Light Valley Solar

Consultation Report

Appendix 11: Section 47 Applicant Response

Document Reference: EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01.11

February 2026

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN0110012
APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)

Light Valley Solar

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 (as amended)

Light Valley Solar

DCO Submission

Consultation Report Appendix 11: Section 47 Applicant Response

Regulation Reference	APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)
Planning Inspectorate Case Reference	EN00110012
Application Document Reference	EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01.11
Author	Light Valley Solar Limited

Version	Date	Status of Version
1.0	February 2026	DCO Submission

Table of Contents

Phase Two consultation Applicant response tables 4
Air quality 4
BESS safety 6
Climate change and energy need 29
Community Benefits and impact 61
Construction and decommissioning 92
Consultation and engagement 129
Cultural heritage 166
Cumulative effects 173
Design principles 179
Ecology and biodiversity 189
General feedback 233
Glint and glare 269
Human health 279
Hydrology, flood risk and drainage 287
Landscape and visual 305
Noise and vibration 353
Ornithology 379
Other environmental issues 392
Public Rights of Way and paths 408
Site Selection and Alternatives 423
Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation 455
Soils and agriculture 479
Traffic and transport 506
Targeted Consultation Applicant Response Table 570

Phase Two consultation Applicant response tables

Air quality

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Air Quality	LV2_OFF_029, LV2_E_066	Respondents expressed general concern for worsening air quality and pollution as a result of construction related activity and traffic.	No	A Construction Dust Assessment (CDA) is included in Environmental Statement (ES) Volume 3 Appendix 16.1: Construction Dust Assessment **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.01]** which supports the Application. The assessment acknowledges a high risk of dust during construction, but determines the resulting effect, including from traffic movements on sensitive ecological receptors and from construction activity, would not be significant. Mitigation measures, including monitoring during the construction phase, provision to erect barriers around dusty activities, and requirement to produce a Dust Management Plan (DMP) are secured via the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02**].

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Air Quality	LV2_E_079	Respondent cited concern for air pollution as a result of the BESS.	No	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. ES Volume 3 Appendix 16.5: BESS Fire Emissions Modelling Report **[EN110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.05]** submitted as part of the Application identified that there would be no significant air quality effects as a result of a BESS fire incident. An outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP) **[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.06]** has been produced as part of the Application and identifies how the Applicant will use good industry practice to reduce risk to life, property, and the environment in the rare event of a BESS fire. Notwithstanding, whilst there is low risk of adverse air quality effects at the closest receptors, the Emergency Response Plan produced at the detailed design stage will incorporate all necessary emergency response procedures and actions based upon thermal runaway test data supplied by the BESS system provider.

BESS safety

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
BESS Safety	LV2_E_004, LV2_OFF_033, LV2_PFF_031, LV2_PFF_034, LV2_PFF_040, LV2_PFF_043, LV2_PFF_049, LV2_PFF_056, LV2_OFF_036, LV2_OFF_145, LV2_PFF_054, LV2_OFF_137, LV2_OFF_045, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068, LV2_OFF_069, LV2_OFF_066, LV2_OFF_058, LV2_OFF_098, LV2_E_080, LV2_E_120, LV2_E_122, LV2_E_079, LV2_E_087, LV2_E_090, LV2_E_030, LV2_E_116, LV2_E_032, LV2_E_103, LV2_OFF_091, LV2_OFF_089, LV2_E_083, LV2_E_078, LV2_E_074, LV2_E_072	Respondents expressed concern about potential safety risks of the BESS and substations, including over fire and the release of toxic gases during a fire	No	The Applicant's Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.06]**) incorporates new key mandatory fire and explosion testing and safety requirements included in the revised NFPA 855 (2026) standard. The oBSMP has been prepared to prevent and fully mitigate the risks from a BESS failure event. The Safety Objectives are listed in Section 1.4 of the oBSMP. The oBSMP stipulates that the Applicant at detailed design will only select a BESS system that as mandated under NFPA 855 (2026 Revision) must have undertaken Large Scale Fire Testing (LSFT). This testing involves burning the full BESS system to validate the safe minimum spacing distances for equipment. The objective of the test is to

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				evaluate the thermal exposure impacts from a developed BESS fire, to determine the risk to adjacent BESS or equipment. As recommended in National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) draft revised guidelines (2024) the Applicant has commissioned a Plume Analysis study BESS Fire Emissions Modelling Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.05]** to assess the environmental impact of a BESS thermal runaway incident to sensitive receptors within a 1 km radius of the potential BESS area, to assess the potential to cause air quality impacts during a BESS fire. Concentrations of carbon monoxide (CO), formaldehyde, hydrogen chloride (HCl), hydrogen cyanide (HCN), hydrogen fluoride (HF), ammonia (NH_3), nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and particulates, were modelled using Atmospheric Dispersion Modelling Software (ADMS) to determine the effects

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				of BESS fire emissions on human health. In line with NFCC recommendations, a high-level visibility assessment has also been undertaken using the modelled particulates results to determine the effect of BESS fire emissions on visibility to the local road network. The Plume Study considers all toxic emissions at the peak of a BESS fire, all emissions at receptor locations were below all relevant public health exposure limit guidelines throughout the timeframe when the battery system of the indicative BESS design was fully consumed (burnt out). The Plume Study concludes that there are no significant toxic emissions or visibility impacts on sensitive receptors. Nonetheless, at the detailed design stage the Applicant will commission a BESS system and site-specific Plume Analysis study to assess the environmental impact

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				of a site incident to sensitive receptors within a 1 km radius. Toxic gas emissions to sensitive receptors must be below relevant public health exposure limit guidelines when the battery system of a BESS is fully consumed (burnt out), production of Particulate Matter (PM) and a visibility impact assessment on any transport links within a 1 km radius of the BESS area will also be included. The Emergency Response Plan (ERP) produced at the detailed design stage (template outlined in Section 4.4.4 of the oBSMP) will incorporate all necessary emergency response procedures and actions based upon thermal runaway test data supplied by the BESS system provider. Section 5 of the oBSMP outlines a comprehensive list of pre-construction requirements to ensure that BESS failure

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				safety risks are minimised and hazards fully mitigated. This is secured via the BSMP.
BESS Safety	LV2_OFF_036, LV2_OFF_145, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068, LV2_OFF_069, LV2_OFF_058, LV2_E_080, LV2_E_120, LV2_E_103	Respondents requested further information on what emergency response provisions are in place for the safety risks of the BESS, including potential evacuation procedures.	No	Section 4.4.4 of the oBSMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.06]** stipulates that the ERP will follow NFCC and NFPA 855 (2026) guidelines and stipulates the minimum content that an ERP must contain, including: "*Emergency procedures for all credible hazards and risks, including building, infrastructure and vehicle fire, wildfires, impacts on local respondents, impacts on transport infrastructure.*" Further detail on BESS site emergency planning commitments (including NYFRS site familiarisation and training) is provided in Section 4.4 of the oBSMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.06].** Section 1.4.2 of the oBSMP confirms that the final BESS design and site layout will

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				be validated through mandatory Large Scale Fire Testing (LSFT) and consequence modelling to minimise the requirement for NYFRS intervention during a thermal runaway incident. In worst-case scenarios, intervention would typically be limited to boundary cooling to prevent fire spread. This approach will be agreed with NYFRS and clearly set out in the Emergency Response Plan (ERP) to ensure: • Fire, smoke, and any release of toxic gases do not significantly affect site operatives, first responders, or the local community; and • Firewater run-off is appropriately contained and managed. In line with NFCC draft revised guidelines (2024), a Plume Analysis study **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.05]** has been undertaken to inform emergency planning. The study identifies no significant impacts on sensitive receptors; however, a site-specific plume analysis

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				will be completed at the detailed design stage to confirm that public health and visibility thresholds are met. Emergency Response Plans (ERPs) can only be finalised once a specific BESS design is confirmed, ensuring that equipment, operating limits, protection systems, and test data are fully defined to support appropriate emergency response and evacuation procedures. The ERP prepared at the detailed design stage (template in Section 4.4.4) will incorporate all necessary emergency response and evacuation actions based on thermal runaway test data provided by the BESS supplier. Section 5.1.8 of the oBSMP confirms that ERPs covering construction, operation, and decommissioning will be developed in consultation with NYFRS and other emergency services to ensure effective incident response and protection of site

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				personnel, first responders, and the local community.
BESS Safety	LV2_OFF_145, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068, LV2_OFF_069, LV2_OFF_066, LV2_OFF_058, LV2_E_080, LV2_E_122	Respondents expressed that there appears to be no emergency fire planning, asked if local fire services are equipped to deal with battery fires.	No	Details of BESS site emergency planning commitments (including NYFRS site familiarisation and training) can be found in Section 4.4 of the oBSMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.06]**. This covers all requisite firefighting considerations including, fire breaks, firefighting water containment, firefighting water supply requirements, all aspects of Emergency Planning including ERP and RM plans, and summaries of Plume Study consequence modelling to validate the BESS site location. Emergency Response Plan(s) covering construction, operation and decommissioning phases will be developed once a construction team and an operator have been appointed. These plans will be developed in consultation NYFRS and other local emergency services to include the adequate provision of firefighting equipment onsite and ensure that fire, smoke, and any

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				release of toxic gases from a thermal runaway incident does not significantly affect site operatives, first responders, and the local community. NYFRS intervention in worst case scenarios would typically be limited to boundary cooling of adjacent BESS and BESS units to prevent the fire from spreading. ERPs can only be drafted when based upon a specific BESS design, key safety content requires that all equipment within the BESS area is defined, battery system operating limits and test data are fully defined, and the BESS failure protection system is defined. Incident response tactics requires significant test data and rigorous consequence modelling from the specific BESS design to develop safe protocols for incident response. North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service (NYFRS) are a statutory consultee for the Proposed Development, and the Applicant will ensure that their firefighting requirements are accommodated. Section

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				4 of the oBSMP covers all aspects of firefighting emergency response requirements for a BESS failure event.
BESS Safety	LV2_OFF_145, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_122	Respondents stated there is not enough of a fire safety buffer around the BESS site.	No	Section 1.4.2 of the oBSMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.06]** stipulates: Final BESS design and site layout will have been validated through mandatory Large Scale Fire Testing (LSFT) and rigorous consequence modelling to minimise the requirement for any NYFRS intervention in a thermal runaway incident. LSFT must establish minimum equipment spacing distances that demonstrate there is no fire propagation to adjacent BESS enclosures or Energy Storage System (ESS) equipment. NYFRS intervention in worst case scenarios would typically be limited to boundary cooling of adjacent BESS and ESS units to prevent the fire from spreading. This strategy will be finalised with NYFRS and be clearly communicated in the Emergency Response Plan (ERP):

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				• To ensure that fire, smoke, and any release of toxic gases does not significantly impact site operatives, first responders, and the local community; and • To ensure that firewater run-off is contained and tested before release or, if necessary, removed by tanker and treated offsite. Areas within 10 m of BESS enclosures do not contain combustible vegetation and would not be planted with any new combustible vegetation wherever possible. Where this is not feasible a full risk assessment would be conducted, and mitigation features applied if required by the NYFRS. Any other vegetation on site would be kept in a condition such that they do not increase the risk of fire on site.
BESS Safety	LV2_PFF_040, LV2_OFF_145, LV2_OFF_066	Respondents requested more information on fire risk in general.	No	The Applicant confirms that as mandated in NFPA 855 (2026) published in September 2025, that at the detailed design stage the selected BESS will have

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				undertaken Large Scale Fire Testing (LSFT) to fully inform inputs for risk assessment tools which will be utilised together with detailed consequence modelling to provide a comprehensive site operations and emergency response safety audit. LSFT of the selected BESS design is conducted to establish minimum equipment spacing distances (no fire propagation to adjacent BESS or infrastructure) and site specific consequence modelling will provide a clear, evidence-based case for the final BESS area installation plans at the detailed design phase and will be agreed with North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service (NYFRS). The Applicant's Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.06]** key safety risk reduction content is referenced in the following sections listed below:

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				• Section 1: 1.3 Potential BESS Failure, 1.4 Safety Objectives, 1.5 Relevant Guidance. • Section 3: BESS safety requirements through the lifecycle of the Proposed Development including: Battery System Enclosure design (3.1.23 - 3.1.28), Detection and Suppression Systems (3.1.29), Explosion prevention and control systems (3.1.30), 3.2 Safe BESS Construction, and 3.3 Safe BESS Operation and decommissioning. • Section 4: All aspects of NYFRS potential firefighting considerations for the Proposed Development including Emergency Response Planning and Risk Management template requirements. • Section 5: Pre-Construction Information Requirements the Applicant will provide including key Risk and Hazard Mitigation Analysis studies listed in Sections 5.1.3, 5.1.4, and 5.1.5.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
BESS Safety	LV2_OFF_145	Respondent, who had been reassured about water supplies at consultation events, pointed out that water cannot be used on a lithium fire.	No	As stipulated in NFPA 855 (2026) water can be used directly on lithium-ion battery fires to provide cooling, but this tactic may prolong the burn out times, therefore the Fire Service is only likely to use water for boundary cooling of adjacent equipment. A range of recent Large Scale Fire Tests (LSFT) has demonstrated that the typical BESS failure fire event with battery systems at a high State of Charge (SOC), the peak fire conditions have lasted for a period spanning 60-150 minutes. The rest of the testing fire events within the BESS enclosures typically lasted another 6-8 hours at a lower intensity, because BESS enclosure designs have very high levels of thermal insulation approximately up to 24 hours of smouldering involving non battery combustibles may occur within BESS structure. No intervention is necessary from firefighters in these low intensity burn scenarios. The detailed design phase of the Proposed Development will consider the

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				lifecycle of the battery system from installation (during the construction phase of the Proposed Development) to decommissioning. At the detailed design stage, the selected BESS will have undertaken Large Scale Fire Testing (LSFT) to fully inform inputs for risk assessment tools which will be utilised together with detailed consequence modelling to provide a comprehensive site operations and emergency response safety audit. LSFT of the selected BESS design is conducted to establish minimum equipment spacing distances (no fire propagation to adjacent BESS or infrastructure) and site-specific consequence modelling will provide a clear, evidence-based case for the final BESS area installation plans at the detailed design phase and will be agreed with NYFRS. Section 4.3.2 of the oBSMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.06]** stipulates that the BESS area will contain 4 hours water supply.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Section 4.3.2 of the oBSMP also stipulates: "A BESS design which may require direct NYFRS firefighting engagement tactics will not be selected for this facility". If firefighters are applying water fog or spray patterns to adjacent BESS enclosures or deploying defensive spray plates that form a water curtain between the affected enclosure and adjacent BESS these "boundary cooling" tactics would likely be applied intermittently in 15-minute application periods with temperature changes measured between application periods. Section 4.3.2 of the oBSMP also stipulates: *If an internal BESS water based fixed suppression system (automatic or dry pipe) is integrated in the BESS enclosures a separate water supply and water containment system will be integrated, water runoff is likely to contain higher levels of pollutants compared to*

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				water used for external boundary cooling of BESS and ESS equipment. All process water used in the system shall be prevented from contaminating potable water sources in accordance with local regulations through the use of check valves or other means as part of the system design. Pollution analysis will be conducted before removing and treating offsite.
BESS Safety	LV2_OFF_098	Respondents expressed concern there is no existing agency that can set standards and monitor safety of the BESS.	No	The Applicant's Outline Battery Storage Safety Management Plan (oBSMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.06]** has been prepared to prevent and fully mitigate the risks from a BESS failure event. Guidance documents and standards considered by the Applicant have been used to inform the design of the scheme are listed in Section 1.5 (Relevant Guidance) of the oBSMP. The design of the BESS and its impact are controlled in several ways. Prior to commencement of construction of the

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				BESS, a BSMP (in accordance with the oBSMP) is required to be submitted to the relevant local planning authority and approved, in consultation with North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service (NYFRS) and the Environment Agency (EA). The Applicant must operate the BESS in accordance with the approved plan. Section 5 of the Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.06]** outlines a comprehensive list of pre-construction requirements to ensure that BESS failure safety risks are minimised and hazards fully mitigated.
BESS Safety	LV2_E_080	Respondent asked if any coordination has occurred with the local fire service in the event of a BESS fire.	No	Fire Service Consultation details are covered in Section 2.1 of the oBSMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.06]**. The local fire and rescue service, North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service (NYFRS) has been consulted during pre-application discussions and as part of

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Statutory Consultation. Engagement with NYFRS will continue across the project lifecycle. The Applicant emailed a range of BESS safety materials for fire service training and education purposes, and a number of full-scale BESS destruction testing reports on 27th and 28th February 2025. The Applicant confirmed that National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) guidance will be followed, and that any deviations will be fully discussed and agreed with NYFRS. The Applicant confirmed that they will share all requisite BESS safety and design documentation for the Proposed Development with NYFRS, once available. The Applicant has complied with NFCC guidelines and engaged with NYFRS throughout the outline design phase and will ensure that the final BSMP produced in consultation with NYFRS and the EA

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				before BESS construction begins accounts for any subsequent revisions made to NFCC guidelines. Close consultation will continue with NYFRS throughout the DCO and development process.
BESS Safety	LV2_OFF_089	Respondent asked where the nearest fire station is in the case of a fire.	No	North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service (NYFRS) will be responsible for deciding how their resources would be utilised in a BESS fire event. The Applicant's outline BSMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.06]** covers all Emergency planning considerations in Section 4.4, contains details of pre-DCO consultation with NYFRS in Section 2, and Section 4 covers all aspects of firefighting emergency response requirements for a BESS failure event. A final Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) must be produced before construction of the BESS units for approval by the local planning authority; this will be produced in consultation with

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				NYFRS and the Environment Agency (EA). As part of the BSMP, Emergency Response Plan(s) (ERPs) covering construction, operation and decommissioning phases will be developed once a construction team, and an operator have been appointed. These plans will be developed in consultation NYFRS and other local emergency services to include the adequate provision of firefighting equipment onsite and ensure that fire, smoke, and any release of toxic gases from a thermal runaway incident does not significantly affect site operatives, first responders, and the local community.
BESS Safety	LV2_E_067	Respondents suggested the Proposed Development could be targeted in war or be a target for terrorism.	No	An Emergency Response Plan will be developed post planning consent to facilitate effective and safe emergency response. It will follow UK National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) and NFPA 855 guidelines covering emergency procedures for all credible hazards and risks.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
BESS Safety	LV2_E_032	Respondent stated that cooling is necessary during hot weather, citing a media report which stated that during a recent heatwave a solar farm had to be switched off.	No	The Applicant can confirm battery systems will integrate internal liquid cooling systems to ensure consistent operating temperatures to maximise performance and safety, irrespective of external BESS temperatures. The BESS enclosure will integrate a separate HVAC system to ensure that all internal operating components operate within optimal operating temperature ranges.
BESS Safety	LV2_E_030	Respondent expressed concern that planning decisions are made by local authorities, which lack knowledge on lithium-related fire risks. The respondent added that fire services are not statutory consultees in planning applications, limiting their ability to enforce safety standards.	No	The BSMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.06]** confirms that North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service (NYFRS) are a statutory consultee for the Proposed Development. Section 6.1.4 of the oBSMP stipulates: "*The implementation of the oBSMP is secured through a Requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO. This will stipulate that a detailed Battery Safety Management Plan will be submitted to and approved in consultation with NYFRS, the Environment Agency (EA), and by the relevant planning authorities*

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				prior to the commencement of the works for the BESS. This plan will be substantially in accordance with the oBSMP."

Climate change and energy need

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Climate Change and Energy Need	LV2_PFF_001, LV2_PFF_003, LV2_E_004, LV2_OFF_025, LV2_PFF_034, LV2_E_036, LV2_E_045, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_PFF_062, LV2_OFF_133, LV2_E_064, LV2_E_020, LV2_E_070, LV2_E_071, LV2_OFF_117, LV2_OFF_073, LV2_E_021, LV2_E_023, LV2_OFF_095, LV2_E_122, LV2_E_085, LV2_E_092, LV2_E_077	Respondents expressed their support for renewable energy as a way to tackle climate change.	Yes	The Applicant notes and welcomes this comment.
Climate Change and Energy Need	LV2_OFF_032, LV2_PFF_036, LV2_PFF_047, LV2_E_036, LV2_E_045, LV2_OFF_041, LV2_OFF_122, LV2_E_066, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068, LV2_OFF_065, LV2_E_121, LV2_E_122, LV2_E_092, LV2_E_115, LV2_E_083	Respondents expressed that the Proposed Development will be more harmful to the environment than any environmental benefits that it may promote.	No	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the comment. ES Volume 1 Chapter 9: Greenhouse Gas Emissions **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.09]** outlines measures to ensure the Proposed Development, through its construction, operation and decommissioning, is environmentally friendly. These measures include

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				increasing recyclability by segregating construction waste to be re-used and recycled, switching vehicles and plant off when not in use and ensuring construction vehicles conform to current EU or international emissions standards, and the use of alternative materials with lower embodied carbon, such as locally sourced products and materials with a higher recycled content where feasible; these measures are secured through the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan **[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**.
Climate Change and Energy Need	LV2_E_038, LV2_E_042, LV2_E_043, LV2_E_049, LV2_E_050, LV2_OFF_140, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068, LV2_OFF_057, LV2_OFF_053, LV2_E_121	Respondents expressed doubt of the need for the Proposed Development.	Yes	The Applicant has prepared a Statement of Need **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.03]** which sets out in full the need and justification for the Proposed Development. The Statement of Need describes the Government's policy that large capacities of low carbon generation will be required to meet increased demand and replace output from retiring (fossil fuel) plants, and that "a secure, reliable, affordable, Net Zero

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar". The Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (December 2025) states that that the UK has huge potential for solar power and that solar energy is at the heart of the Clean Power 2030 Mission [Paras 3.3.23 & 3.3.24]. NPS EN-1 further confirms that there is an urgent need for renewable energy generation that is a critical national priority [para 3.3.62 & 3.3.63]. The Proposed Development therefore directly contributes towards meeting the national net zero and energy security requirements for the near future.
Climate Change and Energy Need	LV2_E_004, LV2_E_011, LV2_E_036, LV2_E_043, LV2_OFF_097, LV2_E_083	Respondents expressed concern and opposition for Net Zero Policy.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Climate Change and Energy Need	LV2_PFF_040, LV2_OFF_146, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_069, LV2_E_101, LV2_E_103	Respondents expressed concern about the manufacture, transport, maintenance, and disposal of the panels over the Proposed	Yes	The Applicant notes these concerns and can confirm that panels would be sourced and shipped from China. This is because the majority of solar panels are produced in China, however UK

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		Development's 60-year lifespan.		manufacturers can supply many of the other components of a solar scheme. The Applicant's parent company is a signatory of the Solar Energy UK Supply Chain Statement, which commits the company and its projects to sourcing materials produced in a sustainable way with a supply chain free of human rights abuses. It is building on this commitment through membership of the Solar Stewardship Initiative, an international supply chain audit programme, and by using independent international standards bodies to review, inspect and accredit suppliers. The use of chemicals within the Proposed Development would be minimal, with no PFAS (forever chemicals) present in solar panel coatings or on BESS batteries. The solar cells would be made from silicon, a material with properties almost the same as sand. They may contain very small amounts of heavy metals, but these are well within the limits set by law; this is

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				confirmed by the Applicant checking the results of testing in independent laboratories. Solar PV Panels typically have a lifespan of up to 40 years or more, and it has been assumed that Solar PV Panels will be replaced once during the lifetime of the Proposed Development. The panels are anticipated to be replaced over a maximum 12 - 24-month period. Up to 99% of solar PV modules are recyclable, with the number of solar panel recycling plants in the UK increasing. Companies which are aligned with the Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment Recycling (WEEE) Regulations 2013 are Approved Authorised Treatment Facilities for solar waste. The solar panels would require occasional maintenance and would be cleaned using water only; stubborn marks would be removed by scrubbing,

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				removing the risk of cleaning chemical runoff. The cleaning of panels, and the decommissioning process for panels and other components are further detailed within Sections 2.9 to 2.11 of the outline Operation Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) **[EN00110012/APP/LVS/07.03]**.
Climate Change and Energy Need	LV2_PFF_036, LV2_L_001, LV2_OFF_045, LV2_E_018, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_120, LV2_E_111	Respondents expressed that solar panels are inefficient. Some respondents expressed concern about the energy productivity / cost productivity of solar panels.	Yes	The Applicant notes these comments. The Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (December 2025) states that that the UK has huge potential for solar power and that solar energy is at the heart of the Clean Power 2030 Mission [Paras 3.3.23 & 3.3.24]. The UK has adequate irradiance levels for solar generation. As detailed in Section 6.4 and 6.8 of the Statement of Need **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.03]** the radiance levels of a proposed site for a solar scheme are just one factor, solar panel efficiency is also influenced by the installed capacity of the panels and their

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				orientation and layout. The efficiency of a scheme is influenced by panel selection, the physical properties of those panels, the properties of other electrical components which make up a scheme, and the electrical design of that scheme. In summary, the efficiency of the solar panels used by the Proposed Development is intrinsic to their design while also dependent on irradiance levels and location, incident sunlight, and panel orientation.
Climate Change and Energy Need	LV2_PFF_040, LV2_PFF_041, LV2_PFF_043, LV2_E_045, LV2_OFF_146, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_101	Respondents expressed concern about the environmental effects of importing solar panels.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding the environmental footprint of imported equipment. ES Volume 1 Chapter 9: Greenhouse Gas Emissions **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.09]** assesses the greenhouse gas emissions from the transport of materials to the development site; the assessment is included in ES Volume 3 Appendix 9.1: Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment **[EN00110012/APP/LVS/06.03.09.01]**.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The manufacturer of solar photovoltaic (PV) panels has not yet been chosen, an assumption of 920,640 (no.) of solar PV panels has been used to inform the assessment. Due to the higher capacity planting arrangement of Fixed South Facing panels, in comparison with a Single Axis Tracker panel arrangement, this assessment accounts for Fixed South Facing panels only, as this results in a greater embodied carbon associated with the materials used and construction. It has been assumed that the BESS, solar PV modules and PV framework will be delivered during the construction phase via sea and HGV from suppliers in China, whereas the rest of the materials are assumed to be sourced more locally. Sea freight distance from China to England is assumed to be 22,000 km (based on the sea freight distance between Shanghai and Dover) and the HGV transport from factory to

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Shanghai Port and Port of Dover to Site are assumed to be 500 km each.
Climate Change and Energy Need	LV2_OFF_140, LV2_E_116	Respondents stated the need for the Proposed Development has not been justified enough, adds that more of a need is required to justify developments on green belt land. A respondent has stated that this conflicts with NPPF Chapter 13.	Yes	The Statement of Need **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.03]**, describes the Government's policy that large capacities of low carbon generation will be required to meet increased demand and replace output from retiring (fossil fuel) plants, and that "a secure, reliable, affordable, Net Zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar". The Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (December 2025) states that that the UK has huge potential for solar power and that solar energy is at the heart of the Clean Power 2030 Mission [Paras 3.3.23 & 3.3.24]. NPS EN-1 further confirms that there is an urgent need for renewable energy generation that is a critical national priority [para 3.3.62 & 3.3.63]. The Proposed Development therefore directly contributes towards meeting the

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				national net zero and energy security requirements for the near future. The Applicant remains committed to delivering a Proposed Development that makes a meaningful contribution to the UK's transition to net zero, while also seeking to minimise adverse impacts and maximise opportunities for environmental enhancement and community benefits. As set out in ES Volume 3 Appendix 3.1: Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]**, the Proposed Development includes limited areas of Green Belt land, affecting parts of Solar Development Sites 2 and 4 only. The majority of the Proposed Development lies outside the Green Belt. The site selection process sought to avoid Green Belt land where practicable, and alternative sites considered would have resulted in a

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				greater extent of Green Belt involvement or were otherwise less suitable. The limited Green Belt effects of the Proposed Development are therefore considered justified in the context of the urgent national need for renewable energy infrastructure. As set out in Section 2.4 of the Applicant's Policy Compliance Document **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.12]**, the Applicant is satisfied that the Proposed Development is demonstrably located on 'grey belt' land and is not inappropriate development under current policy.
Climate Change and Energy Need	LV2_PFF_027	Respondent asked what the increase in CO2 will be as a result of the loss of agricultural land?	No	The Applicant notes that the removal of agricultural land does not automatically increase CO2, and often depends on how intensively farmed the land is, and the land-use planned after removal. The Proposed Development includes a host of ecological enhancement

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				measures, as described in ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/06.01.06]** and shown indicatively on the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**), including new vegetation planting, including trees and hedgerows. These measures are secured in the outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**, and represent new, natural features being reintroduced to agricultural cropland, increase biodiversity (especially on intensively-farmed land) and capture more carbon than farmed cropland.
Climate Change and Energy Need	LV2_E_002	Respondent expressed general scepticism about the science behind climate change policies.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Climate Change and Energy Need	LV2_OFF_140	Respondent stated the need for the Proposed Development has not been	Yes	The Applicant has prepared a Statement of Need **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.03]** which sets out in full the need and

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		justified enough, adds that more of a need is required to justify developments on green belt land.		justification for the Proposed Development. The Statement of Need describes the Government's policy that large capacities of low carbon generation will be required to meet increased demand and replace output from retiring (fossil fuel) plants, and that "a secure, reliable, affordable, Net Zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar". The Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (December 2025) states that that the UK has huge potential for solar power and that solar energy is at the heart of the Clean Power 2030 Mission [Paras 3.3.23 & 3.3.24]. NPS EN-1 further confirms that there is an urgent need for renewable energy generation that is a critical national priority [para 3.3.62 & 3.3.63]. The Proposed Development therefore directly contributes towards meeting the national net zero and energy security requirements for the near future.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				As set out in ES Volume 3 Appendix 3.1: Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]**, the Proposed Development includes limited areas of Green Belt land, affecting parts of Solar Development Sites 2 and 4 only. The majority of the Proposed Development lies outside the Green Belt. The site selection process sought to avoid Green Belt land where practicable, and alternative sites considered would have resulted in a greater extent of Green Belt involvement or were otherwise less suitable. The limited Green Belt effects of the Proposed Development are therefore considered justified in the context of the urgent national need for renewable energy infrastructure. As set out in Section 2.4 of the Applicant's Policy Compliance Document **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.12]**, the

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Applicant is satisfied that the Proposed Development is demonstrably located on 'grey belt' land and is not inappropriate development under current policy.
Climate Change and Energy Need	LV2_E_067	Respondent expressed that the high ratio of panels in the area will influence weather activities and produce a 'heat island' effect.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. Fthenakis, V., & Yu, Y. (2013), (Journal of Solar Energy Engineering) completed an 18-month study which showed that in most days, a solar array was completely cooled at night, and, thus, it was unlikely that heat island effects will occur from large solar arrays. Barron-Gafford G. A., Minor, R. L., Allen, N. A., Cronin, A. D. Brooks, A.E. and Pavao-Zuckerman, M. A. (2016) completed a study on the photovoltaic heat island effect which showed that, temperature increases are localized and do not substantially extend beyond the immediate solar farm boundary. The microclimate and heat island effects from solar farms are considered not

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				significant for nearby residents. Temperature variations remain within acceptable environmental parameters, posing no meaningful thermal stress or discomfort to surrounding communities. No significant effect is likely as a result of microclimate.
Climate Change and Energy Need	LV2_E_036	Respondent stated that the emissions of the UK are so low that the Proposed Development will have an insignificant impact on climate change.	Yes	The Applicant has prepared a Statement of Need **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.03]** which sets out in full the need and justification for the Proposed Development. The Statement of Need describes the government's policy that large capacities of low-carbon generation will be required to meet increased demand and replace output from retiring (fossil fuel) plants, alongside supporting wider efforts to decarbonise the UK economy. These are key motivations for the Proposed Development, alongside supporting the legally binding commitment to reach Net Zero by 2025.
Climate Change and Energy Need	LV2_E_036	Respondent stated the Proposed Development	No	The Applicant has prepared a Statement of Need **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.03]**

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		cannot be justified as the number of coal power stations built and operated by China and India, who share the same hemisphere as the UK, will always counteract any benefits brought by UK solar.		which sets out in full the need and justification for the Proposed Development. The Statement of Need describes the Government's policy that large capacities of low carbon generation will be required to meet increased demand and replace output from retiring (fossil fuel) plants, and that "a secure, reliable, affordable, Net Zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar". The Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (December 2025) states that that the UK has huge potential for solar power and that solar energy is at the heart of the Clean Power 2030 Mission [Paras 3.3.23 & 3.3.24]. NPS EN-1 further confirms that there is an urgent need for renewable energy generation that is a critical national priority [para 3.3.62 & 3.3.63]. The Proposed Development therefore directly contributes towards meeting the national net zero and energy security requirements for the near future.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				As further outlined in ES Volume 1 Chapter 1: Introduction **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.01]** in June 2019 the government passed a law to end the UK's contribution to global warming by 2050: Net Zero. In December 2024, the government published their Clean Power 2030 Action Plan (Ref 4) which reinforces the urgent need for low carbon generation schemes to come forward to pave the way to decarbonise the wider economy (including heat, transport and industry) by 2050. UK electricity demand is expected to double by 2050 as the country pursues the electrification of heat in buildings, transport, and industry. The Clean Power 2030 Action Plan includes a capacity range for solar power (excluding additional rooftop solar projects) of 45-47GW by 2030 and 45-69GW by 2035.
Climate Change and Energy Need	LV2_E_103	Respondent enquired as to what will happen to the solar	Yes	Solar PV Panels typically have a lifespan of up to 40 years or more, and it has been assumed that Solar PV Panels

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		panels when they degrade or overheat.		will be replaced once during the lifetime of the Proposed Development. The panels are anticipated to be replaced over a maximum 12 - 24-month period. Any panels which reach the end of their life or are damaged would be recycled. Up to 99% of solar PV modules are recyclable, with the number of solar panel recycling plants in the UK increasing. Companies which are aligned with the Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment Recycling (WEEE) Regulations 2013 are Approved Authorised Treatment Facilities for solar waste. The solar cells would be made from silicon, a material with properties almost the same as sand. They may contain very small amounts of heavy metals, but these are well within the limits set by law; this is confirmed by the Applicant checking the results of testing in independent laboratories.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The decommissioning process for panels and other components is further detailed within Sections 2.9 to 2.11 of the outline Operation Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) **[EN00110012/APP/LVS/07.03]**.
Climate Change and Energy Need	LV2_PFF_008	Respondent questioned the prudence of solar panels as the government is attempting to dim the sun.	No	The Applicant notes the government isn't actively attempting to dim the sun but is funding research into Solar Radiation Management (SRM).
Climate Change and Energy Need	LV2_PFF_012	Respondent expressed support for tackling climate change but opposes the Proposed Development.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Climate Change and Energy Need	LV2_PFF_027	Respondent asked what the reduction of CO2 would be nationally as a result of the Proposed Development?	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The Proposed Development is being proposed to produce 500 MW of clean, renewable energy, rather than to directly reduce or remove CO2 nationally. As fossil-fuel based sources of energy come offline and renewable sources come online, the amount of CO2 produced in energy generation will decrease nationally.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Climate Change and Energy Need	LV2_PFF_040	Respondent queried if the Proposed Development will really produce affordable energy without government subsidies.	No	The Applicant is funding the proposed development as explained in the Funding Statement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.02]** that forms part of the Application. The Applicant has not received funding from the taxpayer. The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding energy costs. While the Proposed Development does not influence retail electricity pricing, it contributes to national renewable energy and security objectives.
Climate Change and Energy Need	LV2_E_067	Respondent expressed that the Proposed Development will not contribute to lowering electricity costs.	No	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding energy costs. While the Proposed Development does not influence retail electricity pricing, it contributes to national renewable energy and security objectives.
Climate Change and Energy Need	LV2_PFF_055	Respondent expressed belief that a mix of solar and wind is necessary to generate a secure supply of electricity.	No	The Applicant welcomes and agrees with this comment. The Proposed Development includes both solar generation and battery storage to

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				contribute towards a secure supply of electricity.
Climate Change and Energy Need	LV2_PFF_057	Respondent stated that the community webinar mentioned a 20% production in energy production in the winter months.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges that solar generation output would be lower in the winter, which is also when demand is highest. As such, and as outlined in Section 4.3 of the Statement of Need **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.03]**, timing demand to periods of high supply will be important, as will building sufficient generation capacity to meet demand under a variety of weather conditions. Furthermore, as more mixed generation, low-carbon and renewable sources come online, demand will be increasingly easier and cheaper to meet. As outlined in Section 6.9 of the Statement of Need **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.03]** when the BESS is not supporting the operation of the Proposed Development, it may be useful for the BESS to support the national supply and demand balance by

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				importing directly from the grid rather than from the co-located solar, further offsetting the lower generation levels of the Proposed Development during Winter.
Climate Change and Energy Need	LV2_E_030	Respondent expressed that the Proposed Development is not in line with government strategy regarding the consideration of reasonable alternatives.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. ES Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]** provides further detail regarding the site selection and design process, and confirms that alternative sites were considered, assessed, and have been reported on within the Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) (ES Volume 3 **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]**). The SSAR considered, along with proximity to Monk Fryston Substation, planning, environmental and spatial constraints including flood risk, Green Belt, Agricultural Land Classifications and Public Rights of Way, and aspects

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				including vehicle access and visual impacts. The Planning Statement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.02]** provides the policy context for the Proposed Development. The Applicant's Policy Compliance Document **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.12]** sets out how the Proposed Development is compliant with government strategy, planning and legal frameworks. The Applicant is satisfied that the Proposed Development is demonstrably located on 'grey belt' land and is not inappropriate development under current policy. National Policy Statement EN-1 further confirms that, given the level and urgency of need for new energy infrastructure, alternatives should only be taken into account where there is a realistic prospect of it delivering the same capacity in the same timescale as

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				the proposed development, and that regard must be had to the possibility that all suitable sites for energy infrastructure may be needed for future proposals [paras 4.3.22 to 4.3.24].
Clime Change and Energy Need	LV2_PFF_040	Respondent requested further information on the environmental effects of the manufacture, replacement, and cleaning of the solar panels.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment and can confirm that panels would be sourced and shipped from China, however UK manufacturers can supply many of the other components. ES Volume 1 Chapter 9: Greenhouse Gas Emissions **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.09]** assesses the greenhouse gas emissions from the transport of materials to the development site; the assessment is included in ES Volume 3 Appendix 9.1: Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment **[EN00110012/APP/LVS/06.03.09.01]**. The manufacturer of solar photovoltaic (PV) panels has not yet been chosen, an assumption of 920,640 (no.) of solar PV panels has been used to inform the assessment. It has been assumed that

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				the BESS, solar PV modules and PV framework will be delivered during the construction phase via sea and HGV from suppliers in China, whereas the rest of the materials are assumed to be sourced more locally. Sea freight distance from China to England is assumed to be 22,000 km (based on the sea freight distance between Shanghai and Dover) and the HGV transport from factory to Shanghai Port and Port of Dover to Site are assumed to be 500 km each. The Applicant's parent company is a signatory of the Solar Energy UK Supply Chain Statement, which commits the company and its projects to sourcing materials produced in a sustainable way with a supply chain free of human rights abuses. It is building on this commitment through membership of the Solar Stewardship Initiative, an international supply chain audit programme, and by using independent

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				international standards bodies to review, inspect and accredit suppliers. The use of chemicals within the Proposed Development would be minimal, with no PFAS (forever chemicals) present in solar panel coatings or on BESS batteries. The panels are anticipated to be replaced over a maximum 12 - 24-month period. Up to 99% of solar PV modules are recyclable, with the number of solar panel recycling plants in the UK increasing. Companies which are aligned with the Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment Recycling (WEEE) Regulations 2013 are Approved Authorised Treatment Facilities for solar waste. The solar panels would be cleaned using water only; stubborn marks would be removed by scrubbing, removing the risk of cleaning chemical runoff. The solar cells would be made from silicon, a

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				material with properties almost the same as sand. They may contain very small amounts of heavy metals, but these are well within the limits set by law; this is confirmed by the Applicant checking the results of testing in independent laboratories. The cleaning of panels, and the decommissioning process for panels and other components are further detailed within Sections 2.9 to 2.11 of the outline Operation Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) **[EN00110012/APP/LVS/07.03]**.
Clime Change and Energy Need	LV2_PFF_040, LV2_E_120	Respondents enquired as to how efficient solar really is in the UK.	Yes	UK has many areas of commercially viable solar irradiation, it is therefore important to make best use of this natural, renewable energy resource to meet the UK's legal carbon emission reduction obligations. The Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (December 2025) states that that the UK has huge

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				potential for solar power and that solar energy is at the heart of the Clean Power 2030 Mission [Paras 3.3.23 & 3.3.24]. As detailed in Section 6.4 and 6.8 of the Statement of Need **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.03]** the radiance levels of a proposed site for a solar scheme are just one factor, solar panel efficiency is also influenced by the installed capacity of the panels and their orientation and layout. The efficiency of a scheme is influenced by panel selection, the physical properties of those panels, the properties of other electrical components which make up a scheme, and the electrical design of that scheme. In summary, the efficiency of the solar panels used by the Proposed Development is intrinsic to their design while also dependent on irradiance levels and location, incident sunlight, and panel orientation.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Clime Change and Energy Need	LV2_E_045, LV2_E_101, LV2_E_083	Respondents expressed concern over the environmental impact of mining for BESS and solar panel minerals and materials.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. ES Volume 1 Chapter 9: Greenhouse Gas Emissions **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.09]** assesses the greenhouse gas emissions associated with the Proposed Development; the assessment is included in ES Volume 3 Appendix 9.1: Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment **[EN00110012/APP/LVS/06.03.09.01]**. While the manufacturer of solar photovoltaic (PV) panels has not yet been chosen, it has been assumed that the BESS, solar PV modules and PV framework will be delivered during the construction phase via sea and HGV from suppliers in China, whereas the rest of the materials are assumed to be sourced more locally. Furthermore, the assessment in referenced does include a 'Product Stage' which takes into account the raw materials associated with the Proposed Development,

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				including materials for the solar panels and the BESS.
Clime Change and Energy Need	LV2_OFF_078	Respondent stated that they live in a grade 2 listed building on the A63, and they cannot put solar panels up, asking why the Applicant wants to install 100s.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant has prepared a Statement of Need **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.03]** which sets out in full the need and justification for the Proposed Development. The Statement of Need describes the Government's policy that large capacities of low carbon generation will be required to meet increased demand and replace output from retiring (fossil fuel) plants, and that "a secure, reliable, affordable, Net Zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar". The Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (December 2025) states that that the UK has huge potential for solar power and that solar energy is at the heart of the Clean Power 2030 Mission [Paras 3.3.23 & 3.3.24]. The Proposed Development therefore directly contributes towards

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				meeting the national net zero and energy security requirements for the near future. A full assessment of potential impacts on listed buildings has been carried out within the ES **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.08]**, including a site walkover, settings assessment, geophysical survey of Solar Development Sites and Cable Route Corridor and archaeological evaluation (trial trenching) of Solar Development Sites. This assessment has concluded that, whilst there will be minor adverse impacts on elements of the built historic environment as a result of changes in their setting, these will be limited. Consultation with NYC's Conservation Officer has concluded that any harm to listed buildings will be less than substantial.

Community Benefits and impact

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_PFF_013, LV2_OFF_005, LV2_OFF_006, LV2_OFF_009, LV2_OFF_016, LV2_OFF_029, LV2_OFF_030, LV2_PFF_030, LV2_PFF_034, LV2_PFF_035, LV2_PFF_036, LV2_PFF_037, LV2_PFF_048, LV2_PFF_050, LV2_E_036, LV2_E_041, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_OFF_146, LV2_OFF_040, LV2_OFF_041, LV2_OFF_140, LV2_OFF_126, LV2_OFF_125, LV2_OFF_047, LV2_OFF_048, LV2_OFF_122, LV2_E_066, LV2_OFF_111, LV2_OFF_107, LV2_OFF_068, LV2_OFF_065,	Respondents have expressed concern about the Proposed Development's impact on the community, stating that it offers little or no benefit locally, with some describing the community benefits package as a bribe or an attempt to buy support. Some respondents feel that insufficient information has been provided about these benefits and have requested further details.	N/A	The Applicant is committed to ensuring that communities benefit from the project including by receiving direct funding to important causes in the local area. As a low-cost form of generation, if the project is connected to the electricity transmission network, it will contribute to lowering the cost of energy for all, including locally. During the development of the project proposals, the Applicant consulted on community benefits and will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. Furthermore, the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.13]** anticipates that the estimated labour requirement for the Proposed Development over the projected construction period is equivalent to a gross 385 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) employees per annum. In addition to the

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_OFF_060, LV2_OFF_058, LV2_OFF_057, LV2_OFF_106, LV2_OFF_102, LV2_OFF_042, LV2_E_119, LV2_E_080, LV2_E_120, LV2_E_123, LV2_E_099, LV2_E_111, LV2_E_112, LV2_OFF_086, LV2_PFF_020, LV2_PFF_029, LV2_PFF_042, LV2_E_042, LV2_E_077			direct construction employment generated by the Proposed Development itself, there would be an increase in local employment arising from both indirect and induced effects of the construction activity. Employment growth is anticipated to arise locally through suppliers to the construction process as a result of additional spending within local supply chains. Other benefits of the Proposed Development include: • Connectivity and public access improvements, including enhancements to the local PRoW network and the creation of additional permissive paths. • Local recruitment and procurement and supporting local education and skills uplifting, including promotion of apprenticeship schemes, workforce training, and STEM education initiatives. • Ecological and landscape enhancement, including creating additional areas of hedgerow (including

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				infilling existing hedgerow), grassland, woodland planting. • Significant BNG contributions and habitat creation/ enhancement, including commuting corridors through the development and wetland areas for ground nesting birds. • Retention and enhancement watercourses, ponds and ditches, including providing connectivity for species such as otter, water vole, and amphibians. • Installation of habitat features, including bat and bird boxes.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_023, LV2_OFF_026, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_OFF_056, LV2_E_111, LV2_OFF_090	Respondents suggested general financial compensation for residents impacted by the Proposed Development. A respondent has asked how much compensation will be given out, and how many people will receive it.	N/A	In the event that losses can be demonstrated then compensation may be payable in circumstances where properties meet the criteria set out in legislation relating to compulsory acquisition and the compensation code. The Applicant has submitted the Book of Reference **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.03]**. This

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				includes persons who may be entitled to compensation if the Development Consent Order is granted and the Proposed Development developed. Under Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973, property owners (Category 3) are eligible to claim compensation for any physical impacts from the operation of the Proposed Development, such as noise and vibration. However, compensation is not available for loss of value due to visual impacts or diminished views—this is consistent with established planning law. Separate from the above circumstances, the Applicant does not intend to provide 'general' financial compensation to residents, however, the Applicant is committed to providing a community benefit fund. Moreover, electricity generated from the Proposed Development will be exported to the National Electricity Transmission System (NETS), and provided to

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				consumers via third party electricity companies, which means that the Applicant cannot commit to the provision of cheaper electricity prices for the specific community surrounding the site. However, building large quantities of renewable generation in the UK is anticipated to keep consumer costs down by capturing and storing energy when it is abundant (therefore cheap) and releasing it when it is needed. Solar remains one of the cheapest forms of electricity generation available with current technologies.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_PFF_030, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_OFF_140, LV2_OFF_107	Respondents stated that the plans lack any specific benefits for the existing community.	N/A	The Applicant is committed to ensuring that the community benefits from the project including by receiving direct funding to important causes in the local area. As a low-cost form of generation, if the project is connected to the electricity transmission network, it will contribute to lowering the cost of energy for all, including locally. During the development of the project proposals, the Applicant consulted on community benefits and will continue to

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. The Applicant notes that a pedestrian crossing on the A63 for Monk Fryston has been suggested as a possible community benefit by respondents; this suggestion will be considered alongside other feedback to receive funding from the Community Benefit Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_025, LV2_OFF_146, LV2_OFF_106, LV2_OFF_090	Respondents expressed general support for the principle of community benefits.	N/A	The Applicant welcomes support for the principle of community benefit funding. During the development of the project proposals, the Applicant consulted on community benefits and will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_028, LV2_OFF_128, LV2_OFF_047	Respondents expressed general support for a ringfenced community fund for local projects, with some suggesting that a percentage of profits should go into such projects.	N/A	The Applicant welcomes support for the principle of community benefit funding. During the development of the project proposals, the Applicant consulted on community benefits and will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. Funding is anticipated to be based on the capacity of the Proposed Development and

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				therefore will not be subject to variations in output or project income.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_PFF_008, LV2_PFF_025, LV2_PFF_051	Respondents stated that rural communities do not need trails, information boards or nature improvements as they already have these things.	No	The Applicant notes these comments but respectfully disagrees that improvements in local biodiversity are unnecessary. The Applicant is also conscious that different people experience an area in different ways, and that, while the commenters may not see the benefit of information boards or new trails, others feel differently as evidenced by their comments. Policies and processes to manage such disagreement will be included in the design of the Community Benefit Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_029, LV2_E_057	Respondents expressed scepticism that the community benefits will be delivered.	No	Where other projects by Island Green Power, the Applicant's parent group, have promised community benefits, these have been paid, or the new owner of the project has committed to paying them.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_128, LV2_E_099	Respondent suggested improving mobile phone signal across the area, reported that signal is very poor.	No	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This comment will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_E_042	Respondent suggested that immediately effected villages and parishes should only benefit from community benefits Proposed Development.	No	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. These comments will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_PFF_018	Respondent requested that as a good will gesture, community benefit improvements to recreation should be announced before any construction begins.	No	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. These comments will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_PFF_036	Respondent expressed opposition to suggestions of a community benefit to add improved street lighting to Escrick, stated it will ruin the character of the village.	No	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. As part of this, the Applicant understands that, as in this case, there may be disagreement between members of the community about how funds should be allocated. Policies and processes to manage such disagreement will be included in the design of the Fund.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_106	Respondent stated that some local roads do not have safe paths to walk and drainage systems to stop surface water accumulating on some land areas.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment and where possible, has incorporated new permissive paths alongside existing roads in order to create an alternative. This is shown on the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]** and secured in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**. The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_PFF_060, LV2_PFF_061	Respondents suggested an A19 roundabout for Riccall.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. These comments will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_PFF_001	Respondent suggested any support or assistance in helping the local area's public buildings become carbon neutral, e.g.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This comment will be considered alongside

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		schools, community centres, village halls.		other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_PFF_003	Respondent suggested doing something to ensure a more stable electricity supply to Skipwith, which has had over 350 power cuts over the past 30 years.	N/A	While the Applicant is not the Distribution Network Operator for the area and cannot lawfully alter that network, it is willing to consider how it could support improvement works as part of a Community Benefit Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_PFF_017	Respondent requested that the site should be moved away from homes.	Yes	The design of the Proposed Development has been informed by an environmentally-led approach, with residential amenity and proximity to sensitive receptors considered throughout site selection and layout refinement. This has included setting development boundaries away from villages and residential properties where practicable and including buffer zones between the Proposed Development boundaries and residential receptors. Further mitigation measures include retaining existing vegetation and incorporating substantial new planting to screen and filter views. For the Cable Route Corridor, construction works would

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				be avoided within 300m of residential receptors. These embedded mitigation measures are set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]**, Section 10.8, with additional mitigation set out in Section 10.10 and secured through the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]** and the Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04]**. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) demonstrates that some residential receptors would experience adverse changes to views during construction and operation (Section 10.9); Appendix 10.3: Visual Baseline and Effects **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.10.03]**. However, the assessment shows that

