applicant anticipates will not be resolved by Deadline 4. ML confirmed that only one matter remains under discussion relating to the permissive footpaths and there is to be a design change submitted to address Natural England's concerns.

Noting the applicant's response to the ExA's written question ExQ2.6.3 setting out that no further noise modelling is proposed, whether discussions with NE indicate that this is likely to be agreed.

1.9.9 ML confirmed this matter has been agreed and Natural England have confirmed that no further noise modelling is required.

To what extent ERYC's outstanding concerns have been addressed.

1.9.10 ML confirmed that the Applicant has agreed with ERYC the inconsistencies and comments they made in relation to the biodiversity net gain assessment and have also addressed the provisions for welfare facilities within the local wildlife site through addition of the following commitment in the **Outline CEMP [EN010157/APP/7.2 Revision 6]** at Deadline 4: "Should welfare facilities need to be located within Figham Pastures LWS to comply with construction welfare standards, the design of the welfare facilities would be sympathetic to the surroundings of the LWS in terms of location and size as far as reasonably practicable".

1.9.11 BT addressed ERYC's concerns regarding the loss of trees. BT noted that even though a number of the proposed tree losses are Category B features, this is a very low number (35) of the total Category B features recorded within the Order Limits (540). This equates to an approximate 6.48% loss of category B trees within the Order Limits out of all trees lost. As set out in paragraph 4.3.2 of **ES Volume 4, Appendix 7.11: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [REP2-127]**, a number of the Category B tree groups and Category B trees are likely to not require removal along the grid connection cable route once the final cable alignment has been determined. Overall, 8 Category B trees and 1 Category B group within the grid connection cable route may not be needed for removal but have been assumed as needing removal as a worst-case scenario for the purposes of assessment. BT also noted that the Applicant is proposing approximately 10,240m² of woodland, which far exceeds the amount proposed to be lost in terms of trees and woodland.

1.9.12 In relation to Category A trees, BT noted in terms of Tree 076, there is 22% incursion on the Root Protection Area (**RPA**) for T076 – a category A oak. BT outlined that where possible, the Applicant would avoid the Root Protection Area (RPA) of T076 or at the minimum, reduce the 22% incursion. ERYC do indicate this is noted and is considered acceptable if the Applicant can commit to reducing impacts to "below 20%" in accordance with '*BS: 5837 (2012) Trees in relation to demolition, design and construction – Recommendations*'. BT noted that a 22% incursion is unlikely to compromise the long term physiological and structural condition of Tree 076 and that as the design in its current form is preliminary in nature there will be opportunities to revisit this during detailed design. BT added that the **Outline LEMP [REP3-032]** (paragraph 6.1.7) contains a commitment that: "Existing trees and hedgerows (including root protection zones / areas) either within, or along the boundary of, the Site will be protected during construction in accordance with 'BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations'." BS 5837 (2012) provides at paragraph 7.4.2.3 that "new permanent hard surfacing should not exceed 20% of any existing unsurfaced ground within the RPA". BT also noted that as set out in the **Applicant's Response to Local Impact Report [REP2-037]**: "there appears scope in the Order Limits, to avoid the RPA of T076 (Cat A) or at least improve on the 22% impact". BT concluded that given the commitment in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, the Applicant considers it has addressed EYRC's concern.

1.9.13 EYRC sought revision to the Arboricultural Impact Assessment section 4.3 **[REP2-127]** relating to tree management and the inclusion of a commitment to retain mature trees wherever possible. BT confirmed that this would need to be discussed and responded to in writing.

1.9.14 **Action 8**: Revise the **Arboricultural Impact Assessment section 4.3 [REP2-127]** relating to tree management as requested by ERYC.

1.9.15 **Post-hearing note:** The Applicant has made amendments to **ES Volume 4, Appendix 7.11: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [EN010157/APP/6.4**

Revision 3] after requesting clarifications from Jennifer Woollin (East Riding of Yorkshire Council, Biodiversity Officer) following the ISH2 hearing.

1.9.16 The following clarifications were provided by East Riding of Yorkshire Council:

1. Section 4.1 should detail the removal of Category A groups;

2. It would be useful to note the proportion of Category B groups and trees that are scrub elements and refer to the relative replaceability of these as part of the impact assessment; and

3. Why losses of Category A groups/ Category B elements are considered unavoidable.

1.9.17 Upon receiving further detail of the requested change, an update to Section 4.3 was not required, instead updates have been made to Section 4.1 that outline the justification for the unavoidable loss of category A and B trees and details of category A trees for removal.

1.9.18 In response to point 2 regarding '*proportion of category B groups and trees that are scrub elements'* - Category B tree groups would not be defined as scrub within **ES Volume 4, Appendix 7.11: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [EN010157/APP/6.4 Revision 3]** and would be Category C or a Category would not be applied, normally unmanaged woody vegetation comprising predominantly shrub species or immature, self-seeded trees

1.9.19 **ES Volume 4, Appendix 7.11: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [EN010157/APP/6.4 Revision 3]** has been resubmitted at Deadline 4.

1.10 Agenda item 9 – Application documents

Clarification of updates to documents following change requests and having regard to the Environmental Statement Addendum.

1.10.1 SR confirmed that all amended versions of the ES documents identified in the **ES Addendum [REP3-037]** that have not already been resubmitted into the examination will be resubmitted at Deadline 5. Thereafter, the **ES Addendum [REP3-037]** will become defunct.

1.10.2 The ExA also sought clarification on the scope of document updates for Change Request 3. SR confirmed there will be updates to various documents and a complete list will be provided as part of the submission.