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				these effects will reduce over time as mitigation planting establishes, with the majority of visual effects on residential receptors negligible adverse by Year 15 of operation (Tables 10.22 and 10.26; Section 10.8), with only one residential receptor assessed as having moderate adverse (significant) effects. The LVIA has not identified any residual effects on the views of residents that would remain of major significance (the highest category) at year 15 of operation.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_PFF_015	Respondent requested facilities for young people in Sherburn.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This comment will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_PFF_024	Respondent suggested an environmental education centre supporting climate change energy management, energy technology.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This comment will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_PFF_031	Respondent suggested a contribution to Hambleton village in the form of improvements for residents such as the parish council, the village hall, local events so a community improvement can be part of the programme.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This comment will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_PFF_039	Respondent suggested support for young people's athletics.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This comment will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_132	Respondent requested that any benefits are discussed with Riccall Parish Council and existing local groups.		The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This will include discussions with parish councils and existing local groups.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_117	Respondent suggested planting trees as a community benefit to block the view of the panels.	Yes	The Applicant can confirm that extensive planting, including of trees, will be undertaken for the purposes of ecological mitigation and enhancement, screening, habitat creation or replanting in the case of

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				any vegetation removal, although such removal would be avoided as far as practicable. Proposed tree and wider vegetation planting is shown on the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]** and further detailed in and secured by the outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_106	Respondent requested more facilities for young people including indoor and outdoor sports facilities.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This comment will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_E_099	Respondent suggested local infrastructure improvements.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This comment will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_076	Respondent requested an indoor sports barn for the community to use.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				comment will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_050	Respondent expressed that Gateforth Hall Estate Residents Association owns and runs a private sewage plant and system that discharges, after treatment, and against an EA discharge consent, into a drainage dike just north of West Lodge. The plant is at least 100 yrs old and requires ongoing maintenance and supervision. One potential community benefit would be replacement of this Proposed Development with a modern low-maintenance installation or an appropriate connection into the mains sewer that runs over the Hough	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This comment will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		between Gateforth and Hambleton.		
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_E_091	Respondent stated that the community benefit should be focused on the road safety and traffic calming measures as opposed to recreational development.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This comment will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_084	Respondent stated that they would be happy to do an art project for the community charting the site development within the landscape.	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_PFF_039	Respondent suggested sponsorship for Hillam in Bloom.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This comment will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_PFF_039	Respondent suggested support for a cafe in Hillam.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This comment will be considered alongside

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_083	Respondent stated that South Milford Memorial Park and Playing Field association would be an ideal recipient of community funds as the majority of play equipment needs replacing.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This comment will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_PFF_005, LV2_OFF_032, LV2_PFF_029, LV2_OFF_140, LV2_OFF_128, LV2_OFF_109, LV2_OFF_072, LV2_OFF_051, LV2_OFF_089, LV2_OFF_090	Stakeholders expressed preference for benefits in the form of discounted or free electricity, i.e. support for their energy bills.	N/A	Electricity generated from the Proposed Development will be exported to the National Electricity Transmission System (NETS), and provided to consumers via third party electricity companies, which means that the Applicant cannot commit to the provision of cheaper electricity prices for the specific community surrounding the site. However, building large quantities of renewable generation in the UK is anticipated to keep consumer costs down by capturing and storing energy when it is abundant (therefore cheap) and releasing it when it is needed. Solar remains one of

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				the cheapest forms of electricity generation available with current technologies.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_136	Respondent suggested energy efficiency advice, and advice on investments in other renewable energy projects.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This comment will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_025	Respondent suggested funding for local and community energy initiatives such as rooftop solar funds for locals, installation of heat pumps, smart meters, vehicle-to-grid charging systems, highspeed internet cabling, and other community scale green energy initiatives.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This comment will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_042	Respondent suggested allowing local landowners and communities small scale inputs into the cable to access electricity	No	The design of the cable would not practically and safely be able to accommodate this suggestion.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		directly from the Proposed Development.		
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_098	Respondent suggested supporting the Monk Fryston Conservation Area - and that this would be an opportunity to enhance negating MF Hall Estate and woodlands by supporting sports and leisure there.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This comment will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_009, LV2_OFF_025	Respondents suggested community funds be used for nature and wildlife enhancements such as beehives, wildflower meadows, bird houses, hedgehog homes, greens spaces etc.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. These comments will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_PFF_052	Respondent suggested provision of completion of project 'woodland nature days' to promote ownership/responsibility. Respondent gave Wood	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This comment will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		Meadow Project and Wood Meadow Trust run by Plant Life. The respondent added that these organisations can be funded by Light Valley Solar.		
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_009	Respondent expressed that funds should be used for elements of "agri-solar" including sheep grazing, bee hives etc.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This comment will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund. The Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**, secured within the DCO, commits the Proposed Development to undertake sheep grazing in the Proposed Development boundary
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_032	Respondent expressed support for funding to support community flood defences.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This comment will be considered alongside

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_032, LV2_OFF_128, LV2_OFF_125	Respondents suggested repairs, improvement, and maintenance of local roads used during and after construction as a community benefit.	Yes	The Applicant welcomes this suggestion and can confirm that road restoration following use during the construction phase will be undertaken, as outlined in and secured through the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP), **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]**. This is already an embedded measure, as opposed to a measure added based on Community Benefit Fund suggestions.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_026, LV2_OFF_119	Respondent suggested installing road safety measures such as speed indicator devices as a community benefit.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. These comments will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_001, LV2_OFF_002	Respondent expressed that they would like to see any new pavements built with bricks instead of tarmac in keeping with the villages of North Yorkshire.	No	The Applicant is not proposing any new pavements. Were Community Benefit Funding to be allocated for this, the design would be for local councils and communities to decide.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_E_061, LV2_OFF_119	Respondent requested pelican crossings for Monk Fryston, Hambleton, and other villages with access routes proposed.	No	The Applicant notes this request and can confirm this is part of ongoing discussions with North Yorkshire Council and it will continue to engage with them over this.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_115	Respondent suggested funding pedestrian crossings in both Hambleton and Monk Fryston.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This comment will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_002	Respondent suggested road signage connecting the sites to nearby villages.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This comment will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_125	Respondent suggested building new roads away from the villages to alleviate traffic.	No	The Applicant notes that building multiple news roads as is suggested would be a separate planning application. The local highway network is in the stewardship of North Yorkshire Council, who are best placed to decide where new roads are required. Nevertheless, the Applicant is proposing to construct temporary access

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				routes for its own traffic to reduce the impact on some communities and areas. These routes would be removed after works finish, with the land restored to its previous condition.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_115	Respondent suggested a ring road to bypass traffic outside of Hambleton and Monk Fryston.	No	The Applicant notes that a significant new road project such as the one suggested would be a separate planning application. The local highway network is in the stewardship of North Yorkshire Council, who are best placed to decide where new roads are required.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_PFF_042	Respondent expressed general support for using community benefits to fund healthcare, surgeries, GPs, local health services and mental health services.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This comment will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_PFF_042	Respondent expressed general support for using community benefits to fund schools and other learning infrastructure.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This comment will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_022	Respondent requested that the local community, especially young people between 16-21, are engaged in the process of installation to develop working opportunities.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. The Application includes an outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan (oSSCEP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.13]** which includes measures such as this.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_PFF_024	Respondent suggested that money be provided for talks in schools on environmental issues and energy conservation.	Yes	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This comment will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund. Sections 21 to 23 of the outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan (oSSCEP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.13]** details the potential engagement the Applicant may undertake with schools.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_115	Respondent suggested a private wire connection to local villages with underground lines vulnerable to wind damage	N/A	While the Applicant is not the Distribution Network Operator for the area and cannot lawfully alter that network, it is willing to consider how it could support resilience works as part of a Community Benefit Fund

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		leading to recurrent power outages.		
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_113	Respondent suggested Escrick Primary schools and Escrick play park for accessible playground equipment funding as they have a child with Down Syndrome.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This comment will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_009, LV2_OFF_136, LV2_OFF_133, LV2_E_064, LV2_OFF_109, LV2_OFF_090	Respondents suggested permissive routes specifically for bikes.	Yes	The Applicant can confirm that approximately 8 km (5 miles) of new permissive paths will be created (as shown on the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**) and secured in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05],** improving access for cyclists and creating new loops and new links between existing routes. The outline PRoW Management Plan (oPRoWMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.09]** provides a framework for the management of cycling as well as walking and horse riding and other public access routes throughout the Site. The key objective is to

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				ensure safety at all times throughout the Proposed Development's construction, operational and decommissioning phases, with the same applying to permissive paths during the operational phase.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_PFF_031, LV2_PFF_039, LV2_OFF_146, LV2_OFF_133, LV2_OFF_130	Respondents expressed support for funds for the improvement of local amenities or for local projects such as sports halls, gyms and fields.		The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. These comments will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_PFF_039, LV2_OFF_133	Respondents suggested nature trails.	Yes	The Applicant can confirm that approximately 8 km (5 miles) of new permissive paths will be created (as shown on the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**) and secured in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05],** increasing access to nature. In addition, access to existing routes will be maintained throughout the construction phase, with three permanent diversions planned.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_PFF_039, LV2_OFF_128	Respondents suggested nature or information boards.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. These comments will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_146, LV2_OFF_133	Respondents suggested areas for leisure and exercise located safely away from roads and built-up areas.	Yes	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. These comments will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund. The Applicant can confirm that approximately 8 km (5 miles) of new permissive paths will be created (as shown on the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**) and secured in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05],** increasing access to nature. In addition, access to existing routes will be maintained throughout the construction phase, with three permanent diversions planned.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_001, LV2_OFF_002	Respondents expressed that recreational areas are kept clean, well maintained and look modern.	N/A	The Applicant notes these comments.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_133	Respondent suggested rest and viewing areas.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This comment will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_PFF_006	Respondent requested a circular long distance route around Solar Development Site 1.	Yes	The Applicant can confirm that new permissive paths will be created (as shown on the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**) and secured in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05],** with the objective of creating new loops by create new links between existing routes for local residents. The outline PRoW Management Plan (oPRoWMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.09]** provides a framework for the management of these.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_020	Respondent expressed that they don't want ramblers in their field or any footpaths.	N/A	The Applicant notes these comments.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_E_099	Respondent requested installing and maintaining local footpath signs and access points.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This comment will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_136	Respondent suggested free parking is introduced for new and existing PRoWs to encourage people to use them.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This comment will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_129	Respondent requested that parish councils are worked with to identify what further facilities would be useful.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This will include discussions with parish councils and existing local groups.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_128	Respondent expressed support for new paths and linking villages together on the condition they do not	Yes	The Applicant welcomes support for its proposals to add new paths. The proposed locations are shown on the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM)

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		interfere with agricultural land and habitats.		**[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]** and secured in the Works Plans **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02/03],** with the proposed solar farm and have been designed to minimise disruption to agriculture and habitats.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_113	Respondent requested accessible footpaths with information boards potentially with links to a website showing live stats for energy production.	N/A	The Applicant will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. This comment will be considered alongside other feedback as part of designing the Fund.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_095	Respondent stated that any new permissive paths should be accessible from existing pedestrian routes in the surrounding villages without the need to walk along busy roads.	Yes	The Applicant can confirm that as part of the new permissive paths that will be created (as shown on the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**) and secured in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**, sections have specifically been introduced to provide an alternative to walking along existing roads. The outline PRoW Management Plan (oPRoWMP,

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.09]) provides a framework for the management of these.
Community Benefits and Impact	LV2_OFF_083	Respondent stated that South Milford has very few public footpaths with no circular routes available.	Yes	The Applicant can confirm that new permissive paths will be created (as shown on the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**) and secured in the Works Plans **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02/03],** increasing access for cyclists and creating new loops and new links between existing routes for local residents. The outline PRoW Management Plan (oPRoWMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.09]** provides a framework for the management of these.

Construction and decommissioning

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_PFF_025, LV2_PFF_028, LV2_PFF_039, LV2_PFF_045, LV2_PFF_047, LV2_PFF_050, LV2_L_001, LV2_E_036, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_E_049, LV2_E_050, LV2_OFF_145, LV2_OFF_126, LV2_E_066, LV2_E_067, LV2_OFF_069, LV2_E_120, LV2_E_122, LV2_E_123, LV2_E_112, LV2_E_113, LV2_OFF_085, LV2_OFF_079	Respondents expressed general concern for disruption during construction.	No	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding potential disruption as a result of the construction phase. ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]** sets out the methods being taken to mitigate this disruption. Construction impacts have also been assessed in other ES chapters, including Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]**, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.08]**, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.11]**, Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.14]**, and Chapter 16: Other Environmental Matters **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.16]**. Further information on these strategies can be found in the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**), which

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				further details and secures construction phase mitigation measures, including appropriate working and delivery hours. In addition, traffic-related construction phase mitigation measures, including the clear and strict defining of construction traffic routes, are detailed in and secured through the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]**.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_PFF_047, LV2_PFF_050, LV2_E_036, LV2_OFF_142, LV2_OFF_126, LV2_E_066, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_120, LV2_E_122, LV2_E_123	Respondents raised concern over the environmental consequences of construction and decommissioning.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding potential disruption because of construction and decommissioning. ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]** sets out the methods being taken to mitigate disruption. Further information on these strategies can be found in the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]** and outline Decommissioning Environmental

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Management Plan (oDEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04]**.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_PFF_034, LV2_OFF_069, LV2_OFF_148	Respondents expressed general concern about the impact of underground cables.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. The potential impact of the underground cables has been assessed in various ES chapters where relevant. This includes ES Volume 1 Chapter 15: Water Resources and Flood Risk **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.15]** and Annex H of ES Volume 3 Appendix 15.1: Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01]**, where the potential impact of cable construction, including trenchless, horizontal directional drilling (HDD) techniques, have been fully assessed. Further information regarding the Cable Route Corridor can be found in ES Volume 3 Appendix 2.1: Cable Route Construction Method Statement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.02.01]**.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_PFF_047	Respondent expressed concern that the environmental impacts from the construction	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding potential environmental impacts as a result of the construction phase. ES Volume 1 Chapter 9: Greenhouse Gas

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		phase will take years to pay back.		Emissions **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.09]** assesses the likely significant effects arising from greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with the construction phase, and details mitigation measures, as secured through the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**. These include adopting the Considerate Constructors Proposed Development (CCS) to assist in reducing pollution, including GHG emissions, by employing good industry practice measures, switching vehicles and plant off when not in use and ensuring construction vehicles conform to current EU emissions standards; and, reusing suitable infrastructure and resources already available in the Order Limits where possible to minimise the use of natural resources and unnecessary materials (e.g. reusing excavated soil for fill requirements or storing, preserving and restoring top soil).

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The measures outlined, taken in combination with other measures in the oCEMP and (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]** for construction traffic specifically) will support in limiting the environmental impact of the construction phase. The Applicant notes that, once operational, the Proposed Development would be exporting 500 MW of clean, renewable energy, a process that will last for up to 60 years and not produce any pollution or wider negative environmental effects. Further details regarding the construction phase are included within ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]**.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_PFF_039	Respondent expressed concern that the construction phase is too long.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The earliest the construction phase could start is in 2028. Construction work is unlikely to start on the Solar Development Sites in all locations at the same time. Sites 1-4 and 6-8 and the Cable Route Corridors would likely require different lengths of construction given their variance in size,

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				and therefore there would be some overlap between them. Construction works within the Cable Route Corridor would commence with multiple teams spread along the route. It is estimated that the construction period would require approximately 24-36 months in total. Management plans including the oCEMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]** have been designed to manage and minimise all impacts and any disruption caused as a result of the construction phase.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_OFF_145	Respondent expressed concern about the proposed working hours during the construction phase.	Yes	ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]** sets out the core construction working hours of the Proposed Development as Monday to Friday from 07:00 to 18:00 and Saturday from 08:00 to 13:30, with no Sunday or Bank Holiday working unless crucial to construction (for example for HDD which must be a continuous activity) or in an emergency. While restricted to daytime working, activities such as HDD will require

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				nighttime working; these instances would be communicated ahead of time.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_OFF_145	Respondent expressed general support for minimising the impact of building work on local residents.	Yes	The Applicant is committed to minimising the impact of construction on local residents. To support this, the Applicant has prepared an outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**) which sets out and secures the methods and strategies used to minimise impacts across the construction phase.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_PFF_031	Respondent requested further information on construction, suggested that not enough information has been provided on the construction plans.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding potential impacts as a result of construction. ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]** sets out the methods being taken to mitigate these impacts. Further information on these strategies can be found in the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**. The Applicant can confirm that more detailed plans have been developed

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				following PEIR-stage and Statutory Consultation (Phase Two), with plans being refined following consideration of consultation feedback and environmental assessments, as part of the iterative design process followed for the Proposed Development. Final plans have been submitted as part of the DCO application, including the Works Plans **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.03]**, the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]** and figures contained in ES Volume 2 **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02]**, including Figure 2.1: Illustrative Site Layout Plan and Figure 2.2: Cable Route Corridor Numbering, among others.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_PFF_031	Respondent asked when would construction start and how long would this take?	Yes	ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]** sets out that subject to development consent being granted, the earliest construction could start is 2028.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				It is estimated that the construction period would require approximately 24-36 months in total. Table 27 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]** sets out the indicative construction programme for different aspects of the Proposed Development.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_OFF_009	Respondent enquired about the environmental consequences of construction and decommissioning.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding potential environmental impacts as a result of the construction phase. Table 21 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]** sets out the design parameters for the ES and has informed the assessment of environmental impacts. ES Volume 1 Chapter 9: Greenhouse Gas Emissions **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.09]** assesses the likely significant effects arising from greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with the construction and decommissioning phases, and details

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				mitigation measures, as secured through the oCEMP **[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.02]** and the Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04]**. These include adopting the Considerate Constructors Proposed Development (CCS) to assist in reducing pollution, including GHG emissions, by employing good industry practice measures, switching vehicles and plant off when not in use and ensuring construction vehicles conform to current EU emissions standards; and, reusing suitable infrastructure and resources already available in the Order Limits where possible to minimise the use of natural resources and unnecessary materials (e.g. reusing excavated soil for fill requirements or storing, preserving and restoring top soil). The measures outlined, taken in combination with other measures in the oCEMP (and oCTMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]** for

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				construction traffic specifically) will support in limiting the environmental impact of the construction phase. The Applicant notes that, once operational, the Proposed Development would be producing and exporting 500 MW of clean, renewable energy, a process that will last for up to 60 years and not produce any pollution or wider negative environmental effects. Further details regarding the construction phase are included within ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]**.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_E_068	Respondent enquired how safety of horse riders, cyclists and walkers will be accounted for and considered during construction.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding the safety of horse riders, cyclists and walkers. Active travel users and their safety have been assessed in Sections 2.5 and 4.7 of ES Volume 3 Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (TA) **[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**. Following this, discussions were held with NYC highways department about the local access routes, and feedback was used to identify construction traffic routes and

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				access locations which are safe and considerate of other road users. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]** provides detail on mitigation measures to avoid impacts to active travel users.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_E_069	Respondent stated the PEIR lacks detail on centralised welfare, office facilities, parking and storage, crew buses, and the central point construction workers will report to before going to the site they are working on each day.	No	An Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**, Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.03]** and Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04]**) have been prepared as part of the DCO Application. These management plans provide detail on the construction, operation and decommissioning workforce and appropriate welfare facilities. A detailed OEMP, DEMP and CEMP will be prepared by the appointed Contractor(s),

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				substantially in accordance with the outline plans, and will be submitted for approval by North Yorkshire Council in advance of each stage of works.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_PFF_018	Respondent asked if temporary construction or haul roads will be temporary.	Yes	The Applicant can confirm that the haul roads will be temporary. During construction, the appointed Contractor(s) will ensure that the impacts from construction traffic and associated roads are minimised, where reasonably practicable, by implementing the measures set out in the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]**. Construction access and associated haul roads will be confirmed in the detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP(s)) and CTMP as the design progresses and in consultation with the relevant highways authority.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_E_003, LV2_OFF_085	Respondents expressed concern about the **width and/or depth** of the trench that will be dug up for the	No	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding the construction methodology for the Proposed Development. ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		construction of the cable route.		**[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]** sets out the construction method and mitigation measures to avoid any potential impacts. For the open cut sections of the Cable Route Corridor, the working width for installation of the cable is anticipated to be 25 m. This may be widened in places and narrowed in others, for example to minimise removal of hedgerows or at open cut watercourse crossings. The 25 m working width will include a temporary haul road along which vehicles and plant will be located as well as an area for temporary storage of excavated soil. For the Interconnecting Cables, the open cut cable trench would be up to approximately 7 m wide. This includes separation distances where multiple cables are running in parallel. Trench depth would be approximately up to 2 m subject to design and ground conditions. For the Grid Connection Cables, the working area will include a single trench within which the 275 kV connection cables will be installed.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The trench will be up to approximately 2 m wide and 2 m deep, subject to design and ground conditions. Further detail regarding the Cable Route Corridor construction is included within ES Volume 3 Appendix 2.1: Cable Route Corridor Construction Method Statement **[EN00110012/APP/LVS/06.03.02.01]**.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_E_003, LV2_PFF_045	Respondents expressed concern for the ecological impact that the cable construction will result in.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding the construction methodology for the Proposed Development. ES Chapter 2: The Proposed Development **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]** sets out the construction method and mitigation measures to avoid any potential impacts. In addition, ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]** provides an assessment of the likely significant effects arising from the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development in respect of terrestrial and aquatic biodiversity, alongside embedded and additional

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				mitigation required to reduce or remove any identified significant effects.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_OFF_131	Respondent expressed general concern regarding the construction of the cable route, cited the obstacles to cross e.g. the river Ouse, railways, the A19 and A63.	Yes	The Applicant notes this concern. Further information regarding the Cable Route Corridor can be found in ES Volume 3 Appendix 2.1: Cable Route Construction Method Statement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.02.01]**.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_OFF_085	Respondent expressed that the delivery of the cable route will be too expensive.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The Funding Statement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.02]** provides further details regarding the cost of the Proposed Development. The Applicant notes that the Proposed Development is privately funded.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_PFF_011	Respondent requested that all cables in the corridor are underground.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The Construction Cable Corridor Route will be located underground. Further information regarding the cable route can be found in ES Volume 3 Appendix 2.1: Cable Route Construction Method Statement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.02.01]**
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_E_003	Respondent stated that the construction of the cable	No	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding long-term soil compaction.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		corridors will result in long-term soil compaction.		An Outline Soil Resource Management Plan (oSRMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.14]**) has been prepared as part of this Application. A Detailed Soil Resource Management Plan(s) (SRMP) will be prepared by the Contractor(s) which will outline the adoption and implementation of good practice measures for all phases of the Proposed Development to minimise damage to soils.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_PFF_004	Respondent expressed concern that the water pumping station to the south of Riccall could be obstructed during cable laying.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The Cable Route Corridor construction will not interact with the pumping station. Further information regarding the cable route can be found in ES Volume 3 Appendix 2.1: Cable Route Construction Method Statement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.02.01]**.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_PFF_031, LV2_OFF_145, LV2_E_068	Respondents expressed concern about the long-term operation and maintenance of the site.	No	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding potential long-term impacts from operation and maintenance of the Proposed Development. An Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP)

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02], Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.03]** and Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04]** have been prepared as part of the DCO Application to outline the mitigation measures relevant to construction, operation and decommissioning for the Proposed Development. A detailed OEMP, DEMP and CEMP will be prepared by the appointed Contractor(s), substantially in accordance with the outline plans, and will be submitted for approval by North Yorkshire Council in advance of each stage of works.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_PFF_031, LV2_OFF_145, LV2_E_068	Respondents requested further information and/or express that insufficient information has been provided about the	No	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding the operation and maintenance of the Proposed Development. An Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.03]** has been

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		operation and maintenance of the site.		prepared as part of the DCO Application to outline the management, maintenance and mitigation measures relevant to operation for the Proposed Development. A detailed OEMP will be prepared by the appointed Contractor(s), substantially in accordance with the oOEMP, and will be submitted for approval by North Yorkshire Council in advance of decommissioning.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_PFF_031	Respondent requested more information on the ongoing maintenance of the substation, cited Heathrow Airport substation fire as being caused by a lack of maintenance.	No	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding the maintenance of the Proposed Development. I An Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.03]** has been prepared as part of the DCO Application to outline the management, maintenance and mitigation measures relevant to operation for the Proposed Development. A detailed OEMP will be prepared by the appointed Contractor(s), substantially in accordance with the oOEMP, and will be submitted for approval by North Yorkshire Council in advance of decommissioning.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_E_068	Respondent enquired about the life expectancy of the solar panels and underground cable, and how many times they will need replacing over the Proposed Development's lifespan.	No	An Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.03]** has been prepared as part of the DCO Application to outline the management, maintenance and mitigation measures relevant to operation for the Proposed Development. This plan outlines the life expectancy of the solar panels and associated infrastructure and the replacement assumptions. A detailed OEMP will be prepared by the appointed Contractor(s), substantially in accordance with the oOEMP, and will be submitted for approval by North Yorkshire Council in advance of decommissioning.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_E_059	Respondent asked if a road is proposed next to cable corridors.	No	A road is not proposed adjacent to the Cable Route Corridor. Further information regarding the cable route can be found in ES Volume 3 Appendix 2.1: Cable Route Construction Method Statement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.02.01]**
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_PFF_003, LV2_E_006, LV2_PFF_040, LV2_PFF_041,	Respondents requested further information about how decommissioning will	No	If consented, the Development Consent Order (DCO) would require the removal of the Proposed Development at the end of

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_E_067, LV2_E_122, LV2_E_083	be financed and/or ask who will coordinate it.		its operational phase. There would also be bonds in place to cover the cost of decommissioning in the event of any breach in doing so. Such funds would be regularly revalued and topped up if necessary to ensure the Proposed Development would be fully removed and land restored. An Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04]** has been prepared as part of the DCO Application to outline the mitigation measures relevant to decommissioning for the Proposed Development. A detailed DEMP will be prepared by the appointed Contractor(s), substantially in accordance with the oDEMP, and will be submitted for approval by North Yorkshire Council in advance of decommissioning.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_PFF_036, LV2_PFF_041, LV2_E_043, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_E_122, LV2_E_123, LV2_E_103	Respondents expressed scepticism that land will be returned to its original use or farmland after the	No	The Applicant acknowledges these concerns. Upon decommissioning, the above-ground physical infrastructure at the Solar Development Sites will be removed

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		decommissioning of the Proposed Development. Some respondents additionally asked for evidence showing whether long-term solar projects on green fields have returned the land used to its original state.		and each Solar Development Site will be restored to its current condition and returned to the landowner. The mode of dealing with Interconnecting Cables and Grid Connection Cables during decommissioning will be dependent upon government policy and good practice at that time. An Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04]** has been prepared as part of the DCO Application to outline the management and mitigation measures relevant to decommissioning for the Proposed Development. A detailed DEMP will be prepared by the appointed Contractor(s), substantially in accordance with the oDEMP, and will be submitted for approval by North Yorkshire Council in advance of decommissioning. By not decommissioning the Proposed Development as defined in the oDEMP and final DEMP, this would constitute a criminal

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				offence. As such, the decommissioning process is legally binding. The Applicant notes that there is no UK-based evidence of a solar farm being decommissioned, as no solar farms have reached that stage.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_PFF_003, LV2_PFF_040, LV2_E_061, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_083	Respondents requested further information about decommissioning generally, express that there has not been sufficient information provided on decommissioning.	No	An Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04]** has been prepared as part of the DCO Application to outline the management and mitigation measures relevant to decommissioning for the Proposed Development. A detailed DEMP will be prepared by the appointed Contractor(s), substantially in accordance with the oDEMP, and will be submitted for approval by North Yorkshire Council in advance of decommissioning.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_PFF_003, LV2_PFF_046, LV2_OFF_145, LV2_E_067	Respondents requested assurance that there are clear accountability and planning for decommission and restoration of the site.	No	The Applicant notes the comments. Clear planning and accountability for decommissioning is achieved via the legally binding Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04]**, which has been prepared as part of the DCO

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Application to outline the management and mitigation measures relevant to decommissioning for the Proposed Development. A detailed DEMP will be prepared by the appointed Contractor(s), substantially in accordance with the oDEMP, and will be submitted for approval by North Yorkshire Council in advance of decommissioning. Not decommissioning the Proposed Development in accordance with the oDEMP and final DEMP would constitute a criminal offence.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_OFF_049, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_070	Respondents expressed concern that the Proposed Development's lifetime is 60 years.	No	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding the lifespan of the Proposed Development, and notes that 40 – 60 years is the most common lifetime for a utility-scale solar installation. ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]** provides further detail on the life expectancy of the various components of the Proposed Development and any replacement requirements. Detail is also provided in the

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.03]**.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_E_080, LV2_E_030, LV2_E_083	Respondents asked what plans are in place for recycling components within the first 15 years of development.	No	Solar PV Panels typically have a lifespan of up to 40 years or more, and the Applicant's EIA has assumed that the panels will be replaced once during the lifetime of the Proposed Development. Up to 99% of solar PV modules are recyclable, with the number of solar panel recycling plants in the UK increasing. Companies which are aligned with the Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment Recycling (WEEE) Regulations 2013 are Approved Authorised Treatment Facilities for solar waste. A detailed Materials and Waste Management Plan (MWMP) will be prepared alongside the detailed Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan(s) (DEMPs) by the appointed Contractor(s) setting out how measures to manage the disposal of waste during the operational and

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				decommissioning phases respectively from the Order Limits may be required in accordance with relevant legislative and policy requirements. The detailed MWMP will ensure panel and component decommissioning waste streams are sent to waste recycling and handling facilities that have sufficient capacity to handle waste arisings from the Proposed Development. An outline MWMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.07]** is included as part of the Application.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_PFF_040	Respondent expressed general support for restoring land to its original use.	No	The Applicant acknowledges the support for restoring land to its original use at the time of decommissioning. An Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04]** has been prepared as part of the DCO Application to outline the management and mitigation measures relevant to decommissioning for the Proposed Development.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				A detailed DEMP will be prepared by the appointed Contractor(s), substantially in accordance with the oDEMP, and will be submitted for approval by North Yorkshire Council in advance of decommissioning.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_PFF_041	Respondent expressed concern about the impact of decommissioning on the environment.	No	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns regarding decommissioning of the Proposed Development. An Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04]** has been prepared as part of the DCO Application to outline the management and mitigation measures relevant to decommissioning for the Proposed Development. In addition, ES Volume 3 Appendix 9.1: GHG Emissions Assessment **[EN00110012/APP/LVS/06.03.09.01]** assessed the environmental impact of decommissioning, stating that GHG emissions associated with the deconstruction of the Proposed Development are assumed to be 50% of

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				the GHG emissions calculated at construction. This assumes that the recovery of the majority of materials is prioritised and promoted, as per the RICS guidance and that the carbon intensity of deconstruction activities will have reduced significantly in the 60 years after construction, due to improvements in fuel efficiency, transition to alternative fuels, and improvements in best practices. A detailed DEMP will be prepared by the appointed Contractor(s), substantially in accordance with the oDEMP, and will be submitted for approval by North Yorkshire Council in advance of decommissioning.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_OFF_145	Respondent asked what plans have been put in place for decommissioning should the Proposed Development be purchased by another organisation, asking if the	No	In the event that the Proposed Development is purchased by another organisation, the new organisation will be subject to the requirements in the Development Consent Order (DCO). Failure to comply with these requirements would be a breach of the DCO.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		new organisation would be held to the same commitments.		These include the requirement to decommission the Proposed Development no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning as well as the requirement to comply with a detailed Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan, which must be produced substantially in accordance with an Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04]**.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_PFF_046	Respondent enquired as to what plans there are for long-term ecological stewardship of the site post-operation.	No	An Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04]** has been prepared as part of the DCO Application to outline the management and mitigation measures relevant to decommissioning for the Proposed Development, including details on ecological restoration. The Applicant notes that the stewardship responsibility post-operation would return to the landowners, along with the land itself.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				A detailed DEMP will be prepared by the appointed Contractor(s), substantially in accordance with the oDEMP, and will be submitted for approval by North Yorkshire Council in advance of decommissioning.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_OFF_023, LV2_PFF_041, LV2_L_001, LV2_OFF_146, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_030	Respondents expressed scepticism that panels will be recycled.	No	The Applicant can confirm that up to 99% of solar PV modules are recyclable, with the number of solar panel recycling plants in the UK increasing. Companies which are aligned with the Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment Recycling (WEEE) Regulations 2013 such as Recycle solar in Scunthorpe, Solar Recycling Solutions in Dartford and Waste Experts based in Huddersfield are Approved Authorised Treatment Facilities for solar waste. A detailed Materials and Waste Management Plan (MWMP) will be prepared setting out how measures to manage the disposal of waste from the Order Limits may be required in accordance with relevant legislative and policy requirements. This includes the commitment to recycle all components that

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				can be recycled. The detailed MWMP will ensure component decommissioning waste streams are sent to waste recycling and handling facilities that have sufficient capacity to handle waste arisings from the Proposed Development. An outline MWMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.07]** is included as part of the Application.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_OFF_146, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068	Respondents expressed belief that the disposal of solar panels and components has not been adequately considered by Light Valley Solar.	No	An Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04]** has been prepared as part of the DCO Application to outline the management and mitigation measures relevant to decommissioning for the Proposed Development. A detailed DEMP will be prepared by the appointed Contractor(s), substantially in accordance with the oDEMP, and will be submitted for approval by North Yorkshire Council in advance of decommissioning. In addition, a detailed Materials and Waste Management Plan (MWMP) will be prepared alongside the detailed DEMP(s) setting out how measures to manage the

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				disposal of waste from the Order Limits may be required in accordance with relevant legislative and policy requirements. The detailed MWMP will ensure decommissioning waste streams are sent to waste recycling and handling facilities that have sufficient capacity to handle waste arisings from the Proposed Development. An outline MWMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.07]** is included as part of the Application
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_L_001, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_030	Respondents requested further information about how the panels and the BESS will be disposed of or recycled.	No	As detailed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]** and further detailed and secured through the Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04]**, the process of decommissioning will involve the removal of all solar infrastructure, including the solar PV modules, and BESS and all associated infrastructure (including On-Site Cabling). The components will be recycled

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				or disposed of in accordance with good practice and processes at that time. Any piles will be removed. Up to 99% of materials in a solar PV module are recyclable, with the number of solar panel recycling plants in the UK increasing. Companies which are aligned with the Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment Recycling (WEEE) Regulations 2013 such as Recycle solar in Scunthorpe, Solar Recycling Solutions in Dartford and Waste Experts based in Huddersfield are all Approved Authorised Treatment Facilities for solar waste. In addition, a detailed Materials and Waste Management Plan (MWMP) will be prepared alongside the detailed DEMP(s) setting out how measures to manage the disposal of waste from the Order Limits may be required in accordance with relevant legislative and policy requirements.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The detailed MWMP will ensure decommissioning waste streams are sent to waste recycling and handling facilities that have sufficient capacity to handle waste arisings from the Proposed Development. An outline MWMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.07]** is included as part of the Application.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_L_001, LV2_E_067	Respondents enquired how metals and chemicals will be disposed of.	No	The Applicant acknowledges this concern. The use of chemicals within the Proposed Development would be minimal, with no PFAS (forever chemicals) present in solar panel coatings or on BESS batteries. The solar cells would be made from silicon, a material with properties almost the same as sand. They may contain very small amounts of heavy metals, but these are well within the limits set by law; this is confirmed by the Applicant checking the results of testing in independent laboratories. In order to control the waste generated during operation and maintenance phases, the Contractor(s) will separate the main

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				waste streams on-site, prior to transport to an approved, licensed third party facility for recycling or disposal, including metal components. Measures to mitigate this during construction are secured in the Outline Materials and Waste Management Plan (oMWMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.07]**. The Proposed Development will prioritise waste prevention, followed by preparation for reuse, recycling and recovery, with landfill disposal as the last resort. All waste to be removed from the Site will be undertaken by fully licensed waste carriers and taken to suitably licensed waste management facilities and managed in line with the requirements of the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 and the Hazardous Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2005. These measures are further detailed and secured through the Outline Operation Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.03]** and Outline

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04]**.
Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_E_030	Respondent expressed concern regarding the limited capacity for domestic panel recycling.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. Up to 99% of solar PV modules are recyclable, with the number of solar panel recycling plants in the UK increasing. Companies which are aligned with the Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment Recycling (WEEE) Regulations 2013, such as Recycle solar in Scunthorpe, Solar Recycling Solutions in Dartford and Waste Experts based in Huddersfield are Approved Authorised Treatment Facilities for solar waste. An Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04]** has been prepared as part of the DCO Application to outline the management and mitigation measures relevant to decommissioning for the Proposed Development. A detailed DEMP will be prepared by the appointed

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Contractor(s), substantially in accordance with the oDEMP, and will be submitted for approval by North Yorkshire Council in advance of decommissioning. In addition, a detailed Materials and Waste Management Plan (MWMP) will be prepared alongside the detailed DEMP(s) setting out how measures to manage the disposal of waste from the Order Limits may be required in accordance with relevant legislative and policy requirements. The detailed MWMP will ensure decommissioning waste streams are sent to waste recycling and handling facilities that have sufficient capacity to handle waste arising from the Proposed Development. An outline MWMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.07]** is included as part of the Application.

Consultation and engagement

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_E_007, LV2_E_008, LV2_E_010, LV2_E_012, LV2_E_013, LV2_E_014, LV2_E_016, LV2_E_017, LV2_E_019, LV2_E_022, LV2_E_027, LV2_E_009, LV2_E_011, LV2_OFF_026, LV2_E_035, LV2_E_048, LV2_E_061, LV2_E_062, LV2_E_070, LV2_E_071, LV2_E_056, LV2_E_069, LV2_OFF_109, LV2_OFF_073, LV2_OFF_067, LV2_OFF_066, LV2_E_082, LV2_E_081, LV2_E_118, LV2_E_121, LV2_E_080, LV2_E_122, LV2_E_123, LV2_E_088, LV2_E_125, LV2_E_090, LV2_E_100, LV2_E_115, LV2_OFF_089, LV2_E_107, LV2_E_076, LV2_E_074	Respondents expressed that the community should have been consulted at an earlier stage. Includes concerns that the Proposed Development was developed in secret or lacked transparency prior to the consultation.	No	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this response. The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with all legislation and guidance on consultation (See Consultation Report Appendix 1: Statement of Compliance **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01.01]**), as well as commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation (See Consultation Report Appendix 4: Statement of Community Consultation Materials **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01.04]**), which in turn was informed by consultation with the relevant host authority. This process is described in Chapter 6 (Preparation for Statutory Section 47 Consultation) of the Consultation Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01]**. The Applicant also put consultation and engagement at the heart of the design process, as evidenced by Chapter 7 (Pre-Statutory Consultation Design Workshops) of the Consultation Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01]**.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The Applicant undertook an iterative consultation process through from introducing the project and conducting a first phase of non-statutory consultation, before consulting with North Yorkshire Council and City of York Council on the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC). The SoCC, all of which complied with, set out how the design workshops and statutory consultation would be undertook. The phases of consultation are set out within Chapter 1 (Introduction) of the Consultation Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01]**. To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's project team, and hosted

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				free-to-use communications channels for enquiries. In addition to this, the Applicant made all consultation materials available online, at CAP sites, at public information events and by request to the communication channels. Consultation opportunities and materials were further publicised by local media advertising, statutory notices, and maintaining a register of interested individuals. This is further set out in Section 8: Phase Two (Statutory) Consultation **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01]**.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_E_007, LV2_E_008, LV2_E_010, LV2_E_012, LV2_E_013, LV2_E_014, LV2_E_016, LV2_E_017, LV2_E_019, LV2_E_022, LV2_E_027, LV2_PFF_041, LV2_E_035, LV2_E_048, LV2_E_061, LV2_E_062, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_070, LV2_E_071, LV2_E_069,	Respondents expressed concern that their feedback and the wider consultation will be ignored and will make no difference. Some respondents expressed consultation is a tick box exercise or a 'done deal' already.	No	The Applicant's iterative approach to consultation has allowed the proposals to be updated throughout the pre-application process as a result of technical surveys, engagement with statutory bodies and feedback from the local community. The consultations involved consulting on initial proposals through a phase one

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_OFF_109, LV2_OFF_073, LV2_OFF_067, LV2_E_024, LV2_OFF_099, LV2_E_082, LV2_E_081, LV2_E_118, LV2_E_121, LV2_E_123, LV2_E_088, LV2_E_100			(non-statutory) consultation, followed by more detailed proposals – accompanied by a PEIR – during a phase two (statutory) consultation. Following this, the Applicant further consulted on specific changes to the Proposed Development prior to finalising the DCO Application. The Consultation Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01]** describes this process and the Applicant's regard to feedback received. Chapter 0 (Executive Summary), Chapter 12 (Section 47 Responses Received, Issues Raised and Changes Made) and Chapter 13 (Section 47 Responses Received, Issues Raised and Changes Made) of the Consultation Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01]** outline how feedback received has informed changed in the final design of the Proposed Development. This includes the re-routing of some traffic routes to avoid properties, the reduced of panels near to sensitive receptors to

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				mitigate landscape and visual impacts, and the creation of 8 km of new permissive paths to improve public amenity.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_PFF_013, LV2_OFF_006, LV2_OFF_014, LV2_OFF_034, LV2_OFF_037, LV2_OFF_047, LV2_E_053, LV2_E_070, LV2_E_071, LV2_E_054, LV2_E_069, LV2_OFF_067, LV2_OFF_066, LV2_E_024, LV2_E_080, LV2_E_122, LV2_E_123, LV2_E_094, LV2_E_096, LV2_OFF_111, LV2_E_026, LV2_E_115, LV2_OFF_089, LV2_E_107, LV2_E_108, LV2_OFF_080, LV2_E_076, LV2_E_075, LV2_E_074, LV2_E_072	Respondents expressed general concern regarding the quality of Proposed Development communications.	No	To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including a PEIR, a Community Consultation Leaflet summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's team. The Applicant also held design workshops for parish councils, interest groups, and statutory consultees in advance of the phase two (statutory) consultation to invite feedback on the Proposed Development's design and the consultation materials. Consultation materials were available online and in-paper copy. Paper copies

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				were provided upon request to the Applicant, or from the Applicant's series of in-person public information events and five identified Community Access Point.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_E_007, LV2_E_008, LV2_E_010, LV2_E_012, LV2_E_013, LV2_E_014, LV2_E_016, LV2_E_017, LV2_E_019, LV2_E_022, LV2_E_027, LV2_E_035, LV2_E_048, LV2_E_061, LV2_E_062, LV2_E_069, LV2_OFF_067, LV2_E_082, LV2_E_081, LV2_E_118, LV2_E_121, LV2_E_123, LV2_E_088, LV2_E_100, LV2_E_102	Respondents expressed belief that there has been no meaningful engagement with parish councils, county council(s) and other authorities.	No	The Applicant has sought to engage with host and neighbouring local authorities throughout the pre-application period. This has included offering and holding briefings before and during the phase one and phase two consultation periods, holding design workshops to inform statutory consultees and parish councils of the upcoming round of consultation and refine the design, and continuing to notify consultees via email and post at every stage of consultation. This process is further set out in the Consultation Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01]**.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_E_007, LV2_E_008, LV2_E_010, LV2_E_012, LV2_E_013, LV2_E_014, LV2_E_016, LV2_E_017, LV2_E_019, LV2_E_022, LV2_E_027, LV2_E_011,	Respondents stated that they did not receive the consultation postcard despite living inside the Core Consultation Zone.	No	The Applicant issued 12,500 postcards setting out the details of the Phase One Consultation. The Applicant then mapped a Core Consultation Zone (CCZ) for the Phase Two Consultation, which local authorities were consulted

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_OFF_034, LV2_E_035, LV2_E_048, LV2_E_061, LV2_E_062, LV2_E_069, LV2_OFF_073, LV2_E_082, LV2_E_081, LV2_E_118, LV2_E_121, LV2_E_088, LV2_E_100			on. This CCZ included over 14,000 addresses, which were sent two postcards in advance of the phase two consultation. These addresses were mapped using the most up to date Royal Mail data available and subsequently posted using Royal Mail's postal service. The Applicant therefore acknowledges that there were addresses that were not sent postcards at Phase One consultation compared to Phase Two consultation due to changes in the CCZ. Further information on the creation of the CCZ, alongside information on the postcards sent to communicate the phases of consultation, can be found in the Consultation Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01]**.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_PFF_043, LV2_OFF_145, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_070, LV2_E_069, LV2_OFF_067, LV2_E_024, LV2_E_123	Respondents attended an information event and expressed the Proposed Development team lacked knowledge or were unable to	Yes	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this statement. The Applicant team were well prepared for information events etc. The nature of complex developments like LVS is that the project evolves,

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		answer specific questions about the Proposed Development.		particularly as more surveys etc are done and information comes to light. Therefore, if a member of the Applicant's team was unable to answer a question put to them on the day, the stakeholder was encouraged to submit their question to the Applicant who would then subsequently respond via the Proposed Development's communication channels.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_OFF_073, LV2_OFF_067. LV2_E_024, LV2_E_122, LV2_E_123, LV2_E_125, LV2_E_102, LV2_E_107	Respondents expressed belief that there has been no meaningful local consultation.	No	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this statement. The Applicant approached pre-application consultation with a commitment to ensuring that anyone with an interest in the Proposed Development could find out more and share their views. The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation (See Consultation Report Appendix 4: Statement of Community Consultation Materials **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01.04]**, which

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				in turn was informed through consultation with the relevant host authority. This process is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Section 47 Consultation) of the Consultation Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01]**.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_OFF_133, LV2_E_071, LV2_E_055, LV2_E_069, LV2_OFF_066, LV2_E_123, LV2_OFF_089	Respondents expressed that the consultation and/or consultation events have been inadequate or misleading.	No	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this statement. The Applicant set out clearly its approach to consultation within the Statement of Community Consultation (See Consultation Report Appendix 4: Statement of Community Consultation Materials **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01.04]**), and further advertised within the Community Consultation Postcard, and Project Information Booklet (See Consultation Report Appendix 6: Phase Two Consultation Materials **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01.06]**).
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_OFF_133, LV2_E_055, LV2_OFF_106, LV2_OFF_100, LV2_E_080, LV2_E_085, LV2_E_099	Respondents expressed satisfaction with the level of detail and or presentation of	No	The Applicant sought to show thorough, open, and transparent engagement and consultation on its proposals, and provided sufficient opportunities for

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		information in plans, documents and at meetings.		interested parties to understand and influence its plans. The Applicant published information in a variety of different formats and levels of detail to ensure consultees were given the opportunity to understand and provide feedback on the Proposed Development. This includes all materials that can be viewed within Consultation Report Appendix 6: Phase Two Consultation Materials **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01.06]** as well as the Proposed Development website (www.lightvalleysolar.co.uk). At the in-person information events, the Applicant ensured that all up to date consultation materials were present and arranged in an accessible format across the rooms used. These materials are available in Appendix 2: Phase One Consultation Materials **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01.02]** and Appendix 6: Phase Two Consultation

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Materials **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01.06]**.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_E_053, LV2_E_070, LV2_E_071, LV2_E_054, LV2_E_069, LV2_E_123	Respondents stated that they had received no formal notice ahead of statutory consultation.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. For the majority of those consulted within the community, they did not receive a formal notice as they were not identified as a subject within the Book of Reference **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.03]**; instead, a Community Consultation Postcard was circulated, if respondents lived within the Core Consultation Zone (CCZ). 12,500 postcards were issued to publicise the Phase One consultation, with two rounds of over 14,000 issued to publicise the Phase Two Consultation. These addresses were identified using the most up to date Royal Mail data available. The Applicant also sent notices to Local Information Points, published statutory notices in the York Press, the Selby Times, and The Guardian, alongside

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				advertisements in the York Press and Selby Times. Copies of the postcards and evidence of the notices can be found in Appendix 6: Phase Two Consultation Materials **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01.06]**.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_E_065, LV2_E_123, LV2_E_125	Respondents requested a further round of consultation.	No	The Applicant held a further round of Targeted Consultation on specific changes as a result of ongoing technical surveys, and feedback received during previous rounds of consultation. These can be found in Section 11 of the Consultation Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01]**. However, based on the information available on the Proposed Development at Phase Two Consultation, and the opportunities available for stakeholders to provide feedback on the proposals at that time, the Applicant does not believe that a further full consultation was necessary beyond the Targeted Consultation undertaken.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_OFF_133, LV2_E_123, LV2_OFF_111	Respondents stated they were disappointed with the webinar, felt that key issues were brushed aside, pre-submitted questions not answered, and that attendees' cameras and microphones were off.	No	The Applicant held a webinar as part of the Phase Two Consultation to give an opportunity for those unable to attend the in-person events. The webinars allowed attendees to view the consultation materials and submit questions for the members of the project team to respond to. The Applicant responded to numerous questions from the attendees, while keeping within the time allotted for the meeting. Further details of this are set out within the Consultation Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01]**.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_OFF_026, LV2_OFF_067, LV2_E_123, LV2_E_086	Respondents expressed materials in general were inadequate in detail.	No	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this comment. The Applicant sought to show thorough, open, and transparent engagement and consultation on its proposals, and provided sufficient opportunities for interested parties to understand and influence its plans. The Applicant published information in a variety of different formats and levels of detail to

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				ensure consultees were given the opportunity to understand and provide feedback on the Proposed Development. This includes all materials that can be viewed within Consultation Report Appendix 6: Phase Two Consultation Materials **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01.06]** as well as the Proposed Development website (www.lightvalleysolar.co.uk).
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_PFF_043, LV2_PFF_050, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_069, LV2_OFF_067, LV2_OFF_042, LV2_E_123	Respondents expressed concern regarding the quality of consultation maps, with some pointing to missing or incorrect road and place names and a lack of local landmarks.	No	The Applicant notes comments regarding consultation maps at Phase Two Consultation. The maps produced were illustrative and could not include all detail without compromising the quality of the maps. The Applicant had a range of consultation materials and maps present at the consultation events, detailing different aspects of the Proposed Development site. Within the Environmental Statement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01]**, a number of maps and plans have been produced that contain various different

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				environmental and local features, including local landmarks, road names and listed buildings.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_E_122, LV2_E_123	Respondents commented the timing of events were inappropriate, this includes how many events were held in total.	No	The Applicant selected a number of information events on different days of the week and at different times, to ensure accessibility, which was agreed and supported by North Yorkshire Council when consulting on the SoCC. The Applicant set out the details, proposed dates and times of the consultation events in the Statement of Community Consultation (See Consultation Report Appendix 4: Statement of Community Consultation Materials **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01.04]**.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_PFF_013, LV2_E_024	Respondents referred to the consultation process as 'an information dump'.	No	The Applicant presented a range of information at the Phase Two information events. A condensed summary of this information was present in the information events and uploaded to the project website (See Appendix 6: Phase Two Consultation Materials **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01.06]**.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The Applicant acknowledges the amount of information published as part of Phase Two Consultation, particularly with the publication of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR). To support the PEIR, the Applicant published a PEIR Non-Technical Summary, providing an overview of the environmental information available in a shorter, more accessible format. Within the final application, the Applicant has published an Environmental Statement Non-Technical Summary **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.04.01]** to summarise the information within the Environmental Statement in a more accessible format.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_PFF_016, LV2_E_070	Respondents asked what actual consultation has there been with local community to question the proposals.	No	The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation (See Consultation Report Appendix 4: Statement of Community Consultation Materials **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01.04]**, which

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				in turn was informed through consultation with the relevant host authority. This process is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Section 47 Consultation) of the Consultation Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01]**. To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's project team, and hosted free-to-use communications channels for enquiries. In addition to this, the Applicant made all consultation materials available online, at CAP sites, at public information events and by request to the

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				communication channels. Consultation opportunities and materials were further publicised by local media advertising, statutory notices, and maintaining a register of interested individuals. This is further set out in Section 8: Phase Two (Statutory) Consultation **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01]**.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_E_053, LV2_E_054	Respondents stated that the Proposed Development has not been communicated adequately with "non-digital" residents.	No	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this comment. The Applicant sought to publicise the Phase Two consultation using methods that were accessible to all local stakeholders. This included issuing two rounds of postcards to over 14,000 addresses, publishing notices in The Guardian, the Selby Times, the York Press, publishing adverts in the Selby Times and York Press, placing notices at various Local Information Points (LIPs), holding in person and online information events, and providing hard-copy materials for free, by post upon request. The Applicant also made consultation materials available at Community

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Access Points (CAPs). Materials available included: • Feedback forms (to take away) • Project information booklets (to take away) • Copies of the PEIR Non-Technical Summary (NTS) (to inspect) • Copies of the Phase One Consultation Summary Report (to take away) • Copies of the SoCC (to inspect) The CAPs were selected based on their public accessibility and their proximity to the Proposed Development: • Selby Library, 52 Micklegate, Selby, YO8 4EQ. • Barlby Library and Community Hub, Howden Road, Barlby, Selby, YO8 5JE. • Sherburn & Villages Community Library, Finkle Hill, Sherburn-in-Elmet, Leeds, LS25 6EA.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				All three CAPs were contacted in advance of the consultation to ensure they each had working computers with internet access. Further information of the means of consultation can be found in Chapter 8 (Phase Two (Statutory) Consultation) of the Consultation Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01].**
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_E_069, LV2_E_074	Respondents stated that residents in South Milford have not been correctly consulted.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. Residents of South Milford were not directly mailed a postcard at Phase One Consultation, as Sites 6 and 7 were not part of the Proposed Development at this stage. However, the village of South Milford was included within the Core Consultation Zone, set out within the SoCC. The CCZ set out in the SoCC (Appendix 4: Statement of Community Consultation Materials **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01.04]**) approved by North Yorkshire Council

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				sets out the methodology of how addresses were identified for the CCZ, within both a statutory minimum distance and as a result of diligent inquiry.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_OFF_111	Respondent stated that publicising the consultation only through postal communication was not enough.	No	Chapter 8 of the Consultation Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01]** sets out the publicity of the consultation. This includes communication channels open via telephone, postage, or email. The Consultation Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01]** sets out the consultation being publicised through newspapers, postcards, and posters in Local Information Points.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_PFF_043	Respondent suggested the format of consultation events is wrong, suggested Q&A sessions with parish councils invited.	No	The Applicant offered briefings to parish councils throughout the pre-application process. This included invitations to Design Workshops which all host parish councils were invited to attend. This process is set out in the Consultation Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01]**.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_PFF_035	Respondent reported they were told different and conflicting information on the	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Information on the cable route has been built on since Phase Two Consultation

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		cable route at the Sherburn event.		and has set out in more detail in Environmental Statement Chapter 2: The Proposed Development **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]**.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_E_123	Respondent commented the venues chosen were inappropriate.	No	The Applicant respectively disagrees with this comment. The Applicant selected the venues within the Core Consultation Zone, allowing for stakeholders from all nearby communities to attend the events. The venues were consulted on with North Yorkshire Council, who agreed with the venue choices. Further information on the choice of venues is set out in the Consultation Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01]**.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_E_069	Respondent expressed concern that South Milford Parish Council was not consulted at Phase One.	No	The Applicant notes that the first phase of consultation did not constitute a statutory consultation, and so South Milford Parish Council was not formally consulted. The Applicant confirms that South Milford Parish Council was consulted at the Phase Two Consultation (the statutory consultation),

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				undertaken along with all other host and neighbouring parish councils.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_E_069	Respondent expressed concern at the delay between Phases One and Two.	No	The Applicant notes respectfully disagrees with this comment. There was six months between the end of Phase One and start of Phase Two consultation, which gave the Applicant sufficient time to consider feedback from Phase One consultation, as well as carry out environmental assessments to inform the PEIR. The Applicant also utilised this time to consult on the SoCC with North Yorkshire Council on the approach to consultation, as set out in the Consultation Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01]**.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_E_069	Respondent stated that consultation has not been compliant in accordance with the SoCC as they did not get a chance to attend a design workshop as a local resident, and that they were informed too late (June 30, 2025) to be able to participate	No	The Applicant respectfully disagrees and considers that it undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation (See Consultation Report Appendix 4: Statement of Community Consultation Materials **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01.04]**, which

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		properly. Respondent believes they have not been afforded to opportunity to comment on the proposals.		in turn was informed through consultation with the relevant host authority. This process is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Section 47 Consultation) of the Consultation Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01]**. The design workshops provided an opportunity for statutory undertakers, parish councils, and local elected representatives to provide feedback on the design of the Proposed Development and the materials for the upcoming Phase Two consultation. Members of the public were not invited to the design workshops as the Applicant followed PINS guidance on good design through inviting statutory bodies and other local organisation. Instead, members of the public were invited to partake in the following Phase Two consultation, including an invite to attend information events, view

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Proposed Development Materials, and provide feedback. The information events held as part of the Phase Two consultation provided an opportunity for members of the public to attend. Each of the in-person events and the webinar was held following 30 June 2025, as set out in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Section 47 Consultation) of the Consultation Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01]**.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_E_085	Respondent stated that the Proposed Development team seemed dismissive during the webinar.	No	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this comment.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_E_103	Respondent has asked if Natural England has been consulted.	No	Natural England has been consulted as part of the pre-application process. Feedback from Natural England, and the Applicant response to feedback provided can be found in Appendix 12: Section 42 Applicant Response Table **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/0501.12]**.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_PFF_041, LV2_OFF_042	Respondents expressed that images showing agrivoltaics,	No	The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use within the area of the

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		sheep among solar panels are misleading.		solar panel infrastructure, using conservation sheep grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_PFF_037, LV2_PFF_043	Respondents took issue with the 'Legacy of Power Generation' section of materials, stated that a history of generation does not justify yet more energy schemes.	No	The Applicant notes this comment, and would point to National Policy Statement EN-1 paragraph 3.3.58: *"Given the urgent need for new electricity infrastructure and the time it takes for electricity NSIPs to move from design conception to operation, there is an urgent need for new (and particularly low carbon) electricity NSIPs to be brought forward as soon as possible, given the crucial role of electricity as the UK decarbonises its economy,"* as well as paragraphs 3.3.62 and 3.3.63: *"Government has concluded that there is a critical national priority (CNP) for the provision of nationally significant low carbon infrastructure. Section 4.2 states which energy generating technologies are low carbon and are therefore CNP infrastructure.*

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				"Subject to any legal requirements, the urgent need for CNP infrastructure to achieving our energy objectives, together with the national security, economic, commercial, and net zero benefits, means that it is likely the need case will outweigh any other residual impacts not capable of being addressed by application of the mitigation hierarchy, in all but the most exceptional circumstances. Government strongly supports the delivery of CNP infrastructure and it should be progressed as quickly as possible."

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_PFF_051	Respondent reported their frustration and concern that Birkin was not mentioned in any materials despite its proximity to Sites 3 and 4.	No	The Applicant has included references to Birkin in relation to its proximity to solar sites throughout the pre-application process. For example, both Phase One and Phase Two Consultation Booklets detailed Birkin where relevant on the maps enclosed (For Phase One see Appendix 2: Phase One Consultation Materials **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01.02]** for Phase Two see Appendix 6: Phase Two Consultation Materials **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01.06]).**
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_E_069	Respondent expressed concern that the SoCC list of gateway organisations omitted Hambleton's two Pre-Schools, South Milford Primary and Tadcaster Grammar School, amongst others. Respondent suggested this means adequate engagement has not been undertaken in	No	The Applicant notes this comment but does not agree that consultation is inadequate as a result of this. The Applicant consulted on a list of gateway organisations with North Yorkshire Council, which resulted in a number of organisations being added to the final list within the Statement of Community Consultation (See Consultation Report Appendix 4: Statement of Community Consultation Materials **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01.04]**).

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		accordance with the PEIR and the SoCC.		While the organisations mentioned were not mapped by the Applicant or picked up by North Yorkshire Council, the two Hambleton pre-schools identified by the respondent, along with South Milford Primary School and Tadcaster Grammar School, have been added to the Applicant's stakeholder contacts list and will receive all future project communications.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_E_069	Respondent stated that the PEIR and NTS of the PEIR are full of ambiguities and were clearly rushed documents.	No	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this comment. The Applicant produced a PEIR that has been prepared using months of surveys and assessments, including references to ongoing technical surveys, with the available data being published for the Phase Two Consultation. The PEIR included a large amount of information available to the Applicant at the time of Phase Two Consultation and was not rushed by the Applicant. The level of detail in the PEIR has since been built on and has been used for the

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				publication of the Environmental Statement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01]**.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_E_079	Respondent stated that the PEIR assessment of environmental impacts is a report on incomplete baseline data.	No	As part of an iterative design process, the PEIR included references to ongoing technical surveys, which is common for projects at that stage. However, we provided information reasonably required for the consultation bodies to develop an informed view of the likely significant effects of the development at that stage, complying with EIA Regulation 12(2). For completeness, the Applicant notes that these outstanding surveys have been completed and published in full in the Environmental Statement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01]**.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_E_123	Respondent stated that formal letters with maps should have been sent to properties instead of postcards.	No	The Applicant enclosed site maps within the first round of postcards of the Phase Two consultation. An example of this postcard can be found in Appendix 6: Phase Two Consultation Materials **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01.06]**.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_E_082	Respondent stated that the information does not indicate the closeness of houses and villages, and that the roads on some printed information are not clearly shown.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant has used OS and Esri mapping for the majority of maps used. The Applicant acknowledges that some maps are more detailed than others, and more detailed maps are available in the updated maps produced as part of the final DCO Application and in the Environmental Statement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01]**.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_E_099	Respondent stated that the language around environmental masterplans and mitigation were deliberately 'greenwashing' the Proposed Development.	No	The Applicant respectfully disagrees this comment. The Outline Environmental Masterplans included within the Phase Two Consultation Materials **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01.06]** used non-technical language for stakeholders to understand mitigation in a more accessible way. More detail on how this mitigation will be implemented and secured is highlighted in management plans such as the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]** and the Outline Construction Environmental

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Management Plan **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_E_074	Respondent stated that there has been no opportunity to attend an event in South Milford, despite being affected significantly.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The Phase Two consultation leaflet (See Appendix 6: Phase Two Consultation Materials **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01.06]**) sets out that consultation events were hosted in Monk Fryston and Sherburn in Elmet, both in close proximity to South Milford, allowing residents to attend either event. The venues where information events were held were agreed with North Yorkshire Council in consultation on the SoCC.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_E_074	Respondent stated that insufficient information was provided on Sites 6, 7 and 8.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_E_042	Respondent claimed that there is a lack of feedback, which can be attributed to the design and usability of the online feedback form.	No	The Applicant notes this comment but believes that the online feedback form was accessible. The Applicant used Typeform, a third-party software with a strong reputation of producing accessible feedback forms. The Applicant received over 140 online

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				feedback forms during Phase Two Consultation, more than any other channel, as set out in the Consultation Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01].** The Applicant welcomed the respondents feedback via email and was glad that the respondent was able to provide their feedback clearly via the Proposed Development's communication channels.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_E_063	Respondent stated that the online feedback form was too hard to find.	No	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this comment. The online feedback form could be accessed via the Proposed Development website, which was set out within the SoCC (See Consultation Report Appendix 4: Statement of Community Consultation Materials **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01.04]**).
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_E_079	Respondent stated that the feedback form was inaccessible.	No	The Applicant respectfully disagrees. The Applicant offered an online feedback form, a paper feedback form available at information events and for free upon request via postage. The Applicant also had a freepost address where written feedback and completed

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				feedback forms could be sent, and accepted feedback via email. More information on the project communication channels can be found in the Consultation Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01].**
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_E_069	Respondent stated that the cumulative developments map sent to them on request was not detailed enough and should have included the full boundary and application details of each development.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. A map of cumulative schemes is set out within Environmental Statement - Volume 2 - Location of Short List Cumulative Proposed Developments **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.17.01]**.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_OFF_066	Respondent doubted that all landowners have actually been contacted, provides no evidence.	No	The Applicant used His Majesty's Land Registry (HMLR) to identify registered land interests within the draft Order Limits. Additionally, notices to identify the owners of unregistered land within the draft Order Limits were placed on-site. All identified interests are contacted through an introduction letter and questionnaire to confirm their land interest and contact details, as well as a

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Section 44 letter and Section 48 notice, inviting them to consultation. Further detail of the methodology taken is provided within the Consultation Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01]**.
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_OFF_111	Respondent stated that signs which were erected at the sites of proposed work could not adequately be viewed as they were not fit properly leading to them being destroyed and lost or placed beside busy roads with nowhere for people to stop and park safely to access these.	No	The Applicant placed notices at a minimum of every 5 km across the Proposed Development boundary. The notices were placed at publicly accessible locations. During Phase Two Consultation 22 general notices, 1 registered notice and 86 unregistered land notices were erected. The notices were checked weekly during the consultation period and photographs taken. If the notice was damaged or missing, these were replaced during the weekly checks. During Targeted Consultation, 11 change request notices and 57 unregistered notices were erected. The notices were checked weekly during the consultation period and photographs taken. If the notice was damaged or

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				missing, these were replaced during the weekly checks.

Cultural heritage

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Cultural Heritage	LV2_OFF_026, LV2_OFF_034, LV2_PFF_045, LV2_E_045, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_OFF_130, LV2_OFF_128, LV2_OFF_126, LV2_E_066, LV2_OFF_098, LV2_E_121, LV2_E_112, LV2_E_030, LV2_E_113	Respondents expressed general concern for the Proposed Development's impact on local cultural heritage and history.	No	A full assessment of potential impacts has been carried out within Environmental Statement (ES) Volume 1 Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/ 06.01.08.00]**, including a site walkover, settings assessment, Geophysical survey of the Solar Development Sites and Cable Route Corridor, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/0.6.03.08.03]** and trial trenching **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.04]** of Solar Development Sites. This assessment has concluded that, whilst there will be minor adverse impacts on elements of the built historic environment as a result of changes in their setting, these will be limited. Where possible, impacts have been mitigated by design. An Archaeological Mitigation Strategy **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.11]**

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				has been prepared to mitigate impacts on the archaeological resource from the Proposed Development.
Cultural Heritage	LV2_OFF_081	Respondents expressed concern for the Proposed Development's impact on listed buildings.	Yes	A full assessment of potential impacts has been carried out within the ES **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.08]**, including a site walkover, settings assessment, geophysical survey of Solar Development Sites and Cable Route Corridor and archaeological evaluation (trial trenching) of Solar Development Sites. This assessment has concluded that, whilst there will be minor adverse impacts on elements of the built historic environment as a result of changes in their setting, these will be limited. Where possible, impacts have been mitigated by design. Mitigation includes full landscape reinstatement being undertaken following the installation of the Cable Route Corridor to minimise changes in the setting of heritage assets.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Consultation with NYC's Conservation Officer has concluded that any harm to listed buildings will be less than substantial.
Cultural Heritage	LV2_PFF_004	Respondent asked what possibility is there for archaeological finds needing to be investigated in the area, citing the historically rich value of the site.	No	A Geophysical survey **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.03]** and trial trenching **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.04]** have been carried across the solar development sites, supplemented with geophysical survey of the Cable Route Corridor. The survey concluded there is limited potential for buried archaeological remains to be present outside of areas where geophysical survey has been completed and has identified a potential for archaeological remains to be present, which could be impacted upon by the Proposed Development.
Cultural Heritage	LV2_E_112, LV2_E_113	Respondents expressed concern about the cultural and heritage impact on Wistow.	No	The proposed Highways Improvement Areas (HIA) within Wistow will not result in direct impacts to any heritage assets or changes within the setting of assets that will impacts on their significance,

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				beyond temporary construction works. These temporary works are assessed to have the potential to have a negligible adverse impact, through changes in setting, on the Grade II Listed Oaklands Farmhouse, only. These impacts will be fully resolved following temporary construction works with no permanent effects.
Cultural Heritage	LV2_PFF_045	Respondent highlights Monk Fryston's founding year of 600 AD, adds that the historic area is being pillaged.	No	There are no direct impacts predicted on assets within Monk Fryston as a result of the Proposed Development. Volume 1 Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/ 06.01.08]** has considered the potential impacts from the Proposed Development as a result of changes in the setting of individual designated assets and the Monk Fryston Conservation Area. These were found to be no greater than Minor Adverse, with intervening built structures screening the Conservation Area from the Proposed Development and any temporary construction impacts from short-term increases in traffic or low

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				levels of construction noise, resolving on completion of the construction phase of the scheme.
Cultural Heritage	LV2_PFF_051	Respondent reported the presence of heritage assets in Birkin within close proximity of the Proposed Development.	No	The historic core of Birkin is located to the west of Solar Development Site 4 and no assets will experience direct physical impacts as a result of the Proposed Development. Volume 1 Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/ 06.01.08]** has assessed that no significant effects will arise from changes in the setting of heritage assets, however construction activities may be visible from heritage assets (buildings identified on the first edition Ordnance Survey). The project has been designed to minimise views from the historic core including leaving additional space and strengthening of the woodland buffer around Birkin House.
Cultural Heritage	LV2_PFF_052	Respondent noted that Birkin Parish Church is a recognised Grade I heritage structure and noted for its	No	The church is located immediately adjacent to an area of AIL access works. The proposed works are likely to

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		Romanesque detailing when the CRB Index of structures of use.		be limited to the temporary removal of street furniture. Views to the construction activities and solar infrastructure at Solar Development Site 4 would be glimpsed only as the church is heavily screened by intervening built form. Volume 1 Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/ 06.01.08]** states that landscape mitigation and planting undertaken as part of the construction phase will reach maturity during the operation phase to reduce visibility of the Proposed Development from heritage assets.
Cultural Heritage	LV2_OFF_095	Respondent stated that the majority of Monk Fryston is a conservation area with numerous listed buildings being present. The respondent cited the PEIR's assessment of archaeological assets in the area but questioned the impact such a	No	There are no direct impacts predicted on assets within Monk Fryston as a result of the Proposed Development. Volume 1 Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/ 06.01.08]** has considered the potential impacts from the Proposed Development as a result of changes in the setting of individual designated assets and the Monk

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		vast development would have on it.		Fryston Conservation Area. These were found to be no greater than Minor Adverse, with intervening built structures screening the Conservation Area from the Proposed Development and any temporary construction impacts from short-term increases in traffic or low levels of construction noise, resolving on completion of the construction phase of the scheme.

Cumulative effects

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Cumulative Effects	LV2_PFF_030, LV2_PFF_031, LV2_PFF_034, LV2_PFF_037, LV2_PFF_042, LV2_PFF_047, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_OFF_146, LV2_OFF_124, LV2_E_063, LV2_E_066, LV2_E_055, LV2_E_069, LV2_OFF_069, LV2_E_119, LV2_E_079, LV2_E_092, LV2_E_112, LV2_E_113, LV2_E_115, LV2_OFF_087	Respondents expressed general concern about cumulative impact of other types of development, such as housing estates, and other infrastructure projects, such as Yorkshire Green and the proposed limestone quarry on the A63.	Yes	Information regarding cumulative effects can be found in Environmental Statement (ES) Volume 1 Chapter 17: Cumulative and In-Combination Effects **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.17].** In addition, through developing the ES, each topic chapter, where relevant, has included a cumulative impact assessment, considering other committed developments in the area and potential added impacts to aspects such as traffic. It has been assessed that the Proposed Development is likely to lead to some cumulative landscape and visual effects during construction, year 1 of operation and decommissioning stages. These effects represent the change to the landscape and visual experiences that would emerge during any change to the landscape, as recognised through NPS

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				EN-1 which acknowledges in Section 5.10 "and 'virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will impact the landscape"'. It should be noted that with proposed mitigation in place and following initial establishment, the cumulative assessment does not identify any significant cumulative landscape or visual effects beyond year 1 of operation.
Cumulative Effects	LV2_OFF_009, LV2_PFF_030, LV2_PFF_047, LV2_PFF_048, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_E_063, LV2_E_066, LV2_E_055, LV2_E_069, LV2_OFF_098, LV2_E_119, LV2_E_122, LV2_E_111, LV2_E_116	Respondents expressed concern about the cumulative impact of solar parks in North Yorkshire.	Yes	Information regarding cumulative effects can be found in ES Volume 1 Chapter 17: Cumulative and In-Combination Effects **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.17].** In addition, through developing the ES, each topic chapter, where relevant, has included a cumulative impact assessment, considering other committed developments in the area and potential added impacts to aspects such as traffic.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The assessment has taken into account nearby developments, including other solar projects, that fall within the relevant zones of influence for each topic to evaluate potential combined effects. Many of these developments are located within North Yorkshire, with some in nearby administrative areas due to the proximity of the Proposed Development to other administrative areas.
Cumulative Effects	LV2_E_066, LV2_E_122, LV2_E_124	Respondents expressed concern that proposals do not adequately consider, assess or show the cumulative effects of the Proposed Development.	Yes	A full assessment of cumulative effects can be found in ES Volume 1 Chapter 17: Cumulative and In-Combination Effects **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.17].** In addition, through developing the ES, each topic chapter, where relevant, has included a cumulative impact assessment, considering other committed developments in the area and potential added impacts to aspects such as traffic.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The assessment has taken into account nearby developments that fall within the relevant zones of influence for each topic to evaluate potential combined effects.
Cumulative Effects	LV2_PFF_016	Respondent has stated that little effort has been done to establish the impact on the local area.	Yes	A full assessment of cumulative effects can be found in ES Volume 1 Chapter 17: Cumulative and In-Combination Effects **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.17].** In addition, through developing the ES, each topic chapter, where relevant, has included a cumulative impact assessment, considering other committed developments in the area and potential added impacts to aspects such as traffic. The assessment has taken into account nearby developments that fall within the relevant zones of influence for each topic to evaluate potential combined effects. Appendix 17.1: Long List of In-Combination Effects

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				and Cumulative Developments **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.17.01]** sets out all common receptors that have been assessed as part of the in-combination effects assessment, which maps out receptors across the full Proposed Development boundary.
Cumulative Effects	LV2_E_069	Respondent stated that cumulative impacts have not been adequately considered in accordance with the SoCC.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The SoCC does not detail how assessments on cumulative impacts have been carried out.
Cumulative Effects	LV2_E_124	Respondent requested that the cumulative effects on their home of being close to Sites 2, 6 and 8 be modelled or addressed, adds that this should have been done but has not.	No	A full assessment of cumulative effects can be found in ES Volume 1 Chapter 17: Cumulative and In-Combination Effects **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.17].** Appendix 17.1: Long List of In-Combination Effects and Cumulative Developments **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.17.01]** sets out that the impacts of this property were not deemed significant enough to be included in the in-combination effects

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				assessment, from a visual, noise, vibration or glint and glare perspective.

Design principles

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Design Principles	LV2_PFF_008, LV2_PFF_036, LV2_PFF_044, LV2_PFF_047, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_OFF_037, LV2_OFF_140, LV2_OFF_045, LV2_OFF_120	Respondents 'disagreed' with all design principles.	Yes	The Applicant notes these comments and has sought to clarify the approach that has been taken to design throughout the pre-application phase, including the design principles adopted and how they have influenced the final design, within the Design Approach Document **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.05]**, secured within the Design Parameters and Commitments document **[EN00110012/APP/LVS/05.06]**.
Design Principles	LV2_PFF_036, LV2_PFF_044, LV2_OFF_145, LV2_OFF_066	Respondents described the design principles as 'vague' or 'misleading'.	Yes	
Design Principles	LV2_PFF_061, LV2_PFF_060	Respondents stated that UK materials and manufacturing should be used for the Proposed Development.	No	The Applicant has been upfront in stating its expectation that panels will come from China. This is because the majority of solar panels are produced in China. UK manufacturers can supply many of the other components of a solar scheme.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The Applicant's parent company is a signatory of the Solar Energy UK Supply Chain Statement, which commits the company and its projects to sourcing materials produced in a sustainable way with a supply chain free of human rights abuses. It is building on this commitment through membership of the Solar Stewardship Initiative, an international supply chain audit programme, and by using independent international standards bodies to review, inspect and accredit suppliers. This is secured within the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.13]**.
Design Principles	LV2_OFF_098, LV2_OFF_093	Respondents expressed general approval of the design principles.	No	The Applicant notes and welcomes the comment.
Design Principles	LV2_PFF_013, LV2_PFF_030	Respondents stated that there is not much information supporting the design principles.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant has sought to clarify the approach that has been taken to design, and has included more information regarding the design principles within the Design Approach Document

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.05], secured within the Design Parameters and Commitments document **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.06]**.
Design Principles	LV2_PFF_037	Respondent expressed that the design principles are just 'buzzwords' or disingenuous and the Applicant does not really care about them.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. During the pre-application period, the Applicant has integrated design principles throughout consultation and in the final design of the Proposed Development. Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01]** details the design workshops the Applicant undertook, engaging with stakeholders on how the design principles and vision could help deliver outcomes for the Proposed Development.
Design Principles	LV2_OFF_095	Respondent expressed concern that the design principles will not be achieved or are unrealistic.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant has sought to clarify how the design principles will be achieved with the Proposed Development design within Section 14: Design Principles of
Design Principles	LV2_OFF_095	Respondent enquired as to how the design principles are	Yes	

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		assessed; against what and by whom.		the Design Approach Document **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.05]**, secured within the Design Parameters and Commitments document **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.06]**.
Design Principles	LV2_OFF_032	Respondent enquired about the hierarchy of importance placed on each area covered in the design principles.	Yes	
Design Principles	LV2_PFF_036	Respondent stated that the design principles are loaded towards the current government's agenda.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant has incorporated design principles into the Proposed Development's design to maximise delivery outcomes, and not because of UK Government targets. The design workshops set out in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01]** highlight the intention of the Applicant with achieving these outcomes, going above and beyond what is required for a DCO application.
Design Principles	LV2_OFF_140	Respondent stated the design principles do not acknowledge that the solar panels are 'alien' to the	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Design principle 1: Environmentally Led Design, sets out how landscape impacts are mitigated against, within Section 14:

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		landscape and cannot be visually mitigated against.		Design Principles of the Design Approach Document **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.05]**, secured within the Design Parameters and Commitments document **[EN00110012/APP/LVS/05.06]**.
Design Principles	LV2_OFF_128	Respondent stated that as good as the design principles are, they overlook the core issue of removing productive and biodiverse farmland.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The impact on agricultural land has been assessed throughout the pre-application period, set out in Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils of the Environmental Statement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]**. Land within the Solar Development Sites is comprised of approximately 495 ha (55% of agricultural land) classified as BMV quality, mostly in Subgrade 3a (34% of agricultural land) with the remaining proportion Grade 2 (18% of agricultural land) and Grade 1 (2% of agricultural land), and approximately 410 ha (45% of agricultural land) as

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Subgrade 3b and which is not BMV land. The Proposed Development design seeks to site semi-permanent infrastructure (e.g. substations) on lower quality agricultural land where this does not conflict with other environmental objectives or affect delivery of the project benefits. For example, the 275 kV substation in Solar Development Site 1 is located on agricultural land of Subgrade 3b quality, which is not considered BMV land, and is therefore lower quality. The Proposed Development will also be returned to the landowner following the decommissioning phase, set out in Chapter 2: The Proposed Development of the Environmental Statement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02].**
Design Principles	LV2_OFF_122	Respondent noted there isn't a design principle regarding	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Design Principle 5: Social Value and

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		local opinion and engagement, adds that this implies that local objections are not considered materially important.		Community includes a specific principle to 'Consider the needs of the adjacent communities through consultation', set out within Section 14: Design Principles of the Design Approach Document **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.05],** and is set out within the design vision within the Design Parameters and Commitments document **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.06]**. Separate to this document is the Consultation Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01]**, that sets out how feedback has influenced the design of the Proposed Development.
Design Principles	LV2_E_079	Respondent questioned the description of the Proposed Development as 'environmentally led'.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. More detail regarding Design Principle 1: Environmentally Led Design can be found in Section 14: Design Principles of the Design Approach Document **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.05]** and secured in the Design Parameters and

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Commitments document **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.06]**.
Design Principles	LV2_PFF_044	Respondent expressed concern regarding 'design flexibility', stating that it meant further developments being added.	No	The Applicant can confirm that no further sites will be added to the Proposed Development. By 'design flexibility' the Applicant refers to the iterative design process that has been followed for the Proposed Development to allow for detailed design to be informed by technical considerations, post-consent work and take advantage of innovation in technology, rather than additional sites to be added. This is set out in the Design Parameters and Commitments document **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.06]**.
Design Principles	LV2_PFF_044	Respondent stated that this area is already serviced very well in terms of social value.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Design Principles	LV2_PFF_044	Respondent stated that efficient infrastructure and ethical supply chains would be expected of any project	No	The Applicant notes the importance of using efficient infrastructure and ethical supply chains considering the ethical concerns surrounding the solar panel

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		and would not benefit the local community.		market, which at this time is dominated by China. The Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.13]**, secured in the DCO, states that the approach to procurement for the Proposed Development will take into account the objective of maximising benefits to local firms; while balancing this goal to ensure the Proposed Development is delivered in a competitive manner.
Design Principles	LV2_PFF_044	Respondent stated that sustainability, durability, and reversibility is an irrelevant design principle as the land will be contaminated by the Proposed Development.	Yes	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this comment. As outlined in ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]**, the Proposed Development is reversible and would be carefully decommissioned at the end of its operational life, in accordance with the Outline Decommissioning Environmental

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Management Plan (oDEMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04]**). The Proposed Development would not contaminate the site, with the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**) and Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.03]**) securing the relevant measures, including careful handling and reinstatement of soils and the correct storing of fuels and other materials on-site. In addition, the oOEMP secures the continued monitoring of the site, including soils and the ground beneath the Proposed Development, during the operational phase. The Applicant can confirm that the Proposed Development, once decommissioned, would be returned to its original use.

Ecology and biodiversity

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_OFF_009, LV2_OFF_010, LV2_OFF_012, LV2_OFF_013, LV2_OFF_017, LV2_OFF_020, LV2_OFF_022, LV2_OFF_023, LV2_OFF_024, LV2_OFF_026, LV2_OFF_029, LV2_OFF_032, LV2_OFF_034, LV2_OFF_037, LV2_OFF_040, LV2_OFF_041, LV2_OFF_042, LV2_OFF_046, LV2_OFF_048, LV2_OFF_056, LV2_OFF_057, LV2_OFF_058, LV2_OFF_060,	Respondents have expressed their concern about the Proposed Development's potential impact to local ecology, biodiversity and wildlife. Many respondents have stated that the Proposed Development will destroy ecology and displace habitats, and no measures put forward will mitigate this impact. Respondents are seeking more information on the ecological impact.	Yes	The effects of the Proposed Development on ecology and habitat are assessed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]**. The Applicant has incorporated a variety of mitigation and enhancement measures into the design of the Proposed Development; these include: • Fencing of the Solar Development Areas within the Solar Development Sites will be designed to let small mammals pass through, the layout of the fencing specifically designed to retain commuting corridors around existing linear features (ditches and hedgerows) through the Proposed Development that will be free of obstacles for animals. • The woodland and hedgerow network within the Solar Development Sites will be

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_OFF_062, LV2_OFF_069, LV2_OFF_073, LV2_OFF_076, LV2_OFF_077, LV2_OFF_079, LV2_OFF_081, LV2_OFF_086, LV2_OFF_088, LV2_OFF_089, LV2_OFF_092, LV2_OFF_094, LV2_OFF_099, LV2_OFF_106, LV2_OFF_109, LV2_OFF_117, LV2_OFF_122, LV2_OFF_126, LV2_OFF_128, LV2_OFF_135, LV2_OFF_140, LV2_OFF_141, LV2_OFF_142, LV2_OFF_143, LV2_OFF_147,			strengthened through the creation of new areas of habitat, increasing habitat connectivity. • Buffer zones around watercourses will comprise grassland habitat and will be managed sympathetically for ecology where possible. • The final cable route will be microsited within the Cable Route Corridor to best avoid impacts on important ecological features and fauna as identified during the UK Habitat surveys and species surveys. • The appointment of an Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) at the start of construction works, who will provide ecological supervision during any ecologically sensitive works. • Landscape planting will be provided within the buffer zones (where possible), green corridors, and within larger areas of habitat creation within the Proposed Development, to provide habitat managed

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_OFF_148, LV2_E_007, LV2_E_008, LV2_E_010, LV2_E_012, LV2_E_013, LV2_E_014, LV2_E_016, LV2_E_017, LV2_E_019, LV2_E_021, LV2_E_022, LV2_E_023, LV2_E_027, LV2_E_028, LV2_E_029, LV2_E_030, LV2_E_032, LV2_E_033, LV2_E_035, LV2_E_036, LV2_E_038, LV2_E_039, LV2_E_041, LV2_E_045, LV2_E_048, LV2_E_051, LV2_E_059, LV2_E_060, LV2_E_061, LV2_E_062, LV2_E_064, LV2_E_065, LV2_E_066, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_069, LV2_E_070, LV2_E_074, LV2_E_075, LV2_E_077, LV2_E_078, LV2_E_081, LV2_E_082, LV2_E_084, LV2_E_086, LV2_E_087, LV2_E_088, LV2_E_092, LV2_E_097,			sympathetically for ecology, and to provide the net gain in biodiversity. These measures are further detailed in and secured through the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]** and Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.03]**). It is intended that the Proposed Development will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG, including 78.58% for habitats, 73% for hedgerows, and 10.42% for watercourses. Full details of the gain are set out in the BNG assessment **[EN011012/APP/LVS/05.09]**. The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain. The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_E_099, LV2_E_100, LV2_E_105, LV2_E_107, LV2_E_110, LV2_E_111, LV2_E_114, LV2_E_115, LV2_E_118, LV2_E_120, LV2_E_121, LV2_E_122, LV2_E_123, LV2_PFF_025, LV2_PFF_034, LV2_PFF_036, LV2_PFF_037, LV2_PFF_043, LV2_PFF_045, LV2_PFF_047, LV2_PFF_050, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_PFF_053			Management Plan **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**.
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_OFF_138, LV2_OFF_128, LV2_PFF_006, LV2_OFF_013, LV2_OFF_014, LV2_PFF_047, LV2_E_036, LV2_E_067, LV2_OFF_069, LV2_OFF_062, LV2_E_094, LV2_E_096, LV2_E_111, LV2_E_026, LV2_E_114, LV2_E_116, LV2_OFF_009, LV2_OFF_017, LV2_PFF_036, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_OFF_040, LV2_OFF_050, LV2_E_068,	Respondents expressed concern for the impact of site fencing on wildlife movement and wildlife corridors. Respondents have stated that the current corridors through fields will be stopped, and habitats will displaced or separated from each other. Respondents expressed particular concern for deer.	No	The Applicant notes the comments. The effects of the Proposed Development on ecology and habitat, including specific species and habitats, are assessed in ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]**. The Applicant can confirm that commuting routes through the site for deer, such as ditches, hedgerows and their surrounding buffers, have been included throughout the Proposed Development, with fencing designed to work around

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_E_051, LV2_E_070, LV2_OFF_060, LV2_OFF_057, LV2_OFF_099, LV2_OFF_098, LV2_E_120, LV2_OFF_089, LV2_E_108, LV2_OFF_081, LV2_OFF_080, LV2_E_077, LV2_E_074, LV2_E_072			these commuting routes; this is detailed further in table 6-6 of the Chapter.
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_PFF_025, LV2_PFF_045, LV2_OFF_141, LV2_OFF_130, LV2_OFF_122, LV2_E_064, LV2_OFF_069, LV2_OFF_148, LV2_E_120	Respondents expressed concern for the loss of trees, hedgerows, shrubs and wildflower meadows.	No	The effects of the Proposed Development on ecology and habitat, including specific species and habitats, are assessed in ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]**. Trees, hedgerows, shrubs and grassland will be retained and buffered wherever possible, and where small areas of loss are required, the habitats will be replaced within the development. It is intended that the Proposed Development will have a gain of at least 70%; the Applicant has produced a

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Biodiversity Net-Gain Report (ES Volume 5: BNG Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.09]**) which confirms a BNG of 78.58% is expected for habitats, 73% for hedgerows, and 10.42% for watercourses. The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net-gain. The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**, which secures the habitat enhancement measures which would enable BNG across the Proposed Development.
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_PFF_025, LV2_PFF_045, LV2_OFF_130, LV2_OFF_050, LV2_E_064	Respondents expressed preference for the retention of existing woodland and trees.	No	The Applicant acknowledges respondents' preference for the retention of existing woodland and trees. As set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]**, the design of the Proposed Development has sought to avoid the loss of woodland and trees wherever practicable through an environmentally

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				led layout and the application of the mitigation hierarchy. No loss of ancient woodland is proposed, and appropriate buffers are applied to woodland habitats, including a minimum 10 m buffer to broad-leaved woodland and a 15 m buffer to ancient woodland, to protect these habitats from direct and indirect effects. Existing trees and hedgerows are retained where possible, with any limited removals confined to locations where necessary for access or infrastructure connections. These measures, alongside habitat protection and management secured through the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**, ensure the protection of retained woodland and trees and support biodiversity conservation and enhancement across the site.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_OFF_138, LV2_OFF_128, LV2_OFF_098	Respondents expressed general support for the Proposed Development's environmental improvements and/or Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG).	Yes	The Applicant welcomes this comment and can confirm that it has produced a Biodiversity Net-Gain Report (ES Volume 5: BNG Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.09]**) which confirms a BNG of 78.58% is expected for habitats, 73% for hedgerows, and 10.42% for watercourses. The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**, which secures the habitat enhancement measures which would enable BNG across the Proposed Development.
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_E_103	Respondent has asked whether any independent, multi-seasonal ecological impact and biodiversity net gain assessments have been conducted.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. The effects of the Proposed Development on ecology are assessed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]** including the results from the protected species surveys. All ecological impact and BNG surveys were undertaken across the year and is

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				therefore representative of baseline data over multiple seasons. The methodology of all ecological assessments is further detailed in Section 6.5 of Chapter 6. It is intended that the Proposed Development will have a gain of at least 70%; the Applicant has produced a Biodiversity Net-Gain Report (ES Volume 5: BNG Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.09]**) which confirms a BNG of 78.58% is expected for habitats, 73% for hedgerows, and 10.42% for watercourses. The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net-gain. The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**, which secures the habitat enhancement measures which would enable BNG across the Proposed Development.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_OFF_138	Respondents expressed general support for wildlife corridors.	Yes	The Applicant welcomes this comment.
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_E_036, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_070, LV2_OFF_057, LV2_E_028, LV2_E_114, LV2_E_077, LV2_E_074, LV2_E_070	Respondents expressed concern for the impact on hares & rabbits and their habitat.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. Section 6.9 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]** sets out the impact of the Proposed Development on brown hare and other protected species, and the methods being undertaken to mitigate for them. These include retaining and appropriately buffering arable field margins, neutral grassland and woodland edges, which will maintain key habitats offering value for brown hare within the Solar Development Sites. Brown hare utilise cropland habitat and as such, there will be a temporary reduction in the extent of suitable habitat due to the loss of arable habitats, until new ones establish. Hares are highly mobile and the temporary loss of habitats during construction is

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				anticipated to be similar in effect (i.e. causing disturbance or temporary displacement to hares) to the regular agricultural activities or harvesting, sowing, harrowing and rolling that take place across much of the Proposed Development at present. It is considered that the Proposed Development would become more suitable for brown hares immediately once works in a particular area are completed. As a result, no significant effects arising from the loss of habitat or displacement/disturbance during the construction phase are anticipated. Fencing within the Proposed Development has been designed to let brown hare pass through where possible, and construction lighting will be controlled to limit impacts on surrounding habitats. These measures are outlined in the Chapter and secured through the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP)

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05] and Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**. Rabbits are not afforded any legislative protection and are therefore not considered in the chapter, however some of the measures included to protect brown hare will also benefit rabbit.
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_PFF_006, LV2_OFF_009, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_114, LV2_E_084	Respondents expressed concern for the impact on badgers and their habitat.	Yes	ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]** sets out the methods being undertaken to mitigate the impact of the Proposed Development on badgers, including locating construction works and solar infrastructure away from known badger setts, and the micrositing of cables within the Cable Route Corridor to pass through existing gaps in hedgerows, avoiding habitats of value to badger, where possible. Mitigation measures are secured through the oCEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**, which

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				further includes Precautionary Working Methods (PWMs) to protect badger, such as through infilling of excavations / providing mammal ladders to reduce the likelihood of entrapment, maintaining a tidy site and preserving important commuting routes. Construction lighting will also be controlled to limit impacts on surrounding habitats, including habitats of importance to badger. Perimeter security fencing is not considered to be a barrier to badger movement given their propensity for digging (the security fencing is not proposed to be buried). Badger gates are not considered necessary within security or protective fencing as there is no known evidence of their efficacy.
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_E_051, LV2_E_070, LV2_E_028, LV2_E_114	Respondents expressed concern for the impact on foxes and their habitat.	Yes	ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]** sets out the methods being undertaken to mitigate the impact of the Proposed Development on fauna. However, there is no specific legislative protection for

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				foxes, and they are therefore not considered in the chapter, although measures included to protect other mammals with also benefit foxes. These include the layout of fencing specifically designed to retain commuting corridors around existing linear features (ditches and hedgerows) through the Proposed Development that will be free of obstacles for animals, and through strengthening the woodland and hedgerow network within the Solar Development Sites through the creation of new areas of habitat, increasing habitat connectivity.
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_OFF_009, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068	Respondents expressed concern for the impact on newts, including great crested newts, and their habitat.	Yes	ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]** sets out measures taken to mitigate the risk of the Proposed Development regarding amphibians, including newts. The vast majority of the habitat within the Solar Development Sites is sub-optimal habitat for amphibians, namely the cropland. Habitat features of importance for amphibians, i.e.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				watercourses, ponds, grassland, woodland and hedgerows will be retained and appropriately buffered where possible, with the complete retention of all on-site ponds. This will maintain key habitats which offer value for the species, with only discrete areas of terrestrial habitat loss, such as for access, which will aim to use existing access and crossing points were possible to reduce impacts. As detailed in Section 6.9 of the Chapter, newts were identified in a selection of ponds surveyed both on and off-site, although not in the majority; any ponds that could not be accessed for surveys in 2025 will be surveyed in April 2026. In order to minimise the risk of accidental killing / injury of common amphibians during the construction phase, the oCEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]** sets out the supervision and protective measures required during works affecting

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				potentially suitable habitat for amphibians at field boundaries, for example where new hedgerow gaps for access or cabling are required. These will include sympathetic, staged habitat clearance, and supervised by an ECoW where required. Further detail regarding the assessment of newts is available within ES Volume 3 Appendix 6.6: GCN Report **[EN0110012/APP/06.03.06.07]**.
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_E_028, LV2_OFF_086	Respondents expressed general concern for insects, including bees.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. The effects of the Proposed Development on ecology are assessed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]**, which sets out the methods being undertook to mitigate the impact of the Proposed Development on invertebrates. With regard to insects, the hedgerows, mature trees, woodland edges, neutral grassland and arable field margins are,

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				comparatively, of higher importance than the cultivated cropland, which is largely of negligible importance for insects such as pollinating bees. However, as these habitats are either limited in extent, or subject to degradation from agricultural activities, such as dust deposition and spray drift from herbicide and pesticide applications, the presence of a notable assemblage of insects within the Solar Development Sites is considered unlikely. Habitat features of importance for terrestrial insects will be retained and appropriately buffered where possible, helping to maintain key habitats which offer value for insects within the Solar Development Sites. As the solar panels will largely extend across habitat of negligible importance to invertebrates (namely cropland), and as it is unlikely there will be a notable assemblage of them, it is anticipated that there will not

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				be any significant adverse effects on terrestrial invertebrates as a result of the construction phase of the Proposed Development. Once operational, the Proposed Development will not be of disturbance to insect life, with the provision of wildflowers and other planting providing long-term habitat for insects. Mitigation and enhancement measures are secured through the oCEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]** and oLEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**.
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_E_051, LV2_E_124	Respondents expressed concern for the impact on bats and their habitat.	Yes	ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]** sets out the species of bat returned in the data search and site surveys, which sites they were located, and methods proposed to mitigate any impacts on the species group. The level of bat activity recorded across the Order Limits was similar, with Solar Development Site 1 having the highest

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				level of bat activity recorded while Solar Development Site 8 had the lowest. The vast majority of the habitat within the Order Limits is sub-optimal habitat for commuting and foraging bats, namely the cropland. Habitat features of importance for commuting and foraging bats, such as watercourses, ponds, grassland, woodland and hedgerows will be retained and appropriately buffered where possible. This will maintain key habitats which offer value for commuting and foraging bats. Other proposed habitat enhancement within the Solar Development Sites, as shown on the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]** includes hedgerow planting/enhancement, wet grassland, ditch enhancement/creation and tree planting. This habitat enhancement will aim to connect and extend commuting networks within the Proposed Development, which will

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				improve habitat quality, extent and connectivity for commuting and foraging bats. In addition, a series of bat boxes will be installed on mature trees within the Sites. Mitigation and enhancement measures are secured through the oLEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**. To ensure commuting and foraging bats are protected during the construction phase, the oCEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]** secures and further details measures and approaches to be adopted which will limit the likelihood of impacts upon retained habitats of importance for commuting and foraging bats, through damage, pollution and disturbance during the construction phase. Further detail regarding the assessment of bats is available within ES Volume 3 Appendix 6.4: Bat Report **[EN0110012/APP/ LVS/06.03.06.04]**.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_E_051, LV2_E_028	Respondents expressed concern for the impact on hedgehogs and their habitat.	Yes	ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]** sets out an assessment of potential impacts on hedgehog and how these impacts will be mitigated. A record of hedgehog was returned within Solar Development Site 6, with an additional record of the species within the Cable Route Corridor, and incidental sightings at other sites. The Order Limits comprises habitat features of importance for hedgehog; hedgerows, woodland, scrub and grassland will be retained and appropriately buffered where possible. This will maintain key habitats which offer value for the species, with only discrete areas of loss, such as for access, which will aim to use existing access points were possible to reduce impacts. In addition, a series of hedgehog houses will be installed in suitable habitat within the Solar Development Sites. Mitigation and enhancement measures are secured

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				through the oLEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**. To ensure hedgehog are protected during the construction phase, the oCEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]** details measures and approaches to be adopted which will limit the likelihood of impacts upon retained habitats of importance for hedgehog, through damage, pollution and disturbance during the construction phase. The oCEMP also includes PWMs to protect hedgehogs, such as though infilling of excavations, inclusion of mammal ladders and maintaining important commuting routes. Construction fencing within the Proposed Development has been designed to let small mammals such as hedgehog pass through where possible, and construction lighting will be controlled to limit impacts on surrounding habitats, including habitats of importance to hedgehogs.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_E_124	Respondent expressed concern for the impact on stoats and their habitat.	No	ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]** sets out the methods being undertaken to mitigate the impact of the Proposed Development on mammals. The Applicant can confirm that no record of the presence of stoats has been found within 2 km of the Order Limits in the last 10 years and as such, the species are not specifically considered in the Chapter, although measures included to protect other mammals with also benefit stoats.
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_OFF_009	Respondent expressed concern for the impact on grass snakes and their habitat.	No	The effects of the Proposed Development on ecology are assessed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06],** which sets out the methods being undertook to mitigate the impact of the Proposed Development on reptiles such as grass snake. As the vast majority of the habitat within the Order Limits is sub-optimal habitat for reptiles, namely the cropland, and

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				habitat features of importance for reptiles, such as watercourses, ponds and grassland will be retained and appropriately buffered where possible, no reptile surveys were proposed and instead the species group was assessed through a data search and habitat assessment (ES Volume 3 Appendix 6.1: Habitats Report **[EN0110012/APP/06.03.06.01]**). This approach was agreed with North Yorkshire Council. No record of reptiles was found within the Order Limits; however, the presence of grass snake was recorded approximately 60 m north of the Cable Route Corridor associated with Selby Dam. Eight other records of grass snake were also recorded within the 2 km search area, the vast majority of which were associated with Skipwith Common SAC/SSSI or Hollicarrs Wood SINC.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Mitigation and enhancement measures relevant for grass snake and reptiles, such as installing a series of log piles/hibernacula in suitable habitat within the Solar Development Sites, such as in the grassland margins adjacent to wet ditches, are further detailed in and secured through the oLEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**.
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_E_067	Respondent expressed concern for the impact on muntjacs and their habitat.	No	Muntjac deer are an invasive non-native species in the UK that cause damage to woodlands, and as such, they are not afforded any legislative protection and are therefore not considered in the Chapter.
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_OFF_138	Respondent has requested a study into the relationship between deer and solar farms.	Yes	The effects of the Proposed Development on ecology and habitat, including specific species and habitats, are assessed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]** and further reported in ES Volume 3 Appendix 6.1: Habitats Report **[EN0110012/APP/06.03.06.01]**.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Table 6-6 of Chapter 6 sets out that commuting routes through the site for deer, such as ditches hedgerows, and their surrounding buffers, have been retained through the Proposed Development and fencing has been designed to ensure deer can use these commuting routes, as further detailed in and secured through the oLEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**.
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_PFF_053	Respondent stated that the ecology is particularly valued by walkers, cyclists and wildlife.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Approximately 8 km (5 miles) of new permissive paths will be created (as shown on the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**) across the Proposed Development, secured in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**, increasing access to nature and the countryside. In addition, access to existing routes will be maintained

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				throughout the construction phase, with three permanent diversions planned, as secured through the outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.09]**. As well as maintaining and increasing access to nature, it is intended that the Proposed Development will have a biodiversity net-gain of at least 70%; the Applicant has produced a Biodiversity Net-Gain Report (ES Volume 5: BNG Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.09]**) which confirms a BNG of 78.58% is expected for habitats, 73% for hedgerows, and 10.42% for watercourses. Further details of the effects of the Proposed Development on ecology and habitat are included in ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]**.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_PFF_051, LV2_OFF_140, LV2_OFF_141, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_070, LV2_E_069, LV2_OFF_067, LV2_PFF_046, LV2_E_077, LV2_OFF_058, LV2_E_086, LV2_OFF_076	Respondents expressed scepticism that the Applicant has full understanding of the local ecology and therefore have underestimated the potential impact on ecology and the local environment. Respondents expressed scepticism that the ecological mitigation measures proposed will be sufficient.	Yes	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the comments. The Applicant can confirm it has undertaken a series of rigorous, multi-season ecological assessments across all Solar Development Sites and the Cable Route Corridor, the scope and methodology of which are set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 4: Approach to EIA **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.04]** and Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]**. The effects of the Proposed Development on ecology and habitat are further detailed in Chapter 6, including the various protected species and habitat surveys completed to accurately quantify the ecological baseline of the site. ES Volume 3 Appendices 6.1 to 6.7 include species-specific assessment reports, including for bats, water voles, and badgers, as well as a Habitats Report **[EN0110012/APP/06.03.06.01]**.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				It is intended that the Proposed Development will have a biodiversity net-gain of at least 70%; the Applicant has produced a Biodiversity Net-Gain Report (ES Volume 5: BNG Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.09]**) which confirms a BNG of 78.58% is expected for habitats, 73% for hedgerows, and 10.42% for watercourses. The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain. To achieve a 70% BNG, through mitigation, enhancement and habitat creation measures, the proposals are supported by the oLEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**, which further details and secures these measures, such as the retention and strengthening of the hedgerow network, extensive landscape planting, wooden and deer mesh fencing, and the provision of grassland habitat in watercourse buffer zones.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_PFF_027, LV2_PFF_046, LV2_E_051	Respondents request further information about BNG and mitigation measures.	Yes	It is intended that the Proposed Development will have a biodiversity net-gain of at least 70%; the Applicant has produced a Biodiversity Net-Gain Report (ES Volume 5: BNG Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.09]**) which confirms a BNG of 78.58% is expected for habitats, 73% for hedgerows, and 10.42% for watercourses. The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain. To achieve a 70% BNG, through mitigation, enhancement and habitat creation measures, the proposals are supported by the oLEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**, which further details and secures these measures, such as the retention and strengthening of the hedgerow network, extensive landscape planting, wooden and deer mesh fencing, and the provision of grassland habitat in watercourse buffer zones.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_E_068, LV2_E_069, LV2_OFF_035	Respondents expressed concern that biodiversity proposals are not yet precise since further surveys need to be done.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Surveys and assessments committed to in the PEIR at Statutory Consultation have since been carried out, and were both rigorous and multi-seasonal, and undertaken across all Solar Development Sites and the Cable Route Corridor. The scope and methodology of the assessments are set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 4: Approach to EIA **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.04]** and Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]**. The results of the assessments and resulting embedded and additional mitigation are further detailed in Chapter 6 and secured through the oLEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**, which further details and secures these measures, such as the retention and strengthening of the hedgerow network, extensive landscape planting, wooden and deer mesh fencing, and the provision of grassland habitat in watercourse buffer zones.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_OFF_128	Respondent wishes to see biodiversity measures carried out alongside continued farming - combine both rather than sacrificing one.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. There is potential for some livestock (sheep) grazing to occur beneath the solar panels as there are no known landowner restrictive covenants or other reasons that would prevent such use. There is no proposal for cattle grazing. Conservation grazing is proposed for the operational phase of the Proposed Development, as detailed in the oLEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**.
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_PFF_027	Respondents support more wildflower meadows.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment.
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_OFF_010	Respondent expressed they do not believe sheep and wildlife can live or graze beneath the panels.	Yes	The Proposed Development includes the retention of agricultural use within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, through using conservation sheep grazing as outlined in the oLEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**.
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_PFF_027	Respondent suggested that the areas between panels are exploited as meadow sites, benefitting pollinators and wider local ecology.	Yes	The Applicant has committed to multiple means of increasing the biodiversity of the site throughout the lifespan of the Proposed Development. The Applicant notes this comment. It is intended that