1.11 Agenda item 10 – Review of issues and actions arising

1.11.1 The ExA will address how any actions placed on the applicant are to be met.

1	Applicant	Update Table 14-5 of **ES Chapter 14: Transport and Access [REP2-081]** to refer to the correct number of heavy goods vehicle (HGV) movements associated with Park Lane (grid connection cable route works).	The Applicant has updated Table 14-5 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Transport and Access** [**EN010157/APP/6.2 Revision 4**] to refer to 10 HGVs/20 HGV movements associated with Park Lane for the grid connection cable route works. A copy of the updated chapter is submitted at Deadline 4.
2	Applicant	Update the outline **Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP3-034]** to specify that the use of a potential direct access route from the A1079 for construction purposes as opposed to Park Lane would be explored by the applicant further and used if feasible.	The Applicant has updated the **Outline CTMP [EN010157/APP/7.7 Revision 5]** at paragraph 4.1.6 to include the following commitment: "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 the construction programme of the Proposed Development and subject to all necessary agreements and rights being able to be obtained to use the access."
3	Applicant	Regarding deliveries of replacement solar panels or other infrastructure by HGV to Field E15 to E17 during the operation of the proposed development, address any need to travel though Weel village and Carr Lane (Weel), and provide details of any subsequent effects in a written	The Applicant has amended Table 14-3 in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Transport and Access [EN010157/APP/6.2 Revision 4]** to scope out Carr Lane, Weel.

		submission and/ or an update to **ES Chapter 14 [REP2-081]**.	
4	Applicant	Update the **Flood Risk Assessment [REP1-032 to REP1-049]** with culvert modelling as requested by the Environment Agency, or signpost to where this information can be found in the FRA or its appendices.	The Applicant can confirm that specific model scenarios have been completed, which test the impact of adding or amending watercourse crossings. The results of these model scenarios are described in Section 3 (Missing Structures) of the Hydraulic Modelling Addendum, which is Appendix F of the **Hydraulic Modelling Report [REP1-046]**. The modelling report forms **Appendix C of ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.6: Flood Risk Assessment, [REP1-039]**. The model tests conclude that the impact of adding or amending structures is not significant, specifically, paragraph 3.1.5 states that 'Given the very minor changes experienced in flood levels across the site it is concluded that the definition of these structures has no material impact on the flood levels, the mitigation (a freeboard of 300mm has been applied), or the layout.'
5	Applicant	Clarify the battery energy storge system megawattage as requested by George Swallow.	The Applicant confirms the BESS output is 320 megawatts symmetrical .
6	Applicant and EYRC	ERYC to liaise with the applicant to clarify matters around the acceptability of all planting proposals as suggested in statement of common ground (SoCG) entry **ERYC34 [REP3-043]** and to liaise with the applicant around any further opportunities	The Applicant and East Riding of Yorkshire Council landscape officer had a meeting on 28 October 2025. 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

		for planting or constraints as appropriate.	access track. It was accepted that no further mitigation measures were practical and feasible, when all issues taken into account and this has been reflected in the updated **Statement of Common Ground with East Riding of Yorkshire Council [EN010157/APP/9.2 Revision 4]** submitted at Deadline 4. As set out in item ERYC34 of the **Statement of Common Ground with East Riding of Yorkshire Council [EN010157/APP/9.2 Revision 4]**, the Applicant is exploring 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.
7	Applicant	Clarify proposals for hedgerow planting between the site of Meaux Cistercian Abbey scheduled monument and the proposed solar array, given it is noted in the application documents as providing mitigation, and update plans as necessary, including the Indicative **Environmental Masterplan [REP2-091]** which does not appear to show such planting.	The Applicant has provided clarification in paragraphs 1.8.10-1.8.17 of this Oral Summary. In summary, while the new hedgerow is proposed to be established in Field F6 only rather than Fields F1, F4, F5 and F6 as stated in Table 9-7 of **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [REP1-021]**, the existing hedgerows and mitigation measures contained in the relevant outline plans are sufficient to secure no impact to the significance of Meaux Abbey Scheduled Monument by the Proposed Development. This would not result in a change to the conclusions of the Applicant's assessment of no significant residual effects. Therefore, no amended or additional mitigation measures are proposed and no changes to the Applicant's

			assessment are deemed to be required.
8	Applicant	Revise the **Arboricultural Impact Assessment section 4.3 [REP2-127]** relating to tree management as requested by ERYC.	The Applicant has made amendments to **ES Volume 4, Appendix 7.11: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [EN010157/APP/6.4 Revision 3]** after requesting clarifications from Jennifer Woollin (East Riding of Yorkshire Council, Biodiversity Officer) following the ISH2 hearing. Further detail is set out in paragraphs 1.9.15 - 1.9.18.
9	Applicant and ERYC	Liaise on matters relating to the potential for effects from construction lighting and update the **SoCG [REP3-043]** as necessary	The Applicant and East Riding of Yorkshire Council landscape officer had a meeting on 28 October 2025. It was explained that the anticipated construction period for any single Land Area was a maximum of nine months and that therefore any single area would only have construction works over a single Winter. The East Riding of Yorkshire Council landscape officer was content with this and this has been reflected in the updated **Statement of Common Ground with East Riding of Yorkshire Council [EN010157/APP/9.2 Revision 4]** submitted at Deadline 4.

1.12 Agenda item 11 – Any other matters

1.12.1 The Applicant did not speak to this agenda item.

1.13 Agenda item 12 – Closure of the hearing

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