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG units. Full details of the gain are set out in the BNG assessment **[EN011012/APP/LVS/05.09]**.
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_E_124	Respondent expressed concern that there is no evidence their own local wildlife data has been reviewed or integrated into mitigation strategies for Site 2.	Yes	Page 63 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]** sets out the results of assessments regarding Solar Development Site 2, what habitats were recorded in the area, and what mitigation methods are proposed. A full review of the data held by the local records centre has also been completed and is summarised in the Chapter.
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_E_124	Respondent would like to see how ecological data gathered during Phase One has been integrated into mitigation and monitoring commitments.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment, technical surveys conducted throughout the pre-application process and referenced in the PEIR have been referred to in ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]** to inform the mitigation and monitoring.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_PFF_043	Respondent expressed concern about the use and impact of herbicide and pesticide and any other sprays under the panels.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges this concern. ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]** indicates that the end of the current farming practices within the Solar Development Sites, such as the application of fertilisers or pesticides and machinery use, may also further benefit woodland, trees, ponds, hedgerows, and watercourses.
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_PFF_004	Respondent stated that the deer which sometimes reside in the wooded area west of the Riccall access road would need protecting.	Yes	ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]** includes provisions for the protection of deer. Table 6-6 sets out that commuting routes through the site for deer, such as ditches hedgerows, and their surrounding buffers, have been included throughout the Proposed Development and fencing has been designed to work around these commuting routes. These measures are further detailed in and secured through the oLEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_PFF_006	Respondent stated that fencing around Solar Development Site 1 specifically should allow access for badgers due to their high concentration in the area. The respondent added that Solar Development Site 1 covers badger habitat but not the location where the badgers feed, so access would have to be allowed so as to prevent them being forcibly relocated to unsuitable habitats.	Yes	Page 62 of ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]** sets out the results of assessments regarding Solar Development Site 1, what habitats were recorded in the area, and what mitigation methods are proposed. Chapter 6 also provides details regarding mitigation measures for badgers, including locating construction works and solar infrastructure away from known badger setts, and the micrositing of cables within the Cable Route Corridor to pass through existing gaps in hedgerows, avoiding habitats of value to badger, where possible. Mitigation measures are secured through the oCEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**, which further includes PWMs to protect badger, such as through infilling of excavations / providing mammal ladders to reduce the likelihood of entrapment, maintaining a tidy site and preserving

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				important commuting routes. Construction lighting will also be controlled to limit impacts on surrounding habitats, including habitats of importance to badger. Perimeter security fencing is not considered to be a barrier to badger movement given their propensity for digging (the security fencing is not proposed to be buried). Badger gates are not considered necessary within security or protective fencing as there is no known evidence of their efficacy.
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_PFF_006	Respondent requested amending the fencing in Solar Development Site 1 specifically to allow badgers and deer to thrive in the area.	Yes	Page 62 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]** sets out the results of assessments regarding Solar Development Site 1, what habitats were recorded in the area, and what mitigation methods are proposed. Fencing of the Solar Development Areas within the Solar Development Sites will be designed to let small

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				mammals pass through, the layout of the fencing specifically designed to retain commuting corridors around existing linear features (ditches and hedgerows) through the Proposed Development that will be free of obstacles for animals. The fencing will be designed to work around deer commuting routes; this is detailed further in table 6-6 of the Chapter. Perimeter security fencing is not considered to be a barrier to badger movement given their propensity for digging (the security fencing is not proposed to be buried). Badger gates are not considered necessary within security or protective fencing as there is no known evidence of their efficacy.
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_E_079	Respondent expressed concern regarding the impact of Site 2 on badger setts.	No	The Applicant can confirm that no badger setts were recorded within Solar Development Site 2, however three badger setts were recorded immediately adjacent to the Site, within the

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				surrounding 30 m buffer. ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]** sets out the mitigation methods proposed to protect badgers within the order limits
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_E_003	Respondent stated that the proposed sites lie in the shadow of notable protected habitats.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. The effects of the Proposed Development on ecology and habitat are assessed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]** including an assessment of neighbouring notable habitats. Further detail is provided in ES Volume 3 Appendix 6.1: Habitats Report **[EN0110012/APP/06.03.06.01]**.
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_E_045	Respondent enquired as to the impacts of Solar Development Site 6 on the nearby conservation area?	Yes	ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]** sets out the results of assessments regarding Solar Development Site 6, including any mitigation required to protect neighbouring designated sites. Construction activities have the potential to produce increases in dust and pollution, IAQM guidance indicates that

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				with the successful implementation of best practice embedded dust mitigation measures, including how vehicles, plant and materials will be transported to and around the construction zone, as well as other standard environmental protection measures that will apply, there is likely to be a negligible effect on nearby conservation areas. Further detail is provided in ES Volume 3 Appendix 16.1: Construction Dust Assessment **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.01]**) and, along with wider pollution prevention and best practice measures, further detailed in and secured through the oCEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**. As ditches within the Solar Development Sites will be retained, buffered and protected by the oCEMP, and following the implementation of the embedded mitigation to reduce water related pollution, no significant adverse effects as a result of water quality impacts are

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				anticipated during the construction phase of the Proposed Development on nearby conservation areas.
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_PFF_051	Respondent expressed concern for the impact of the Proposed Development on River Aire riparian habitats.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. Following the removal of the site's southern portion, the River Aire is now located approximately 460 m south of Solar Development Site 4. The Site has been assessed as offering medium value for otter due to its relative proximity to the River Aire, and it is likely otter utilise the drainage ditch network within the site for commuting. The quality of these ditches across the Order Limits have been identified as poor, due to agricultural impacts such as runoff; the cessation of intensive agricultural activity in proximity to these watercourses will likely lead to better water quality over the duration of the Proposed Development. In addition, wide buffers of at least 10 m will enhance the ditch and river habitats for associated protected and notable

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				species, including otter as well as water vole, birds and invertebrates. These measures are further detailed in and secured through the oLEMP **[EN011012/APP/LVS/05.09]** and oCEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**.
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_E_068	Respondent cited the close proximity of one of their fields to the Proposed Development, and the presence of a duck pond with great crested newts, which may end up moving onto a solar panel area.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]** sets out measures taken to mitigate the risk of the Proposed Development regarding newts. Habitat features of importance for newts, i.e. watercourses, grassland, woodland, hedgerows and ponds will be retained and appropriately buffered where possible, with the complete retention of all on-site ponds. As detailed in Section 6.9 of the Chapter, newts were identified in a selection of ponds surveyed both on and off-site, although not in the majority; any ponds that could not be accessed for surveys in 2025 will be surveyed in April 2026.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				In order to minimise the risk of accidental killing / injury of common amphibians during the construction phase, the oCEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]** sets out the supervision and protective measures required during works affecting potentially suitable habitat for amphibians at field boundaries, for example where new hedgerow gaps for access or cabling are required. These will include sympathetic, staged habitat clearance, and supervised by an ECoW where required. Further detail regarding the assessment of newts is available within ES Volume 3 Appendix 6.6: GCN Report **[EN0110012/APP/06.03.06.07]**.
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_PFF_004	Respondent stated that the wooded area West of the Riccall access road would need to be protected.	No	Impacts on and protection to retained trees is set out in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment in ES Volume 1 Chapter 16: Other Environmental Matters **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.02]**.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				All trees to the west of the Riccall access road will be retained. Belowground parts of the trees to the west of the access road will be protected by the existing hard standing of the road. The width of the road will not be altered. Above ground the majority of trees have a crown clearance that is above the standard clearance over highways of 5 m. Two oaks and a cherry will need minor pruning in the form of crown raising to achieve a 5 m clearance. Following these works there should be no impact on the trees from construction vehicle using the access road.
Ecology and Biodiversity	LV2_PFF_052	Respondent requested 30 m buffer zones for any sites abutting ancient woodland.	No	The Applicant has committed to a minimum buffer of 15 m around Ancient Woodlands in line with government standing advice on protecting ancient woodland from development. This is further detailed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 16: Other Environmental Matters **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.02]**

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				and secured via the oLEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**.

General feedback

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
General Feedback	LV2_PFF_014, LV2_PFF_012, LV2_PFF_016, LV2_OFF_009, LV2_OFF_010, LV2_OFF_014, LV2_E_003, LV2_E_005, LV2_E_006, LV2_E_009, LV2_E_007, LV2_E_008, LV2_E_010, LV2_E_012, LV2_E_013, LV2_E_014, LV2_E_016, LV2_E_017, LV2_E_019, LV2_E_022, LV2_E_027, LV2_OFF_021, LV2_OFF_027, LV2_OFF_029, LV2_OFF_030, LV2_OFF_033, LV2_PFF_023, LV2_PFF_025, LV2_PFF_026, LV2_PFF_033, LV2_PFF_035, LV2_PFF_047, LV2_L_001, LV2_E_035, LV2_E_036, LV2_E_037, LV2_E_039, LV2_E_041, LV2_E_042, LV2_E_043, LV2_E_044,	Respondents expressed general opposition and objection to the Proposed Development.	N/A	The Applicant notes these comments. The Statement of Need **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.03]**, describes the Government's policy that large capacities of low carbon generation will be required to meet increased demand and replace output from retiring (fossil fuel) plants, and that "a secure, reliable, affordable, Net Zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar". The Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (published December 2025) states that that the UK has huge potential for solar power. The Applicant notes this comment, and would point to National Policy Statement EN-1 paragraph 3.3.58: *"Given the urgent need for new electricity infrastructure and the time it takes for electricity NSIPs to move from design conception to operation, there is an*

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_E_045, LV2_E_048, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_E_049, LV2_E_050, LV2_E_061, LV2_OFF_147, LV2_OFF_036, LV2_OFF_146, LV2_OFF_040, LV2_OFF_137, LV2_OFF_135, LV2_OFF_133, LV2_OFF_129, LV2_OFF_128, LV2_OFF_046, LV2_OFF_126, LV2_OFF_124, LV2_OFF_123, LV2_OFF_122, LV2_OFF_048, LV2_OFF_121, LV2_OFF_120, LV2_OFF_119, LV2_E_062, LV2_E_065, LV2_E_066, LV2_E_018, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_070, LV2_E_053, LV2_E_071,			*urgent need for new (and particularly low carbon) electricity NSIPs to be brought forward as soon as possible, given the crucial role of electricity as the UK decarbonises its economy,"* as well as paragraphs 3.3.62 and 3.3.63: *"Government has concluded that there is a critical national priority (CNP) for the provision of nationally significant low carbon infrastructure. Section 4.2 states which energy generating technologies are low carbon and are therefore CNP infrastructure.* *"Subject to any legal requirements, the urgent need for CNP infrastructure to achieving our energy objectives, together with the national security, economic, commercial, and net zero benefits, means that it is likely the need case will outweigh any other residual impacts not capable of being addressed by application of the mitigation hierarchy, in all but the most exceptional circumstances. Government strongly*

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_E_054, LV2_E_055, LV2_E_056, LV2_E_060, LV2_OFF_117, LV2_OFF_110, LV2_OFF_108, LV2_OFF_073, LV2_OFF_071, LV2_OFF_070, LV2_OFF_069, LV2_OFF_066, LV2_OFF_065, LV2_OFF_063, LV2_OFF_062, LV2_E_021, LV2_OFF_060, LV2_OFF_059, LV2_E_024, LV2_OFF_057, LV2_OFF_053, LV2_OFF_104, LV2_OFF_102, LV2_OFF_099, LV2_OFF_097, LV2_OFF_095, LV2_OFF_094, LV2_OFF_035, LV2_OFF_148, LV2_E_082,			*supports the delivery of CNP infrastructure and it should be progressed as quickly as possible."*

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_E_117, LV2_E_081, LV2_E_080, LV2_E_118, LV2_E_119, LV2_E_120, LV2_E_121, LV2_E_122, LV2_E_123, LV2_E_087, LV2_E_088, LV2_OFF_052, LV2_E_124, LV2_E_090, LV2_E_092, LV2_E_093, LV2_E_094, LV2_E_095, LV2_E_096, LV2_E_097, LV2_E_098, LV2_E_100, LV2_E_026, LV2_E_114, LV2_E_032, LV2_E_101, LV2_E_033, LV2_E_034, LV2_OFF_092, LV2_OFF_091, LV2_OFF_089, LV2_OFF_087, LV2_E_105, LV2_E_106, LV2_OFF_085, LV2_E_108, LV2_OFF_082, LV2_OFF_081, LV2_OFF_080, LV2_OFF_079, LV2_OFF_078, LV2_OFF_077,			

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_OFF_074, LV2_E_083, LV2_E_078, LV2_E_077, LV2_E_076, LV2_E_075, LV2_E_074, LV2_E_073, LV2_E_072			
General Feedback	LV2_PFF_034, LV2_PFF_036, LV2_OFF_141, LV2_OFF_136, LV2_OFF_131, LV2_OFF_042	Respondents expressed opposition to Solar Development Site 1 specifically due to size and location.	No	The Applicant notes these views, however considers that Solar Development Site 1 is a suitable site for solar development. Further details on the Site Selection are set out in the Site Selection Assessment Report (ES Volume 3, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]**).
General Feedback	LV2_PFF_001, LV2_E_020, LV2_OFF_093, LV2_OFF_090, LV2_OFF_084	Respondents expressed general support for the Proposed Development.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and welcomes support for the Proposed Development.
General Feedback	LV2_PFF_041, LV2_OFF_143	Respondents expressed opposition to Site 2 specifically due to size and location.	No	The Applicant notes these views, however considers that Site 2 is a suitable site for solar development. Further details on the Site Selection are set out in the Site Selection Assessment Report (ES Volume 3, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]**).

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
General Feedback	LV2_PFF_035, LV2_OFF_066	Respondents requested more information on the cable route and mitigation measures.	Yes	Details of the Cable Route Corridor including its indicative alignment and construction approach, are set out in the application documents, including ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: Proposed Development **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]** and the relevant Environmental Statement topic chapters. The Cable Route Corridor has been developed to minimise environmental effects where practicable, including avoiding sensitive receptors, utilising existing transport corridors where possible, and limiting land take through trenching and reinstatement. Embedded and additional mitigation measures for the Cable Route Corridor are secured through the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**) and the relevant topic-specific management plans.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The detailed alignment and final mitigation measures will be confirmed at the detailed design stage, within the parameters assessed in the Environmental Statement and set out in the Design Parameters and Commitments Document **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.06]** and secured through the DCO requirements.
General Feedback	LV2_PFF_041	Respondent expressed opposition to Solar Development Site 8 specifically due to size and location.	No	The Applicant notes these views, however considers that Solar Development Site 8 is a suitable site for solar development. Further details on the Site Selection are set out in the Site Selection Assessment Report (ES Volume 3, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]**).
General Feedback	LV2_E_066	Respondent stated that Hillam has not been acknowledged by the Applicant, cited a lack of presence in materials, surveys and assessments.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges that Hillam has not been named specifically in the locational description used by the Proposed Development, however, Hillam is recognised, has been referenced and assessed within the DCO Application.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
General Feedback	LV2_PFF_020	Respondent reported that Hambleton experiences power cuts, asked if the Proposed Development will resolve this due to use of solar panels and substations?	No	The supply of electricity to Hambleton is through the local distribution network, which will not be altered by the Applicant's proposals. While the Applicant is not the Distribution Network Operator for the area and cannot lawfully alter that network, it is willing to consider how it could support improvement works as part of a Community Benefit Fund.
General Feedback	LV2_PFF_031	Respondent asked what the next steps are and when will a decision be made?	N/A	Following the submission of the Development Consent Order (DCO) Application for the Proposed Development, the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) has 28 days to decide whether to accept the application for examination. If accepted, PINS will then publish all the application documents on its website. Anyone with an interest in the Proposed Development will then be able to register with PINS and have the opportunity to comment further on the proposals during the examination. Information about how you can have your say at different stages of the

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				development process for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) can be found on the PINS website. After the examination concludes, PINS will make a recommendation to the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero about whether the application should be approved. The Secretary of State will then decide whether to grant a Development Consent Order (DCO) for the Proposed Development. Subject to being granted consent, construction would start no earlier than 2028.
General Feedback	LV2_PFF_049	Respondent stated that local people are not involved in the Proposed Development (no further context provided).	No	The Applicant has carried out extensive local consultation, with three stages of consultation carried out across 2024 and 2025, as outlined in the Consultation Report. While consultation activities concluded in 2025, it is still possible to get involved with the process and provide any or

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				further comments. Subject to PINS accepting the DCO Application for examination, anyone with an interest in the Proposed Development will be able to register with PINS and have the opportunity to comment further on the proposals. Information about how you can have your say at different stages of the development process for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) can be found on the PINS website. To be involved in the examination process, please register for updates on the Planning Inspectorate's specific Light Valley Solar webpage.
General Feedback	LV2_E_036	Respondent stated that the Proposed Development will increase the cost of living crisis if it goes ahead.	No	The Applicant respectfully disagrees. As one of the lowest-cost forms of generation, solar generation connected to the transmission network can reduce the cost of energy, which contributes to the goal of reducing bills for UK families and businesses.
General Feedback	LV2_OFF_131	Respondent requested further information on Solar	Yes	Further information regarding Solar Development Site 1 can be found in ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		Development Site 1 in order to support the proposals.		Development **[EN0110012/APP/06.01.02]** and Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]**. In addition, all assessments relevant to Solar Development Site 1 can be found elsewhere in the ES, including Chapter 6 for biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]**, and Chapter 14 for traffic **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.14]**. A detailed map of Solar Development Site 1 can be found within the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**)
General Feedback	LV2_E_067	Respondent stated that as BESS can only store energy for up to a few days, but demand is lowest when solar performs best, in the summer, meaning there is a discrepancy here, as storage of energy would need to last	No	The Applicant notes that the BESS is not intended to store energy for months at a time. The BESS would work to allow excess electricity generated from the Solar PV Panels, and/or excess energy in the grid, to be stored in the batteries. This excess electricity would then be exported at strategic times of the day to provide flexibility and

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		until winter, which is a matter of months not days.		enhance grid reliability. The BESS will be designed to provide peak generation and grid balancing services to the electricity grid.
General Feedback	LV2_OFF_053	Respondent expressed belief that the overall capacity and output of the Proposed Development has been overinflated.	N/A	The Applicant is confident in its assessments of generation capacity and notes that it would be against its interests to develop a Proposed Development based on 'over-inflated' figures.
General Feedback	LV2_E_068, LV2_E_102	Respondents expressed concern that Proposed Development is bypassing local government and not democratic.	N/A	The Applicant notes that it is using the application route prescribed by the Planning Act 2008 mandated by Parliament because the Proposed Development qualifies as a 'Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project' Far from bypassing local government, the pre-Application process has included consultation with councils and, if the Proposed Development is consented, the Applicant would work with local government to discharge conditions of the consent as set out in the draft DCO

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				[EN0110012/APP/LVS/03.01] requirements. The Applicant further notes that the DCO process, with up to six months of examination including multiple hearings that members of the public and all stakeholders, are able to attend or watch online and in which they may also participate, delivers a level of transparency and accountability that would be hard to replicate within the processes of a local planning authority.
General Feedback	LV2_PFF_041, LV2_E_068	Respondents stated they believe the Proposed Development is a 'done deal', citing works currently going on in Monk Fryston.	No	None of the current works at Monk Fryston are being carried out for the Proposed Development, which remains subject to an extensive examination process by the Planning Inspectorate.
General Feedback	LV2_PFF_034, LV2_PFF_036	Respondents expressed concern over the motives of the landowner for Solar Development Site 1.	N/A	The Proposed Development would provide a long-term, alternative income source that would remove reliance on direct public support from agri-environment projects whilst still providing environmental benefits. It

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				would offer a stable diversification option.
General Feedback	LV2_E_043	Respondent stated that the money being offered to farmers and other agents by the Applicant is too high.	No	The Applicant pays a market rate for the options and leases it negotiates.
General Feedback	LV2_OFF_005, LV2_OFF_007, LV2_OFF_021, LV2_PFF_036, LV2_PFF_037, LV2_PFF_042, LV2_PFF_043, LV2_PFF_047, LV2_E_038, LV2_E_043, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_OFF_142, LV2_OFF_135, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_070, LV2_E_059, LV2_E_069, LV2_OFF_069, LV2_OFF_068, LV2_OFF_067, LV2_OFF_065, LV2_OFF_060, LV2_OFF_057, LV2_OFF_056, LV2_OFF_053, LV2_OFF_042, LV2_E_117,	Respondents expressed general distrust towards the Applicant, including Macquarie.	N/A	The Applicant is ultimately owned by three investment funds, which are managed by Macquarie Asset Management on behalf of a range of investors, including a number of UK pension funds. These investors would receive returns through the funds, while Macquarie would receive management fees, as is standard. Further funding may come from commercial lenders, who would receive interest payments. The funding structure is common in the energy sector and ensures that the Proposed Development is financially robust and deliverable.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_E_119, LV2_E_092, LV2_E_111, LV2_E_100, LV2_PFF_061, LV2_PFF_060, LV2_E_115, LV2_E_083			Solar and battery storage projects carry significant upfront development risk. In fact, until a planning consent is secured, these projects generate no income at all. As such, investment is made at commercial risk, with no guarantee of return unless the project progresses successfully through development, planning and construction. This creates a strong long-term commercial incentive for investors to see the project through to completion.
General Feedback	LV2_E_005, LV2_OFF_021, LV2_PFF_037, LV2_PFF_042, LV2_PFF_045, LV2_PFF_047, LV2_E_043, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_OFF_037, LV2_OFF_041, LV2_OFF_142, LV2_OFF_135, LV2_OFF_140, LV2_OFF_045, LV2_OFF_047, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_070,	Respondents expressed concern that the motivation for the Proposed Development is for financial profit and/or greed.	N/A	In relation to the funding and delivery of the Proposed Development, it is important to clarify that all large-scale energy projects in Great Britain are financed through private investment. This model enables the development of essential low-carbon infrastructure without reliance on public funds. The Applicant is ultimately owned by three investment funds, which are managed by Macquarie Asset Management on

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_E_069, LV2_OFF_069, LV2_OFF_068, LV2_OFF_067, LV2_OFF_065, LV2_OFF_060, LV2_OFF_057, LV2_OFF_056, LV2_OFF_099, LV2_E_117, LV2_E_112, LV2_E_113, LV2_E_115, LV2_OFF_087, LV2_E_106, LV2_E_083			behalf of a range of investors, including a number of UK pension funds. These investors would receive returns through the funds, while Macquarie would receive management fees, as is standard. Further funding may come from commercial lenders, who would receive interest payments. The funding structure is common in the energy sector and ensures that the Proposed Development is financially robust and deliverable. Private investment goes beyond generating returns for investors; it brings essential capital, expertise, and innovation to UK solar projects, which can help deliver upgrades and new developments faster and more efficiently. The private funding structure also helps ease pressure on public finances, allowing government resources to be channelled elsewhere. Funding structures like this are designed

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				to build resilient, future-ready infrastructure that benefits everyone.
General Feedback	LV2_OFF_021, LV2_E_038, LV2_E_043, LV2_OFF_037, LV2_E_019, LV2_E_068, LV2_OFF_042, LV2_E_092, LV2_E_100, LV2_E_102	Respondents expressed concern regarding Macquarie's involvement in the Proposed Development and shareholding in Island Green Power. Many respondents reference Macquarie's management of Thames Water.	N/A	Macquarie, which grew out of UK bank Hill Samuel's Australian operations in 1985, has a strong record of long-term UK investment. Since 1999, Macquarie has invested more than £65 billion into UK infrastructure, including energy projects, supporting more than 33,000 UK jobs. In terms of Island Green Power specifically, the company is owned by three investment funds, which are managed by Macquarie Asset Management on behalf of a range of investors, including a number of UK pension funds. These investors have provided up-front equity capital to develop projects. Solar and battery storage projects carry significant upfront development risk. In fact, until a planning consent is secured, these projects generate no income at all, as such investment is made at commercial

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				risk, with no guarantee of return unless the project progresses successfully through development, planning and construction. This creates a strong long-term commercial incentive for investors to see the project through to completion.
General Feedback	LV2_PFF_008, LV2_PFF_037, LV2_PFF_043, LV2_E_038, LV2_E_043, LV2_E_068	Respondents expressed concern about foreign and state actors, as well as other forms of investment, ownership, or profit leaving the UK, including worries that the Applicant may not pay UK tax.	N/A	The Applicant is a UK-registered company subject to UK tax. Its beneficial owners include UK investors such as pension funds.
General Feedback	LV2_E_002, LV2_L_001, LV2_E_051, LV2_E_070	Respondents enquired about or expressed concern regarding how much taxpayer money has been spent or will be spent on the Proposed Development.	Yes	The Applicant is funding the Proposed Development as explained in the Funding Statement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.02]** that forms part of the Application. The Applicant has not received funding from the taxpayer.
General Feedback	LV2_E_004, LV2_E_043, LV2_E_059	Respondents expressed general concern that	Yes	The Applicant's ability to fund the proposed development is explained in

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		Proposed Development is financially risky, uncertain, or not financially viable.		the Funding Statement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.02]**. The Applicant is also backed by Macquarie, a major international investor with a strong record of long-term UK investment. Since 1999, Macquarie has invested more than £65 billion into UK infrastructure, including energy projects, supporting more than 33,000 UK jobs.
General Feedback	LV2_OFF_143, LV2_E_103	Respondents expressed concern that the ownership may be sold or that the sale of the Proposed Development could result in a lack of responsibility and accountability to comply with the specifics of the DCO and proposals.	Yes	The Applicant notes that conditions attached to the DCO transfer with the project, meaning that the Requirements are enforceable for anyone who holds the benefit of the DCO. The Requirements in Schedule 2 to the draft DCO will control the construction, commissioning, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. The Requirements secure a range of detailed plans to manage and mitigate environmental effects, provide planting enhancements and biodiversity net gain.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				A breach of any requirement in the DCO would constitute a criminal offence under the Planning Act 2008. This demonstrates how community and environmental obligations and commitments will be complied with by throughout the Proposed Development's lifetime, regardless of ownership. The Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 would act as a further deterrent to such a breach given that the solar infrastructure would represent a valuable asset for the Applicant.
General Feedback	LV2_E_103	Respondent requested further information on who benefits financially from the Proposed Development.	N/A	In relation to the funding and delivery of the Proposed Development, it is important to clarify that all large-scale energy projects in Great Britain are financed through private investment. This model enables the development of essential low-carbon infrastructure without reliance on public funds. The Applicant is ultimately owned by three investment funds, which are managed by Macquarie Asset Management on

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				behalf of a range of investors, including a number of UK pension funds. These investors would receive returns through the funds, while Macquarie would receive management fees, as is standard. Further funding may come from commercial lenders, who would receive interest payments. The funding structure is common in the energy sector and ensures that the Proposed Development is financially robust and deliverable. Private investment goes beyond generating returns for investors; it brings essential capital, expertise, and innovation to UK solar projects, which can help deliver upgrades and new developments faster and more efficiently. The private funding structure also helps ease pressure on public finances, allowing government resources to be channelled elsewhere. Funding structures like this are designed

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				to build resilient, future-ready infrastructure that benefits everyone. Electricity generated from the Proposed Development will be exported to the National Electricity Transmission System (NETS), and provided to consumers via third party electricity companies, which means that the Applicant cannot commit to the provision of cheaper electricity prices for the specific community surrounding the site. However, building large quantities of renewable generation in the UK is anticipated to keep consumer costs down by capturing and storing energy when it is abundant (therefore cheap) and releasing it when it is needed. Solar remains one of the cheapest forms of electricity generation available with current technologies.
General Feedback	LV2_E_067	Respondent disagreed with the claim that the Proposed Development and, more broadly, increasing solar	N/A	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this comment.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		capacity, will bring down energy bills in the long term, cited the way energy is priced as a reason.		Electricity generated from the Proposed Development will be exported to the National Electricity Transmission System (NETS), and provided to consumers via third party electricity companies, which means that the Applicant cannot commit to the provision of cheaper electricity prices for the specific community surrounding the site. However, building large quantities of renewable generation in the UK is anticipated to keep consumer costs down by capturing and storing energy when it is abundant (therefore cheap) and releasing it when it is needed. Solar remains one of the cheapest forms of electricity generation available with current technologies.
General Feedback	LV2_E_051	Respondent asked if the solar sites are owned by the Applicant or if the lands are leased.	N/A	The Applicant can confirm it will lease land from the landowners. While voluntary agreements are being sought, the Applicant is also seeking Compulsory Acquisition powers under the DCO.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The Applicant has submitted the Book of Reference **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.03]** his includes persons who may be eligible to claim compensation if the Development Consent Order is granted and the Proposed Development consented.
General Feedback	LV2_E_070	Respondent stated that if the Proposed Development was really driven by the free market, and not government subsidies and support, then it simply would not be built in this area.	N/A	The Proposed Development is privately financed and will not receive subsidies. Availability of grid connections drives project locations rather than subsidies. The Proposed Development has strong support of Government policy through the National Policy Statements, which establish that there is an urgent need for new low carbon electricity projects to come forward as soon as possible (see paragraph 3.3.58, NPS EN-1 (January 2026)). The Proposed Development is considered 'Critical National Priority' (CNP) Infrastructure, and therefore the presumptions in favour of CNP infrastructure apply as a starting point,

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				pursuant to paragraphs 4.2.28 – 4.2.30 of NPS EN-1. As set out in the Planning Statement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.02]** and the Consultation Report Appendix 1: Statement of Compliance **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01.01],** the Applicant has satisfied these policy tests.
General Feedback	LV2_E_069	Respondent stated that Arup should have known Site 5 would not be suitable due to flooding, as they worked on the Environment Agency's Yorkshire Asset Recovery Project prior to 2020, where they were responsible for the design of flood defence works adjacent to the proposed development site.	N/A	The Applicant does not automatically discount land subject to flooding, as solar can be developed on such sites, dependent on maximum flood levels and appropriate design. This approach can make use of land which is less suitable for farming because of flood damage to crops. This approach is secured within the Outline Drainage Strategy **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.04]**. In the case of the site referenced in the comment, the Applicant did not include this site in its Application after detailed flood modelling was carried out which confirmed that Solar Development Site 5

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				was not suitable for development due to potential flood depths, and was removed prior to Phase Two Consultation.
General Feedback	LV2_PFF_051, LV2_E_068, LV2_OFF_035, LV2_E_124	Respondents claimed that all assessments and surveys undertaken have been inaccurate.	No	The Applicant respectfully disagrees and has included the results of its surveys within the Application.
General Feedback	LV2_E_068, LV2_OFF_035, LV2_E_124	Respondents expressed scepticism about the impartiality and bias of the Proposed Development team conducting environmental assessments and question the validity of the assessment findings.	N/A	The Applicant is proud to work with professional specialists whose work uses established methodologies. Their reports form part of the Application and set out the approach taken and results. As such they are subject to public scrutiny as part of the examination process.
General Feedback	LV2_E_068, LV2_OFF_035, LV2_E_124	Respondents requested more information on the details of the environmental surveys, express concern that survey data has not been shared.	N/A	The details of the surveys are presented within the Environmental Statement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01]**. Wherever available, survey data was shared in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report.
General Feedback	LV2_E_068, LV2_E_124	Respondents expressed general scepticism about the efficacy of the Proposed	N/A	The Applicant works with professional specialists who have the experience to identify and propose suitable mitigation

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		Development's proposed mitigation measures and ability to reduce impact on local communities.		measures to assess potential impacts. The specialists and the organisations they work for have extensive experience both in their field and in undertaking the relevant surveys and assessments which help form appropriate mitigation measures. ES Volume 1 Chapter 4: Approach to EIA **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]** provides further details on the process, methods and scope of the Environmental Impact Assessments.
General Feedback	LV2_E_124	Respondent expressed concern about the accountability of the Applicant to deliver mitigation measures.	No	The Requirements in Schedule 2 to the draft DCO **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/03.01]** will control the construction, commissioning, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. The Requirements secure a range of detailed plans to manage and mitigate environmental effects, including providing planting enhancements and biodiversity net gain. There is a Schedule in the draft DCO

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				which includes all documents to be certified, and therefore secured, as part of the final consent (if granted). A breach of any requirement in the DCO would constitute a criminal offence. This demonstrates how community and environmental priorities will be fundamental to the Proposed Development operations throughout its lifetime.
General Feedback	LV2_E_124	Respondent stated that visual, noise, traffic, and light impacts must be considered in aggregate, not in isolation.	No	The Application includes assessments of cumulative impact for all relevant aspects, as set out in Chapter 17: Cumulative and In-Combination Effects **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.17]**. The comment here is referring to the need for an assessment of in-combination effects. The Applicant confirms that it has assessed the combined effect of individual impacts from the Proposed Development, which have been identified as part of the assessments reported within ES Chapters 5 to 16 (ES Volume 1)

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01] that are considered likely to result in a new or different likely significant impacts than on their own. For example, this can occur during construction if a receptor is subjected to noise, dust, and visual impacts associated with the Proposed Development. See Tables 17-8 and 17.9 in Chapter 17: Cumulative and In-Combination Effects **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.17]** which set out the potential for significant in-combination effects. For completeness, the Applicant has also assessed cumulative effects, being where there is the potential for two or more developments that are reasonably foreseeable and/or consented, but not yet forming part of the baseline environment, within close enough proximity to the Proposed Development to lead to significant cumulative effects on the same receptor (see: Figure 17.1: Location of Short List Cumulative

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Proposed Developments (ES Volume 2) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.17.01**] and Appendix 17.1: Long List of In-Combination Effects and Cumulative Proposed Developments (ES Volume 3) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.17.01**].
General Feedback	LV2_E_124	Respondent requested a combined visual, noise, and traffic assessment covering Sites 2, 6, and 8.	No	The Application includes assessments of cumulative impact for all relevant aspects, as set out in Chapter 17: Cumulative and In-Combination Effects **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.17]**. The Applicant confirms that it has assessed the combined effect of individual impacts from the Proposed Development, which have been identified as part of the assessments reported within ES Chapters 5 to 16 (ES Volume 1) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01**] that are considered likely to result in a new or different likely significant impacts than on their own. See Tables 17-8 and 17.9 in Chapter 17: Cumulative and In-Combination Effects **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.17]** which

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				set out the potential for significant in-combination effects.
General Feedback	LV2_E_002, LV2_E_004, LV2_PFF_037, LV2_PFF_040, LV2_PFF_041, LV2_PFF_043, LV2_E_045, LV2_OFF_049, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_051, LV2_E_025, LV2_E_069	Respondents expressed concern that panels will be procured from China or not ethically sourced, for example via modern slave labour. Respondent claimed the PEIR fails to provide information on procurement and supply chains.	No	The Applicant's parent company is a signatory of the Solar Energy UK Supply Chain Statement, which commits the company and its projects to sourcing materials produced in a sustainable way with a supply chain free of human rights abuses. It is building on this commitment through membership of the Solar Stewardship Initiative, an international supply chain audit programme, and by using independent international standards bodies to review, inspect and accredit suppliers. The Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan **[EN0110012/App/LVS/07.13]** sets out that international suppliers will be held to a minimum quality with regard to professional and ethical working practices as agreed by the members of Solar Energy UK. This plan is secured in the DCO.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
General Feedback	LV2_PFF_040	Respondent queried why solar panels would be imported when the UK government has placed a moratorium on the use of Chinese panels in the UK.	No	The moratorium referred to applies to panels funded by the Government's Great British Energy and only applies to equipment when there is credible evidence of modern slavery. It is not a ban on using all solar panels manufactured in China. The Applicant's parent company is a signatory of the Solar Energy UK Supply Chain Statement, which commits the company and its projects to sourcing materials produced in a sustainable way with a supply chain free of human rights abuses. It is building on this commitment through membership of the Solar Stewardship Initiative, an international supply chain audit programme, and by using independent international standards bodies to review, inspect and accredit suppliers. The Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan **[EN0110012/App/LVS/07.13]** sets out

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				that international suppliers will be held to a minimum quality with regard to professional and ethical working practices as agreed by the members of Solar Energy UK. This plan is secured in the DCO.
General Feedback	LV2_OFF_146	Respondent raised concerns over quality control of panels and components from China, adds that their could be a risk to installation workers with components not up to UK standards.	No	Panels sold into the UK market must meet applicable standards and this would also be provided for in the Applicant's procurement contracts. The majority of solar panels are produced in China and meet high standards of quality, with external auditing to provide assurance to purchasers.
General Feedback	LV2_E_067	Respondent expressed concern over security regarding procuring panels from China, cited the fact all solar products from China are internet-connected for software updates, meaning they can be remotely switched off. Respondent adds that the	No	The Applicant follows UK government guidance on the security of electrical and electronic equipment. Threats to solar sites are similar to those that can affect all industries, and would be managed by robust cyber security processes that identify, prevent, and mitigate against, potential issues.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		Applicant has not considered this.		
General Feedback	LV2_PFF_040, LV2_E_069, LV2_OFF_042	Respondents questioned where panels will come from.	No	The Applicant has been upfront in stating its expectation that panels will come from China. This is because the majority of solar panels are produced in China. UK manufacturers can supply many of the other components of a solar scheme. The Applicant's parent company is a signatory of the Solar Energy UK Supply Chain Statement, which commits the company and its projects to sourcing materials produced in a sustainable way with a supply chain free of human rights abuses. It is building on this commitment through membership of the Solar Stewardship Initiative, an international supply chain audit programme, and by using independent international standards bodies to review, inspect and accredit suppliers.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
General Feedback	LV2_E_067, LV2_OFF_084	Respondents requested a commitment to sourcing solar panels manufactured in the UK, or look into setting up UK-based production of solar panels.	No	The majority of solar panels are produced in China. UK manufacturers can supply many of the other components of a solar scheme. The Applicant does not manufacture solar equipment and therefore does not have the knowledge or experience to create a UK manufacturer. The Applicant's parent company is a signatory of the Solar Energy UK Supply Chain Statement, which commits the company and its projects to sourcing materials produced in a sustainable way with a supply chain free of human rights abuses. It is building on this commitment through membership of the Solar Stewardship Initiative, an international supply chain audit programme, and by using independent international standards bodies to review, inspect and accredit suppliers. The Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				[EN0110012/App/LVS/07.13] sets out that international suppliers will be held to a minimum quality with regard to professional and ethical working practices as agreed by the members of Solar Energy UK. This plan is secured in the DCO.

Glint and glare

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Glint and Glare	LV2_PFF_041, LV2_OFF_143, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_120, LV2_E_111	Respondents expressed concern about glint and glare from the panels impacting pilots, drivers, horse riders, and walkers. Respondents have expressed their concern over glint and glare impacts to local airfields such as Sherburn, Burn Gliding Club, and Doncaster-Sheffield Airport.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges these comments. As part of the Application, the Applicant submitted a Solar Photovoltaic Glint and Glare Study **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.04]**. The Applicant considered the impact of the Proposed Development from a glint and glare perspective on the Sherburn-In-Elmet Airfield and Burn Airfield within the Glint and Glare Study **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.04]**, and which is discussed further in ES Volume 1 Chapter 16: Other Environmental Matters **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.16]**, with mitigation recommended, which are secured in the Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.03]**).

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Doncaster Sheffield Airport has been scoped out from assessment as it is located approximately 30 km from the nearest Solar Development Site. The assessment methodology sets out a 10 km distance for licensed airports.
Glint and Glare	LV2_PFF_051, LV2_OFF_143, LV2_E_059, LV2_E_124	Respondents expressed concern about glint and glare from the panels into properties and houses.	Yes	The Applicant's Glint and Glare Study **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.04]** submitted as part of the Application concludes that no significant impacts are predicted towards dwellings. The assessment adds that for all receptors where glare is geometrically possible, screening will be present in the form of existing and/or proposed vegetation or reflections occur in the presence of significant mitigating factors. Further information on the assessments conducted, the methodology used, and outcomes of the assessments, can be found in the Glint and Glare Study **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.04]**.
Glint and Glare	LV2_E_090, LV2_E_074, LV2_E_079	Respondents expressed concern for the impact on	Yes	The Applicant considered the impact of the Proposed Development from a glint and glare perspective on the Sherburn-

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		Sherburn Aero Club specifically.		In-Elmet Airfield within the Glint and Glare Study **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.04]**, and which is discussed further in ES Volume 1 Chapter 16: Other Environmental Matters **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.16]**, with mitigation recommended, which are secured in the Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.03]**). Consultation is being undertaken to understand their position towards the Proposed Development and their operations.
Glint and Glare	LV2_OFF_004, LV2_E_079	Respondents enquired as to whether an assessment for A63 road users driving next to the site will be carried out and how issues identified will be mitigated.	Yes	The Glint and Glare Study **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.04]** submitted as part of the Application, concludes that no significant impacts are predicted towards road receptors. For all receptors where glare is geometrically possible, screening will be present in the form of existing and/or proposed vegetation or reflections occur

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				in the presence of significant mitigating factors. This is secured in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**. Table 3 of the Glint and Glare Study **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.04]** sets out a summary of the roads identified within the assessment areas, which includes the A63.
Glint and Glare	LV2_E_124	Respondent expressed glint and glare mitigations are insufficient.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. The Glint and Glare Study **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.04]** sets out the mitigation strategy proposed in relation to different categories of receptors. Mitigation measures have been secured in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]** and the Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.03]**.
Glint and Glare	LV2_OFF_109	Respondent opposes the proximity positioning of	Yes	The Applicant's Glint and Glare Study **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.04]**

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		automated elevational panels to the perimeter of the Proposed Development, particularly those boundaries to locally adopted highways.		submitted as part of the Application concludes that no significant impacts are predicted towards dwellings. The assessment adds that for all receptors where glare is geometrically possible, screening will be present in the form of existing and/or proposed vegetation or reflections occur in the presence of significant mitigating factors. Further information on the assessments conducted, the methodology used, and outcomes of the assessments, can be found in the Glint and Glare Study **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.04]**. Mitigation measures have been secured in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05].**
Glint and Glare	LV2_E_080	Respondent stated that the Glint and Glare assessment referred to Burn and Sherburn Airfields only. The respondent asked if any communication had occurred	Yes	The assessment methodology followed for the Glint and Glare Study **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.04]** sets out a 10 km distance for licensed airports. As Doncaster Sheffield Airport and Leeds Bradford Airport both lie beyond 10 km from the nearest Solar

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		with Leeds Bradford Airport and Doncaster.		Development Site, both airports have been scoped out of the assessment.
	LV2_E_124	Respondent requested night-time light-spill modelling for all Site 2 substations, switch rooms, and BESS compounds.		Lighting, including for both the construction and operational phases, considering aspects including light spill, has been assessed as part of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and is further detailed in ES Volume 1 Chater 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]**. The Applicant has prepared an outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) **[EN00110012/APP/LVS/07.03]** which secures measures for the control of operational lighting, including the use of motion detection security lighting to avoid permanent lighting within the substation and BESS area, while a sensitive lighting scheme will be developed ensuring inward distribution of light and avoiding light spill onto existing boundary features.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Glint and Glare	LV2_E_124	Respondent requested that the Applicant demonstrate zero lux at the curtilage of residential properties through downward-shielded, motion-activated fixtures.	Yes	The Applicant can confirm that lighting used during the construction phase will utilise directional fittings to minimise outward light spill and glare, such as through the use of light hoods/cowls which direct light below the horizontal plane, preferably at an angle greater than 20° from horizontal. Lighting will be directed towards the middle of the works areas rather than towards the boundaries. Measures to control lighting during the construction phase are set out in and secured through the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.02]** with further detail outlined in ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]** and Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10].**

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Regular lighting is not required within the majority of the Solar Development Sites during the operational phase of the Proposed Development, and no lighting is proposed for the Cable Route Corridor. All routine maintenance activities would be scheduled for daylight hours as far as is practicable, and therefore it is anticipated that lighting should only be required in the event of emergency works/equipment failure requiring night-time working. Motion sensing security lighting would be provided within the substation compounds and within the BESS Compound to be used to maintain safe working conditions in winter months, security purposes, and maintenance activities. The lighting commitments for the operational phase are set out in the outline Operational Environmental Masterplan (oOEMP), **[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.03]**, including

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				details on lighting design, such that light spill is anticipated to be minimal.
Glint and Glare	LV2_E_124	Respondent requested that the lighting design and lux limits are made as an enforceable DCO Requirement.	Yes	The lighting design is outlined in ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]** and are secured through the oCEMP **[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.02]** and oOEMP **[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.03]** which accompany the DCO Application and are secured by way of DCO Requirement. In addition, a Commitments Register is included as part of the Application and can be found in ES Volume 3 Appendix 1.3: Commitments Register **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.01.03]**. The register is intended to allow stakeholders to track commitments from the Environmental Statement through to the relevant securing mechanisms. The register itself is not intended to be secured, it simply provides a record of

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				the commitments that have been made by the Applicant and the mechanisms by which they are secured, such as the oCEMP and oOEMP for commitments regarding construction phase and operational phase lighting respectfully.

Human health

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Human Health	LV2_PFF_033, LV2_PFF_037, LV2_E_038, LV2_OFF_146, LV2_PFF_054, LV2_E_064, LV2_OFF_117, LV2_OFF_073, LV2_OFF_062, LV2_E_117, LV2_E_086, LV2_E_032, LV2_E_116, LV2_E_101, LV2_E_103, LV2_E_107, LV2_E_077	Respondents expressed concern over the potential effect of the Proposed Development on residents' mental health and well-being. Some respondents express concern about the potential increase in stress among residents.	No	The Applicant notes the comments. A screening and scoping exercise was undertaken for human health as part of the EIA Scoping Report (ES Volume 3 Appendix 1.1: EIA Scoping Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.01.01]**) and concluded that there would be no significant effects with regard to environmental amenity; access to health and social care; community safety; access to open land and nature; or access to work and training. The Planning Inspectorate accepted the scoping out of a human health chapter but identified that it was essential that mental health impacts are not overlooked (See ES Volume 3 Appendix 1.2: EIA Scoping Opinion **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.01.02]**).
Human Health	LV2_OFF_145, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068, LV2_OFF_069, LV2_OFF_066,	Respondents expressed concern that not enough has been done to address safety	No	The potential for effects on population health have been considered in ES Volume 1 Chapter 4: Approach to EIA

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_OFF_058, LV2_E_120, LV2_E_122	of humans (residents, businesses, visiting etc.) in general.		**[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.04]** and no potentially significant effects were identified. Issues relating to safety are considered across the ES chapters, including battery fire safety measures, as detailed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 16: Other Environmental Matters **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.16]** and secured through the outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.06]**. Road and pedestrian safety measures, including adequate signage, set access routes away from pedestrian areas, and improvements to sightlines and driver visibility, are detailed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.14]** and secured through the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]**.
Human Health	LV2_E_117, LV2_E_103	Respondents enquired if the Applicant is aware of any long-term health effects of	No	The Applicant is not aware of any such effects.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		living close to a large solar farm.		
Human Health	LV2_E_117	Respondent expressed concern about the impact on health of pets and livestock.	No	The Applicant can confirm that no potential effects on the health of pets and livestock are anticipated.
Human Health	LV2_E_004	Respondent expressed concern regarding the dust pollution of the construction process impacting human health.	No	ES Volume 3 Appendix 16.1: Construction Dust Assessment **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.01]**, has considered potential human health impacts as a result of the construction of the Proposed Development. Following application of best practice mitigation measures (which are provided in Appendix 16.1: Construction Dust Assessment), there would be no significant effect on human health.
Human Health	LV2_E_004	Respondent expressed concern regarding toxic chemicals in the Solar Panels.	No	The Applicant can confirm the use of chemicals within the Proposed Development would be minimal, with no PFAS (forever chemicals) present in solar panel coatings or on BESS batteries. The solar cells would be made from silicon, a material with properties almost the same as sand. They may contain very small amounts of heavy

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				metals, but these are well within the limits set by law; this is confirmed by the Applicant checking the results of testing in independent laboratories. Ground contamination was considered as part of the Preliminary Risk Assessment (PRA) undertaken for ground conditions (ES Volume 3: Appendix 16.3 Ground Conditions Preliminary Risk Assessment [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.03]**). The PRA is further detailed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 16:Other Environmental Issues **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.16]**, where it is acknowledged that while risks from contamination to the Proposed Development are typically low for the Solar Development Sites, the conceptual site model will be confirmed through a further ground investigation, to be undertaken post consent, prior to the start of construction activities.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Human Health	LV2_OFF_143	Respondent reported that their daughter has autism and their neighbour's son has schizophrenia; respondent is deeply concerned about the impact of noise and glare to the quality of life of both of them.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The potential for effects on population health has been considered in ES Volume 1 Chapter 4: Approach to EIA **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.04]**, concluding that no likely significant effects on health (including children's health) are anticipated. Specifically, regarding noise impacts, the Applicant confirms that assessments of construction and operational noise and vibration were undertaken in accordance with the methodologies outlined in Section 11.5 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.11]**; predicted construction noise levels are presented in ES Volume 3 Appendix 11.2: Construction Noise and Vibration Assumptions and Results **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.11.02]**. The assessments conclude that adverse effects from construction noise and

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				vibration are not significant, while the effects of operational noise are assessed as not significant beyond the closest residential receptors. Details of noise mitigation measures are presented in Section 11.8 of ES Chapter 11. Regarding glare, a Glint and Glare Assessment was undertaken (ES Volume 3 Appendix 16.4: Glint and Glare Assessment **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.04]**). As detailed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 16: Other Environmental Matters **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.16]**, no significant glint and glare impacts are predicted upon roads, residential amenity, railway operations, or public rights of way, Where mitigation is recommended it is secured in the oCEMP **[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.02]** and in the Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				(oOEMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.03]**).
Human Health	LV2_E_064	Respondent stated that removing green, recreational space will do harm to the fight against obesity in children.	Yes	The potential for effects on population health and wellbeing associated with impacts on green recreational space has been considered in ES Volume 1 Chapter 4: Approach to EIA **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.04]**. No likely significant effects on health (including children's health) were identified. The Proposed Development will increase access to green and recreational spaces with approximately 8 km (5 miles) of new permissive paths to be created (as shown on the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**) increasing access to nature and the countryside. In addition, access to existing routes will be maintained throughout the construction phase, with three permanent diversions planned, as

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				secured through the outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.09]**).

Hydrology, flood risk and drainage

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage	LV2_OFF_025, LV2_PFF_028, LV2_PFF_047, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_OFF_125, LV2_E_066, LV2_E_068, LV2_OFF_069, LV2_E_021, LV2_OFF_102, LV2_E_121, LV2_E_123, LV2_E_112, LV2_E_030, LV2_E_077	Respondents expressed concern about the Proposed Development's potential impact on flood risk and/or express concern for an increase in flood risk. Some respondents specified that water run-off would increase flood risk.	Yes	Flood risk from all relevant sources has been carefully considered within the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), included in ES Volume 3 Appendix 15.1: Flooding Risk Assessment **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01]**. The FRA assesses both the risk of flooding to the development itself and the potential effects of the Proposed Development on flood risk elsewhere, including from surface water runoff, in line with current planning policy and guidance. The assessment has been informed by ongoing consultation with the Environment Agency, Lead Local Flood Authority, and relevant Internal Drainage Boards. Appropriate mitigation measures are proposed within the FRA and the Outline Drainage Strategy **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.04]** to ensure that flood risk is not increased as

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				a result of the development. The Applicant has and continues to engage with key stakeholders on issues related to flood risk and drainage.
Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage	LV2_OFF_125, LV2_OFF_069, LV2_OFF_068, LV2_E_123, LV2_E_077	Respondents expressed they do not believe risk of flooding has been adequately considered by the Applicant.	Yes	Flood risk from all relevant sources has been carefully considered within the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), included in ES Volume 3 Appendix 15.1: Flooding Risk Assessment **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01]**. The FRA assesses both the risk of flooding to the development itself and the potential effects of the Proposed Development on flood risk elsewhere, including from surface water runoff, in line with current planning policy and guidance. The assessment has been informed by ongoing consultation with the Environment Agency, Lead Local Flood Authority, and relevant Internal Drainage Boards. Appropriate mitigation measures are proposed within the FRA

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				and the Outline Drainage Strategy **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.04]** to ensure that flood risk is not increased as a result of the development.
Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage	LV2_PFF_028, LV2_OFF_068	Respondents requested further information on what mitigation measures are in place regarding flood risk.	Yes	Mitigation measures relating to flood risk are set out within the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA, ES Volume 3 Appendix 15.1: Flooding Risk Assessment **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01]**) prepared for the Proposed Development. These include measures applicable to the design, construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development, to manage flood risk on-site and to ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Measures relating to construction-phase flood risk management are also addressed within the Outline Construction Environmental

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Management Plan (oCEMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**).
Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage	LV2_PFF_028, LV2_E_123	Respondents expressed general scepticism about proposed flooding and water security mitigation measures.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. Flood risk and associated water-related effects, including water quality, have been rigorously assessed and are further detailed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 15: Water Resources and Flood Risk **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.15]**. Based on these assessments and in consultation with relevant statutory bodies such as the Environment Agency (EA), appropriate mitigation measures have been designed and proposed to manage flood risk and water-related effects. These include the provision of a minimum offset of 10 m from all watercourses (50 m for Canal and River Trust watercourses, e.g. River Ouse) and their associated riparian zones from all infrastructure (including fencing) and construction works (e.g. oil/ fuel storage, stockpiles etc); and, locating the BESS Compound outside of Flood Zone 2 and

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				3 to minimise the loss of floodplain and associated adverse flood risk effects. In addition, the solar panels will be designed to be flood resilient, with its associated electrical infrastructure naturally elevated to provide freeboard. These and other mitigation measures will ensure that flood risk is not increased as a result of the Proposed Development. These are outlined in Chapter 15 and ES Volume 3 Appendix 15.1: Flooding Risk Assessment **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01]** and Appendix 15.4: Outline Drainage Strategy **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.04]**.
Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage	LV2_OFF_068	Respondent expressed general concern for both natural and man made drainage systems.	Yes	The Applicant has considered both natural and man-made drainage systems as part of the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01]**). The Applicant reviewed the North Yorkshire Sustainable urban Drainage System (SuDS) Guidance, which sets

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				out design expectations and requirements for sustainable drainage systems, and to follow the Drainage Hierarchy alongside supplementary infiltration testing guidance to ensure infiltration feasibility is properly assessed – this has informed the Outline Drainage Strategy **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.04]**, which further details the appropriate measures to manage drainage and flood risk associated with the Proposed Development.
Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage	LV2_OFF_098	Respondent asked if communication has occurred with the Internal Drainage Board regarding access to dykes and ditches.	Yes	The Applicant has engaged with the Environment Agency, Lead Local Flood Authority, and relevant Internal Drainage Boards (Selby Area and Ouse and Derwent). Appropriate measures have been agreed with the IDBs and set out in ES Volume 3 Appendix 1.3: Design Parameters and Commitments document **[EN00110012/APP/LVS/05.06]**,

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				including the provision of minimum offset distances from watercourses including a minimum offset of 10 m from bank top for all watercourses (50 m for Canal and River Trust watercourses, e.g. River Ouse) and their associated riparian zones from all infrastructure to facilitate access for inspection and maintenance. Any works to, or within the buffer of, IDB-maintained watercourses would be subject to the relevant post-DCO consents.
Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage	LV2_PFF_017, LV2_PFF_052	Respondents stated that the Solar Development Site 4 water table is at a high risk of flooding.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Groundwater and the potential for groundwater flooding at Solar Development Site 4 is considered within Annex D of ES Volume 3 Appendix 15.1: Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01]**. The FRA notes that while parts of Solar Development Site 4 lie within Flood Zones 2 and 3, the site is not at high risk of groundwater flooding. Groundwater susceptibility across the site is variable,

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				with some areas showing potential for shallow groundwater, particularly near watercourses. However, there is no substantial evidence of widespread or severe groundwater flooding, and the overall groundwater flood risk is assessed as low to medium. In addition, solar panels and their associated mounting structures will be designed to be flood resilient, as set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 15: Water Resources and Flood Risk **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.15]**.
Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage	LV2_PFF_028, LV2_OFF_069	Respondents expressed concern for Wistow's flood defences if a flood occurs during construction.	Yes	The Applicant notes this concern, the functionality of flood defences will not be impacted by the Proposed Development should a flood occur during construction. The potential effects on existing flood defences during construction of the Cable Route Corridor have been considered within Annex H of ES Volume 3 Appendix 15.1: Flood Risk Assessment (FRA, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01]**).

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				With reference to ES Volume 2 Figure 15.14 **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.15.14]** which shows the EA's Asset Information and Maintenance Systems (AIMS) Spatial Flood Defence dataset, this Cable Route Corridor can be seen to cross flood defences indicated to be present on the River Ouse and the Selby Dam. As such, an assessment of existing flood defence assets has been completed for this Cable Route Corridor and is presented in Section H.4 of Annex H. Any works within proximity to or impacting existing flood defences would be undertaken in consultation with the EA and subject to the necessary approvals under their Protective Provisions in the DCO. Any works would be designed to ensure there is no adverse effect on the integrity or operation of the flood defence during construction.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage	LV2_PFF_047	Respondent reported that Solar Development Site 4 is regularly underwater / flooded.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. The potential for flooding at Solar Development Site 4 is considered within Annex D of ES Volume 3 Appendix 15.1: Flood Risk Assessment (FRA, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01]**). The FRA notes that while parts of Solar Development Site 4 lie within Flood Zones 2 and 3, the site is not at high risk of groundwater flooding. Groundwater susceptibility across the site is variable, with some areas showing potential for shallow groundwater, particularly near watercourses. However, there is no substantial evidence of widespread or severe groundwater flooding, and the overall groundwater flood risk is assessed as low to medium. In addition, solar panels and their associated mounting structures will be designed to be flood resilient, as set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 15: Water Resources and Flood Risk **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.15]**.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage	LV2_E_001	Respondent stated that there is an increasingly high risk of flooding in Solar Development Site 1.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Flood risk at Solar Development Site 1 from all relevant sources has been carefully considered within Annex A of ES Volume 3 Appendix 15.1: Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01]**. Solar Development Site 1 is divided into parcels, with the northern parcel primarily shown to be in Flood Zone 1, indicating a very low probability of flooding. The southern parcel, however, falls within Flood Zones 2 and 3. The majority of the site is shown to be at very low risk of surface water flooding (chance of flooding less than 0.1% each year). No significant surface water flow paths are shown to be located within Solar Development Site 1, with areas at a higher risk of surface water flooding generally aligning with the existing IDB drains, ordinary watercourses, and field margins. Considering the site topography from north to south, the risk

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				of flooding from surface water to Solar Development Site 1 is considered to be low. Flood risk from groundwater has also been assessed as being low, while from artificial sources it has been assessed as being very low. In addition, solar panels and their associated mounting structures will be designed to be flood resilient, as set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 15: Water Resources and Flood Risk **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.15]**.
Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage	LV2_E_001	Respondent stated that Solar Development Site 1 appears to be in Flood Zone 1 and Flood Zone 3 on the environmental flooding map.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. As detailed in Annex A of ES Volume 3 Appendix 15.1: Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01]**, Solar Development Site 1 is divided into parcels, with the northern parcel primarily shown to be in Flood Zone 1, indicating a very low probability of flooding. The southern parcel, however, falls within Flood Zones 2 and 3. The majority of the site is shown to be at

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				very low risk of surface water flooding (chance of flooding less than 0.1% each year). No significant surface water flow paths are shown to be located within Solar Development Site 1, with areas at a higher risk of surface water flooding generally aligning with the existing IDB drains, ordinary watercourses, and field margins. Considering the site topography from north to south, the risk of flooding from surface water to Solar Development Site 1 is considered to be low. Flood risk from groundwater has also been assessed as being low, while from artificial sources it has been assessed as being very low. In addition, solar panels and their associated mounting structures will be designed to be flood resilient, as set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 15: Water Resources and Flood Risk **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.15]**.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage	LV2_E_112,	Respondent expressed concern about the flood risk at Sites 6 and 7 through soil compaction.	Yes	The potential effects of soil compaction during construction have been considered within the Outline Drainage Strategy **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.04]** and the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**) which considers appropriate construction-phase measures to be implemented to manage this risk.
Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage	LV2_PFF_052	Respondent expressed support for the decision to remove Site 5 due to flood risk.	No	The Applicant notes and welcomes this comment.
Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage	LV2_OFF_125	Respondent reported that farms to the North - North East of Monk Fryston frequently flood, adds their concern that run-off will make this worse.	Yes	The potential effects of surface water runoff are considered within the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01]** and Outline Drainage Strategy **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.04]** which considers appropriate measures to be implemented to manage the risk

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				from surface water runoff and prevent off-site impacts.
Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage	LV2_OFF_069	Respondent expressed concern for flooding of the cable, points out the proximity of the cable corridor to the flood-prone River Ouse.	Yes	The Applicant notes this concern. The cable would be installed below ground and flood risk associated with the cable corridor, including its proximity to the River Ouse, has been assessed within Annex H of ES Volume 3 Appendix 15.1: Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01]**.
Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage	LV2_OFF_068	Respondent expressed concern over flooding to Fryston Common Lane, points out that in the past the land at Site 2 was waterlogged, only recently drained for agriculture, however flood issues persist on both the site and FCL.	Yes	The Applicant notes this concern. Flood risk at Solar Development Site 2 and potential effects on surrounding areas, including Fryston Common Lane, have been assessed within the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and Outline Drainage Strategy (ES Volume 3 Appendix 15.4: **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.04]**) Access to the northern land parcel of Site 2 would be provided via an access point from the south, allowing vehicles to cross Fryston Common Lane. Consideration would be given to any

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				existing drainage infrastructure at this location to ensure drainage performance is maintained and to mitigate any potential flood risk impacts. Standard construction or operational traffic is not proposed to be routed via Fryston Common Lane, with Fryston Common Lane itself providing a secondary access point for emergency purposes only, thereby avoiding any additional pressure on associated drainage or highway infrastructure. The FRA and Outline Drainage Strategy consider the risk of flooding from all relevant sources, including highway drainage, and identify appropriate measures to ensure that the Proposed Development would not increase flood risk to Fryston Common Lane or surrounding land, in accordance with national planning policy.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage	LV2_OFF_068	Respondent expressed concern for the water table and changing watercourses, cited subsidence problems caused by Selby Coalfield's water pumping, which impacted a number of properties including one in Priory Park Grove, leading to remedial work by British Coal.	No	Impacts on surface water and groundwater levels and flows are assessed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 15: Water Resources and Flood Risk **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.15]** and the accompanying Flood Risk Assessment (FRA, ES Volume 3 Appendix 15.1 **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01]**). Below ground construction for the foundations of the BESS and substations is not anticipated to require dewatering. If groundwater control measures are required, these would be non-consumptive with water returned to the aquifer.
Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage	LV2_E_059, LV2_OFF_068, LV2_E_079, LV2_E_030, LV2_E_032, LV2_OFF_091	Respondents expressed concern for contamination of the water table and water bodies caused by water run-off, with herbicides, de-weeding chemicals, and chemicals from a BESS fire potentially contaminating	No	Impacts on surface water and groundwater quality and the underlying aquifers are assessed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 15: Water Resources and Flood Risk **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.15]** and the accompanying Flood Risk Assessment (FRA, ES Volume 3

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		local fresh water. Some respondents noted that the aquifer which supplies drinking water lies underneath the Proposed Development.		Appendix 15.1 **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01]**). The Outline Drainage Strategy **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.04]** and Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.06]**) contain details of the requirements and measures employed to manage the pollution risks from firewater runoff, including firewater containment and testing prior to disposal. In an event where contamination is confirmed, the contaminated runoff will be disposed of by a licenced waste contractor off-site.

Landscape and visual

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Landscape and Visual	LV2_PFF_014, LV2_PFF_015, LV2_OFF_003, LV2_OFF_009, LV2_OFF_010, LV2_OFF_014, LV2_OFF_016, LV2_OFF_020, LV2_E_002, LV2_E_007, LV2_E_008, LV2_E_010, LV2_E_012, LV2_E_013, LV2_E_014, LV2_E_016, LV2_E_017, LV2_E_019, LV2_E_022, LV2_E_027, LV2_E_009, LV2_OFF_021, LV2_OFF_023, LV2_OFF_024, LV2_OFF_027, LV2_PFF_021, LV2_OFF_033, LV2_PFF_023, LV2_PFF_024, LV2_PFF_025, LV2_PFF_030, LV2_OFF_034, LV2_PFF_036, LV2_PFF_037, LV2_PFF_039, LV2_PFF_041, LV2_PFF_043, LV2_PFF_050,	Respondents expressed concern about the visual impact of the Proposed Development. Many expressed belief that the local rural character will be impacted, industrialising the area, and that this will be a permanent impact.	No	A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and is reported in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]**. The LVIA assesses the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development on both landscape character and visual amenity during construction, operation and decommissioning, in accordance with the relevant legislation, policy, standards and guidance set out in Chapter 10, Section 10.3. The design of the Proposed Development has been informed by an environmentally led approach, with landscape and visual considerations embedded from the outset. This has included site selection, iterative layout refinement, appropriate offsets from sensitive receptors, and the retention of

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_L_001, LV2_E_035, LV2_E_036, LV2_E_037, LV2_E_039, LV2_E_042, LV2_E_045, LV2_E_048, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_E_061, LV2_OFF_147, LV2_OFF_146, LV2_OFF_040, LV2_PFF_054, LV2_PFF_053, LV2_OFF_141, LV2_OFF_140, LV2_OFF_133, LV2_OFF_128, LV2_OFF_046, LV2_OFF_126, LV2_OFF_122, LV2_E_062, LV2_OFF_049, LV2_E_064, LV2_E_065, LV2_E_066, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_070, LV2_E_071, LV2_E_055, LV2_E_057, LV2_E_060, LV2_E_069, LV2_OFF_114, LV2_OFF_112, LV2_OFF_109, LV2_OFF_107,			existing landscape features such as hedgerows, trees and woodland where practicable. These embedded mitigation measures are described in Chapter 10, Section 10.8. Mitigation measures include substantial new planting, reinforcement of existing vegetation, careful siting and height control of infrastructure, and minimisation of lighting to avoid unnecessary urbanising effects. While landscape mitigation takes time to establish, the LVIA demonstrates that by Year 15 of operation, once planting has matured, the majority of landscape and visual effects would reduce to minor or non-significant levels. These are shown on the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]** and will be secured through the Works Plans **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.03]** and Outline Landscape and Ecology

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_OFF_073, LV2_OFF_070, LV2_OFF_069, LV2_OFF_068, LV2_OFF_065, LV2_OFF_063, LV2_OFF_062, LV2_E_021, LV2_OFF_061, LV2_OFF_060, LV2_E_023, LV2_OFF_058, LV2_OFF_057, LV2_OFF_055, LV2_OFF_053, LV2_OFF_105, LV2_OFF_100, LV2_OFF_098, LV2_OFF_096, LV2_OFF_095, LV2_OFF_042, LV2_OFF_035, LV2_E_082, LV2_E_081, LV2_E_080, LV2_E_118, LV2_E_119, LV2_E_121, LV2_E_122, LV2_E_123, LV2_E_079, LV2_E_124, LV2_E_085,			Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**. Further mitigation measures relating to construction and decommissioning are set out in Chapter 10, Section 10.10, and will be secured through the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]** and the Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04]**, respectively. The Applicant acknowledges that the Proposed Development would introduce changes to the character of parts of the landscape and to some views. However, the LVIA concludes that, with embedded and additional mitigation, the resulting effects would be localised, reversible and would reduce over time. This approach is consistent with paragraph 5.10.5 of the Overarching National

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_E_086, LV2_E_088, LV2_E_090, LV2_E_091, LV2_E_092, LV2_E_093, LV2_E_094, LV2_E_096, LV2_E_097, LV2_E_099, LV2_E_111, LV2_E_100, LV2_PFF_061, LV2_PFF_060, LV2_E_026, LV2_E_029, LV2_E_030, LV2_E_031, LV2_E_115, LV2_E_116, LV2_E_101, LV2_E_032, LV2_E_102, LV2_E_033, LV2_E_034, LV2_OFF_089, LV2_OFF_088, LV2_OFF_086, LV2_E_105, LV2_E_108, LV2_OFF_080, LV2_OFF_079, LV2_OFF_077, LV2_OFF_076, LV2_OFF_074, LV2_E_084, LV2_E_083, LV2_E_072			Policy Statement for Energy (NPS EN-1), which recognises that "virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will have adverse effects on the landscape," while also acknowledging that beneficial landscape character effects may arise through mitigation. ES Chapter 10, paragraph 10.8.3 further explains how the LVIA has been central to achieving the criteria for good design set out in NPS EN-1 and the Planning Inspectorate's NSIP Advice on Good Design (2024), and that this has been a key consideration from the outset. At the end of the Proposed Development's operational life, the oDEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04]** will be implemented for decommissioning works. This will provide for the removal of infrastructure and the restoration of the land to its former use. The proposed green infrastructure is expected to be retained

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				as part of decommissioning works, except where required for access.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_OFF_010, LV2_OFF_013, LV2_OFF_014, LV2_E_007, LV2_E_008, LV2_E_010, LV2_E_012, LV2_E_013, LV2_E_014, LV2_E_016, LV2_E_017, LV2_E_019, LV2_E_022, LV2_E_027, LV2_E_009, LV2_OFF_026, LV2_PFF_018, LV2_PFF_019, LV2_PFF_025, LV2_PFF_031, LV2_OFF_034, LV2_PFF_037, LV2_PFF_039, LV2_PFF_050, LV2_E_035, LV2_E_036, LV2_E_041, LV2_E_045, LV2_E_048, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_E_061, LV2_OFF_147, LV2_OFF_040, LV2_OFF_133, LV2_OFF_119, LV2_E_062, LV2_OFF_049, LV2_E_063, LV2_E_065, LV2_E_066, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_070,	Respondents expressed that the Proposed Development is too big, and that it should be reduced in size.	No	The Statement of Need **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.03]** describes that there is an urgent and unprecedented need for new low carbon generation in the UK to meet our climate change, energy security and affordability targets. Further, the Government considers that a secure, reliable, affordable, net zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar (NPS EN-1, Para 3.3.20). The Applicant remains committed to delivering a development that makes a meaningful contribution to the UK's transition to net zero, while also seeking to minimise adverse impacts and maximise opportunities for environmental enhancement and community benefits.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_E_071, LV2_OFF_073, LV2_OFF_070, LV2_OFF_069, LV2_OFF_068, LV2_E_023, LV2_OFF_056, LV2_OFF_042, LV2_E_082, LV2_E_081, LV2_E_117, LV2_E_118, LV2_E_119, LV2_E_121, LV2_E_122, LV2_E_088, LV2_E_090, LV2_E_094, LV2_E_096, LV2_PFF_044, LV2_OFF_105, LV2_E_100, LV2_E_026, LV2_E_115, LV2_E_102, LV2_E_107, LV2_E_108, LV2_OFF_080, LV2_E_076, LV2_E_075, LV2_E_072			The scale and extent of the Proposed Development have been informed by an environmentally led design process, with landscape and visual considerations forming a key part of site selection, option testing and iterative design refinement, as set out in ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]**. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) assesses the effects of the Proposed Development at its maximum design parameters, representing a reasonable worst-case scenario, and considers landscape and visual effects during construction, operation (Year 1 and Year 15) and decommissioning. The LVIA demonstrates that, while the Proposed Development would introduce change to the landscape, effects would be localised and would reduce over time as mitigation planting establishes. On this basis, the Applicant considers that

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				the scale of the Proposed Development is appropriate to meet the identified energy need and that further reductions in size would undermine its ability to deliver nationally significant renewable energy benefits, without proportionate reductions in environmental effects.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_OFF_055, LV2_OFF_060, LV2_OFF_062, LV2_OFF_063, LV2_OFF_079, LV2_OFF_082, LV2_OFF_094, LV2_OFF_095, LV2_OFF_100, LV2_OFF_116, LV2_OFF_122, LV2_OFF_133, LV2_E_030, LV2_E_032, LV2_E_066, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_069, LV2_E_070, LV2_E_071, LV2_E_079, LV2_E_091, LV2_E_093, LV2_E_112, LV2_E_113, LV2_E_122,	Respondents expressed concern for the visual impact of the Proposed Development on nearby homes. Respondent expressed general concern that the sites are too close to residential areas. Some respondents express that the buffer zones are too small/need to be bigger. Some respondents express that the Proposed Development is too close to		A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and is reported in ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]**. The LVIA assesses the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development on both landscape character and visual amenity during construction, operation and decommissioning, in accordance with the relevant legislation, policy, standards and guidance set out in Chapter 10, Section 10.3. The design of the Proposed Development has been informed by an environmentally-led approach, with

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_E_123, LV2_E_124, LV2_PFF_018, LV2_PFF_019, LV2_PFF_030, LV2_PFF_043, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_PFF_057, LV2_PFF_060, LV2_PFF_061	villages, properties, rivers, and/or woodlands. Some respondents express concern about the size of buffer zones between the BESS sites and properties.		residential amenity and proximity to sensitive receptors considered throughout site selection and layout refinement. This has included setting development boundaries away from villages and residential properties where practicable; providing offsets from Public Rights of Way, watercourses and woodland; retaining existing vegetation; and incorporating substantial new planting to screen and filter views. These embedded mitigation measures are set out in Chapter 10, Section 10.8, with additional mitigation set out in Section 10.10 and secured through the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]** and the Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04]**. The LVIA demonstrates that some residential receptors would experience adverse changes to views during

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				construction and operation (Section 10.9; Appendix 10.3: Visual Baseline and Effects **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.10.03]**). However, the assessment shows that these effects will reduce over time as mitigation planting establishes, with the majority of visual effects on residential receptors negligible adverse by Year 15 of operation (Tables 10.22 and 10.26; Section 10.8), with only one residential receptor assessed as having moderate adverse (significant) effects. The LVIA has not identified any residual effects on the views of residents that would remain of major significance (the highest category) at Year 15 of operation. The Applicant notes the concerns regarding buffer zones between BESS sites and properties. As shown on the Works Plans **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.03]** and the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				the BESS site at Site 2 has been located away from residential receptors. Within the buffer zones, areas within 10 m of BESS enclosures would not contain combustible vegetation and would not be planted with any new combustible vegetation wherever possible, one of a series of measures to further reduce risks and enhance safety in the unlikely event of a BESS fire, as detailed and secured through the Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.06]**.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_E_009, LV2_PFF_036, LV2_E_036, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_069, LV2_OFF_114, LV2_OFF_068, LV2_OFF_063, LV2_OFF_062, LV2_OFF_058, LV2_OFF_057, LV2_OFF_095, LV2_OFF_042, LV2_E_122,	Respondents expressed general concern for the visual impact of specific components of the Proposed Development, with respondents highlighting the solar panels, inverters, substations, and the BESS Site.		A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and is reported in ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]**. The design development included visual considerations form the outset. This has included site selection, iterative layout refinement, appropriate offsets from sensitive receptors, and the retention of

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_E_123, LV2_E_124, LV2_E_085, LV2_E_031, LV2_E_032, LV2_E_033			existing landscape features such as hedgerows, trees and woodland where practicable. These embedded mitigation measures are described in Chapter 10, Section 10.8. Mitigation measures include substantial new planting, reinforcement of existing vegetation, careful siting and height control of infrastructure, and minimisation of lighting to avoid unnecessary urbanising effects. While landscape mitigation takes time to establish, the LVIA demonstrates that by Year 15 of operation, once planting has matured, the majority of landscape and visual effects would reduce to minor or non-significant levels. These are shown on the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]** and will be secured through the Works Plans [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.03**] and Outline Landscape and Ecology

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**. The Applicant acknowledges that the Proposed Development would introduce changes to the character of parts of the landscape and to some views. However, the LVIA concludes that, with embedded and additional mitigation, the resulting effects would be localised, reversible and would reduce over time. This approach is consistent with paragraph 5.10.5 of the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (NPS EN-1), which recognises that "virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will have adverse effects on the landscape," while also acknowledging that beneficial landscape character effects may arise through mitigation. ES Chapter 10, paragraph 10.8.3 further explains how the LVIA has been central to achieving the criteria for good design set out in NPS EN-1 and the Planning Inspectorate's NSIP Advice on Good Design (2024), and that

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				this has been a key consideration from the outset.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_PFF_034, LV2_E_041, LV2_OFF_136, LV2_OFF_141, LV2_OFF_042, LV2_PFF_003, LV2_OFF_017	Some respondents stated that panels should be located closer to the substation. Some respondents specified Solar Development Site 1 was too far from the substation.	No	Full details of the site selection process are included within ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]**. The availability of grid connections is limited and represents a significant risk to the UK's approach to achieving net zero. The utilisation of existing grid infrastructure is therefore fundamental to ensure that new renewable energy projects can be brought online quickly. Following discussions with National Grid, a point of connection was identified at the Monk Fryston Substation which has available capacity for a utility scale energy project, as detailed in the Grid Connection Statement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.10]**. From this, an area of search was established to determine the site options for the Proposed Development; the Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR)

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				(ES Volume 3 **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]**) provides an assessment of alternative sites. The SSAR considered, along with proximity to Monk Fryston Substation, planning, environmental and spatial constraints including flood risk, Green Belt, Agricultural Land Classifications and Public Rights of Way, and aspects including vehicle access and visual impacts.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_E_082, LV2_E_124	Respondent requested a property-specific visual impact and mitigation plan where homes are directly adjacent.		As set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]**, the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has assessed effects on residential visual amenity in accordance with relevant guidance. Further detail on the approach to assessing the potential impacts on the views of residents of local communities is provided in Appendix 10.1: Landscape and Visual Assessment Methodology (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.10.01]**.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				This makes reference to the Landscape Institute's Technical Guidance Note 02/19: Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) (LI TGN 02/19) (Ref 25), which states that the aim of RVAA is to identify those residential properties whose visual amenity has the potential to be affected to the largest magnitude of impact. A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and is reported in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]**, the assessment concluded that residents of Siddle Farm House will experience moderate adverse effects, noting this is the only residential receptor with significant residual visual effects through to and after Year 15 of operation.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_OFF_147	Respondent expressed they do not believe the visual		As set out in ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		impact from roads in the local area has been considered.		**[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]**, the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has explicitly assessed effects on views from local roads, including classified and unclassified roads. Where potential effects are identified, mitigation measures including the retention of existing vegetation, hedgerows and roadside trees, the provision of new landscape planting, and the careful siting and orientation of infrastructure have been incorporated into the design. The LVIA identifies and summarises the significant visual effects during Year 1 of operation on people travelling on local roads within Section 10.9.127 – 10.9.129. By Year 15, the assessment identifies that effects on road users are generally reduced as a result of the establishment of landscape mitigation,

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				with no major adverse residual effects identified for road users.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_E_116	Respondent has expressed concern about the cumulative landscape impact from all solar farms nearby.		As set out in ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]**, the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) includes a cumulative assessment which considers the Proposed Development alongside other existing, consented and reasonably foreseeable developments, including other solar schemes. The cumulative assessment is set out in Chapter 10, Section 10.14. The assessment has been made with reference to the methodology and guidance set out in Chapter 17: Cumulative and In-Combination Effects (ES Volume 1) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.17]** and the shortlist of cumulative plans and projects identified within.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The LVIA concludes that cumulative effects are generally limited and, where identified, are not significant in the long term. Embedded and additional mitigation, including the retention of existing vegetation and the provision of new landscape planting, is secured through the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**. The assessment demonstrates that cumulative effects reduce over time as mitigation establishes, including by Year 15 of operation.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_E_103	Respondent enquired as to what visual assessments have been undertaken on walking routes, AONBs and heritage sites.		As set out in ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]**, the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) assesses effects on a range of visual receptors, including people using public rights of way and recreational routes, designated landscapes, including AONBs, and heritage assets with an important visual setting.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The visual setting of designated heritage assets is also considered as part of the LVIA, with effects on views to and from heritage assets assessed alongside the findings of the Cultural Heritage assessment set out in ES Volume 1, Chapter 8: Historic Environment **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.08]**. Where potential visual effects are identified, mitigation measures including the retention of existing vegetation, the provision of new landscape planting, and the careful siting and design of infrastructure have been incorporated into the Proposed Development. These measures are secured through the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]** and are intended to reduce visual effects over time as planting matures.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Landscape and Visual	LV2_E_029	Respondent attached photographs of views that will be impacted by the Proposed Development.	No	The Applicant notes and thanks the respondent for providing the photographs. As set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]**, the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) assessed visual effects through a series of representative viewpoints, informed by Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) analysis and field survey work. These viewpoints are selected to represent a range of receptor types and viewing locations, including residential properties, public rights of way and local roads. The views illustrated by the photographs are considered to be representative of the types of views assessed through the LVIA viewpoints. Where likely significant effects are identified, mitigation measures including the retention of

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				existing vegetation and the provision of new landscape planting are incorporated into the Proposed Development and are secured through the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]** and the Works Plans **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.03]**.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_OFF_092	Respondent cited the solar panels near Sudforth Lane and Camblesforth as being ugly.		The Applicant notes this comment. The Proposed Development has been assessed on its own merits, and the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) considers the effects of the Proposed Development specifically, rather than the appearance or design of other developments. The Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (NPS EN-1) states in paragraph 4.7.6 that "Whilst the applicant may not have any or very limited choice in the physical appearance of some energy infrastructure, there may be

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				opportunities for the applicant to demonstrate good design in terms of siting relative to existing landscape character, landform and vegetation". The design development included visual considerations form the outset. This has included site selection, iterative layout refinement, appropriate offsets from sensitive receptors, and the retention of existing landscape features such as hedgerows, trees and woodland where practicable and introduction of significant new woodland and hedgerow planting. These embedded mitigation measures are described in Chapter 10, Section 10.8. Additionally, as set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]**, the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) includes a cumulative assessment which considers the Proposed Development alongside other existing, consented and reasonably foreseeable developments,

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				including other solar schemes. The cumulative assessment is set out in Chapter 10, Section 10.14.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_PFF_056, LV2_PFF_059, LV2_OFF_107,	Respondents stated that the proposals will ruin the rural character of Monk Fryston.	No	As shown on the Works Plans **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.03]** and the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**), all works are located at a distance from Monk Fryston with additional mitigation proposed as part of the Proposed Development. Mitigation measures include the retention and strengthening of existing hedgerows and woodland, extensive new native planting, and the creation of new habitats such as wildflower grassland, species-rich field margins, as detailed in and secured through the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_E_112, LV2_E_113	Respondents stated that the proposals will ruin the rural character of Wistow.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and is reported in ES

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]** and includes visual receptors at this location. As only Cable Route Corridor construction works are expected at this location, no significant effects are expected after temporary construction works. More widely, the Proposed Development has been designed to help preserve the rural character of the area, with measures including planted screening and security fencing, where needed, being made of deer wire and wooden posts, helping to minimise wider landscape impacts. These measures are further outlined in and secured through the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_PFF_055, LV2_PFF_057	Respondents stated that Site 2 located off the A63 will be highly visible to road users given the A63 is elevated above land level. The respondent added that there	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and is reported in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]**

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		appears to be very limited landscape planting.		and includes visual receptors at this location. It has concluded that the visual effects will not be significant after mitigation planting has matured, expected in-full by year 15. Mitigation measures include the retention and strengthening of existing hedgerows and woodland, extensive new native planting, and the creation of new habitats such as wildflower grassland, species-rich field margins. These measures are further outlined in and secured through the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_E_036	Respondent reported that the panels, at 4m high, will significantly impact views in Gateforth and Haddlesey.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and is reported in ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]** and includes visual receptors at this location. The assessment concluded no significant residual visual effects for

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				residents of Gateforth and Haddlesey but noted significant visual effects for users of PRoW around these locations. Mitigation measures include the retention and strengthening of existing hedgerows and woodland, extensive new native planting, and the creation of new habitats such as wildflower grassland, species-rich field margins. These measures are further outlined in and secured through the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_PFF_051	Respondent reported that their home at Woodhouse Farm will be completely surrounded by Solar Development Site 4.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment, and further notes that Woodhouse Farm lies adjacent to the site. A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and is reported in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]** and includes visual receptors at this location.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The Chapter confirms that Woodhouse Farm (Viewpoint 19) would partially view the installed solar panels at Solar Development Site 4 through gaps in existing vegetation. While the presence of hedgerows, trees, and garden planting would filter and soften some views, the solar panels and infrastructure may still be directly visible. The offset from panels to residential properties would provide further distance to reduce views. The baseline landscape conditions for Solar Development Site 4 and Woodhouse Farm specifically are further detailed in ES Volume 3 Appendix 10.2: Landscape Baseline and Effects **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.10.02]**.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_PFF_055	Respondent stated that Solar Development Site 6 appears to be sited in close proximity to residential properties with only a limited distance and virtually no landscape planting.	Yes	As shown on the Works Plans **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.03]** and the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]** residential offsets of minimum 30 m are included from the residential properties, with further mitigation measures

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				including planting. Mitigation measures include the retention and strengthening of existing hedgerows and woodland, extensive new native planting, and the creation of new habitats such as wildflower grassland, species-rich field margins, as detailed in and secured through the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**. A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and is reported in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]** and includes visual receptors within the vicinity of Solar Development Site 6.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_PFF_059	Respondent stated that Monk Fryston will be surrounded by a ring of solar panels with no green fields left for local people to enjoy.	Yes	As shown on Works Plans **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.03]** and the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**), all works are located at a distance from Monk Fryston with additional mitigation

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				proposed as part of the Proposed Development. The Applicant is committed to maintaining access to the countryside, guidance has been provided on how to minimise disruption and manage temporary diversions during construction, ensuring pedestrian access is maintained wherever possible and that safe, clearly signposted alternatives are implemented where necessary. These are set out in the outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP) **[EN010012/APP/LVS/07.09]**. Spread over several sites, the Applicant will create approximately 8 km (5 miles) of new permissive paths, improving local walking and cycling routes; these are shown on the OEM **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**. Mitigation measures include the retention and strengthening of existing

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				hedgerows and woodland, extensive new native planting, and the creation of new habitats such as wildflower grassland, species-rich field margins. These measures are detailed in and secured via the oLEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_OFF_141	Respondent expressed they do not believe the visual impact on views to the west of Solar Development Site 1 has been adequately considered, respondent adds that small wooded areas, fields and copses make up this landscape and should be considered protected from the visual impacts of Solar Development Site 1.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and is reported in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]**. The assessment has been carried out using a robust, transparent methodology in line with best practice, and considers a range of impacts on local landscapes at different scales and key views identified through engagement fieldwork and engagement with North Yorkshire Council. Mitigation measures include the retention and strengthening of existing hedgerows and woodland, extensive

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				new native planting, and the creation of new habitats such as wildflower grassland, species-rich field margins, and Bird Mitigation Area, as further detailed in and secured through the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_OFF_109	Respondent stated that a representative who visited their property in Skipwith misrepresented the impact of the panels on the local landscape.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and is reported in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]**. The assessment has been carried out using a robust, transparent methodology in line with best practice, and considers a range of impacts on local landscapes at different scales.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_E_079	Respondent stated that Site 2 is described in the PEIR as being unusually open, without internal screening.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. As described in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		The respondent added that the impact is likely to be particularly felt from Siddle Farm House among other residents. The respondent stated that residual harm, even with fencing will remain significant.		**[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]** and with more detail provided in oLEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**, the LVIA assessment assumes a typical growth rate for new native hedgerow planting of approximately 30 centimetres per year. Based on this, it is expected that the screening effect will increase year by year. The assessment of visual effects considers both Year 1 (when planting is newly established and offers limited screening) and Year 15 (when hedges are assumed to have reached their intended height and density). A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and is reported in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]**, the assessment concluded that residents of Siddle Farm House will experience moderate adverse effects, noting this is the only residential receptor with significant residual visual

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				effects through to and after Year 15 of operation.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_OFF_079	Respondent opposes Site 2, stating that the property (Siddle House) will be significantly impacted by the proposals.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and is reported in ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]**, the assessment concluded that residents of Siddle Farm House will experience moderate adverse effects, noting this is the only residential receptor with significant residual visual effects through to and after Year 15 of operation.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_PFF_005, LV2_OFF_006, LV2_OFF_009, LV2_PFF_041,LV2_PFF_054, LV2_PFF_057, LV2_OFF_140, LV2_OFF_047, LV2_OFF_049, LV2_E_064, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_070,	Respondents expressed general scepticism about the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures, with some stating that tree and hedgerow planting will take too long to grow. Additionally,	Yes	As set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]**, the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) assesses visual effects during the operational phase at both Year 1 and Year 15, explicitly

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_E_123, LV2_E_124, LV2_E_090, LV2_E_111, LV2_E_030, LV2_E_031, LV2_E_074	some respondents further noted that such measures will not be effective in winter when the leaves have fallen.		recognising that landscape mitigation takes time to establish and that effects may be more apparent during early operation and in winter conditions. The mitigation strategy has been developed to provide visual screening and softening throughout the year and does not rely solely on leaf cover. It includes the retention and reinforcement of existing hedgerows and trees, the use of mixed native planting with evergreen and semi-evergreen species, and the incorporation of landform, setbacks and layout design to reduce visibility irrespective of seasonal change. These embedded mitigation measures are described in Chapter 10, Section 10.8. The LVIA demonstrates that, as planting establishes, visual effects reduce over time, with effects generally lower by Year 15 of operation when mitigation is assumed to be effective. The delivery, management and long-term

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				maintenance of mitigation are secured through the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**, which includes provisions for establishment, replacement planting and ongoing management to ensure the intended mitigation function is achieved.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_PFF_024, LV2_PFF_042, LV2_E_064, LV2_OFF_116	Respondents expressed support for screening and the need for enhanced screening via tree planting and hedgerows.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and is reported in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]**. The design of the Proposed Development has been informed by an environmentally led approach, with landscape and visual considerations embedded from the outset. This has included site selection, iterative layout refinement, appropriate offsets from sensitive receptors, and the retention of existing landscape features such as

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				hedgerows, trees and woodland where practicable. These embedded mitigation measures are described in Chapter 10, Section 10.8. Mitigation measures include substantial new planting, reinforcement of existing vegetation, careful siting and height control of infrastructure, and minimisation of lighting to avoid unnecessary urbanising effects. While landscape mitigation takes time to establish, the LVIA demonstrates that by Year 15 of operation, once planting has matured, the majority of landscape and visual effects would reduce to minor or non-significant levels.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_PFF_027, LV2_OFF_138, LV2_E_064	Respondents requested that more trees, hedgerows and foliage are planted as part of the proposals.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. As set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]**, the Proposed Development has been designed using an environmentally led approach, with landscape and visual

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				mitigation embedded from the outset. This includes the retention and reinforcement of existing hedgerows and trees, together with the provision of new hedgerow, tree and woodland planting to strengthen landscape structure and provide visual screening. The delivery, management and long-term maintenance of mitigation are secured through the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**, while measures including new planting will help achieve the gains in biodiversity set out in the BNG Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.09]**, which confirms a BNG of 78.58% is expected for habitats, and 73% for hedgerows.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_PFF_018, LV2_PFF_019	Respondent requested a buffer zone specifically along the Skipwith Road boundary of the site.	Yes	As shown on the Works Plans **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.03]** and the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**, the infrastructure is proposed to be located at an offset from Skipwith Road,

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				with hedge reinforcement and a new permissive path proposed along.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_E_068, LV2_E_124	Respondent expressed they do not believe that a realistic site survey has been conducted which allows visual impact assessments to have been made.	No	As set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]**, the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) assesses the likely effects of the Proposed Development on both landscape character and visual amenity during construction, operation and decommissioning, in accordance with the relevant legislation, policy, standards and guidance set out in Chapter 10, Section 10.3. The LVIA has been informed by a detailed programme of desk-based analysis and site survey work. This includes field surveys carried out by experienced landscape professionals, walkover surveys from publicly accessible locations, assessment of views from a range of representative viewpoints, and verification of Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) analysis on

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				the ground. The approach to the LVIA was agreed with North Yorkshire Council. On this basis, the Applicant considers that the site survey work undertaken provides a robust and realistic basis for the visual impact assessment reported in the Environmental Statement.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_E_124, LV2_OFF_098	Respondents enquire who will be responsible for maintaining the planting and vegetation over the lifespan of the Proposed Development, and who will fund this maintenance.	Yes	As set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]**, landscape mitigation measures form an integral part of the Proposed Development and are required to be implemented, managed and maintained for the duration of the operational phase. The delivery, management and long-term maintenance of planting and vegetation are secured through the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The oLEMP sets out the framework for establishment, management, monitoring and replacement of planting, and confirms that the Applicant (or a suitably appointed management body acting on the Applicant's behalf) will be responsible for ensuring that landscape mitigation is maintained for the lifetime of the Proposed Development. This includes provisions for replacement planting where necessary to ensure the ongoing effectiveness of the mitigation. The costs associated with implementing and maintaining planting and vegetation are borne by the Applicant as part of the delivery and operation of the Proposed Development and are secured through the Development Consent Order requirements, ensuring that funding is in place for the lifetime of the Proposed Development.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Landscape and Visual	LV2_PFF_024	Respondent suggested painting, shielding or camouflaging substations, the BESS and other infrastructure with murals or art.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_PFF_019	Respondent requested a 'visual' buffer zone along Wheldrake Lane.	Yes	The Applicant can confirm that the Order Limits at Solar Development Site 1 have been set back from Wheldrake Lane, with land removed from the scheme to maintain visual amenity, landscape sensitivity and the openness of the higher land to the north. This is shown on the Works Plans **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.03]** and the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_PFF_041	Respondent enquired how long it will take for the hedges to grow tall enough to screen the solar panels.	No	As described in in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]** and with more detail provided in oLEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**, the LVIA assessment assumes a typical growth rate for new native hedgerow planting of approximately 30 centimetres per year.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Based on this, it is expected that the screening effect will increase year by year. The assessment of visual effects considers both Year 1 (when planting is newly established and offers limited screening) and Year 15 (when hedges are assumed to have reached their intended height and density).
Landscape and Visual	LV2_PFF_003	Respondent suggested that panels be mounted as low as possible to minimise visual impact.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. As described in ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development **[EN0110012/APP/06.01.02]** and Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]**, the visual impact of solar panels assessment has been based on a reasonable worst-case scenario, with panels modelled at a maximum height of 4.5 metres (at maximum tilt close to sunrise and sunset times) to ensure that all potential effects are robustly evaluated. The final design will seek to minimise panel height wherever practicable, taking into account technical

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				requirements, site topography, and operational efficiency.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_PFF_005	Respondent stated that mitigation is not nature focused.		As outlined in ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]** and shown on the OEM **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**, the mitigation strategy for the project has been developed to deliver both landscape integration and ecological enhancement, in line with best practice and relevant policy. Measures include the retention and strengthening of existing hedgerows and woodland and extensive new native planting, with these measures having been informed by the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA), which identified any potential ancient woodland and veteran trees. The results of the AIA are presented in Appendix 16.2 (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.02]**. Further measures include the creation of new habitats such as wildflower grassland, species-rich field margins,

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				and Bird Mitigation Area. Landscape and ecological mitigation measures will be secured through the oLEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_PFF_042	Respondent stated that Old Lane, Fox Lane and Common Lane will require screening.	No	The Applicant notes this comment, all proposed screening, including for Old Lane, Fox Lane and Common Lane, is shown on the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**) and further detailed in and secured through the oLEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_PFF_055	Respondent requested a buffer zone to protect any views of the BESS from the A63.	Yes	As described in the oLEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]** and ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]** and shown on the OEM **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**, the BESS will be located at an offset from A63 with a native woodland belt planted within the offset.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_PFF_052	Respondent suggested a minimum of 4 meters-high for	Yes	As described in oLEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]** and in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		hedgerows used for screening.		Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]**, the hedgerow is proposed to be maintained at 4.5m height. The hedgerow with trees will have trees allowed to grow beyond this height.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_OFF_100	Respondent stated that the screening and mitigation proposed for Site 2 are inadequate.	No	The screening and mitigation measures proposed for Site 2 have been developed through an environmentally-led, iterative design process, informed by the LVIA in line with best practice guidance and national policy, as described in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]**. The adequacy of these measures has been consulted with North Yorkshire Council, and this will continue post-submission / pre-examination. Although the open character of Site 2 means significant effects are unavoidable with the scale of the Proposed Development, the combination of retained and new planting, design setbacks, and sensitive

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				siting will ensure that residual effects are minimised over time.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_E_124	Respondent requested installation of tall, multi-layered evergreen screening along the entire northern boundary of Site 2 to prevent visual impact to their private view.	No	As described in the oLEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]** and shown on the OEM **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**, the northern boundary of Site 2 will be planted with native hedgerow and with additional planting (scrub and woodland) proposed for residential offsets around residential receptors.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_E_124	Respondent requested a commitment to screen lighting or simulate nighttime light to protect the area around Site 2 and preserve night skies.	No	As described in ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development **[EN0110012/APP/06.01.02]**, the use of lighting will be minimised to that required for safe site operations; Lighting will utilise directional fittings to minimise outward light spill and glare (e.g. via the use of light hoods/cowls which direct light below the horizontal plane, preferably at an angle greater than 20° from horizontal); lighting will be directed towards the middle of the works areas rather than towards the boundaries to avoid spilling beyond the

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				areas of activity. These measures are included in the Commitments Register **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.01.03]** and further detailed in and secured through the outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.03]** which will be subject to planning authority approval prior to operation.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_E_124	Respondent that light from motion-activated substation lighting at Site 2 be prevented from reaching their windows or garden.	Yes	As described in ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development **[EN0110012/APP/06.01.02]**, the use of lighting will be minimised to that required for safe site operations; Lighting will utilise directional fittings to minimise outward light spill and glare (e.g. via the use of light hoods/cowls which direct light below the horizontal plane, preferably at an angle greater than 20° from horizontal); Lighting will be directed towards the middle of the works areas rather than towards the boundaries to avoid spilling beyond the areas of activity. These measures are

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				secured through the oOEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.03]** and will be subject to planning authority approval prior to operation.

Noise and vibration

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Noise and Vibration	LV2_OFF_020, LV2_OFF_024, LV2_OFF_025, LV2_OFF_027, LV2_PFF_018, LV2_PFF_028, LV2_PFF_036, LV2_PFF_037, LV2_PFF_039, LV2_PFF_045, LV2_PFF_050, LV2_E_042, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_E_049, LV2_E_050, LV2_OFF_143, LV2_PFF_054, LV2_OFF_045, LV2_E_066, LV2_E_059, LV2_E_069, LV2_E_023, LV2_OFF_098, LV2_OFF_035, LV2_E_117, LV2_E_079, LV2_E_123, LV2_E_124, LV2_E_093, LV2_E_028, LV2_E_084, LV2_E_078, LV2_E_077, LV2_E_075	Respondents expressed concern for noise pollution or 'buzzing' caused by the Proposed Development during construction. Some respondents specify concern for noise from drilling and piling.	No	The assessment of construction noise and vibration is undertaken in accordance with the methodologies outlined in Section 11.5 of Environmental Statement (ES) Volume 1 Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.11]**. The assessment references British Standard BS 5228:2009+A1:2014 *Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites - Noise (Part 1) and Vibration (Part 2).* Details of the assessment including plant equipment assumptions and predicted construction noise levels are presented in ES Volume 3 Appendix 11.2: Construction Noise and Vibration Assumptions and Results **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.11.02]**. The assessment, which includes noise emissions from horizontal directional drilling and piling, concludes that

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				adverse effects from construction noise and vibration are not significant. This is because the design of the Proposed Development has included embedded mitigation measures to manage noise and vibration impacts from an early stage in the design process. There is no noise emission from construction plant anticipated to generate 'buzzing'.
Noise and Vibration	LV2_OFF_020, LV2_OFF_024, LV2_OFF_025, LV2_OFF_027, LV2_PFF_018, LV2_PFF_028, LV2_PFF_036, LV2_PFF_037, LV2_PFF_039, LV2_PFF_045, LV2_PFF_050, LV2_E_042, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_E_049, LV2_E_050, LV2_OFF_143, LV2_PFF_054, LV2_OFF_045, LV2_E_066, LV2_E_059, LV2_E_069, LV2_E_023, LV2_OFF_098, LV2_OFF_035, LV2_E_079,	Respondents expressed concern for noise pollution and/or 'buzzing' caused by the Proposed Development during operation.	No	The assessment of operational noise is undertaken in accordance with the British Standard 4142:2014+A1:2019 Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound, as presented in Section 11.5 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.11]**. The assessment of operational likely impacts and effects are provided in Section 11.9. An acoustic feature correction for clearly perceptible tonality has been applied as a reasonable

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_E_124, LV2_E_101, LV2_E_084			worst-case scenario to determine rating sound levels. Details of noise modelling results and assumptions are presented in Appendix 11.3: Operational Noise and Vibration Assumptions and Results **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.11.03]** and Figure 11.3: Operational Noise Modelling Results **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.11.03]**. This assessment concludes that although exceedances are predicted at the closest sensitive receptors, the effects of operational noise are assessed as not significant. This is because the design of the Proposed Development has included embedded mitigation measures to manage noise and vibration impacts from an early stage in the design process. Details of mitigation measures are presented in Section 11.8 of Chapter 11.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Noise and Vibration	LV2_PFF_018, LV2_PFF_028, LV2_PFF_036, LV2_E_049, LV2_E_050, LV2_E_069, LV2_E_124	Respondents expressed concern for vibration caused by the Proposed Development.	No	The assessment of construction vibration is undertaken in accordance with the methodologies outlined in Section 11.5 of ES Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.11]**. The assessment references British Standard BS 5228:2009+A1:2014 *Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites - Vibration (Part 2)*. Details of the assessment including plant equipment assumptions and predicted construction vibration levels are presented in Appendix 11.2: Construction Noise and Vibration Assumptions and Results **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.11.02]**. The assessment concludes that with the implementation of a suitable Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) adverse effects from construction vibration are not significant. An outline CEMP

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				supports the Application **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**. Operational vibration has been scoped out of further assessment since the nature of the Proposed Development's plant is unlikely to transmit any appreciable vibration into the ground. Moreover, the distances to any sensitive receptors will attenuate any residual vibration.
Noise and Vibration	LV2_PFF_036, LV2_E_042	Respondents expressed concern about the impact of noise on horses and horse riders.	No	The assessment of operational noise impacts upon Public Rights of Way is presented in Section 11.5 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.11]**. The assessment considers plant items most likely to give rise to adverse impacts and uses a 3D noise prediction model. Details of noise modelling for PRoWs are presented in Appendix 11.3: Operational Noise and Vibration Assumptions and Results **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.11.03]** and Figure 11.3 Operational noise

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				modelling results **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.11.03]**. For the assessment of PRoWS, the assessment refers to guidelines presented in British Standard 8223 *Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings*. As presented in the ES chapter, operational noise impacts on PRoWs are assessed as not significant. Operational noise from new plant is continuous and if well maintained it is not expected to generate such levels or character of noise that would startle horses. With regard to construction noise impacting horses and riders using the PRoWs, there may be relatively short periods when activities close to the PRoWs are audible. As construction progresses, works will move further away from these routes, resulting in a

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				reduction in noise levels. Mitigation measures for PRoWs, including proposed diversions, are set out in the outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.09]**. To minimise the level of noise to which PRoWs will be exposed, construction activities will be undertaken in accordance with the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**. The appointed contractor will also apply Best Practicable Means (BPM), to be set out in the detailed CEMP, as defined under Control of Pollution Act 1974 and described in section 11.8 of the ES Noise and Vibration chapter.
Noise and Vibration	LV2_OFF_026, LV2_OFF_143	Respondent expressed concern over the possible health effects of noise and continuing vibration on residents.	No	The assessment of construction noise and vibration is undertaken in accordance with the methodologies outlined in Section 11.5 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.11]**. The

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				assessment references British Standard 5228:2009+A1:2014 *Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites – Noise (Part 1) and Vibration (Part 2)*. The assessment concludes that with the implementation of a suitable oCEMP adverse effects from construction noise and vibration are not significant. Moreover, the assessment considers the health and wellbeing effects of noise through assessment against the adverse effect levels defined in Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE). The assessment concludes that for the daytime, construction noise levels are not predicted to exceed either the SOAEL (significant observed adverse effect level) or the LOAEL (lowest observed adverse effect level) at any receptor. For the night-time the SOAEL is not predicted to be exceeded at any receptor and the LOAEL is predicted to be exceeded temporarily at a number of

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				receptors as presented in ES Volume 3 Appendix 11.2: Construction Noise and Vibration Assumptions and Results **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.11.02]**. An outline CEMP supports the Application **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**. As for operational noise, the assessment is undertaken in accordance with British Standard 4142:2014+A1:2019 Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound and is presented in Section 11.5 of ES Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration. The assessment of operational likely impacts and effects are provided in Section 11.9. Details of noise modelling results and assumptions are presented in ES Volume 3 Appendix 11.3: Operational Noise and Vibration Assumptions and Results

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.11.03] and Figure 11.3: Operational Noise Modelling Results **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.11.03]**. This assessment concludes that although exceedances are predicted at the closest sensitive receptors, the effects of operational noise are assessed as not significant.
Noise and Vibration	LV2_E_069	Respondent stated that the PEIR NTS sections 2.3.3 to 2.3.4 do not address the impacts from piling and other aspects of the construction phase that will make noise / cause vibration.	No	The assessment of construction noise and vibration, including piling, is undertaken in accordance with the methodologies outlined in Section 11.5 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.11]**. This is presented in paragraphs 11.9.22-11.9.28 for vibration assessment and within ES Volume 3 Appendix 11.2: Construction Noise and Vibration Assumptions and Results **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.11.02]**. The assessment references British

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Standard BS 5228:2009+A1:2014 *Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites - Noise (Part 1) and Vibration (Part 2)*. Details of the assessment including plant equipment assumptions and predicted construction noise levels are presented in Appendix 11.2. The assessment concludes that with the implementation of a suitable oCEMP adverse effects from construction noise and vibration are not significant. An outline CEMP supports the Application **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**.
Noise and Vibration	LV2_E_069	Respondent expressed concern for the effect of noise and vibration from piling on Birkin Fisheries, adds that the PEIR concludes impacts to this location would be 'not significant'.	No	The assessment of construction noise and vibration, including piling, is undertaken in accordance with the methodologies outlined in Section 11.5 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.11]**. The assessment references British Standard BS 5228:2009+A1:2014 *Code of*

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites - Noise (Part 1) and Vibration (Part 2). Details of the assessment including plant equipment assumptions and predicted construction noise levels are presented in ES Volume 3 Appendix 11.2: Construction Noise and Vibration Assumptions and Results **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.11.02]**. Sensitive receptor reference S4_R11 is representative of the construction noise and vibration levels that would be expected at the Birkin Fisheries Tea Room (located approximately 50 m from where construction works would occur). Details of sensitive receptors and assessment locations are presented in Figure 11.2: Environmental Sound Survey and Assessment Locations **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.11.02]**. Vibration levels at this receptor are anticipated to be in the order of

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				1.8mm/s. As per standard, these levels can be tolerated if prior warning and explanation is given to residents. As presented in Table 2.1 of Appendix 11.2, construction activities during the daytime are not predicted to exceed Category A. In line with BS5228, this is an indication of impacts not resulting in a significant effect. The assessment concludes that with the implementation of a suitable oCEMP adverse effects from construction noise and vibration are not significant. An outline CEMP supports the Application **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**. With regards to potential impacts on fish, the predicted PPV of about 1.8mm/s when works at the closest distance to pond, is well below levels associated with adverse effects on either fish or fish eggs. For context, the Environment Agency identifies a

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				threshold of 13mm/s for potential risk of egg damage, indicating that the predicted vibration levels are not expected to result in significant impacts. In terms of disturbance of adult fish due to construction noise, as sound does not transfer well from airborne to underwater, it is expected that impacts will be minimal.
Noise and Vibration	LV2_OFF_100	Respondent stated that close proximity of the BESS (site 2) will mean noise near their property.	No	The assessment of operational noise including BESS is undertaken in accordance with the British Standard 4142:2014+A1:2019 *Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound* and is presented in Section 11.5 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.11]**. The assessment of operational likely impacts and effects are provided in Section 11.9.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Details of noise modelling results and assumptions are presented in ES Volume 3 Appendix 11.3: Operational Noise and Vibration Assumptions and Results **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.11.03]** and Figure 11.3: Operational Noise Modelling Results **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.11.03]**. This assessment concludes that although exceedances are predicted at the closest sensitive receptors, the effects of operational noise are assessed as not significant.
Noise and Vibration	LV2_E_124	Respondent requested that noise surveys be conducted at their property, including in individual rooms. Respondent cited their proximity to the BESS at Site 2.	No	The assessment of operational noise is undertaken in accordance with the British Standard 4142:2014+A1:2019 *Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound* and is presented in Section 11.5 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.11]**. The methods described in BS4142 use outdoor sound levels to assess likely

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				effects of sound on people. Moreover, where relevant, the assessment considers absolute indoor sound levels predicted with opened windows, to contextualise any exceedances over noise impact thresholds. Details of the environmental sound survey are presented in Section 11.7 of the main report as well as in ES Volume 3 Appendix 11.1: Environmental Sound Survey **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.11.01]**. The selection of environmental sound survey is representative of receptors most likely to be impacted by the construction and operation of the project. The location of surveys has been discussed and agreed with the North Yorkshire Council. The assessment of operational likely impacts and effects are provided in Section 11.9.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Details of noise modelling results and assumptions are presented in Appendix 11.3: Operational Noise and Vibration Assumptions and Results **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.11.03]** and Figure 11.3: Operational Noise Modelling Results **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.11.03]**. This assessment concludes that although exceedances are predicted at the closest sensitive receptors, the effects of operational noise are assessed as not significant. It is not practicable for the Proposed Development to conduct internal sound measurements at sensitive receptors. Such measurements are likely to be influenced by domestic sources such as appliances, making it difficult to establish the specific sound level from the plant.
Noise and Vibration	LV2_E_117	Respondent expressed concern for the impact to their		The assessment of construction noise is undertaken in accordance with the

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		dogs (owners of kennel business) of construction noise for years.		methodologies outlined in Section 11.5 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.11]**. The assessment references British Standard BS 5228:2009+A1:2014 *Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites - Noise (Part 1)*. Details of the assessment including plant equipment assumptions and predicted construction noise levels are presented in ES Volume 3 Appendix 11.2: Construction Noise and Vibration Assumptions and Results **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.11.02]**. The assessment concludes that with the implementation of a suitable oCEMP adverse effects from construction noise and vibration are not significant. An outline CEMP supports the Application **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**. The construction noise prediction represents a reasonable typical scenario

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				for each stage of works, assuming that the construction equipment is situated at a typical location. However, noise levels may vary over shorter durations. Specifically, when construction activities are at their closest to receptors, noise levels are expected to be at their highest level and levels would be lower when works are more distant. As construction progresses, the works will generally move away from the receptors. This means that relatively higher noise levels would not persist for the duration (approximately 12 months for site 6), but only during the periods when construction activities are at their nearest point. To minimise the level of noise to which PRoWs will be exposed, construction activities will be undertaken in accordance with the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP)

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]. The appointed contractor will also apply Best Practicable Means (BPM), to be set out in the CEMP, as defined under Control of Pollution Act 1974 and described in section 11.8 of the ES Noise and Vibration chapter.
Noise and Vibration	LV2_E_124	Respondent requested full operational noise predictions (LAeq and octave-band data) at the façades of Old Tythe Barn and neighbouring dwellings with windows open.	No	The assessment of operational noise is undertaken in accordance with the British Standard 4142:2014+A1:2019 *Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound* and is presented in Section 11.5 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.11]**. The assessment of operational likely impacts and effects is provided in Section 11.9. Details of noise modelling results including S6_R5 (representative of Old Tythe Barn) are presented in ES Volume 3 Appendix 11.3: Operational Noise and Vibration Assumptions and

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Results **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.11.03]** and Figure 11.3: Operational Noise Modelling Results **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.11.03]**. Noise prediction results are presented in $L_{Aeq,T}$ form for the relevant time period. Results in octave band are available upon request. The predicted rating sound level at receptor S6_R5 do not exceed the measured typical background sound level. In accordance with BS4142, this indicates a low impact. The effects at this receptor are therefore assessed as not significant. Predicted internal sound levels with openable windows at receptors closer to the project than S6_R5, are below the low-frequency noise criterion in NANR45. Because S6_R5 is located further away and consequently

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				experiences lower rating sound levels, the NANR45 criterion is not exceeded.
Noise and Vibration	LV2_E_124	Respondent requested confirmation that enhanced acoustic enclosures, bunding or other attenuation measures will be implemented as requested.	No	Details of embedded, good practice mitigation and enhancement measures are presented in Section 11.8 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.11]**. These are mitigation measures which have been implemented as part of the design and are required to minimise operational noise impacts. As noted in Section 11.9 of the report, the design of the Proposed Development is expected to evolve and if necessary and where appropriate, opportunities to incorporate mitigation measures to minimise any risk of noise disturbance will be explored and implemented. To support future design development, Table 11-21 of the noise and vibration chapter provides examples

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				of the types of mitigation measures that will be implemented, where appropriate.
Noise and Vibration	LV2_E_077	Respondent stated that the noise impact assessment of 300m and 1km is not sufficient given the topography of many areas being minimal.	No	The study area for operational and construction noise and vibration is based on the extent of the Order Limits and is described in section 11.2 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.11]**. A study area of 300m around the Order Limits is considered sufficient to assess impacts, based on precedent from other similar projects and the limitations of prediction methods beyond this distance, as noted in British Standard *5228:2009+A1:2014 Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites - Noise (Part 1)*. For operational noise, a study area of 1 km is adopted to assess impacts. Sound levels are expected to be well below those likely to cause a risk of a significant effect at or beyond this

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				distance. Moreover, the assessment presented in the Noise and Vibration chapter shows that the closest receptors, all located well within 1 km, are predicted to experience no significant effects. The assessment of construction noise and vibration is undertaken in accordance with the methodologies outlined in Section 11.5. A three-dimensional noise model has been developed for construction noise calculation which includes topographical information from the National LiDAR Programme 2023 (Defra Survey open data). This includes local topography and any existing intervening ground or structures. The assessment of operational noise is undertaken in accordance with British Standard 4142:2014+A1:2019 Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound and is presented in

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Section 11.5 Methodology. The assessment of likely impacts and effects are provided in Section 11.9. The assessment is based on a 3D noise prediction model which uses topographical information from the National LiDAR Programme 2023 (Defra Survey open data). This includes local topography and any intervening ground or structures. The study area extends 1 km from the main Solar Development Sites as predicted sound levels beyond this distance are unlikely to result in a significant effect. Noise propagation has been modelled using proprietary software in accordance with BS ISO 9613-2:2024 Acoustics - Attenuation of sound during propagation outdoors - Part 2: Engineering method for the prediction of sound pressure levels outdoors. This standard assumes downwind propagation conditions, i.e. wind blowing

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				from the source to the receiver, representing a cautious assumption for meteorological conditions.

Ornithology

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Ornithology	LV2_OFF_020, LV2_PFF_036, LV2_PFF_037, LV2_PFF_045, LV2_E_036, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_OFF_141, LV2_OFF_050, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_051, LV2_E_070, LV2_OFF_109, LV2_OFF_066, LV2_OFF_062, LV2_OFF_057, LV2_OFF_099, LV2_OFF_148, LV2_E_120, LV2_E_123, LV2_E_124, LV2_OFF_086, LV2_OFF_081	Respondents expressed general concern for birds.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges these concerns. A detailed desk study, including breeding and non-breeding bird surveys were undertaken in accordance with recognised guidance and are reported in Section 12 .6 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 12: Ornithology **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.12]**. Potential impacts to birds have been assessed, and a comprehensive package of embedded and additional mitigation, including habitat retention, enhancement and the Bird Mitigation Area, has been secured through the Outline Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]** and Outline Bird Mitigation Area Management Plan (oBMAMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.19]** to avoid or reduce effects to a non-significant

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				level, but will also be beneficial to all species.
Ornithology	LV2_OFF_057, LV2_E_120, LV2_E_124, LV2_E_084	Respondents expressed general concern for owls.	Yes	Embedded mitigation includes retention of boundary features, provision of prey-rich grassland management (particularly around the solar development sites), and installation of barn owl and kestrel A-frame boxes, which are expected to maintain or enhance foraging opportunities throughout the Order Limits has been secured through the Outline Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the owl population at present is not well monitored and therefore it is likely that with the above enhancements, that this will be beneficial to the species of concern.
Ornithology	LV2_OFF_062, LV2_OFF_057, LV2_E_084	Respondents expressed concern regarding birds of prey being unable to find prey under the panels.	Yes	The Applicant notes these concerns. Research undertaken by Solar Energy UK in 2023 (Solar Habitat: Ecological trends on solar farms in the UK) indicates that solar farms managed

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				under low-intensity regimes support small mammals and invertebrates. The proposed grassland management beneath and between panels, alongside the Bird Mitigation Area, will maintain and increase prey availability for raptors. No adverse effects are predicted.
Ornithology	LV2_E_120, LV2_E_124	Respondents expressed general concern for kestrels.	Yes	Embedded mitigation includes retention of boundary features, provision of prey-rich grassland management (particularly around the solar development sites), and installation of barn owl and kestrel A-frame boxes, which are expected to maintain or enhance foraging opportunities throughout the Order Limits has been secured through the Outline Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**.
Ornithology	LV2_E_116	Respondent expressed general concern for red kites.	No	Red kite was recorded infrequently within the wider area. The species is not reliant on the habitats lost within the Order Limits, see Section 12.8 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 12: Ornithology **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.12]**.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Retained and enhanced woodland and boundary features will continue to provide suitable nesting habitat. Note that this species is well-known for scavenging and resources impacts are therefore considered negligible.
Ornithology	LV2_E_124	Respondent expressed general concern for buzzards.	No	Buzzard is widespread and adaptable and was recorded at low levels, it is also a green listed species on the e Birds of Conservation Concern 5 (BoCC5) based on its common and widespread nature within the U.K. The Proposed Development will not result in the loss of key nesting or foraging habitat for the species as these are to be retained. This is set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 12: Ornithology **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.12]**.
Ornithology	LV2_OFF_057	Respondent expressed general concern for grouse.	No	Grouse are an upland species and are not characteristic of lowland arable landscapes within or adjacent to the Order Limits, and no records were obtained during surveys. The Proposed Development is therefore not expected to affect grouse.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Ornithology	LV2_OFF_089	Respondent expressed general concern for pheasants.	No	Pheasant is a non-native gamebird and was recorded occasionally. The Proposed Development is not expected to adversely affect pheasant populations.
Ornithology	LV2_OFF_066	Respondent enquired as to when bird surveys were carried out?	Yes	Breeding and non-breeding bird surveys were undertaken over appropriate seasonal windows in accordance with published guidance. Full details of survey timing, effort and methodology are provided in ES Volume 1 Chapter 12: Ornithology **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.12]** and its associated appendices (ES Volume 3): Appendix 12.1: Breeding Bird Survey Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.12.01]**, Appendix 12.2: Non-breeding Bird Survey Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.12.02]** and Breeding Bird Survey Report Solar Development Sites 6-8 and the Cable Route Corridor **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.12.03]**.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Ornithology	LV2_OFF_062	Respondent expressed concern for the impact to the diversity of bird species currently found in the area.	Yes	In terms of boundary species and edge-associated bird species, these will be maintained and are expected to increase as a result of habitat retention, buffering and enhancement secured through the Outline Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**. The Bird Mitigation Area will provide a dedicated refuge for non-breeding waterbirds and ground-nesting species and will be fully functional prior to the non-breeding season, as detailed in the Outline Bird Mitigation Management Plan **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.19]**. The area will be monitored and adaptively managed to respond to bird usage and species needs, ensuring that any risks arising from the Proposed Development are effectively addressed and overall bird diversity is maintained.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Ornithology	LV2_E_120	Respondent expressed concern for the impact of glint and glare to birds.	Yes	Glint and glare effects on birds are assessed as negligible. There is no robust evidence from UK studies or Natural England reviews that solar PV glint causes disturbance or collision risk to birds. Baseline surveys recorded no regular or directional flight paths over the site, and similar UK solar projects have not identified avian impacts from glint or glare. See Section 12.17 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 12: Ornithology **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.12]**.
Ornithology	LV2_E_124	Respondent requested that the Biodiversity Management Plan be updated to include species identified by residents, such as barn owls, little owls, buzzards, kestrels, woodpeckers.	No	A standalone Biodiversity Management Plan is not proposed. Ornithological assessment is based on systematic desk study and breeding and non-breeding bird surveys undertaken in accordance with recognised guidance, as reported in ES Volume 1 Chapter 12: Ornithology **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.12]** and supporting appendices. Mitigation is habitat-led rather than species-specific and is secured through

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				the Outline Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**, which provides flexibility to support a wide range of bird species, including those identified by residents (e.g. barn owl, little owl, buzzard, kestrel and woodpeckers), which does not require a list of specific species. Note that the species listed largely rely on boundary habitats, which are to be retained and enhanced through the development design. Measures such as habitat retention and enhancement, prey-rich grassland management, and provision of barn owl and kestrel boxes ensure appropriate protection and benefit for birds throughout the Order Limits.
Ornithology	LV2_E_116	Respondent stated that raptors could be impacted in a number of ways. Firstly, they state that raptors	Yes	The assessment concludes that impacts to raptors are not significant. There is no robust UK evidence that solar PV panels cause raptors to

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		could mistake reflective solar panels for water bodies due to polarised light pollution, especially during migration or aerial hunting, leading to collisions. Secondly, they state that vegetation and insect abundance around solar farms can affect populations of voles, mice, and small birds—key prey for raptors.		mistake arrays for waterbodies or that polarised light results in collision risk. Natural England evidence reviews and experience from comparable UK solar schemes have not identified raptor mortality or disturbance linked to glint or glare. See Section 12.17 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 12: Ornithology **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.12]**. With regard to prey availability, evidence indicates that solar farms managed under low-intensity regimes support small mammals, invertebrates and farmland birds. The proposed grassland management beneath and between panels, pesticide free, less frequent disturbance (arable cropping), retention of boundary features, and creation of the Bird Mitigation Area will maintain or increase prey resources for raptors such as buzzard and kestrel. As a result, no adverse effects on raptors are predicted.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				These conditions are generally more favourable for voles, mice and insects than intensively managed arable land, which is often subject to cultivation, harvesting, spraying and seasonal habitat removal.
Ornithology	LV2_OFF_148, LV2_E_112, LV2_E_113	Respondents expressed concern for the ecology, in particular, the rare birds that reside in Wistow Lordship.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding ecology and rare birds within Wistow Lordship. The ornithological assessment has been informed by extensive desk study and breeding and non-breeding bird surveys, undertaken in accordance with recognised guidance and reported in Section 12.8 of the ES Volume 1 Chapter 12: Ornithology and supporting appendices: Appendix 12.1: Breeding Bird Survey Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.12.01]**, Appendix 12.2: Non-breeding Bird Survey Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.12.02]** and Breeding Bird Survey Report Solar Development Sites 6-8 and the Cable

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Route Corridor **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.12.03]**. The Applicant has maintained ongoing engagement with Natural England, including the Senior Reserve Manager within the locale, and with the Friends of the Lower Derwent Valley. It has been confirmed that all species have been adequately captured within the assessment. See Table 12-8 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 12: Ornithology **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.12]**. The assessment also takes a precautionary, habitat-led approach, assuming functional linkage across the wider landscape and securing mitigation through habitat retention, enhancement and the Bird Mitigation Area. These measures are designed to support rare and sensitive species associated with the Lower Derwent Valley over the long term, with monitoring and adaptive management secured through the

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Outline Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]** and the non-breeding season Outline Bird Mitigation Management Plan **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.19].**
Ornithology	LV2_E_079	Respondent expressed concern regarding the impact of the proposals for Site 2 on protected birds.	No	The Applicant acknowledges this concern. Based on the results of the breeding and non-breeding bird surveys, Solar Development Site 2 supports low and infrequent use by bird species, and no SPA/Ramsar qualifying species were recorded at levels meeting Natural England's criteria for Functionally Linked Land. Predicted construction and operational disturbance at Site 2 is low, with noise changes generally within baseline variation and activities limited in duration and frequency, see Section 12.8 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 12: Ornithology **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.12]**. No habitats of high ornithological value for protected bird species will be affected,

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				and suitable alternative habitat is widely available in the surrounding landscape. Embedded mitigation secured through the Outline Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**, including habitat retention, sensitive grassland management and construction controls, will further reduce any potential effects. On this basis, significant effects on protected birds at Site 2 are not predicted, and no changes to the scheme are required.

Other environmental issues

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Other Environmental Issues	LV2_OFF_023, LV2_PFF_031, LV2_OFF_147, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068	Respondents expressed general concern about toxic waste disposal and mess left on site, including toxic cadmium leakage from panels.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges this concern. In order to control the waste generated during operation and maintenance phases, the Contractor(s) will separate the main waste streams on-site, prior to transport to an approved, licensed third party facility for recycling or disposal. Measures to mitigate this during construction are secured in the Outline Materials and Waste Management Plan **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.07]**. The Proposed Development will prioritise waste prevention, followed by preparation for reuse, recycling and recovery, with landfill disposal as the last resort. All waste to be removed from the Site will be undertaken by fully licensed waste carriers and taken to suitably licensed waste management facilities and managed in line with the requirements of the Waste (England and

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Wales) Regulations 2011 and the Hazardous Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2005. These measures are further detailed and secured through the outline Operation Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.03]**. The use of chemicals within the Proposed Development would be minimal, with no PFAS (forever chemicals) present in solar panel coatings or on BESS batteries. The solar cells would be made from silicon, a material with properties almost the same as sand. They may contain very small amounts of heavy metals, but these are well within the limits set by law; this is confirmed by the Applicant checking the results of testing in independent laboratories. Solar PV Panels typically have a lifespan of up to 40 years or more, and the Applicant's EIA has assumed that

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				solar PV panels will be replaced once during the lifetime of the Proposed Development. Up to 99% of solar PV modules are recyclable, with the number of solar panel recycling plants in the UK increasing. Companies which are aligned with the Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment Recycling (WEEE) Regulations 2013 are Approved Authorised Treatment Facilities for solar waste. The solar panels would require occasional maintenance and would be cleaned using water only; stubborn marks would be removed by scrubbing, removing the risk of cleaning chemical runoff. The cleaning of panels, and the decommissioning process for panels and other components are further detailed within Sections 2.9 to 2.11 of the outline Operation Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) **[EN00110012/APP/LVS/07.03]**.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				An outline MWMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.07]** and outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04]** are included as part of the Application. A detailed Materials and Waste Management Plan (MWMP) will be prepared substantially in accordance with the outline plan, and alongside the detailed DEMP(s) setting out how measures to manage the disposal of waste from the Order Limits may be required in accordance with relevant legislative and policy requirements. The detailed MWMP will ensure decommissioning waste streams are sent to waste recycling and handling facilities that have sufficient capacity to handle waste arisings from the Proposed Development.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Other Environmental Issues	LV2_PFF_031, LV2_PFF_034, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_120	Respondents expressed general concern about ground contamination from a fire.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges this concern. With regard to the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS), this will be made up of secure Battery enclosures, which will house the battery systems, electrochemical components and associated equipment. The battery enclosures will be mounted on concrete slabs, protecting the ground beneath in the unlikely event of a fire. BESS components and safety measures are further detailed in an outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.06]**. Section 4.5 of the oBSMP demonstrates how both air and ground pollution risks are measured, prevented, and mitigated. The use of chemicals within the Proposed Development would be minimal, with no PFAS (forever chemicals) present in solar panel coatings or on BESS batteries. The solar cells would be made from silicon, a material with properties almost the same

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				as sand. They may contain very small amounts of heavy metals, but these are well within the limits set by law; as such, in the unlikely event of a fire, the solar panels would not contaminate the ground.
Other Environmental Issues	LV2_OFF_100, LV2_OFF_095, LV2_E_124	Respondents express that they believe that the environmental assessment included as part of the Phase Two proposals were inadequate.	Yes	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this comment. Technical surveys conducted throughout the pre-application process and referenced in the PEIR have been referred to in the relevant topic Environmental Statement (ES) chapters; the Applicant can confirm that all environmental assessments have been undertaken in accordance with the individual topic methodologies set out in Environmental Statement – Volume 1 - Approach to EIA **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.04]**.
Other Environmental Issues	LV2_PFF_034, LV2_E_067	Respondents expressed general concern about ground contamination from toxic minerals.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges this concern. With regard to the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS), this will be made up of secure Battery enclosures, which will house the battery

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				systems, electrochemical components and associated equipment. The battery enclosures will be mounted on concrete slabs, protecting the ground beneath in the unlikely event of a fire. BESS components and safety measures are further detailed in an outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.06]**. Section 4.5 of the oBSMP demonstrates how both air and ground pollution risks are measured, prevented, and mitigated. The use of chemicals within the Proposed Development would be minimal, with no PFAS (forever chemicals) present in solar panel coatings or on BESS batteries. The solar cells would be made from silicon, a material with properties almost the same as sand. They may contain very small amounts of heavy metals, but these are well within the limits set by law; this is confirmed by the Applicant checking the results of testing in independent

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				laboratories. An outline Pollution and Spillage Response Plan (oPSRP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.08]** has been prepared which sets out and secures the intended strategies for managing pollution and spillage incidents on site, including containment measures to ensure that any ongoing spill or leak does not continue to enter soils, groundwater, watercourses or other water features.
Other Environmental Issues	LV2_OFF_147, LV2_E_120	Respondents expressed they do not believe the impact of radiation has been considered, enquired as to what impact radiation will have.	Yes	The Applicant can confirm that radiation has been considered within ES Volume 1 Chapter 16: Other Environmental Matters **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.16]**. The Proposed Development includes some 275 kV cables and therefore the Applicant has provided a High Level Electromagnetic Field (EMF) Assessment in ES Volume 3 Appendix 16.6 **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.06]**.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The maximum magnetic field produced by 275kV underground cables is predicted to be 96.17 micro-Teslas, and are therefore below the reference level from the public exposure limits in UK policy. The assessment concludes that levels of electromagnetic radiation from the underground cables and existing overhead powerlines are predicted to be below ICNIRP (International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection) reference levels for magnetic fields, even when assuming maximum radiation is being emitted from the underground cables and the existing overhead powerlines. Radiation from the conversion units will be less significant as the equipment will be housed in protective enclosures and the substation and conversion units will be CE/UKCA marked, meaning they should not generate or be affected by electromagnetic disturbance.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Radiation from the proposed substations and BESS will not be significant as they will be located at least 350 m from any surrounding dwellings and workplaces. For users of Public Rights of Way (PRoWs), any radiation effects are not significant in EIA terms as these are not continually occupied, rather they are moving receptors, as opposed to residential dwellings and workplaces.
Other Environmental Issues	LV2_E_103	Respondent expressed particular concern about waste left behind in the event of major storms and high winds.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The components of the Proposed Development would be designed to withstand the range of UK weather, including storms. Solar panels are typically rated for up to 140mph wind speeds, equivalent to a mid-range Category 4 hurricane. Although rare, wind speeds above this have been recorded in the UK, but only in highland or coastal areas. Inland areas of the UK are much less prone to high wind speeds. Solar panels can also be rated for higher wind speeds, although these

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				are more typically used in places prone to extreme weather, such as areas of Australia. North Yorkshire is not considered prone to extreme weather, with the most extreme UK storms typically moving in from the Atlantic. In the unlikely event that a storm or extreme weather event does hit, plans and measures would be in place and are set out within Section 2.13 of the outline Operation Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) **[EN00110012/APP/LVS/07.03]**. This includes provision for an outline Pollution and Spillage Response Plan (oPSRP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.08]** which further sets out and secures the intended strategies for managing pollution and spillage incidents on site, including containment measures to ensure that any ongoing spill or leak does not continue to enter soils, groundwater, watercourses or other water features.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Other Environmental Issues	LV2_E_120, LV2_E_103	Respondents expressed concern for electromagnetic field effects on humans and wildlife.	Yes	The Proposed Development includes some 275 kV cables and therefore the Applicant has provided a High Level Electromagnetic Field (EMF) Assessment in ES Volume 3 Appendix 16.6 **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.06]**. As outlined in ES Volume 1 Chapter 16: Other Environmental Matters **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.16]**, the assessment concludes that levels of electromagnetic radiation from the underground cables and existing overhead powerlines are predicted to be below ICNIRP (International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection) reference levels for magnetic fields, even when assuming maximum radiation is being emitted from the underground cables and the existing overhead powerlines. Radiation from the conversion units will be less significant as the equipment will be housed in

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				protective enclosures and the substation and conversion units will be CE/UKCA marked, meaning they should not generate or be affected by electromagnetic disturbance. Radiation from the proposed substations and BESS will not be significant as they will be located at least 350 m from any surrounding dwellings and workplaces. For users of Public Rights of Way (PRoWs), any radiation effects are not significant in EIA terms as these are not continually occupied, rather they are moving receptors, as opposed to residential dwellings and workplaces.
Other Environmental Issues	LV2_E_103	Respondent enquired what the EMF levels are at the site boundary and at nearby homes.	Yes	The Proposed Development includes some 275 kV cables and therefore the Applicant has provided a High Level Electromagnetic Field (EMF) Assessment in ES Volume 3 Appendix 16.6 **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.06]**, which includes current and predicted

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				EMF levels from existing overhead powerlines and the proposed underground cable, the BESS, invertors and conversion units. As outlined in ES Volume 1 Chapter 16: Other Environmental Issues **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.16]**, the assessment concludes that levels of electromagnetic radiation from the underground cables and existing overhead powerlines are predicted to be below ICNIRP (International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection) reference levels for magnetic fields, even when assuming maximum radiation is being emitted from the underground cables and the existing overhead powerlines. Radiation from the conversion units will be less significant as the equipment will be housed in protective enclosures and the substation and conversion units will be CE/UKCA marked, meaning they should not

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				generate or be affected by electromagnetic disturbance. Radiation from the proposed substations and BESS will not be significant as they will be located at least 350 m from any surrounding dwellings and workplaces. For users of Public Rights of Way (PRoWs), any radiation effects are not significant in EIA terms as these are not continually occupied, rather they are moving receptors, as opposed to residential dwellings and workplaces.
Other Environmental Issues	LV2_E_103	Respondent has asked if there are any agreements to have regular, independent environmental testing throughout the operation of the solar farm. Respondent adds query that if any unforeseen harm occurs, can local residents	No	Environmental testing and wider monitoring during the operational phase are set out in and secured through the outline Operation Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) **[EN00110012/APP/LVS/07.03]**. Section 3.2 and tables 31 to 38 and 310 to 314 detail both operational mitigation and required environmental monitoring for each EIA topic, for example: for the EIA topic of Air Quality, the oOEMP secures

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		trigger a process to reverse the Proposed Development?		daily on-site and off-site inspection, where receptors (including roads) are nearby, to monitor dust, record inspection results and make the log available to the Local Authority when asked. The Applicant is also committed to appointing a Community Liaison Officer (or alternative) to lead discussions with the local community during construction, where the community will be encouraged to provide updates and report anything for the construction team to address. This measure is secured in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**.

Public Rights of Way and paths

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Public Rights of Way and Paths	LV2_OFF_003, LV2_OFF_006, LV2_PFF_011, LV2_PFF_013, LV2_PFF_014, LV2_OFF_014, LV2_OFF_016, LV2_OFF_017, LV2_OFF_024, LV2_OFF_030, LV2_PFF_021, LV2_PFF_026, LV2_PFF_031, LV2_PFF_033, LV2_OFF_034, LV2_PFF_037, LV2_PFF_039, LV2_PFF_041, LV2_PFF_043, LV2_PFF_044, LV2_PFF_047, LV2_PFF_049, LV2_PFF_050, LV2_E_036, LV2_E_042, LV2_E_045, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_E_061, LV2_OFF_146, LV2_OFF_145, LV2_OFF_143, LV2_OFF_142, LV2_OFF_140, LV2_OFF_133, LV2_OFF_120,	Respondents expressed concern about the Proposed Development's impact on recreation, amenity and access to the countryside, including impacts to PRoWs, bridleways and cycle tracks. Some respondents express that current rights of way cannot be replaced and that the Applicant has no right to change them.	Yes	The Applicant has embedded mitigation measures to maintain the amenity of Public Rights of Way, including the provision of landscaping and a minimum 15 metre buffer offset from all infrastructure, including fencing; these measures are set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 13: Socioeconomics **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13]**. In addition, measures have been identified to minimise disruption and manage temporary diversions during construction, ensuring pedestrian access is maintained wherever possible and that safe, clearly signposted alternatives are implemented where necessary. These are set out in the outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP) **[EN010012/APP/LVS/07.09]** submitted as part of the Application.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_OFF_119, LV2_E_064, LV2_E_065, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_070, LV2_E_071, LV2_OFF_117, LV2_OFF_069, LV2_OFF_068, LV2_OFF_067, LV2_OFF_066, LV2_OFF_063, LV2_OFF_062, LV2_E_021, LV2_OFF_058, LV2_OFF_055, LV2_OFF_148, LV2_E_120, LV2_E_123, LV2_E_124, LV2_OFF_052, LV2_E_094, LV2_E_096, LV2_E_109, LV2_E_110, LV2_E_026, LV2_E_025, LV2_E_028, LV2_E_031, LV2_E_032, LV2_E_034, LV2_E_104, LV2_E_106, LV2_E_107, LV2_OFF_080, LV2_OFF_077, LV2_E_077, LV2_E_075, LV2_E_074,			

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_E_072, LV2_OFF_045, LV2_OFF_047, LV2_OFF_073			
Public Rights of Way and Paths	LV2_PFF_005, LV2_OFF_022, LV2_OFF_024, LV2_OFF_028, LV2_OFF_032, LV2_PFF_024, LV2_PFF_039, LV2_OFF_037, LV2_OFF_136, LV2_OFF_133, LV2_OFF_130, LV2_OFF_050, LV2_E_064, LV2_OFF_116,	Respondents have expressed concern about the Proposed Development's impact of Public Rights of Way during construction.	Yes	Measures have been identified to minimise disruption and manage temporary diversions during construction, ensuring pedestrian access is maintained wherever possible and that safe, clearly signposted alternatives are implemented when necessary. These are set out in the outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP) **[EN010012/APP/LVS/07.09]** submitted as part of the Application.
Public Rights of Way and Paths	LV2_PFF_005, LV2_OFF_022, LV2_OFF_024, LV2_OFF_028, LV2_OFF_032, LV2_PFF_024, LV2_PFF_039, LV2_OFF_037, LV2_OFF_136, LV2_OFF_133, LV2_OFF_130, LV2_OFF_050, LV2_E_064, LV2_OFF_116, LV2_OFF_109, LV2_OFF_051	Respondents expressed support for any measures which help in using the area for walking and increases public access, as well as improving the experience of walkers through new permissive paths, protection of existing PRoWs. One respondent expressed	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges the support for more Public Rights of Way. The Applicant has committed to the maintenance of existing and realigned Public Rights of Way and the provision of new permissive paths, these plans can be found in ES Volume 1 Chapter 13: Socioeconomics **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13]**, and the outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP)

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		they wanted to see footpath plans published as a community benefit.		**[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.09]** submitted as part of the Application.
Public Rights of Way and Paths	LV2_PFF_033, LV2_PFF_036, LV2_PFF_037, LV2_PFF_041, LV2_PFF_043, LV2_E_036, LV2_E_042, LV2_E_049, LV2_E_050, LV2_OFF_142, LV2_OFF_133, LV2_E_064, LV2_E_065, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_070, LV2_OFF_069, LV2_OFF_062, LV2_OFF_058, LV2_OFF_055, LV2_OFF_042, LV2_OFF_052	Respondents stated they would not want to walk among solar panels or through industrial corridors between panels.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant has embedded mitigation measures to maintain the amenity of Public Rights of Way, including the provision of landscaping and a minimum 15 metre buffer offset from all infrastructure, including fencing; these measures are set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 13: Socioeconomics **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13]**.
Public Rights of Way and Paths	LV2_PFF_021, LV2_PFF_031, LV2_PFF_047, LV2_OFF_143, LV2_OFF_140, LV2_OFF_120, LV2_OFF_119, LV2_E_064, LV2_OFF_067, LV2_OFF_148, LV2_E_120, LV2_E_124, LV2_OFF_077	Respondents requested that access to existing PRoWs remains during construction, with no access restricted.	Yes	ES Volume 1 Chapter 13: Socioeconomics **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13]** sets out that potential effects on access to PRoW and recreational routes, such as PRoW diversions, would be felt most during construction. Measures have been identified to minimise disruption and manage temporary diversions during

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				construction, ensuring pedestrian access is maintained wherever possible and that safe, clearly signposted alternatives are implemented when necessary. These are set out in the outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP, **[EN010012/APP/LVS/07.09]**) submitted as part of the Application.
Public Rights of Way and Paths	LV2_PFF_025, LV2_PFF_036, LV2_PFF_037, LV2_PFF_043, LV2_PFF_044, LV2_PFF_050, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_OFF_066, LV2_OFF_063, LV2_OFF_060, LV2_OFF_057, LV2_OFF_148	Respondents expressed opposition for an increase in permissive paths, state enough are already available.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment.
Public Rights of Way and Paths	LV2_PFF_001, LV2_PFF_039, LV2_PFF_042, LV2_OFF_145, LV2_OFF_138, LV2_OFF_136, LV2_OFF_133, LV2_OFF_128, LV2_OFF_051	Respondents expressed support for an increase in permissive paths.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment.
Public Rights of Way and Paths	LV2_PFF_024, LV2_OFF_140, LV2_OFF_133, LV2_OFF_120,	Respondents requested that existing PRoWs are restored	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. The outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP)

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_OFF_067, LV2_OFF_148, LV2_E_120, LV2_E_124	to their former condition before construction.		**[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.09]** sets out that any damage to the surface of the Public Rights of Way will be repaired as soon as practicable. The oPRoWMP sets out that the surface will be returned to its original condition following construction.
Public Rights of Way and Paths	LV2_PFF_047, LV2_E_042, LV2_OFF_145, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_070, LV2_OFF_058, LV2_OFF_148	Respondents expressed general concern for the safety and wellbeing of horses and riders.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding the health and wellbeing of horses and riders. The outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.09]** provides a framework for the management of walking, cycling and horse riding and other public access routes throughout the Site.
Public Rights of Way and Paths	LV2_PFF_001, LV2_PFF_039, LV2_PFF_042, LV2_OFF_133, LV2_OFF_128	Respondents suggested a focus on circular PRoWs which avoid busy roads.	Yes	The outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.09]** sets out proposals for the proposed permissive paths for each site, some of which include plans for circular routes where feasible.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Public Rights of Way and Paths	LV2_PFF_047, LV2_E_061, LV2_OFF_146, LV2_OFF_055	Respondents expressed doubt that the Proposed Development will lead to any new PRoWs, believe access to the countryside is to be fully prevented.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges the importance of Public Rights of Way in ES Volume 1 Chapter 13: Socioeconomics **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13]**, the outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.09]**) submitted as part of the Application sets out the proposed permissive paths. The permissive paths will be provided whilst the Proposed Development is operational. The Applicant has embedded mitigation measures to maintain the amenity of Public Rights of Way, including the provision of landscaping and a minimum 15 metre buffer offset from all infrastructure, including fencing; these measures are set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 13: Socioeconomics **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13]**.
Public Rights of Way and Paths	LV2_PFF_018, LV2_OFF_145, LV2_OFF_133	Respondents requested that if any new PRoWs are	Yes	The outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP,

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		introduced, a commitment to their upkeep is required.		**[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.09]**) identifies measures to minimise disruption and manage temporary diversions during construction, ensuring pedestrian access is maintained wherever possible and that safe, clearly signposted alternatives are implemented when necessary. The objective throughout the operational phase will be to retain the operation of all PRoW and permissive paths.
Public Rights of Way and Paths	LV2_OFF_136, LV2_OFF_133	Respondents suggested linking up existing PRoWs with the new ones.	Yes	The alignment of existing PRoWs across the various component of Proposed Development Sites have been incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development layout. The proposed permissive paths and realigned PRoW provide new links between existing PRoW, create new loops, introduce increased accessibility to cyclists and improve connectivity. The new routes are further detailed in the outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.09]**) and

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				shown on the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**).
Public Rights of Way and Paths	LV2_PFF_044	Respondent expressed opposition to any new recreational facilities, adds that existing facilities are fine.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Public Rights of Way and Paths	LV2_PFF_001	Respondent reported concern over landowners in the area previously blocking access to PRoWs which cross their land.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.09]**) sets out how the PRoW within the Proposed Development will be managed during the construction and operation of the Proposed Development, to minimise disruption, ensuring pedestrian access is maintained wherever possible and that safe, clearly signposted alternatives are implemented when necessary. The objective throughout the operational phase will be to retain the operation of all PRoW and permissive paths
Public Rights of Way and Paths	LV2_OFF_130	Respondent requested that any new PRoWs have regard	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges this comment.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		for hedgerows and the contours of the land.		New routes for permissive paths were identified based on improving links between existing PRoW, creating new loops, introducing increased accessibility to cyclists and improving connectivity, with consideration given to the local topography and landscape and presence of fauna and habitats. The new permissive paths are shown on the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**. The outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.09]** sets out that any instances where damage is caused to PRoW by maintenance vehicles will be returned to its existing condition as soon as practicable.
Public Rights of Way and Paths	LV2_E_067	Respondent expressed concern for the safety of users, especially women, of PRoWs which would be bordered by 12m high hedges for screening.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and acknowledges the concern, and can confirm that hedges will be 1.5 to 4.5m tall. Where permissive paths and PRoWs cross fields, hedgerows would not be included, preserving the legacy landscape layout.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				All existing PRoWs and new permissive paths will have a 15 m buffer on either side to any infrastructure associated with the Proposed Development, including fencing. Therefore, routes will be located with an open corridor. Security fencing is intended to be used sparingly and kept as low as possible in height. Fencing will also be integrated with existing hedges or landscaping to blend more naturally with the environment. Appropriate gates and barriers will be installed at access points to control the type of users permitted on each path, with gates designed to allow pedestrian and cyclist access while preventing horse riders where equestrian use is not intended. As noted in the oLEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**, the surfacing material (suggested grass) and width of the permissive path will be agreed in advance of operation with the host authorities.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Public Rights of Way and Paths	LV2_OFF_148, LV2_E_112	Respondents raised concern over the impact to PRoWs and amenity specifically at Wistow Lordship.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Wistow Lordship was not included in the Socioeconomic Receptors Impact Assessment (ES Volume 3 Appendix 13.1 **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.13.01]**) due to its distance away from the Solar Development Sites, however PRoWs that cross the Lordship and the Cable Route Corridor have been assessed. During the installation of the cable within the Cable Route Corridor, there may be some instances where the PRoW needs to be closed to users for a short period, where temporary diversion is not practicable. This will not occur at all PRoWs, with signage placed at all PRoW intersections with the Proposed Development to inform the public about planned works, closures, and alternative routes. Further details are provided within the oPRoWMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.09]**.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The oPRoWMP also outlines and secures measures to be employed where PRoW are crossed by the Cable Route Corridor haulage road, including the provision of banksmen to hold vehicles if a PRoW user is present and advise PRoW users of the presence of construction vehicles, the stopping of vehicles at all PRoW crossings, and limiting vehicle speeds on the haulage road and on approach to it to 5 to 10 mph.
Public Rights of Way and Paths	LV2_PFF_031	Respondent requested that recreational areas are created in Hambleton.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Public Rights of Way and Paths	LV2_PFF_051	Respondent expressed concern over the closure of and impact to PRoWs through Solar Development Site 4 and Birkin.	Yes	Section 3.2 of the outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.09]** establishes that PRoWs will remain open throughout the construction period so far as is practicable to do so, with management to ensure the safety of all PRoW users.
Public Rights of Way and Paths	LV2_OFF_145	Respondent raised concern over the impact to PRoWs	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Three permanent PRoW diversions are

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		specifically at Solar Development Site 1 and the Escrick Park Estate.		proposed as part of the Proposed Development; these are located at Solar Development Site 1 and are outlined in Table 33 of the outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.09]**. Two of the three routes to be diverted are bridleways, while the third, a footpath, includes an 800m stretch which will be diverted to connect with the existing bridleway. All diversions are planned to be implemented prior to construction and involve permanent re-routing to accommodate site infrastructure.
Public Rights of Way and Paths	LV2_E_126	Respondent noted that Site 7 has a public right of way along its northern edge, currently subject to a closure order by National Rail (via NY Council) due to safety concerns at the rail crossing in the northwest corner. This closure is being challenged by the local community and will be reviewed by HM		The Applicant notes this response and can confirm that it is aware of the route identified by the respondent, and the challenge which has been mounted against the closure. The Applicant has also been in contact with Network Rail, and the organisation was formally consulted during the pre-application process. Following these discussions and assessment of existing PRoWs, no opportunity was identified to divert or

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		Inspector in October at Selby Town Hall. The respondent urged Light Valley Solar to work with Network Rail on solutions, such as funding and infrastructure, to make the crossing safe and withdraw the closure request. The respondent also suggested creating a new path along the eastern boundary of the railway, connecting the existing route to Common Lane.		improve the PRoW to address the concerns leading to the closure order. The Applicant confirms that both of the routes identified have not been included as part of the proposed enhancements to existing PRoWs or linked to the new proposed permissive paths. The Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**) shows the routes of diverted and existing PRoWs and new permissive paths, with ES Volume 1 Chapter 13: Socioeconomics **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13]** providing further detail.

Site Selection and Alternatives

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_PFF_002, LV2_PFF_005, LV2_PFF_008, LV2_PFF_011, LV2_PFF_013, LV2_PFF_015, LV2_PFF_017, LV2_OFF_003, LV2_OFF_006, LV2_OFF_012, LV2_OFF_013, LV2_OFF_014, LV2_OFF_017, LV2_OFF_018, LV2_OFF_020, LV2_E_003, LV2_E_005, LV2_E_007, LV2_E_008, LV2_E_010, LV2_E_012, LV2_E_013, LV2_E_014, LV2_E_016, LV2_E_017, LV2_E_019, LV2_E_022, LV2_E_027, LV2_E_009, LV2_E_011, LV2_OFF_029, LV2_OFF_031, LV2_PFF_019, LV2_OFF_032, LV2_PFF_023, LV2_PFF_024, LV2_PFF_025, LV2_PFF_026, LV2_PFF_033,	Respondents expressed that solar panels should be on rooftops of houses, industrial units, farm buildings, commercial premises, warehouses, airports, factories and carparks, and placed on other brownfield sites. Specific sites suggested by respondents include Gascoigne Wood, Sherburn Industrial Estate, the former Selby Mine, Sherburn Airfield, and the former power plant sites at Eggborough and Ferrybridge.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges these comments, ES Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]** references the Site Selection Assessment Report (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]** which confirms assessment of previously developed land/brownfield land was carried out within a 25 km radius of the Monk Fryston Substation point of connection. The search did not identify any available suitable land of an adequate area to facilitate a 500 MW connection, either individually or in combination with other sites. Further information on specific alternative sites can be found in the Site Selection Assessment Report (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]**.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_OFF_034, LV2_PFF_034, LV2_PFF_036, LV2_PFF_037, LV2_PFF_041, LV2_PFF_047, LV2_PFF_048, LV2_PFF_050, LV2_L_001, LV2_E_035, LV2_E_036, LV2_E_040, LV2_E_042, LV2_E_043, LV2_E_048, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_PFF_056, LV2_E_061, LV2_OFF_037, LV2_OFF_146, LV2_OFF_145, LV2_OFF_040, LV2_OFF_143, LV2_PFF_053, LV2_OFF_041, LV2_OFF_135, LV2_OFF_136, LV2_OFF_133, LV2_OFF_132, LV2_OFF_129, LV2_OFF_048, LV2_OFF_119, LV2_E_062, LV2_OFF_049, LV2_E_065, LV2_E_066, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_051,			

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_E_053, LV2_E_054, LV2_E_071, LV2_E_055, LV2_E_060, LV2_OFF_117, LV2_OFF_115, LV2_OFF_114, LV2_OFF_113, LV2_OFF_111, LV2_OFF_108, LV2_OFF_073, LV2_OFF_069, LV2_OFF_067, LV2_OFF_065, LV2_OFF_063, LV2_OFF_062, LV2_E_021, LV2_OFF_060, LV2_E_024, LV2_OFF_056, LV2_OFF_106, LV2_OFF_103, LV2_OFF_099, LV2_OFF_095, LV2_E_082, LV2_E_081, LV2_E_118, LV2_E_120, LV2_E_121, LV2_E_122, LV2_E_085, LV2_E_086, LV2_E_087, LV2_E_088, LV2_E_090,			

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_E_092, LV2_E_093, LV2_E_094, LV2_E_096, LV2_E_097, LV2_E_098, LV2_E_109, LV2_E_110, LV2_E_111, LV2_E_112, LV2_E_100, LV2_PFF_061, LV2_PFF_060, LV2_E_025, LV2_E_026, LV2_E_113, LV2_E_114, LV2_E_115, LV2_E_101, LV2_E_032, LV2_E_033, LV2_E_034, LV2_OFF_092, LV2_E_104, LV2_E_059, LV2_E_049, LV2_E_050, LV2_OFF_086, LV2_E_107, LV2_OFF_085, LV2_E_108, LV2_OFF_081, LV2_OFF_080, LV2_OFF_077, LV2_E_077, LV2_E_076, LV2_E_072			
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_OFF_007, LV2_OFF_025, LV2_PFF_021, LV2_OFF_032, LV2_PFF_022, LV2_PFF_025, LV2_PFF_026, LV2_PFF_033, LV2_PFF_034, LV2_PFF_036, LV2_PFF_041,	Respondents expressed general opposition to the Proposed Development because it is in the wrong location or area.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. ES Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]** and the Site Selection Assessment Report (ES Volume 3)

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_PFF_043, LV2_PFF_045, LV2_PFF_048, LV2_L_001, LV2_E_036, LV2_E_040, LV2_E_041, LV2_E_042, LV2_E_043, LV2_E_044, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_E_049, LV2_E_050, LV2_OFF_036, LV2_OFF_146, LV2_OFF_145, LV2_OFF_143, LV2_OFF_142, LV2_OFF_135, LV2_OFF_141, LV2_OFF_140, LV2_OFF_136, LV2_OFF_133, LV2_OFF_132, LV2_OFF_128, LV2_OFF_046, LV2_OFF_126, LV2_OFF_125, LV2_OFF_122, LV2_OFF_119, LV2_E_064, LV2_E_018, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_070,			**[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]** set out the site selection process has undertaken, and demonstrates why the location of the Proposed Development is appropriate

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_E_071, LV2_OFF_069, LV2_OFF_068, LV2_OFF_060, LV2_OFF_058, LV2_OFF_056, LV2_OFF_055, LV2_OFF_103, LV2_OFF_042, LV2_OFF_148, LV2_E_119, LV2_E_120, LV2_E_122, LV2_E_079, LV2_E_085, LV2_E_124, LV2_E_111, LV2_PFF_031, LV2_PFF_047			
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_OFF_005, LV2_PFF_034, LV2_PFF_045, LV2_PFF_048, LV2_E_041, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_OFF_140, LV2_OFF_126, LV2_OFF_125, LV2_E_064, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_051, LV2_E_055, LV2_E_057, LV2_E_069, LV2_OFF_060, LV2_OFF_056, LV2_E_079, LV2_E_085, LV2_E_124,	Respondents expressed general concern regarding the site selection process and the sites selected for the Proposed Development.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges these comments, ES Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]** references the Site Selection Assessment Report (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]** which provides further information on the site selection process.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_E_030, LV2_OFF_049, LV2_E_077			
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_PFF_009, LV2_PFF_012, LV2_PFF_023, LV2_PFF_036, LV2_PFF_047, LV2_E_036, LV2_OFF_146, LV2_OFF_145, LV2_E_067, LV2_OFF_056, LV2_E_031, LV2_E_101, LV2_E_004, LV2_E_002, LV2_OFF_086	Respondents expressed that other forms of renewable or non-renewable energy generation would be more effective, with preferences expressed for wind, nuclear and SMRs, hydro power, tidal power, and offshore solar. Some respondents add that solar generation is not an efficient technology in the UK.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges comments relating to the suitability of other energy infrastructure. ES Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]** (Section 11) establishes that solar, wind, wave, tidal, hydro-electricity sources, alongside low carbon infrastructure, such as nuclear, hydrogen and bioenergy, combined will provide the mix needed to deliver an affordable, reliable energy system. All low-carbon generating technologies, as mentioned in paragraph 3.3.59 of National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1, are *"urgently needed to meet the government's energy objectives"* including deployment of technologies with complementary characteristics.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_OFF_017, LV2_PFF_034, LV2_PFF_036, LV2_PFF_042, LV2_PFF_043, LV2_E_041, LV2_OFF_142,	Respondents expressed that the cable route is too long.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. ES Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]**

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_OFF_141, LV2_OFF_136, LV2_OFF_131, LV2_E_018, LV2_E_059, LV2_OFF_112, LV2_OFF_069, LV2_OFF_066, LV2_OFF_062, LV2_OFF_148, LV2_E_091, LV2_E_092, LV2_E_033, LV2_E_106, LV2_OFF_085			establishes that the primary aim of the Cable Corridor was to find the most direct alignments between the Monk Fryston Substation and each of the Solar Development Sites. This represents the most operationally efficient route and would be expected to result in fewer impacts and a shorter construction period. The Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) (ES Volume 3 **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]**) sets out further how the Cable Corridor Options area was identified throughout the pre-Application process and how this has been further refined to the Cable Route Corridor presented in the DCO Application.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Site Selection and Alternatives	LLV2_PFF_045, V2_PFF_048, LV2_OFF_122, LV2_E_066, LV2_E_119, LV2_E_122	Respondents raised concerns over the proximity of solar sites to the Monk Fryston conservation area, some feel the Proposed Development will destroy it.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges this concern and can confirm that the Monk Fryston Conservation Area was included in the full assessment of potential impacts as detailed within ES Volume 1 Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/ 06.01.08]**. The assessment included a site walkover, assessment of the overall landscape setting of the conservation area, geophysical survey of the Solar Development Sites and Cable Route Corridor, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/0.6.03.08.03]** and trial trenching **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.04]** of Solar Development Sites. This assessment has concluded that, whilst there will be minor adverse impacts on elements of the built historic environment as a result of changes in their setting, these will be limited. Where possible, impacts have been mitigated by design. An Archaeological Mitigation Strategy **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.11]**

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				has been prepared to mitigate impacts on the archaeological resource from the Proposed Development, while the outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**) secures measures to mitigate impacts to the Monk Fryston Conservation Area and other cultural heritage and archaeological aspects during the construction phase. The ES concludes in respect of the Conservation Area that while the village's rural surroundings make a key contribution to its significance, views of the solar panels would be screened by the modern development in the eastern end of the village, as well as the dense woodland in the Monk Fryston Hall estate. As this screening would be limited to glimpsed views, it is considered that overall, the impact will be minor.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_PFF_043, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_059, LV2_OFF_066, LV2_OFF_062, LV2_E_103	Respondents requested assurances that no new solar sites will be added along the cable route from Solar Development Site 1.	No	The Applicant can confirm that it does not intend to add new Solar Development Sites along the Cable Route Corridor from Solar Development Site 1.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_PFF_047, LV2_E_042, LV2_OFF_037, LV2_OFF_145, LV2_E_068	Respondents suggested panels should be near railway lines, motorways and major roads or public transport routes.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges these comments, ES Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]** references the Site Selection Assessment Report (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]** which confirms assessment of previously developed land/brownfield land was carried out within a 25 km radius of the Monk Fryston Substation. The search did not identify any available suitable land of an adequate area to facilitate a solar project with a 500 MW connection, either individually or in combination with other sites. Further information on specific alternative sites can be found in the Site Selection Assessment Report (ES

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Volume 3) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]**.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_PFF_031, LV2_PFF_044, LV2_PFF_048, LV2_OFF_088	Respondents suggested smaller or more broken up sites.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The Site Selection Assessment Report explains the Applicant's approach to sizing as part of the site selection process, and why a network of smaller broken up sites is not possible for the Proposed Development.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_PFF_048, LV2_PFF_049, LV2_E_091	Respondents oppose the siting of any part of the Proposed Development in Monk Fryston.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The connection point for the Proposed Development is at Monk Fryston Substation, where there is available capacity for a utility-scale solar installation, leading to the connection agreement with the National Grid. Beyond access to enable the connecting of the cable, no works are planned at the substation itself.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_E_067, LV2_OFF_073	Respondents expressed deep concern over the impact to the South Milford Community Allotments,	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment and has welcomed previous discussions regarding measures to minimise impacts to the allotments.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		express worry that two sides will border solar panels which could stunt the growth and health of plants on the eastern side of the allotment due to shading from the panels and screening measures.		The Applicant notes there is a buffer of 10 m to watercourses which would apply to Milford Common Drain, which forms a boundary between the allotments and the Proposed Development. Furthermore, solar panels would be set back inside perimeter fencing, which would consist of a deer wire mesh and wooden post security fence with wooden posts. This means that the solar panels will be set back from the allotments, as will planted screening; the location, height and species will be reviewed carefully and set out in the detailed Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**).
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_PFF_042, LV2_OFF_047	Respondents enquired as to why Osgodby Substation has not been used instead of Monk Fryston.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. Following discussions with National Grid, a point of connection was identified at the Monk Fryston Substation which has available capacity

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				for a utility scale energy project. Further information on the site selection process has been found in ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]**.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_OFF_148, LV2_E_112	Respondents wish to see the cable route rerouted away from Wistow Lordship.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. ES Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]** establishes that the primary aim of the Cable Route Corridor (originally referred to as the Cabe Corridor Options Area) was to find the most direct alignments between the Monk Fryston Substation and each of the Solar Development Sites, to ensure minimal electric transmission losses and reduce the land take required for the Cable Route Corridor and the Proposed Development as a whole.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_PFF_034, LV2_OFF_068	Respondents expressed concern that the cable will have to cross roads such as the A19, as well as rail and water ways.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Underground cabling used for the Proposed Development will cross railways, roadways and watercourses, Trenchless techniques will be used for

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				all rail crossings, and for the crossing of the River Ouse, main rivers, IDB watercourses, and WER water body line watercourses (unless an existing culvert crossing can be utilised). Trenchless solutions will also be utilised when/if crossing ditches that lead to the following designated sites: Common Wood SINC, Nightingale Wood SINC, Burr Closes SSSI, and Barber Rain SINC. Trenchless solutions will also be employed to pass beneath Ouse Bank-Westfield-Riccall Ings SINC that flanks the river Ouse. Road crossings will be a combination of trenchless and open cut crossings.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_PFF_026, LV2_PFF_039	Respondents stated that solar panels are too big, requested they are made smaller.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The final panels to be used for the Proposed Development have not yet been determined, however the Applicant can confirm the panels will be bifacial monocrystalline panels, comprising two layers of toughened, low reflectivity black or dark blue glass. The panels would be secured via metal posts driven

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				into ground to an approximate depth of 1.5 m to 4 m (dependent on ground conditions). In areas where archaeological protection is required, concrete feet or other non-ground penetrative techniques would be used. Table 2-1 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development **[EN0110012/APP/06.01.02]** provides further details, including regarding the tracking and fixed panel types (options A and B respectively) being considered. The Design Approach Document (DAD, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.05]**) provides additional detail on this matter.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_PFF_039, LV2_PFF_048	Respondents expressed that the Proposed Development is too dense.	No	The Applicant notes this comment The Site Selection Assessment Report explains the Applicant's approach to site selection and sets out on the basis of the factors applied, how the combination of Solar Development Sites has been chosen, The size of the Proposed Development has been developed to service the 500 MW grid connection offer.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_PFF_045	Respondent expressed that the Proposed Development is too fragmented or spread out, some respondents query why this is the case.	Yes	The Applicant has provided evidence of specific alternative sites in the Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR, ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]**. This explains how the combination of Solar Development Sites has been developed.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_E_080	Respondent stated that the webinar referred to grid connections and a power legacy. The respondent added that this referred to three contained industrial sites, not a wide-spread solar farm.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. As described in ES Volume 1 Chapter 1: Introduction **[EN0110012/APP/06.01.01]**, the Applicant's parent company, Island Green Power (IGP) UK Limited is an international developer of renewable energy projects, including utility-scale solar installations. As such, the Applicant is developing a solar generating station to meet the grid connection offer at Monk Fryston Substation.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_E_004	Respondent expressed concern regarding the distance between the sites and the BESS. Some	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Table 36 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]** sets

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		respondents requested an explanation.		out the criteria that have informed the site selection for the BESS Compound including the Environmental Constraints, Technical, and engineering requirements. The electrical design of the Proposed Development will enable the benefits of a co-located battery and solar scheme to be realised, notwithstanding the distances between the Solar Development Sites. The Site Selection Assessment Report explains how the combination of Solar Development Sites has been developed.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_PFF_037	Respondent pointed out that the difference between the Proposed Development and previous energy projects (legacy of generating power) is that the Proposed Development is bigger, and the sites are closer to residential areas.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The size of the Proposed Development has been determined to accommodate the capacity of the Proposed Development, which has been agreed with National Grid, with Monk Fryston Substation agreed as the connection point due to available capacity. The Applicant notes that, unlike the previous, historic energy developments in the area, the Proposed Development has been proposed to

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				meet government decarbonisation targets. As detailed in the Statement of Need **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.03]** and ES Volume 1 Chapter 1: Introduction **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.01]** in December 2024, the government published their Clean Power 2030 Action Plan which reinforces the urgent need for low carbon generation schemes to come forward to pave the way to decarbonise the wider economy (including heat, transport and industry) by 2050. UK electricity demand is expected to double by 2050 as the country pursues the electrification of heat in buildings, transport, and industry. Furthermore, the Clean Power 2030 Action Plan includes a capacity range for solar power (excluding additional rooftop solar projects) of 45-47GW by 2030 and 45-69GW by 2035. The size of the Proposed Development has also been determined to accommodate mitigation measures,

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				including offset from residential properties, substantial new planting and careful siting and height control of infrastructure; these measures are shown on the Works Plans **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.03]**.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_E_043	Respondent stated that the north and the local area have done their part for energy generation, so should not have to host another energy scheme.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Section 6 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]** sets out the need for the Proposed Development with regards to the National Policy Statement. In addition, the Proposed Development has not purposefully been located in a specific region of the UK; instead, it was determined that Monk Fryston Substation has available capacity for a utility-scale renewable energy project to connect, enabling the future transmission of 500 MW of clean, renewable energy to the national electricity grid.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_E_070	Respondent stated that, contrary to what they were	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. ES Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		told at the Sherburn event, solar farms can be built in hilly areas, as has been done in Spain and Portugal.		Design Iteration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]** states that the Solar Development Sites are considered suitable for solar energy generation due to their topography and the irradiance levels in this part of the country, proximity to a point of connection, and availability.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_E_069	Respondent enquired as to why the overall hectarage of the Proposed Development had to grow between Phase One and Two; respondent adds that they did not believe the true boundary limits have been shown in plans, believing the true size is far bigger and not being shown.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. The area required for the Proposed Development is refined throughout the iterative process as a result of community feedback, technical surveys, and engineering data. The Proposed Development must be located within the limits of deviation and Order Limits as shown on the Works Plans **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.03]**. Further information on this can be found in ES Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03].**
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_PFF_056	Respondent stated that more low-cost homes are needed	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Section 6 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		and the land proposed could be used for that.		**[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]** sets out the need for the Proposed Development with regards to the National Policy Statement.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_PFF_034	Respondent reported their concern over the owner of Solar Development Site 1, stated they hope to lease this land for 60 years. He is also proposing to build a new town (Heronby) close by on the other side of the A19. This would be very profitable for him but not very pleasant for Escrick residents. The noise, heavy industrial traffic etc. would have a devastating effect on the village.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. Land agreements are entered into voluntarily, and engagement with landowners and tenants is ongoing. In respect of the Proposed Development the Applicant can confirm that operational traffic would be minimal, while impacts from construction phase traffic would be short-term, as detailed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14]**. The outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]**) identifies a construction traffic HGV route that avoids the village of Escrick.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_E_067	Respondent expressed concern that land currently used for emergency landings	Yes	Table 35 of ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]** sets

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		and training for Sherburn Aeroclub will be lost to the Proposed Development, does not specify which site or field.		out the design iterations of the proposed development including a section of Solar PV Panels being removed from Field 6.5 to allow for aircraft space if emergency landing is required on approach to/take off from Sherburn Aerodrome.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_E_069	Respondent suggested Site 5 should have been kept as part of the Proposed Development, making use of pontoons to site panels on the flood-prone site. Respondent adds that this would be in-keeping with an 'environmentally-led design', instead of looking at alternative sites as a solution.		The Applicant notes this comment. Following Phase One consultation and a review of the environmental constraints present at the site (including accounting for flood risk), the decision was taken to remove Solar Development Site 5 from the Proposed Development.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_E_079	Respondent cited NPPF plans that stated development on Green Belt land had to be justified under very special circumstances. The respondent added that the PEIR gives very little		As set out in ES Volume 3 Appendix 3.1: Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]**), the Proposed Development includes limited areas of Green Belt land, affecting parts of Solar Development

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		consideration of the Green Belt sites.		Sites 2 and 4 only. The majority of the Proposed Development lies outside the Green Belt. The site selection process sought to avoid Green Belt land where practicable, and alternative sites considered would have resulted in a greater extent of Green Belt involvement or were otherwise less suitable. The limited Green Belt effects of the Proposed Development are therefore considered justified in the context of the urgent national need for renewable energy infrastructure. As set out in Section 2.4 of the Applicant's Policy Compliance Document **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.12]**, the Applicant is satisfied that the Proposed Development is demonstrably located on 'grey belt' land, and is not inappropriate development under current policy.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_PFF_049	Respondent objected to the location of the BESS sites generally.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment, Table 36 of ES Volume 1 Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]** establishes the BESS location selection including environmental constraints, technical, and engineering requirements.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_PFF_049	Respondent implied the siting of the BESS is illegal, cited a councillor who reported that BESS sites should be six miles away from the nearest habitation.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment, Table 36 of ES Volume 1 Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]** sets out the safety requirement of a 100m buffer for residential properties.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_PFF_042	Respondent objected to the location of the substations generally.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_PFF_042	Respondent enquired as to why the cable route approaches Monk Fryston and Hambleton to the south, why not to the north to Site 8?	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges suggestions and preferences for use of alternative routes for the cable, and can confirm that alternative routes were considered, assessed, and have been reported on within the Site Selection

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Assessment Report (SSAR) (ES Volume 3 **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]**). The most direct routes with the least obstacles were chosen for the Cable Route Corridor to ensure maximum efficiency in electricity transmission; the route suggested by the respondent includes more obstacles and would not be as direct a route as the one now proposed.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_E_089	Respondent stated that it is likely their land may be used as part of the cable corridor, which cannot happen as they are in negotiation with a local developer to build a bypass for the village funded by a housing scheme. The respondent asked based on this what provisions have been put in place to prevent overlap with over developments?	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The Proposed Development would not infringe on the bypass scheme, with cables being run underground. The Applicant acknowledges that the bypass scheme is a recognised local need and planning provision exists, however its actual construction is contingent on future reviews and secured funding.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_OFF_136	Respondent suggested making use of the large areas of free space over York's park and ride car parks, as well as the outlets that surround York.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges these comments, ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]** references the Site Selection Assessment Report (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]** which confirms assessment of previously developed land/brownfield land was carried out within a 25 km radius of the Monk Fryston Substation. The search did not identify any available suitable land of an adequate area to facilitate a 500 MW solar project, either individually or in combination with other sites. Further information on specific alternative sites can be found in the Site Selection Assessment Report (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]**.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_E_069	Respondent stated that local residents must be made aware that the solar panels	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		could be as tall as a two-story dwelling.		
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_E_069	Respondent expressed concern for the use of tracker panels.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_E_111	Respondent expressed support for the use of tracker panels.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_E_069	Respondent stated that it is concerning that the Applicant does not yet know if tracker or fixed panels will be used, and on which sites.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment, and can confirm that both tracker and fixed panels have been assessed. The Applicant has undertaken an iterative design process, allowing flexibility in designing the Proposed Development based on ongoing assessments and community feedback. As detailed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]** the Proposed Development would utilise either east-west single axis tracker Solar PV Mounting Tables (Option A) or fixed south facing Solar PV Mounting Tables (Option B) and seeks consent for both as part of this Application.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				For the purposes of assessment, the tracker panels have been assumed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]** as a worst-case scenario given their larger scale. ES Volume 1 Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration **[EN110012/APP/LVS/06.01.11]** also assesses tracker panels given that fixed Solar PV Panels do not have any moving parts and therefore have no noise emission associated with them. Section 16.6 Glint and Glare of ES Volume 1 Chapter 16: Other Environmental Matters **[EN110012/APP/LVS/06.01.16]** considers both fixed and tracker panel options.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_PFF_036	Respondent expressed opposition towards the use of pylons.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Underground cables will be used for the Proposed Development.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_OFF_042	Respondent requested further information on the specifications of solar panels to be used, such as size, make etc.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment, Table 2-1 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 2 **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]** sets out the assessed parameters of the components of the solar array and associated infrastructure, with further detail provided in the Design Parameters and Commitments Document **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.06]**.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_E_103	Respondent expressed concern for capacity limits at substations and the local grid system, asking if National Grid have guaranteed a grid agreement for the Proposed Development.	Yes	The Applicant has entered into a connection agreement with National Grid for the export and import of up to 500 MW of electricity. This is further set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]** and the Grid Connection Statement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.10].**
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_E_103	Respondent asked what specific materials are present	Yes	Section 2.5 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 2 **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]** details the components of the Proposed

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		within the panels, inverters and batteries.		Development, including the BESS, panels and inverters. Table 2-1 of the chapter sets out the assessed parameters of the components of the solar array and associated infrastructure.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_PFF_053	Respondent cited the host MP Keir Mather, who advocates for adopting a brownfield first strategy.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges this comment, ES Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]** references the Site Selection Assessment Report (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]** which confirms assessment of previously developed land/brownfield land was carried out within a 25 km radius of the Monk Fryston Substation. The search did not identify any available suitable land of an adequate area to facilitate a 500 MW solar project, either individually or in combination with other sites. Further information on specific alternative sites can be found in the Site

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Selection Assessment Report (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]**.

Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Socioeconomics, Tourism and Recreation	LV2_PFF_013, LV2_OFF_005, LV2_OFF_006, LV2_OFF_009, LV2_OFF_016, LV2_OFF_029, LV2_OFF_030, LV2_PFF_030, LV2_PFF_034, LV2_PFF_035, LV2_PFF_036, LV2_PFF_037, LV2_PFF_048, LV2_PFF_050, LV2_E_036, LV2_E_038, LV2_E_041, LV2_E_042, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_E_049, LV2_E_050, LV2_OFF_147, LV2_OFF_146, LV2_OFF_142, LV2_OFF_133, LV2_E_065, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_070, LV2_E_071, LV2_OFF_073, LV2_OFF_068, LV2_OFF_067, LV2_OFF_058, LV2_OFF_056, LV2_OFF_055, LV2_E_119,	Respondents expressed general concern about the community being impacted.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges concerns about community impacts. ES Volume 1 Chapter 13: Socioeconomics **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13]** identifies that with embedded design and construction management measures in place, no residual significant effects on local communities are predicted. Mitigation for receptors that could otherwise experience significant effects as a result of the construction phase are secured through the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**) and the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**). More widely, other relevant management plans include the outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP)

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_E_120, LV2_E_122, LV2_E_123, LV2_E_124, LV2_E_103			**[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.09]**, the outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP, **[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.03]**), and the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.13]**.
Socioeconomics, Tourism and Recreation	LV2_OFF_024, LV2_OFF_025, LV2_OFF_027, LV2_PFF_021, LV2_PFF_036, LV2_PFF_037, LV2_PFF_045, LV2_E_036, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_E_049, LV2_E_050, LV2_PFF_054, LV2_PFF_059, LV2_OFF_133, LV2_E_070, LV2_OFF_107, LV2_OFF_056, LV2_OFF_055, LV2_OFF_106, LV2_OFF_105, LV2_OFF_102, LV2_OFF_100, LV2_OFF_094, LV2_E_123, LV2_E_124, LV2_E_028,	Respondents expressed concern for the Proposed Development's potential impact on property prices. Some respondents suggested compensation or subsidies should be paid to those impacted by a decline in property prices as a result of the Proposed Development. Respondents would like more information on how those impacted could be compensated.	No	The Applicant has submitted the **Book of Reference [EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.03]**. This includes persons who may be eligible to claim compensation if the Development Consent Order is granted and the Proposed Development developed. Under Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973, property owners (Category 3) are eligible to claim compensation for any physical impacts from the operation of the Proposed Development, such as noise and vibration. However, compensation is not available for loss of value due to visual impacts or diminished views—this is consistent with established planning law.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_E_101, LV2_E_032, LV2_E_103, LV2_OFF_090			The Applicant will comply with statutory process for any compensation claims submitted and will review and assess each claim in accordance with the relevant legislation under which it is made.
Socioeconomics, Tourism and Recreation	LV2_OFF_029, LV2_E_045, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_117, LV2_E_103	Respondents expressed concern for the Proposed Development's impact on the local economy and local businesses. Respondents have asked for the Applicant to quantify this impact.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding effects on local businesses. ES Volume 1 Chapter 13: Socioeconomics **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13]** concludes that no significant adverse economic effects are expected once embedded mitigation and additional mitigation measures are applied. The Applicant will continue dialogue with local businesses to address any project specific queries.
Socioeconomics, Tourism and Recreation	LV2_PFF_036, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_120, LV2_E_103	Respondents expressed concern about the Proposed Development's impact on tenant farmers and	No	The Applicant notes concerns regarding agricultural livelihoods. It was agreed with PINS that this would be scoped out at PEIR stage due to engagement

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		agricultural workers, with concerns over how many livelihoods could be displaced.		showing one job loss only due to the Proposed Development; this is confirmed within ES Volume 3 Appendix 1.2: Scoping Opinion **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.01.02]**.
Socioeconomics, Tourism and Recreation	LV2_E_067, LV2_E_069, LV2_E_103	Respondents expressed scepticism that the Proposed Development will lead to job creation. include mention of jobs created being for those outside of the area. A respondent has asked how many permanent jobs will be created as a result of the Proposed Development.	Yes	The Applicant understands interest in employment opportunities. ES Volume 1 Chapter 13: Socioeconomics **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13]** confirms temporary construction employment will arise, with no permanent local roles guaranteed, typical of solar developments; this is further detailed in and secured through the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan (oSSCEP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.13]**).
Socioeconomics, Tourism and Recreation	LV2_PFF_024, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_074	Respondents requested and highlighted importance of security measures to stop sabotage and destruction of the Proposed Development once built.	Yes	The Applicant notes concerns about security and vandalism. A perimeter security fence would be installed to enclose the operational areas of the Proposed Development, as shown on the and the Outline

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Environmental Masterplan (OEM, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**). ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]** details that pole-mounted CCTV comprising infra-red security detection cameras would be mounted on poles of up to 3 m in height located within the perimeter fence. It is anticipated that these cameras would have motion detection technology for recording unauthorised access and would be monitored remotely. They would point directly within the Site boundary and away from land outside. In general, it is anticipated that the Proposed Development would not be lit. The exception would be at the BESS and substations, where movement sensor-triggered lighting will be needed for security/safety reasons. These security measures are secured through

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				the oCEMP **[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.02]** and oOEMP **[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.03]** which are secured via the DCO.
Socioeconomics, Tourism and Recreation	LV2_E_111	Respondent expressed concern that farmers are being forced to give up their land against their will for the Proposed Development.	No	The Applicant notes these concerns. Land agreements are entered into voluntarily, and engagement with landowners and tenants is ongoing. As described in the Statement of Reasons **[EN110012/APP/LVS/04.01]**, the Applicant is still seeking compulsory acquisition powers in its draft DCO **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/03.01]** which is the standard approach for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs). Whilst seeking compulsory acquisition powers, the Applicant will continue to seek to acquire the land, the rights and other interests in, on and over the land, the temporary use of land, as well as secure the removal of matters affecting the Order land that may impede the Proposed Development, by agreement wherever possible. This

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				approach of seeking powers of compulsory acquisition in the Application for the DCO and, in parallel, conducting negotiations to acquire land and rights by agreement, accords with paragraph 26 of the Department for Communities and Local Government Planning Act 2008: Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land (2013).
Socioeconomics, Tourism and Recreation	LV2_PFF_036	Respondent expressed concern for horses, including domestic and wild horses.	Yes	The Applicant notes the concerns raised regarding horses, including domestic and equine related facilities. ES Volume 1 Chapter 13: Socioeconomics **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13]** has assessed equine receptors both as local businesses and in terms of their recreational and community value. Where the assessment identified likely significant effects, appropriate embedded and additional mitigation has been incorporated into the Proposed Development to minimise disruption, particularly during construction, as

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				detailed in and secured through the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**). With these measures applied, no significant residual effects on equine receptors are expected.
Socioeconomics, Tourism and Recreation	LV2_PFF_036	Respondent expressed concern that the Proposed Development would result in increased crime risk.	Yes	The Applicant notes concerns about potential crime risk. A perimeter security fence would be installed to enclose the operational areas of the Proposed Development. ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]** details that pole-mounted CCTV comprising infra-red security detection cameras would be mounted on poles of up to 3 m in height located within the perimeter fence. It is anticipated that these cameras would have motion detection technology for recording unauthorised

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				access and would be monitored remotely. They would point directly within the Site boundary and away from land outside. In general, it is anticipated that the Proposed Development would not be lit. The exception would be at the BESS and substations, where movement sensor-triggered lighting will be needed for security/safety reasons. These security measures are secured through the oCEMP **[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.02]** and oOEMP **[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.03]** which accompany the DCO Application.
Socioeconomics, Tourism and Recreation	LV2_E_067	Respondent stated that the Proposed Development will bring no socioeconomic benefits.	Yes	The Applicant notes the concern that there will be no socioeconomic benefits. ES Volume 1 Chapter 13: Socioeconomics **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13]** assesses impacts and concludes a minor beneficial benefit to local employment, including during the construction phase with contracted

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				workers using local accommodation and other local businesses; this is supported by the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.13]** where mitigation action and recommendations are secured.
Socioeconomics, Tourism and Recreation	LV2_PFF_036	Respondent expressed concern that agricultural workers' / farmers' voices and concerns will not be heard out of fear, or overshadowed by landowners.	No	The Applicant recognises concerns about representation. Engagement with tenants and workers is ongoing, and opportunities to raise concerns remain available throughout development. In accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008, the Applicant undertook *"diligent inquiry"* through a land referencing process to identify parties within Categories 1, 2 and 3, as defined in sections 42 and 44 of the Planning Act 2008. These include owners, lessees, tenants and occupiers of the land within the Order Land. Category 2 includes parties that are interested in the land or have the power to sell, convey or release the land within the Order Land. Category 3 includes

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				parties that may be eligible to make a claim for compensation as a result of the construction or operation of the Proposed Development. The current position in relation to the Applicant's engagement and negotiations with each landowner affected by the Proposed Development is explained in the Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.04]**.
Socioeconomics, Tourism and Recreation	LV2_PFF_059	Respondent stated that local people should share in the profits of the Proposed Development.	No	The Applicant notes suggestions regarding financial benefits for local residents. Such arrangements are outside the scope of the DCO process, however the Applicant can confirm that it is preparing a Community Benefit Fund scheme.
Socioeconomics, Tourism and Recreation	LV2_PFF_059	Respondent requested that each of the homes effected should receive free standing charges for their electricity.	No	The Applicant notes the request for free standing electricity charges for affected homes. Such financial arrangements fall outside the scope of the DCO process,

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				however the Applicant can confirm that it is preparing a Community Benefit Fund scheme.
Socioeconomics, Tourism and Recreation	LV2_E_068	Respondent enquired as to what risk assessments have been done for properties closest to the sites? Cited the fact solar farms are in their infancy in the UK. Respondent adds that some local authorities suggest a distance of 2 km between solar panels and properties, and asked why this isn't the case for the Proposed Development?	Yes	The Applicant notes the concerns about risk assessments and proximity to properties. ES Volume 1 Chapter 13: Socioeconomics **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13]** scopes all other socioeconomic effects related to the local population out of the assessment. Solar farms are an established form of renewable energy generation, including in the UK. The Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) paragraph 3.3.23 states: *Wind and solar are the lowest cost ways of generating electricity, helping reduce costs and providing a clean and secure source of electricity supply (as they are not reliant on fuel for generation). Our analysis shows that a secure, reliable, affordable, net zero consistent system in 2050 is*

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar. Nearby residential properties to the Proposed Development have been included in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) , detailed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]**. Appropriate buffer zones between residential properties and solar infrastructure have been embedded into the design; these are further explained in ES Chapter 10 and visually shown on the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**).
Socioeconomics, Tourism and Recreation	LV2_E_069	Respondent stated that the PEIR fails to commit to the creation of jobs, when they will be created within the 60 years, and whether they will be local.	Yes	ES Volume 1 Chapter 13: Socioeconomics **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13]** identifies that the Proposed Development is expected to generate 520 net construction jobs over the 36 month construction period, accounting

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				for displacement and multiplier effects. Of these jobs, it is estimated that 260 would be retained within the Study Area. This employment creation, though identified as beneficial, is not considered to be significant in EIA terms given the relatively short period of construction. While the number of permanent roles is limited due to the nature of solar developments, The Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan (oSSCEP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.13]**) includes embedded measures designed to maximise local benefit where practicable.
Socioeconomics, Tourism and Recreation	LV2_E_082	Respondent requested independent property value guarantees and compensation mechanisms.	No	The Applicant has submitted the **Book of Reference [EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.03]**. This includes persons who may be entitled to compensation if the Development Consent Order is granted and the Proposed Development developed.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The Applicant remains committed to adhering to the statutory process for any compensation claims submitted and will review and assess each claim in accordance with the relevant legislation under which it is made. In accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008, the Applicant undertook *"diligent inquiry"* through a land referencing process to identify parties within Categories 1, 2 and 3, as defined in sections 42 and 44 of the Planning Act 2008. These include owners, lessees, tenants and occupiers of the land within the Order Land. Category 2 includes parties that are interested in the land or have the power to sell, convey or release the land within the Order Land. Category 3 includes parties that may be eligible to make a claim for compensation as a result of the construction or operation of the Proposed Development.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The current position in relation to the Applicant's engagement and negotiations with each landowner affected by the Proposed Development is explained in the Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.04]**.
Socioeconomics, Tourism and Recreation	LV2_E_117	Respondent expressed concern that their dog boarding kennel business will be impacted by the Proposed Development. Respondent provides context: - Claimed solar panels will put off people from using their business. - stated they are already suffering from an uncertain future as a result. - Dogs will suffer due to the noise of construction.	Yes	The Applicant notes the concerns regarding the dog boarding kennel business and can confirm that it was assessed as part of the Socioeconomic Receptors Impact Assessment included within ES Volume 3 Appendix 13.1 **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.13.01]**. The kennel is situated 40 m from the Order Limits, and its sensitivity is considered medium due to its economic and community value and its partial reliance on a calm and quiet environment, which contributes to customer demand. As such, changes in the surrounding environment during construction may indirectly affect the business by discouraging customers

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				who prefer tranquil settings for their pets. Construction works may result in minor changes to its baseline situation as a result of temporary and minor changes in amenity (e.g., vibrations, noise or air pollution). Therefore, the magnitude of impact has been assessed as low. Overall, potential impacts to this receptor during construction are considered to be minor adverse (not significant). ES Volume 1 Chapter 13: Socioeconomics **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13]** has also assessed effects on other individual local businesses and recognises the kennel's sensitivity. Where significant effects were initially identified, additional mitigation has been included, alongside embedded measures to manage construction related disruption such as noise and traffic controls. With these measures in place, no significant residual effects are expected.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The assessment of construction noise is outlined in ES Volume 1 Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.11]**. Details of the assessment including plant equipment assumptions and predicted construction noise levels are presented in ES Volume 3 Appendix 11.2: Construction Noise and Vibration Assumptions and Results **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.11.02]**. The assessment, which includes noise emissions from horizontal directional drilling and piling, concludes that adverse effects from construction noise and vibration are not significant. In addition, there is no noise emission from construction plant anticipated to generate a buzzing effect.
Socioeconomics, Tourism and Recreation	LV2_OFF_086	Respondent stated that the proposed sites surround a dog rescue, which will be	Yes	The Applicant notes the concerns regarding the dog boarding kennel business, and refers to the previous

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		impacted due to the amount of open space being reduced.		response above regarding the assessment of the business. ES Volume 1 Chapter 13: Socioeconomics **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13]** has assessed effects on individual local businesses and recognises the kennel's sensitivity. Where significant effects were identified, additional mitigation has been included, alongside embedded measures to manage construction-related disruption such as noise and traffic controls. With these measures in place, no significant residual effects are expected."
Socioeconomics, Tourism and Recreation	LV2_E_124	Respondent stated there is no information on how to claim compensation, what "criteria" apply, or whether a voluntary or discretionary Proposed Development is being proposed by the Applicant given the scale of	No	The Applicant has submitted the **Book of Reference [EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.03]**. This includes persons who may be entitled to compensation if the Development Consent Order is granted and the Project developed.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		impact. Respondent requested that the Applicant set out the statutory basis, criteria, and application process through which homeowners may claim compensation for demonstrable loss in property value.		The Applicant remains committed to adhering to the statutory process for any compensation claims submitted and will review and assess each claim in accordance with the relevant legislation under which it is made. In accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008, the Applicant undertook *"diligent inquiry"* through a land referencing process to identify parties within Categories 1, 2 and 3, as defined in sections 42 and 44 of the Planning Act 2008. These include owners, lessees, tenants and occupiers of the land within the Order Land. Category 2 includes parties that are interested in the land or have the power to sell, convey or release the land within the Order Land. Category 3 includes parties that may be eligible to make a claim for compensation as a result of the construction or operation of the Proposed Development.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The current position in relation to the Applicant's engagement and negotiations with each landowner affected by the Proposed Development is explained in the Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.04]**.
Socioeconomics, Tourism and Recreation	LV2_E_124	Respondent requested confirmation on whether a discretionary hardship or property-purchase Proposed Development will be offered to residents who are surrounded by the development.	No	The Applicant has submitted the **Book of Reference [EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.03]**. This includes persons who may be entitled to compensation if the Development Consent Order is granted and the Project developed. The Applicant remains committed to adhering to the statutory process for any compensation claims submitted and will review and assess each claim in accordance with the relevant legislation under which it is made. In accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008, the Applicant undertook *"diligent inquiry"* through a

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				land referencing process to identify parties within Categories 1, 2 and 3, as defined in sections 42 and 44 of the Planning Act 2008. These include owners, lessees, tenants and occupiers of the land within the Order Land. Category 2 includes parties that are interested in the land or have the power to sell, convey or release the land within the Order Land. Category 3 includes parties that may be eligible to make a claim for compensation as a result of the construction or operation of the Proposed Development. The current position in relation to the Applicant's engagement and negotiations with each landowner affected by the Proposed Development is explained in the Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.04]**.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Socioeconomics, Tourism and Recreation	LV2_OFF_016, LV2_E_045, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_OFF_062, LV2_E_123	Respondents expressed concern for the Proposed Development's potential impact on tourism.	Yes	The Applicant notes concerns regarding potential impacts on tourism. ES Volume 1 Chapter 13: Socioeconomics **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13]** includes an assessment of tourism receptors, considering both individual tourism assets and local accommodation. With embedded mitigation in place to minimise construction impacts including those arising from noise (oCEMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**) and to restrict construction traffic to set routes and working hours (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) the assessment concludes that no significant effects on tourism or tourism related businesses are expected. Furthermore, the provision of approximately 8 km (5 miles) of new permissive paths (as shown on the OEM **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**) will ensure that access to nature and the countryside for both visitors and the local community is maintained and

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				enhanced. Access to existing routes will be maintained throughout the construction phase, with three permanent diversions planned, as secured through the outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.09]**).
Socioeconomics, Tourism and Recreation	LV2_E_123	Respondent expressed scepticism that the impact on tourism has been adequately considered.	Yes	The Applicant notes concerns regarding potential impacts on tourism. ES Volume 1 Chapter 13: Socioeconomics **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13]** includes an assessment of tourism receptors, considering both individual tourism assets and local accommodation. With embedded mitigation in place, the assessment concludes that no significant effects on tourism or tourism related businesses are expected.

Soils and agriculture

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Agricultural Land and Soils	LV2_PFF_031, LV2_PFF_036, LV2_PFF_043, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_PFF_062, LV2_E_018, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_059, LV2_E_030	Respondents expressed general concern for the Proposed Development's impact to soil and land quality.	Yes	An assessment on soils is included within Environmental Statement (ES) Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils **[EN110012/APP/LVS/06.01.05].** The potential effects of construction and maintenance activities will be minimised through adherence to measures contained within a Soil Resources Management Plan. An Outline Soil Resources Management Plan (oSRMP) **[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.14]** has been submitted as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) Application.
Agricultural Land and Soils	LV2_E_112, LV2_E_113	Respondents expressed concern about soil compaction due to heavy vehicles and water run-off.	Yes	Soil compaction will be managed through the Soil Resources Management Plan (SRMP). The soil condition will be surveyed following the installation of the piles and prior to installation of the panels so that any

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				compaction identified can be remediated using appropriate machinery before space becomes more constrained with the panels in place. The outline Soil Resources Management Plan **[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.14]** is secured by Requirement of the draft Development Consent Order (DCO). The alleviation of any soil compaction during construction will reduce the risk of run-off and flooding. The outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP, **[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**), which is also secured by Requirement to the draft DCO, also sets out how soil compaction will be managed to avoid increasing runoff rates. Suitable ground protection measures will be adopted to prevent soil compaction.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				As Environmental Statement (ES) Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils **[EN110012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]** sets out, while it is possible that intense rainfall events may result in some soil erosion, the effect would likely be less pronounced compared with land under conventional arable cultivation.
Agricultural Land and Soils	LV2_PFF_036, LV2_E_067	Respondents stated that the soil will not recover due to the sun being blocked by the panels once installed.	No	Grass is able to grow in shade and partial shade conditions and is the most prevalent vegetation within existing solar farms growing under as well as between the rows of panels. While there may be marginal temperature differences, underground soil conditions do not rely upon sunlight.
Agricultural Land and Soils	LV2_E_103	Respondent has asked for independent evidence stating that chemicals will not leach into the soil.	No	The Applicant acknowledges this concern. Chemical leaching and runoff are considered in ES Volume 1 Chapter 15: Water Resources and Flood Risk **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.15]**, with

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				the Flooding Risk Assessment (FRA, ES Volume 3 Appendix 15.1 **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01]**) determining the risk of release of contaminants during the construction phase, including chemicals, to be negligible in magnitude and not significant, with no additional mitigation proposed beyond abiding by existing regulations on the safe handling of construction materials and chemicals. The use of chemicals within the Proposed Development would be minimal, with no PFAS (forever chemicals) present in solar panel coatings or on BESS batteries. The solar panels would be cleaned using water only; stubborn marks would be removed by scrubbing, removing the risk of cleaning chemical runoff. The solar cells would be made from silicon, a material with properties almost the same as sand. They may contain very small

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				amounts of heavy metals, but these are well within the limits set by law; this is confirmed by the Applicant checking the results of testing in independent laboratories. Pollution prevention measures pertaining to runoff and leaching are detailed in and secured through the oCEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]** and the outline Pollution and Spillage Response Plan (oPSRP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.08]**). The oCEMP includes provision for daily visual checks on areas where high risk activities, such as stockpiling of materials and refuelling, are taking place, with observations reported back to senior personnel on a weekly basis. The oSRMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.14]** secures the monitoring of soil resource during both the construction and operational

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				phases. Guidelines for monitoring during construction will be included in the detailed SRMP. Continuous, live monitoring by the contractor of soil handling/weather conditions, as well as visual monitoring of ground conditions, will be required
Agricultural Land and Soils	LV2_E_116	Respondent has expressed concern about the impact to soils if the BESS caught fire.	No	The Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) will be made up of secure Battery enclosures, which will house the battery systems, electrochemical components and associated equipment. Being either one, or multiple enclosures joined, or close coupled to each other. The battery enclosures will be mounted on concrete slabs, protecting the ground beneath in the unlikely event of a fire. BESS components and safety measures are further detailed in an outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.06]**). Section 4.5 of the oBSMP demonstrates how both air and ground pollution risks are measured, prevented, and mitigated.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The oBSMP stipulates in Section 4.5.11 that: "*at the detailed design stage, a BESS system and site-specific Plume Analysis study will be conducted to assess the environmental impact of a site incident to sensitive receptors within a 1 km radius. Toxic gas emissions to sensitive receptors will be below relevant public health exposure limit guidelines when the battery system of a BESS is fully consumed (burnt out), production of Particulate Matter (PM) and a visibility impact assessment on any transport links within a 1 km radius of the BESS Compound will also be included*." This is secured through the DCO.
Agricultural Land and Soils	LV2_PFF_002, LV2_PFF_011, LV2_PFF_015, LV2_OFF_003, LV2_OFF_006, LV2_OFF_008, LV2_OFF_009, LV2_OFF_012, LV2_OFF_013,	Respondents expressed concern for the use of high-grade BMV agricultural land, as opposed to making use of brownfield land.	No	The areas of each ALC grade affected by the Proposed Development are set out in Table 517 in Environmental Statement (ES) Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils **[EN110012/APP/LVS/06.01.05],** and has been informed by Appendix 5.1

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_OFF_014, LV2_OFF_016, LV2_OFF_018, LV2_OFF_019, LV2_E_001, LV2_E_002, LV2_E_003, LV2_E_005, LV2_E_006, LV2_E_007, LV2_E_008, LV2_E_010, LV2_E_012, LV2_E_013, LV2_E_014, LV2_E_016, LV2_E_017, LV2_E_019, LV2_E_022, LV2_E_027, LV2_E_011, LV2_OFF_021, LV2_OFF_022, LV2_OFF_029, LV2_OFF_031, LV2_PFF_022, LV2_PFF_024, LV2_PFF_025, LV2_PFF_027, LV2_PFF_030, LV2_PFF_031, LV2_PFF_033, LV2_OFF_034, LV2_PFF_034, LV2_PFF_036, LV2_PFF_037, LV2_PFF_039, LV2_PFF_040, LV2_PFF_041, LV2_PFF_043, LV2_PFF_045, LV2_PFF_047, LV2_PFF_048, LV2_PFF_050,			Agricultural Land Classification **[EN110012/APP/LVS/06.03.05.01].** The Site Selection Assessment Report (ES Volume 3 Appendix 3.1 **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]**) confirms that assessment of previously developed land/brownfield land was carried out within a 25 km radius of the Monk Fryston Substation. The search did not identify any suitable land of an adequate area to facilitate a 500 MW solar project, either individually or in combination with other sites. While brownfield sites were identified, these were often too small or spread out from each other, creating a far more fragmented potential site for the Proposed Development. From this point, the search moved to identifying other sites, prioritising the lowest grade BMV land and avoiding green belt land as far as possible.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_L_001, LV2_E_035, LV2_E_036, LV2_E_038, LV2_E_040, LV2_E_041, LV2_E_042, LV2_E_043, LV2_E_045, LV2_E_048, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_E_061, LV2_OFF_146, LV2_OFF_036, LV2_OFF_040, LV2_OFF_145, LV2_OFF_143, LV2_PFF_054, LV2_OFF_041, LV2_PFF_053, LV2_OFF_137, LV2_OFF_135, LV2_PFF_052, LV2_PFF_062, LV2_OFF_141, LV2_OFF_140, LV2_OFF_133, LV2_OFF_129, LV2_OFF_128, LV2_OFF_126, LV2_OFF_125, LV2_OFF_122, LV2_OFF_048, LV2_OFF_119, LV2_OFF_049, LV2_E_062,			

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_E_063, LV2_E_064, LV2_E_065, LV2_E_066, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_070, LV2_E_053, LV2_E_054, LV2_E_071, LV2_E_055, LV2_E_057, LV2_E_059, LV2_E_060, LV2_E_069, LV2_OFF_114, LV2_OFF_113, LV2_OFF_109, LV2_OFF_073, LV2_OFF_069, LV2_OFF_068, LV2_OFF_067, LV2_OFF_066, LV2_OFF_065, LV2_OFF_062, LV2_E_021, LV2_OFF_060, LV2_E_023, LV2_E_024, LV2_OFF_058, LV2_OFF_057, LV2_OFF_106, LV2_OFF_103, LV2_OFF_101, LV2_OFF_100, LV2_OFF_099,			

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_OFF_098, LV2_OFF_097, LV2_OFF_095, LV2_OFF_035, LV2_E_082, LV2_E_081, LV2_E_117, LV2_E_080, LV2_E_118, LV2_E_119, LV2_E_120, LV2_E_121, LV2_E_122, LV2_E_123, LV2_E_086, LV2_E_087, LV2_E_088, LV2_E_090, LV2_E_092, LV2_E_094, LV2_E_096, LV2_E_097, LV2_E_099, LV2_E_109, LV2_E_110, LV2_E_111, LV2_E_112, LV2_E_100, LV2_PFF_061, LV2_PFF_060, LV2_E_025, LV2_E_026, LV2_E_030, LV2_E_031, LV2_E_113, LV2_E_114, LV2_E_115, LV2_E_116, LV2_E_101, LV2_E_102, LV2_E_032, LV2_E_033, LV2_E_103, LV2_OFF_089, LV2_E_104, LV2_E_105, LV2_E_106,			

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_E_107, LV2_E_108, LV2_OFF_082, LV2_OFF_080, LV2_OFF_077, LV2_OFF_076, LV2_E_084, LV2_E_076, LV2_E_075, LV2_E_074, LV2_E_073, LV2_E_072			
Agricultural Land and Soils	LV2_PFF_011, LV2_OFF_009, LV2_OFF_014, LV2_E_003, LV2_E_007, LV2_E_008, LV2_E_010, LV2_E_012, LV2_E_013, LV2_E_014, LV2_E_016, LV2_E_017, LV2_E_019, LV2_E_022, LV2_E_027, LV2_OFF_029, LV2_PFF_024, LV2_PFF_027, LV2_PFF_030, LV2_PFF_034, LV2_OFF_034, LV2_PFF_041, LV2_PFF_045, LV2_PFF_047, LV2_PFF_048, LV2_E_035, LV2_E_036, LV2_E_038, LV2_E_043, LV2_E_045, LV2_E_048, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_E_061, LV2_OFF_146,	Respondents expressed concern about food security. Some respondents requested more information on the impact that may be had to food security.	No	Food security will not be compromised by the Proposed Development (or solar energy more widely). In 2024, solar occupied around 7,300 ha of agricultural land in England, approximately half of which was in dual use for agricultural production. In the same year, 581,000 ha of arable land in England were left uncropped (source: Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs, Agricultural land use in England at 1 June 2024). It should also be noted that food security is not identified as an issue within the suite of Energy National Policy

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_OFF_145, LV2_OFF_137, LV2_PFF_052, LV2_OFF_128, LV2_OFF_126, LV2_OFF_125, LV2_OFF_119, LV2_E_062, LV2_E_065, LV2_E_066, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_053, LV2_E_071, LV2_E_055, LV2_E_057, LV2_E_059, LV2_E_060, LV2_OFF_114, LV2_OFF_109, LV2_OFF_073, LV2_OFF_069, LV2_OFF_067, LV2_OFF_065, LV2_OFF_062, LV2_OFF_060, LV2_OFF_058, LV2_OFF_106, LV2_OFF_100, LV2_OFF_098, LV2_E_082, LV2_E_081, LV2_E_117, LV2_E_080, LV2_E_118,			Statements or the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Further, the Government's UK Solar Roadmap (2024) states that solar development is not considered to compromise food security, and that climate change itself poses the greatest long-term risk to food production - a risk which the Proposed Development directly helps to address by providing a secure, low-carbon source of electricity. Post-decommissioning of the Proposed Development, the landowners would choose how the land is to be used and managed, the landowner may return all of the land to arable use, although it is likely that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained given their potential benefits to agricultural land and the wider farming estate. Whilst it is recognised the UK imports a greater amount of food than it exports,

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_E_119, LV2_E_120, LV2_E_121, LV2_E_122, LV2_E_123, LV2_E_086, LV2_E_088, LV2_E_094, LV2_E_096, LV2_E_100, LV2_E_026, LV2_E_114, LV2_E_116, LV2_E_033, LV2_OFF_091, LV2_E_104, LV2_E_108, LV2_OFF_080, LV2_E_072			the impact of the Proposed Development on food import requirements or the food and drinks economy is not material at a national scale and has therefore not been assessed.
Agricultural Land and Soils	LV2_OFF_141, LV2_E_066, LV2_E_121, LV2_E_112, LV2_E_113, LV2_E_106, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_OFF_141, LV2_OFF_126, LV2_E_069	Respondents stated that the Proposed Development contradicts National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) Paragraph 5.11.12 and National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) 2.10.29, with respect to agricultural land, rural character and environmental integrity.	Yes	EN-1 paragraph 5.11.12 and EN-3 paragraphs 2.10.29 indicate that applicants should seek to minimise impacts on the BMV agricultural land and preferably use land in areas of poorer quality (grades 3b, 4 and 5). ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils **[EN110012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]** provides an assessment of the impacts on agricultural land and soils and includes survey results from the Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) surveys which define the areas of each ALC grade present within the Order

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				limits such that this assessment has identified and considered implications for BMV agricultural land. EN-3 2.10.29 also states that while land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of the site location, applicants should, where possible, utilise suitable previously developed land, brownfield land, contaminated land and industrial land. The Site Selection Assessment Report (ES Volume 3 Appendix 3.1 **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]**) confirms that assessment of previously developed land/brownfield land was carried out within a 25 km radius of the Monk Fryston Substation. The search did not identify any suitable land of an adequate area to facilitate a 500 MW solar project, either individually or in combination with other sites. While brownfield sites were identified, these

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				were often too small or spread out from each other, creating a far more fragmented potential site for the Proposed Development. From this point, the search moved to identifying other sites, prioritising the lowest grade BMV land and avoiding green belt land as far as possible. The Applicant has demonstrated compliance with UK legislation and policy, including NPS EN-1 and EN-3 in the Planning Statement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.02].**
Agricultural Land and Soils	LV2_E_068, LV2_E_111	Respondents note that other European countries (e.g. France, Germany, Italy) do not allow the use of agricultural land for solar purposes.	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment (although on the contrary, France has legislated in support of agrivoltaics). The Applicant has demonstrated compliance with UK legislation and policy in the Planning Statement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.02]** which recognises that it may not be possible

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				for solar NSIPs to avoid the use of greenfield land.
Agricultural Land and Soils	LV2_PFF_041, LV2_OFF_010	Respondents state that no sheep grazing takes place in the area, so it is wrong to suggest it as a benefit of the Proposed Development / an intention to introduce.	No	There is potential for some livestock (sheep) grazing to occur beneath the solar panels as there are no known landowner restrictive covenants or other reasons that would prevent such use. There is no proposal for cattle grazing.
Agricultural Land and Soils	LV2_OFF_022	Respondent expressed general support for agrivoltaics such as sheep grazing or food growing under panels.	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment.
Agricultural Land and Soils	LV2_PFF_011	Respondent requested that all agricultural land is replaced.	No	The impact on agricultural land is temporary and reversible, such that agricultural land does not require replacement.
Agricultural Land and Soils	LV2_PFF_011	Respondent asked how much less food will be produced following the installing of the panels, asking where the lost food will be received from?	No	In respect of food security, the UK Food Security Report 2024 has anticipated increases in land use change from agriculture to other uses, including energy production, and has concluded that with continued growth in agricultural output and subject to conducive market

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				conditions, food production levels can be maintained or even increased alongside the land use change needed to meet Net Zero and Environment Act targets. Agricultural land use statistics show that of the 7,100 ha used for solar production in 2024 (0.08% of the country's utilised agricultural land), approximately half was also used for some form of agricultural production.
Agricultural Land and Soils	LV2_PFF_031	Respondent reported that the area has a lot of farming, and this must be preserved.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Agricultural Land and Soils	LV2_E_056	Respondent stated that it is impossible to grow food under the solar panels, citing solar farms in Canada as an example.	No	Agricultural land use statistics show that of the 7,100 ha used for solar production in 2024 (0.08% of the country's utilised agricultural land), approximately half was also used for some form of agricultural production.
Agricultural Land and Soils	LV2_E_079, LV2_E_099	Respondent stated that Site 2 comprises 83 hectares of high-quality agricultural land. The respondent added that food production here would be removed from use.	Yes	As set out in Table 1-3 of Appendix 5.1: Agricultural Land Classification **[EN110012/APP/LVS/06.03.05.01],** Site 2 contains approximately 74.4 hectares of BMV land, with the majority of this

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		One respondent also highlights the presence of carrot farming.		(59.2 hectares) being classified as Grade 2 and Grade 3a land. It is accepted there are areas of root crop production. Food production would be removed from use for the duration of the Proposed Development, although there is potential to reduce the loss of the use of land for agricultural production by also using the land for some form of agricultural production, which is common in England, with Defra statistics for 2025 showing that over half of the agricultural land used for solar production was also used for some form of agricultural production.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Agricultural Land and Soils	LV2_E_041, LV2_OFF_141, LV2_E_106	Respondents asked what impact the longest cable route from Solar Development Site 1 will have on the agricultural land it crosses?	Yes	While the installation of the cable will result in some soil disturbance during the construction phase, it will remain largely undisturbed for the whole operation phase except for where maintenance and repairs or replacements are required. The agricultural land affected by the installation of the cable will be restored to its original condition in accordance with a detailed Soil Resource Management Plan. This will be in substantial accordance with the oSRMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.14]** which includes adopting and implementing good practice measures to minimise damage to soils that are stripped, stockpiled and reinstated; minimise soil carbon losses; maintain water infiltration; and enhance soil biodiversity.
Agricultural Land and Soils	LV2_E_043	Respondent stated that, contrary to the language of Light Valley Solar, Solar Development Site 1 is productive farmland as	Yes	As set out in Table 1-2 of Appendix 5.1 Agricultural Land Classification **[EN110012/APP/LVS/06.03.05.01],** Solar Development Site 1 comprises of approximately 195.3 hectares or 54%

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		opposed to 'poor', adds that they have evidence which they will demonstrate to PINS.		BMV land (grade 2 and grade 3a) with the rest classified as Grade 3b (non-BMV) and non-agricultural land.
Agricultural Land and Soils	LV2_PFF_051	Respondent stated that the Proposed Development will takeaway Birkin's food-producing ability.	No	The Applicant notes this comment, data regarding agricultural land use and classification is not available at a parish level, and typically would not be for agricultural land classification; however, further detail regarding the agricultural land classification of the Solar Development Sites is included in Appendix 5.1: Agricultural Land Classification **[EN110012/APP/LVS/06.03.05.01]**. The Applicant notes that any removal of crop-production would be temporary and may be able to continue if agrivoltaics are adopted at the site. Based on the ALC data of the land at all Solar Development Sites and the temporary nature of the Proposed Development, the removal of agricultural land is not deemed as a significant loss and would

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				have no regional or national impacts to food production.
Agricultural Land and Soils	LV2_PFF_052	Respondent expressed concern about the cost of grazing sheep beneath the panels.	No	Sheep grazing within solar farms is common in England, with Defra statistics for 2025 showing that over half of the agricultural land used for solar production was also used for some form of agricultural production.
Agricultural Land and Soils	LV2_E_068	Respondent enquired what percentage of agricultural land has been identified to be used in South Milford & what % of agricultural land would be left in South Milford?	No	The Applicant notes this comment, data regarding agricultural land use and classification is not available at a parish level, and typically would not be for agricultural land classification; however, further detail regarding the agricultural land classification of the Solar Development Sites is included in Appendix 5.1: Agricultural Land Classification **[EN110012/APP/LVS/06.03.05.01]**. The Applicant notes that any removal of crop-production would be temporary and may be able to continue if agrivoltaics are adopted at the site. Based on the ALC data of the land at all Solar Development Sites and the temporary

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				nature of the Proposed Development, the removal of agricultural land is not deemed as a significant loss and would have no regional or national impacts to food production.
Agricultural Land and Soils	LV2_E_069	Respondent stated that the PEIR fails to include Sites 6, 7 and 8 within agricultural studies done to date, and that overall the PEIR is disingenuous when it comes to agricultural lands and classifications.	Yes	ALC surveys have been conducted of Sites 6, 7 and 8 and are provided in Tables 1-6 to 1-8 in Appendix 5.1 Agricultural Land Classification **[EN110012/APP/LVS/06.03.05.01]**. The Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) set out the initial findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). Full agricultural assessments have been conducted and are set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils **[EN110012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]**.
Agricultural Land and Soils	LV2_OFF_095	Respondent stated that agriculture is at the heart of the landscape in the Monk Fryston area. The respondent added that large proportions of the two Sites closest to	No	The agricultural land quality of all the land affected is set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils **[EN110012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]** and Appendix 5.1: Agricultural Land

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		Monk Fryston are classed as BMV.		Classification **[EN110012/APP/LVS/06.03.05.01]**.
Agricultural Land and Soils	LV2_E_079	Respondent stated that avoidance of loss of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land (which includes Grades 1, 2 and 3a land) is recognised as a policy objective of national government. This is recognised in table 5-3 of the PEIR but has not been taken into consideration in that Site 2 remains part of the Proposed Development. The respondent added that there are many alternative sites for solar and BESS development which do not entail the removal of BMV land at scale. A development of this nature, particularly of the BESS, is likely to mean that permanent soil sealing is	No	The Applicant has taken into account national policy objectives in the design of the Proposed Development. National Policy Statement EN-3 Paras 2.10.24 & 2.10.25 explain that the availability of grid connection, suitable irradiance levels, and local topography are key inputs to the selection of sites suitable for large-scale solar generation developments. The number of locations within the UK at which large-scale solar generation is suitable is therefore likely to be limited, and this is a material issue when considering how the UK is to meet the urgent need for low carbon generation as is set out in the NPSs. This point is expanded upon in the Statement of Need **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.03]** provides evidence to support the suitability of the proposed location of the Proposed

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		required, meaning potential loss of BMV land in perpetuity.		Development for large-scale solar plus storage in relation to the timeliness and availability of the grid connection, transmission system operability and the decarbonisation and security benefits the Proposed Development will bring forward from this location. It should also be noted that food security is not identified as an issue within the suite of Energy National Policy Statements or the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Further, the Government's UK Solar Roadmap (2024) states that solar development is not considered to compromise food security, and that climate change itself poses the greatest long-term risk to food production - a risk which the Proposed Development directly helps to address by providing a secure, low-carbon source of electricity. The 495 ha of BMV land, of which approximately 17.5 ha would be

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				required for the more permanent elements of the Proposed Development involving soil sealing, would represent approximately 1% of the likely BMV land in Selby District and 0.08% of the likely BMV land in the Yorkshire and Humber Region. Given the estimate in the 2024 Written Ministerial Statement (Ref 6) that, even under the most ambitious scenarios the total area of agricultural land used for solar panels would occupy less than 1% of the UK's agricultural land, these proportions do not represent a significant use of BMV land in the wider regional context.
Agricultural Land and Soils	LV2_OFF_085	Respondent stated that diagrams shown at the consultation regarding land quality 1,2,3A & 3B) were very misleading as there are also land quality classifications 4 and 5. The respondent concluded that this is not shown, implying	Yes	The Applicant considers the materials provided were accurate, adequate and informative. The Applicant has endeavoured to provide accurate information to support intelligent consideration of the Proposed Development at stages of consultation. Given the timing of pre-application consultation being undertaken while the Proposed Development proposals are

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		the land quality at Escrick is poor - which it isn't.		still emerging, the Applicant notes that images have been illustrative and maximum parameters have been reported. As set out in Table 1-2 of Appendix 5.1: Agricultural Land Classification **[EN110012/APP/LVS/06.03.05.01]**, Solar Development Site 1 comprises of approximately 195.3 hectares or 54% BMV land (grade 2 and grade 3a) with the rest classified as Grade 3b (non-BMV) and non-agricultural land.

Traffic and transport

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Traffic and Transport	LV2_PFF_003, LV2_OFF_006, LV2_E_007, LV2_E_008, LV2_E_010, LV2_E_012, LV2_E_013, LV2_E_014, LV2_E_016, LV2_E_017, LV2_E_019, LV2_E_022, LV2_E_027, LV2_E_011, LV2_OFF_024, LV2_OFF_025, LV2_OFF_027, LV2_PFF_022, LV2_PFF_025, LV2_PFF_028, LV2_PFF_030, LV2_PFF_031, LV2_PFF_034, LV2_PFF_036, LV2_PFF_037, LV2_PFF_039, LV2_PFF_041, LV2_PFF_042, LV2_PFF_044, LV2_PFF_045, LV2_PFF_049, LV2_PFF_050, LV2_L_001, LV2_E_035, LV2_E_036, LV2_E_038, LV2_E_042, LV2_E_048, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_E_049, LV2_E_050, LV2_E_061, LV2_OFF_146,	Respondents expressed concern about the Proposed Development's impact on increased traffic and general disruption to roads during construction. Respondents have asked for more information on the traffic impact during construction.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. A Transport Assessment (TA) has been prepared (Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**) to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]**) has also been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas. The oCTMP includes measures to minimise impacts during construction by reducing HGV movements during the

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_OFF_145, LV2_OFF_040, LV2_OFF_141, LV2_OFF_140, LV2_OFF_130, LV2_OFF_128, LV2_OFF_125, LV2_OFF_047, LV2_OFF_122, LV2_OFF_119, LV2_E_062, LV2_E_063, LV2_E_065, LV2_E_066, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_070, LV2_E_053, LV2_E_054, LV2_E_071, LV2_E_055, LV2_E_069, LV2_OFF_073, LV2_OFF_069, LV2_OFF_062, LV2_OFF_061, LV2_E_023, LV2_E_024, LV2_OFF_058, LV2_OFF_103, LV2_OFF_101, LV2_OFF_098, LV2_OFF_095, LV2_OFF_035,			peak hours and managing employee movements.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_OFF_148, LV2_E_082, LV2_E_081, LV2_E_118, LV2_E_120, LV2_E_121, LV2_E_123, LV2_E_086, LV2_E_088, LV2_E_124, LV2_E_090, LV2_E_110, LV2_E_112, LV2_E_100, LV2_E_025, LV2_E_028, LV2_E_030, LV2_E_113, LV2_E_031, LV2_E_115, LV2_E_116, LV2_E_032, LV2_E_103, LV2_OFF_089, LV2_OFF_088, LV2_E_104, LV2_OFF_081, LV2_OFF_079, LV2_OFF_077, LV2_E_084, LV2_E_075, LV2_E_074, LV2_E_073			
Traffic and Transport	LV2_PFF_003, LV2_OFF_014, LV2_E_007, LV2_E_008, LV2_E_010, LV2_E_012, LV2_E_013, LV2_E_014, LV2_E_016, LV2_E_017, LV2_E_019, LV2_E_022, LV2_E_027, LV2_E_009,	Respondents expressed concern about the capacity of local roads and infrastructure to accommodate construction vehicles. Some respondents express	No	The Applicant notes this comment. A Transport Assessment (TA) has been prepared (Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**) to assess the impact of the Proposed

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_E_011, LV2_PFF_018, LV2_PFF_022, LV2_PFF_028, LV2_PFF_030, LV2_OFF_034, LV2_PFF_034, LV2_PFF_036, LV2_PFF_042, LV2_PFF_045, LV2_L_001, LV2_E_035, LV2_E_036, LV2_E_038, LV2_E_042, LV2_E_048, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_E_061, LV2_OFF_146, LV2_OFF_145, LV2_OFF_141, LV2_OFF_140, LV2_OFF_128, LV2_OFF_125, LV2_OFF_122, LV2_E_062, LV2_E_063, LV2_E_065, LV2_E_066, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_070, LV2_E_071, LV2_E_069, LV2_OFF_073, LV2_OFF_069, LV2_OFF_062, LV2_OFF_061, LV2_OFF_058,	concern that local roads are unsuitable for the increased volume of traffic caused by the Proposed Development.		Development on the transport network during construction. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]**) has also been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas. The TA shows that the majority of routes within the assessed study area (36 of 43) have an average percentage change in traffic flows, as a result of the Proposed Development, of less than 10%, which is reasonably assumed to be within the expected range of daily fluctuation and would go unnoticed to the majority of other road users. Where traffic flows have increased by more than 10%, the oCTMP includes

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_OFF_098, LV2_OFF_035, LV2_E_082, LV2_E_081, LV2_E_118, LV2_E_120, LV2_E_121, LV2_E_123, LV2_E_088, LV2_E_124, LV2_E_094, LV2_E_096, LV2_E_100, LV2_E_026, LV2_E_115, LV2_E_032, LV2_E_103, LV2_E_107, LV2_E_108, LV2_OFF_080, LV2_OFF_077, LV2_E_072			measures to minimise any impacts during construction by reducing HGV movements during the peak hours and managing employee movements. Overall, it is considered that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the CTMP, and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_OFF_014, LV2_E_007, LV2_E_008, LV2_E_010, LV2_E_012, LV2_E_013, LV2_E_014, LV2_E_016, LV2_E_017, LV2_E_019, LV2_E_022, LV2_E_027, LV2_PFF_018, LV2_PFF_022, LV2_PFF_028, LV2_OFF_034, LV2_E_035, LV2_E_036, LV2_E_042, LV2_E_048, LV2_E_061, LV2_PFF_053, LV2_OFF_128, LV2_OFF_119, LV2_E_062,	Respondents expressed concern about the potential risk of accidents and injury to local road and lane users from HGVs. This includes other drivers, pedestrians, cyclists, equestrians on the side of lanes.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The Environmental Statement includes an assessment of fear and intimidation in ES Volume 1 Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.14]**. This calculates a degree of hazard score, which takes into account the average two-way flow, the HGV composition and the vehicle speed.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_E_065, LV2_E_067, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_070, LV2_E_053, LV2_E_054, LV2_E_071, LV2_OFF_073, LV2_OFF_062, LV2_E_021, LV2_OFF_058, LV2_OFF_098, LV2_OFF_148, LV2_E_082, LV2_E_081, LV2_E_118, LV2_E_121, LV2_E_123, LV2_E_088, LV2_E_124, LV2_E_094, LV2_E_096, LV2_E_100, LV2_E_026, LV2_E_028, LV2_E_030, LV2_E_031, LV2_E_101, LV2_E_032, LV2_E_103, LV2_E_106, LV2_E_108, LV2_OFF_080, LV2_E_072			The report shows that the majority of road links within the assessed study area have a 'Small' or 'Moderate' level of fear and intimidation in both the baseline (existing) and 'with construction' scenarios. There are roads that are classified as having a 'great' level of fear and intimidation in the baseline. These are routes with higher traffic flows and include Wheldrake Lane, Wistow Road and Dam Lane. Across all assessed links, there is no step change in the category of fear and intimidation; all routes assessed experience the same level of fear and intimidation with the Proposed Development as in the baseline. Therefore, the temporary increase in traffic during the construction phase is not expected to significantly alter the levels of fear and intimidation.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Traffic and Transport	LV2_PFF_003, LV2_OFF_014, LV2_PFF_028, LV2_L_001, LV2_E_036, LV2_E_042, LV2_PFF_051, LV2_OFF_140, LV2_E_066, LV2_E_071, LV2_E_069, LV2_OFF_062, LV2_OFF_058, LV2_OFF_095, LV2_OFF_148, LV2_E_120, LV2_E_086, LV2_E_094, LV2_E_096, LV2_E_025, LV2_E_026, LV2_E_108, LV2_OFF_080, LV2_E_072	Respondents expressed concern about damage to roads, verges, leading to creation of potholes etc.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]**) has also been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas. With regards to the condition of the road, there is a commitment within the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) for a pre-commencement condition survey and a commitment to resolving any damage to the highway that can be attributed to construction activities.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_PFF_030, LV2_PFF_031, LV2_PFF_036, LV2_PFF_042, LV2_OFF_146, LV2_OFF_130, LV2_E_063,	Respondents expressed concern that the local road network cannot handle the cumulative traffic from	No	The Applicant notes this comment. A Transport Assessment (TA) has been prepared (Appendix 14.1: Transport

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_E_067, LV2_E_070, LV2_OFF_062, LV2_OFF_061, LV2_E_123, LV2_E_109, LV2_E_110, LV2_E_112, LV2_E_113, LV2_E_104	multiple other developments, such as from Yorkshire Green and Sherburn Industrial Estate.		Assessment (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**). The TA has assessed the road network capacity and existing transport conditions. The assessment takes into account other committed developments as part of the cumulative assessment scenario. The cumulative assessment findings show that none of the committed developments will impact the routes that have a greater than 10% increase in traffic from the Proposed Development. Furthermore, the Proposed Development has a 1% or less impact on traffic flows on those routes impacted by other committed developments Therefore, there should not a noticeable cumulative impact from the Proposed Development.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Traffic and Transport	LV2_OFF_146, LV2_OFF_068, LV2_E_121, LV2_E_106	Respondents reported that the area has been prone to road deaths.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The Study Area covers a large part of the network and unfortunately there are likely to have been some fatal accidents on some roads. A Transport Assessment (TA) has been prepared (Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**) which includes a review of road collision data between 2019 – 2024. Overall, there is no evidence of accident clustering, or specific common causation factors, on the network within close proximity to the Proposed Development. Furthermore, the Proposed Development is not significantly altering the highway layout.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_PFF_019	Respondent requested that any road upgrades are made	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		prior to the start of construction.		Highways Improvements Areas (refer to ES Volume 2, Figure 2.3 **[EN110012/APP/LVS/06.02.02.03]**) are sections of the highway network that will contain localised improvements, such as improvements to the road edge where it is deteriorated and provision of temporary passing places within the existing highways boundary, traffic management, and provision of visibility splays, or temporary highway and traffic works required to safely accommodate the Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) deliveries. These areas will support the movement of construction vehicles on narrower sections of the local highway network within parts of the construction vehicle routes to the Site. As they are required for construction access, they will be delivered prior to construction in that area. Coordination of these works be subject to agreement with North Yorkshire Council.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Traffic and Transport	LV2_OFF_145	Respondent requested that adequate consideration be given to construction traffic working hours, respondents request deliveries only take place outside of core rush hour times.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared which includes HGV timing restrictions and working hours. The Site Manager will be responsible for the management of the delivery booking system during the construction phase. Deliveries will be scheduled to avoid morning and evening peak hours. This will avoid HGV traffic arriving during the morning peak hours, creating conflict with local residents' commutes or school runs. As set out in the oCEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**, hours of construction will be restricted to 07:00-18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00-13:30 on Saturdays, with no activity on Sunday or Bank/Public Holidays. The exception to this is for nighttime works, such as Horizontal Directional Drilling

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				(HDD) within the Cable Rout Corridor. These working patterns ensure that the majority of employee trips will also arrive and depart from the Proposed Development outside of peak times.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_E_122	Respondent expressed concern for the widening and straightening of roads to impact the rural character of the area.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. Highways Improvements Areas (refer to ES Volume 2, Figure 2.3 **[EN110012/APP/LVS/06.02.02.03]**) are sections of the highway network that will contain localised improvements, such as improvements to the road edge where it is deteriorated and provision of temporary passing places within the existing highways boundary, traffic management, and provision of visibility splays, or temporary highway and traffic works required to safely accommodate the Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) deliveries. These areas will support the movement of construction vehicles on narrower sections of the local highway network within parts of the construction

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				vehicle routes to the Site. It is not proposed to widen or straighten roads permanently.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_OFF_069	Respondent expressed concern for the widening and straightening of roads causing or worsening the impact to flooding.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. Highways Improvements Areas (refer to ES Volume 2, Figure 2.3 **[EN110012/APP/LVS/06.02.02.03]**) are sections of the highway network that will contain localised improvements, such as improvements to the road edge where it is deteriorated and provision of temporary passing places within the existing highways boundary, traffic management, and provision of visibility splays, or temporary highway and traffic works required to safely accommodate the Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) deliveries. These areas will support the movement of construction vehicles on narrower sections of the local highway network within parts of the construction vehicle routes to the Site. It is not proposed to widen or straighten roads permanently.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Alteration works to roads are not anticipated to affect or worsen flood risk; further details regarding flood risk are provided within ES Volume 3 Appendix 15.1: Flood Risk Assessment (FRA, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01]**).
Traffic and Transport	LV2_PFF_024	Respondent expressed support for widening access points for construction traffic.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_PFF_028	Respondent enquired who will pay for repairs to roads and other infrastructure caused by heavy construction vehicles.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				With regards to the condition of the road, there is a commitment within the oCTMP **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]** for a pre-commencement condition survey and a commitment to resolving any damage to the highway that can be attributed to construction activities.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_E_069	Respondent stated that the PEIR fails to detail HGV and LGV movements, requested specific details are clarified by Light Valley Solar.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. A Transport Assessment (TA) has been prepared (Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**) to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction. This includes traffic network diagrams showing the traffic movements associated with the Proposed Development.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_PFF_031, LV2_PFF_037, LV2_PFF_041, LV2_PFF_042, LV2_PFF_045, LV2_PFF_049,	Respondents expressed concern over the use of the	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	LV2_E_042, LV2_PFF_056, LV2_E_049, LV2_E_050, LV2_OFF_146, LV2_OFF_125, LV2_E_066, LV2_E_069, LV2_OFF_068, LV2_OFF_061, LV2_E_121, LV2_E_092, LV2_E_111, LV2_E_112, LV2_E_113, LV2_E_116, LV2_OFF_078	A63, cited safety, road bend and quality concerns.		A Transport Assessment (TA) has been prepared (Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**) to assess the road network capacity, including the A63 through Monk Fryston. This reviews the current highway network and determines if any highway mitigation is required. The TA forecasts that construction activities could add a further 120 vehicles per day onto the A63 through Monk Fryston during the peak of construction. This additional traffic would be a temporary uplift of 1% on this road based on 2025 traffic survey data; this is within expected levels of ordinary traffic fluctuation.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_PFF_018, LV2_OFF_145, LV2_OFF_129, LV2_OFF_128, LV2_OFF_146, LV2_OFF_068, LV2_E_121, LV2_E_106	Respondents expressed concern over the use of the A19, cited safety, road bend and quality concerns.	No	The Applicant acknowledges this concern. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]**) has

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road, road safety, and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas. Regarding the A19, discussions have taken place with NYC highways, as it was noted that there have been safety concerns raised about the A19 junction at Riccall. The Proposed Development is aware of a fatality at the junction that happened in 2025. NYC advised that there are currently no proposals to alter the highway layout, however it was recommended that HGVs approach the Riccall junction from the south, so they did not have to cross the A19 carriageway. Visibility splays have been checked and based on the recorded speed of the vehicles on the road network to ensure safety. Where visibility splays need to be increased, the DCO provides the

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Applicant with the powers to do so, as further detailed in and secured through the oCTMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]**. The A19 is a key strategic route that is suitable and safe for all vehicles, as determined through the TA (Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**) and in preparation of the oCTMP.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_E_009, LV2_OFF_027, LV2_PFF_049, LV2_E_042, LV2_E_111, LV2_E_116	Respondents expressed concern specifically on the impact on roads in Monk Fryston. A respondent stated that the A63 in Monk Fryston is already in a terrible state before even more heavy plant utilises it. Respondents have also noted the lack of pedestrian infrastructure on the A63.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. A Transport Assessment (TA) has been prepared (Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**) to assess the road network capacity, including the A63 through Monk Fryston. This reviews the current highway network and determines if any highway mitigation is required.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The TA forecasts that construction activities could add a further 120 vehicles per day onto the A63 through Monk Fryston during the peak of construction. This additional traffic would be a temporary uplift of 1% on this road based on 2025 traffic survey data. With regards to the condition of the road, there is a commitment within the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) for a pre-commencement condition survey and a commitment to resolving any damage to the highway that can be attributed to construction activities. The Applicant notes that a pedestrian crossing on the A63 for Monk Fryston has been suggested as a possible community benefit by respondents; this suggestion will be considered alongside

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				other feedback to receive funding from the Community Benefit Fund.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_OFF_146, LV2_E_069, LV2_OFF_061, LV2_E_112, LV2_E_113	Respondents expressed concern over the use of the A162, cited road quality concerns, reported the road has regular repair works.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. A Transport Assessment (TA) has been prepared (Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**) to assess the road network capacity, including the A162 and A63 through Monk Fryston. This reviews the current highway network and determines if any highway mitigation is required. The TA forecasts that construction activities could add a further 16 vehicles per day onto the A162 during the peak of construction. This additional traffic would be a temporary uplift of less than 1% on this road based on 2025 traffic survey data. With regards to the condition of the road, there is a commitment within the

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) for a pre-commencement condition survey and a commitment to resolving any damage to the highway that can be attributed to construction activities.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_E_112, LV2_E_113	Respondents have expressed concern about the use of the main road through Wistow.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas. Following design development and in response to feedback received, a Cable Route Corridor compound location has been relocated onto the B1223 Wistow Road to avoid the need for the majority

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				of vehicles accessing the compound to travel through Wistow village. The exception is Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) Movements. The AIL Report (included in Annex C of Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**) notes that AILs would have to traverse through the village to connect from Selby Road to Garman Carr Lane.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_PFF_022, LV2_E_036	Respondents report that the road from West Haddlesey to Birkin is narrow and has a number of sharp bends, implies it may not be suitable as a construction traffic route.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas. It is forecast that 6 HGVS per-day may use Haddlesey Road / Birkin Road

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				during the construction period. The traffic count data recorded 51 HGVs on this route during an average day. The additional 6 movements would therefore be a 12% increase over baseline conditions. Whilst acknowledging that the route is a rural route, with low traffic flows, it is considered that the route could accommodate a temporary 12% uplift in use during the construction period. Furthermore, an oCTMP **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]** has been prepared to ensure this temporary increase in use is managed to minimise any impacts on other road users.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_PFF_031, LV2_E_121	Respondents ask how speeding traffic on the A63 will be managed during construction?	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				This includes the A63 to access Solar Development Site 2. The proposed access is an existing agricultural access, but as there will be a temporary uplift in vehicle movements during the construction phase, it is expected that there could be some temporary traffic management installed during construction. Subject to agreement with NYC, this could include temporary speed limit reductions on the A63. Specific requirements for traffic management or temporary Traffic Regulation Orders would be outlined in the updated CTMP to be agreed with the highway authorities prior to commencement of construction.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_PFF_051	Respondent expressed concern over the use of Birkin Lane.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP,

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas. The majority of movements to and from the Proposed Development will not use Birkin Lane. The exception is Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) Movements. The AIL report (included in Annex C of Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**) notes that AILs would use Birkin Lane to access the M62 at Junction 33. Works to ensure safe AIL use of Birkin Lane would take place within the highway boundary and would include temporary packing to protect roadside verges.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_OFF_130	Respondent expressed concern over the use of	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		Gateforth Lane, citing its lack of suitability and a nearby building development starting on August 4 2025.		An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas. Gateforth Lane was proposed as route to access the Cable Route Corridor. In response to feedback received, an alternative route via Gateforth New Road has been included. A cable route corridor access is forecast to generate 7 HGV movements (14 two-way) per day when in use; these trips will be dispersed onto the network and movements to / from the site will only be on the network during the period that the cable route corridor access is in use (short-term).

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Traffic and Transport	LV2_PFF_022	Respondent reported that the Haddlesey crossroads with the A19 is hazardous and prone to accidents, implies it is not suitable for access and egress.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. This does identify that Solar Development Site 4 could be accessed via the A19 at the Haddlesey Road crossroads. A Transport Assessment (TA) has also been prepared (Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**) to assess the road network conditions, including a review of road safety. The TA does not identify any road safety issues at this junction. The construction period could add 6 HGVs and 72 car movements to the junction per-day, but this is a worst-case scenario on the assumption that all trips

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				to Solar Development Site 4 use this access. In reality, the construction trips into Solar Development Site 4 would be distributed across the access locations, reducing the impacts at each location. Birkin Road provides a connection from Solar Development Site 4 to the A19 to the east, while Roe Lane provides another access point. Table 2-5 of the oCTMP [**EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]** provides further details regarding Solar Development Site 4 access locations.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_E_066	Respondent expressed concern over the use of Hillam Lane.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. There is a cable route corridor compound and Cable Route Corridor access located on Hillam Lane. As a result, there would need to be access via Hillam Lane during the period that

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				access to that Cable Route Corridor location is required, meaning this would only be a short term use of the road. Hillam Lane is a rural road with no footways as there are minimal frontages and no high or medium category receptors; the Transport Assessment (TA, ES Volume 3 Appendix 14.1 **[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**) and subsequent oCTMP determined the road to be both appropriate and safe for use as an access route. During the short period in which the lane would be used to access the Cable Route Corridor, works could add 28 HGV movements in total (two-way) onto the route. It is also proposed that the Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) movements to the corridor uses this route as outlined in the AIL report, included in Annex C of ES Volume 3 Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Traffic and Transport	LV2_PFF_031	Respondent suggested that if Old Lane is needed for access, then a requisition to make this road 30 mph would greatly benefit the village of Hambleton.	Yes	The Applicant confirms that it has not progressed with the option to use Old Lane for access.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_E_069	Respondent expressed concern for congestion which could be caused around Solar Development Site 3, specifically junctions between the A63 and either Austfield Lane or Lowfield Road.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. A Transport Assessment (TA) has been prepared (Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**) to review the traffic generated by the Proposed Development and assess the road network capacity. Solar Development Site 3 will generate, on average, 3 HGV movements a day and 6 car movements during the construction period. This could peak at 6 HGV movements, and 12 car movements.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				There is a cable route corridor access location on Hillam Common Lane which may be accessed from Austfield Lane or Lowfield Road. The cable route corridor access locations will only be in use during the period when that particular section of the cable route corridor is being developed.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_OFF_116	Respondent stated that the proposed route for access to the cable corridor through Skipwith is inappropriate, suggesting the use of Glade Road from the A19 north of Riccall would have a reduced impact on residents.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas. Glade Road is not part of the adopted highway network and was considered for use but not progressed due to the presence of ancient woodland,

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				representing an ecological constraint. Routes through ancient woodland can only be utilised as a last resort if there are no alternative route options, which in this case, there were alternatives.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_OFF_116	Respondent stated that the road through Little Skipwith is particularly narrow and used by several horse riders.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas. There is a cable route corridor access located to the north-west of Skipwith so access is required during the period when that particular section of the cable route corridor is being constructed. An access located off Skipwith Road, north of Main Street, has been identified to

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				minimise movements through the village. The only construction route through the village is for the movement of Abnormal Loads. These movements have to use Main Street as identified in the Abnormal Load report (included in Annex C of Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**).
Traffic and Transport	LV2_E_028	Respondent expressed concern regarding the impact of traffic on Lumby Lane, and other busy roads in Monk Fryston and Hillam specifically for dog-walkers.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. A Transport Assessment (TA) has been prepared (Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**) to review the traffic generated by the Proposed Development and assess the road network capacity. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has also been prepared to identify the routes that

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas. Lumby Lane is not identified as a construction route so should not be impacted by the construction period.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_PFF_049, LV2_E_042, LV2_E_049, LV2_E_050, LV2_OFF_143, LV2_PFF_054, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_049, LV2_E_058, LV2_E_069, LV2_OFF_068, LV2_OFF_061, LV2_OFF_103, LV2_OFF_100, LV2_OFF_098, LV2_OFF_095, LV2_E_123, LV2_E_079, LV2_E_124, LV2_E_031, LV2_OFF_090, LV2_OFF_081, LV2_E_084	Respondents oppose the use of Fryston Common Lane for access.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has also been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. Fryston Common Lane was previously identified as an access route to Solar Development Site 2. However, following feedback, the route is proposed as an emergency access only, with all construction traffic travelling to and from Site 2 assigned to the main access located on the A63.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Traffic and Transport	LV2_PFF_049, LV2_E_042, LV2_E_049, LV2_E_050, LV2_OFF_143, LV2_E_049, LV2_OFF_068, LV2_E_124, LV2_OFF_081, LV2_E_084	Respondents report that Fryston Common Lane is heavily used by the community for parking, e.g. churchgoers.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12])** has also been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. Fryston Common Lane was previously identified as an access route to Solar Development Site 2. However, following feedback, the route is proposed as an emergency access only, with all construction traffic travelling to and from Site 2 assigned to the main access located on the A63.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_E_042, LV2_E_068, LV2_E_049, LV2_E_058, LV2_OFF_100, LV2_OFF_098, LV2_OFF_095, LV2_E_028, LV2_E_031, LV2_OFF_081	Respondents expressed concern for horse riders using Fryston Common Lane, reported that it is a popular route for horse riders and walkers.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has also been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Fryston Common Lane was previously identified as an access route to Solar Development Site 2. However, following feedback, the route is proposed as an emergency access only, with all construction traffic travelling to and from Site 2 assigned to the main access located on the A63.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_PFF_054, LV2_PFF_062, LV2_PFF_057, LV2_OFF_068, LV2_E_124, LV2_E_084	Respondents expressed concern that the use of Fryston Common Lane for construction traffic would be a danger to cyclists, walkers, and horse riders.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has also been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. Fryston Common Lane was previously identified as an access route to Solar Development Site 2. However, following feedback, the route is proposed as an emergency access only, with all construction traffic travelling to and from

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Site 2 assigned to the main access located on the A63.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_PFF_055, LV2_PFF_057, LV2_E_058, LV2_E_079	Respondents report that Fryston Common Lane has been labelled as an A road when it is not.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and has ensured Fryston Common Lane has been correctly labelled on the plans.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_PFF_049, LV2_E_042	Respondents report that Fryston Common Lane cannot be widened due to ditches and drains on the side of the paths.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Fryston Common Lane was previously identified as an access route to Solar Development Site 2. However, following feedback, the route is proposed as an emergency access only, with all construction traffic travelling to and from Site 2 assigned to the main access located on the A63. There are therefore no proposals to widen the highway on Fryston Common Lane.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_E_049, LV2_E_050	Respondents report that the land under Fryston Common Lane is unstable, with houses	Yes	The Applicant notes there are no proposals to undertake any building on Fryston Common Lane. Fryston Common Lane was previously identified

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		built on concrete rafts due to a former quarry below.		as an access route to Solar Development Site 2. However, following feedback, the route is proposed as an emergency access only, with all construction traffic travelling to and from Site 2 assigned to the main access located on the A63.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_PFF_062	Respondent asked if any other roads can be used to access Sites 6 and 7.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has also been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. Common Lane at South Milford is the only route into Solar Development Sites 6 and 7. There are limited alternative routes and the Transport Assessment (TA) (Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**) considers the impact of the Proposed Development trips, and concludes that

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				the routes have sufficient capacity to accommodate the uplift in traffic.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_E_049	Respondent stated that cars park up regularly where Fryston Common Lane meets the A63 in Monk Fryston, adding that the lane is very narrow there and HGVs would not be able to pass without going onto the pavement.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Fryston Common Lane was previously identified as an access route to Solar Development Site 2. However, following feedback, the route is proposed as an emergency access only, with all construction traffic travelling to and from Site 2 assigned to the main access located on the A63. Therefore, HGVs should not be using Fryston Common Lane on a regular basis, only crossing it at designated access points rather than travelling down the highway itself.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_OFF_068	Respondent reported that residents park on Fryston Common Lane because they cannot on the A63, which has caused access issues for	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Fryston Common Lane was previously identified as an access route to Solar Development Site 2. However, following feedback, the route is proposed as an

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		those living in houses in Priory Park Grove.		emergency access only, with all construction traffic travelling to and from Site 2 assigned to the main access located on the A63. Therefore, the Proposed Development should not impact on Fryston Common Lane.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_OFF_095	Respondent cited the PEIR reference to North Yorkshire Council considering upgrades to the roundabout west of Monk Fryston, and asked what the alternative proposals will be for access if upgrades are not completed in time.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. A Transport Assessment (TA) has been prepared (Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**) to review the traffic generated by the Proposed Development and assess the road network capacity. The TA acknowledges that North Yorkshire Council has advised that the A63/A162 roundabout junction is at capacity, and therefore upgrades to provide additional capacity at the junction are planned. If the proposed improvements are not in place

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				prior to commencement of construction, alternative routing could be agreed with NYC to access those Solar Development Sites that use the A63 / A162 junction. However, the TA also highlights that the additional movements generated by the Proposed Development would be a small proportion of the overall future baseline traffic flows, and a small proportionate increase when compared with the trips that are forecast to be generated by the nearby committed developments. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared that includes measures to manage construction vehicle arrival and departure times to avoid the network peak hours, which will further minimise the magnitude of any impact at the junction.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Traffic and Transport	LV2_E_079	Respondent stated that Fryston Common Lane is only used approximately 20-30 days a year and it was never intended to be used by the proposed levels of traffic on a daily basis.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Fryston Common Lane was previously identified as an access route to Solar Development Site 2. However, following feedback, the route is proposed as an emergency access only, with all construction traffic travelling to and from Site 2 assigned to the main access located on the A63. Therefore, vehicles from the Proposed Development will not be using Fryston Common Lane on a regular basis.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_E_124	Respondent expressed concern over a lack of plans for traffic calming, marshalling, signage, safe pedestrian zones, or noise mitigation for Fryston Common Lane.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. Fryston Common Lane is no longer proposed as a construction route. The outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) that has been prepared details the proposals for traffic management during the construction period. This includes the

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				use of banksmen, signage, and measures to reduce noise and dust.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_E_124	Respondent requested post-construction screening for Fryston Common Lane, unhappy there has been no previous confirmation of this.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Fryston Common Lane is no longer proposed as a construction route so there will be no impact on the road. HGVs would only cross at designated access points rather than travelling down the highway itself. Fryston Common Lane has been retained for emergency access only.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_OFF_081	Respondent noted conflicting information being said at consultation events regarding the use of Fryston Common Lane.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Fryston Common Lane was previously identified as an access route to Solar Development Site 2. However, following feedback, the route is proposed as an emergency access only, with all construction traffic travelling to and from Site 2 assigned to the main access located on the A63.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Traffic and Transport	LV2_PFF_018, LV2_OFF_129, LV2_OFF_128, LV2_OFF_116, LV2_E_092, LV2_OFF_141	Respondent stated that Skipwith should not be used for construction traffic, cited safety concerns.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas. There is a cable route corridor access located to the north-west of Skipwith so access is required during the period when that particular section of the Cable Route Corridor is being constructed. An access located off Skipwith Road, north of Main Street, has been identified to minimise movements through the village. The only construction route through the village is for the movement of Abnormal Loads. These movements have to use Main Street as identified in

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				the abnormal load assessment report, included in Annex C of Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_PFF_003	Respondent reported that Escrick Park Estate has good quality, wide stone tracks which HGVs could use, especially for access to the cable route.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has also been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. The use of the estate roads was considered, but these were not found to be appropriate for use due to the presence of ancient woodland, representing an ecological constraint. Routes through ancient woodland can only be utilised as a last resort if there are no alternative route options, which in this case, there were alternatives. The routes that have been identified seek to minimise any impacts on Escrick and Skipwith Village.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Traffic and Transport	LV2_PFF_010	Respondent asked if the construction traffic for Solar Development Site 6 would avoid the A63 Monk Fryston roundabout.		The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. Access to Solar Development Site 6 is proposed via the A162/A63 roundabout junction. Alongside the CTMP, a Transport Assessment (TA) has been prepared (Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**) to review the traffic generated by the Proposed Development and assess the road network capacity. The TA acknowledges that North Yorkshire Council has advised that the A63/A162 roundabout junction is at capacity, and therefore upgrades to provide additional capacity at the

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				junction are planned. If the proposed improvements are not in place prior to commencement of construction, alternative routing could be agreed with NYC to access those Solar Development Sites that use the A63 / A162 junction. However, the TA also highlights that the additional movements generated by the Proposed Development would be a small proportion of the overall future baseline traffic flows, and a small proportionate increase when compared with the trips that are forecast to be generated by the nearby committed developments. An oCTMP **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]** has been prepared that includes measures to manage construction vehicle arrival and departure times to avoid the network peak hours, which will further minimise the magnitude of any impact at the junction.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Traffic and Transport	LV2_OFF_025	Respondents expressed that Solar Development Site 6 specifically has access points down roads that are hard to walk down already with the current level of traffic.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. Access to Solar Development Site 6 is only available via Common Lane. The Environmental Statement includes an assessment of cycling and pedestrian amenity in ES Volume 1 Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.14]**. It was found that Common Lane, which is classed as being of high receptor sensitivity because it is known for being a well-used walking route, would not experience a perceptible negative impact upon pedestrian and cyclist amenity. It is forecast that the Proposed Development could generate up to 28 additional movements on Common

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Lane, a 10% increase in traffic flows. The Institute of Sustainability and Environmental Professionals (ISEP) Guidelines note that a change in traffic of up to10% is considered to have no discernible environmental effect, given that daily variations in background traffic flow may fluctuate by this amount.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_OFF_025	Respondent insists the Proposed Development use the road that takes you by the garden centre in Sherburn for Solar Development Site 6.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. The oCTMP was prepared following the Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3 Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment **[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**) which assessed road and route suitability, considering aspects including safety and capacity. The TA and oCTMP identified that access to Solar

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Development Site 6 is only available via Common Lane.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_OFF_061	Respondent raised concern that access to Sites 2, 3, 6, 7, and 8 is reliant on the Monk Fryston Roundabout being redeveloped, adds that even if this happens, the roundabout will not be sufficient.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has also been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic and does propose to route traffic via the A162/A63 roundabout junction to avoid the need to travel through residential areas as far as reasonably possible. Alongside the CTMP, a Transport Assessment (TA) has been prepared (Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**) to review the traffic generated by the Proposed Development and assess the road network capacity. The TA acknowledges that North Yorkshire Council has advised that the

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				A63/A162 roundabout junction is at capacity, and therefore upgrades to provide additional capacity at the junction are planned. If the proposed improvements are not in place prior to commencement of construction, alternative routing could be agreed with NYC to access those Solar Development Sites that use the A63 / A162 junction. However, the TA also highlights that the additional movements generated by the Proposed Development would be a small proportion of the overall future baseline traffic flows, and a small proportionate increase when compared with the trips that are forecast to be generated by the nearby committed developments. The CTMP includes measures to manage construction vehicle arrival and departure times to avoid the network peak hours, which will further minimise the magnitude of any impact at the junction.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Traffic and Transport	LV2_E_079	Respondent stated that the second access to Site 2 is via Selby road, a national speed limit road with high accident rates. The respondent added that this combined with poor visibility will result in an increased risk to drivers.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. This includes the A63 Selby Road to access Solar Development Site 2. The proposed access is an existing agricultural access, but as there will be a temporary uplift in vehicle movements during the construction phase, it is expected that there could be some temporary traffic management installed during construction. Subject to agreement with NYC, this could include temporary speed limit reductions on the A63. Specific requirements for traffic management or temporary Traffic Regulation Orders would be outlined in

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				the updated CTMP to be agreed with the highway authorities prior to commencement of construction.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_PFF_003, LV2_PFF_018, LV2_OFF_141, LV2_OFF_128, LV2_E_091	Respondents expressed concern regarding increased traffic in Skipwith during construction.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas. There is a cable route corridor access located to the north-west of Skipwith so access is required during the period when that particular section of the cable route corridor is being constructed. An access located off Skipwith Road, north of Main Street, has been identified to minimise movements through the village. The only construction route

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				through the village is for the movement of Abnormal Loads. These have to use Main Street as identified in the Abnormal Load report (included in Annex C of Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**).
Traffic and Transport	LV2_E_036, LV2_PFF_051	Respondent expressed concern regarding traffic in Birkin during construction.		The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas. There is no main construction route identified via Birkin, although it is identified as an alternative access as it proposed to be used to transport an Abnormal Load. The Abnormal Load that will travel through the village to access the site from the M62. This is

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				identified in the Abnormal Load report (included in Annex C of Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**).
Traffic and Transport	LV2_PFF_031, LV2_PFF_042	Respondent asked how extra traffic from the 300 houses being built in Hambleton will be controlled?	No	The Applicant notes this comment. A Transport Assessment (TA) has been prepared (Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**). The TA has assessed the road network capacity and existing transport conditions. The assessment takes into account any other committed developments as part of the cumulative assessment scenario. The committed developments are forecast to generate a significant number of movements onto the local highway network, with an additional 876 daily trips forecast on the A63 near Hambleton.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The Proposed Development is forecast to add a further 24 daily movements onto this part of the network during the construction period. This is a small proportion of the overall future traffic, and this temporary uplift will not significantly impact on future traffic conditions. Therefore, it was concluded that there should not a noticeable cumulative impact from the Proposed Development.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_PFF_039, LV2_E_069	Respondent expressed concern over traffic increases near Solar Development Site 3 and the substation, requested clear diversions for HGVs.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. A Transport Assessment (TA) has been prepared (Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**). The TA has assessed the road network capacity and existing transport conditions. It found that for the majority of routes within the study area, the average percentage change in traffic

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				flows, as a result of the Proposed Development, would be less than 10%, which is reasonably assumed to be within the expected range of daily fluctuation and would go unnoticed to the majority of other road users. Those that did experience a greater 10% increase did include some of the roads close to Solar Development Site 3, including Roe Lane (14% increase), Haddlesey Road (22% increase) and Birkin Road (15% increase). The larger percentage increase is a result of the low baseline daily traffic. The area is predominantly rural and therefore it is acknowledged that the construction traffic will temporarily alter the composition of the traffic flows on the network. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]**) has

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				been prepared and includes measures to minimise impacts during construction by reducing HGV movements during the peak hours and managing employee movements. It also covers signage requirements. Clear construction warning signs will be placed on the roads leading to the Proposed Development access points. The Site entrance will also be appropriately signed. Details of the signage proposals will be set out in the detailed CTMP.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_PFF_022	Respondent expressed concern regarding traffic in West Haddlesey during construction.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				This CTMP does identify that Solar Development Site 4 could be accessed via the A19 at the Haddlesey Road crossroads and therefore vehicles would travel through West Haddlesey. A Transport Assessment (TA) has also been prepared (Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**) to assess the road network conditions and assess the impact of development movements on the network. The TA reports that during the construction period there could be an additional 6 HGVs and 72 car movements travelling through West Haddlesey, but this is a worst case scenario on the assumption that all trips to Solar Development Site 4 use this route.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_PFF_021	Respondent noted that a canal bridge is on the access	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		route for Solar Development Site 4, expressed concern that the bridge will be damaged, respondent provides added context that the bridge was previously damaged and closed for an extensive period of time.		An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]**) has also been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas. With regards to the condition of the road and any structures, there is a commitment within the oCTMP **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]** for a pre-commencement condition survey and a commitment to resolving any damage that can be attributed to construction activities.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_E_111	Respondent stated that there is no pedestrian crossing in Monk Fryston, and this could increase the chances of accidents for local villagers.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. A Transport Assessment (TA) has been prepared (Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**) to

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				assess the road network capacity, including the A63 through Monk Fryston. This reviews the current highway network and determines if any highway mitigation is required. The TA forecasts that construction activities could add a further 120 vehicles per day onto the A63 through Monk Fryston during the peak of construction. This additional traffic would be a temporary uplift of 1% on this road based on 2025 traffic survey data. The Applicant notes that a pedestrian crossing for Monk Fryston has suggested as a possible community benefit by respondents; this suggestion will be considered alongside other feedback to receive funding from the Community Benefit Fund.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Traffic and Transport	LV2_E_036	Respondent reported that a nearby, now non-existent wood chipping operation, Woody Fuels, caused major road damage in the area, notably the historic bridge next to Birkin Church; respondent concerned the same will happen again with this scheme.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]**) has also been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas. With regards to the condition of the road and any structures, there is a commitment within the oCTMP **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]** for a pre-commencement condition survey and a commitment to resolving any damage that can be attributed to construction activities.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_OFF_083	Respondent expressed concern that the Environmental Impact Assessment does not include	No	A Transport Assessment (TA) has been prepared (Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**) to

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		sufficient data around the impact on Sites 6 and 7. The respondent added that there is no reference to the impact on the road network around South Milford.		assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction. This includes the routes providing access to Solar Development Sites 6 and 7.
Traffic and Transport	LV2_OFF_079	Respondent stated that construction traffic to Site 2 will obstruct access to their property of Siddle House.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared which outlines traffic management measures during construction, and roles and responsibilities. The Site Manager will have overall responsibility for activity onsite and will ensure that properties are not obstructed by construction activities. The Site Manager's contact details will be made available to local residents.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or the Applicant's evidence (Yes/No)	Applicant Response

Targeted Consultation Applicant Response Table

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Traffic and transport	LVTC_OFF_008	Carr lane junction has two homes with one on each side, to try to widen the lane (currently single track) and the heavy vehicles using it along with the dirt and noise would make life unbearable for the occupants, I do not see how this can be achieved.	No	Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid travelling through residential areas. There is a Cable Route Corridor access on Black Fen Lane, and therefore access in this location will be required during the period when that particular section of the Cable Route Corridor is being constructed. The majority of vehicles will approach from the south and will not use Carr Lane.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The exception is Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) Movements. The Abnormal load assessment report (included in Annex C of ES Volume 3 Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**) notes that AILs would traverse via Wistow Road and Carr Lane to access the Cable Route Corridor. The report confirms that, for AIL movements, which are infrequent compared to regular HGV construction traffic, the junction is suitable for AIL movements and turning, and alteration works would only take place within the highway boundary. For further details regarding the junction's suitability, see swept path analysis contained within the Abnormal Load Assessment report (included in Annex C of ES Volume 3 Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**).
Traffic and transport	LVTC_OFF_042	The entrance to Carr lane is on a blind bend. It is flanked	No	The Applicant notes this comment and can confirm that road alteration works,

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		by two houses, one each side, to widen here would be impossible unless they take the gardens.		which would be temporary, would be carried out only within the highway boundary. The suitability of the turn is included within the swept path analysis contained within the Abnormal Load Assessment report (included in Annex C of ES Volume 3 Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**). An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid travelling through residential areas. There is a Cable Route Corridor access on Black Fen Lane, and therefore access in this location will be required during the period when that particular section of the Cable Route Corridor is

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				being constructed. The majority of vehicles will approach from the south and will not use Carr Lane. The exception is Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) Movements. The Abnormal load assessment report (included in Annex C of Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3 **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**) notes that AILs would traverse via Wistow Road and Carr Lane to access the Cable Route Corridor. The AIL will be escorted as identified in the Abnormal load assessment report. The Applicant can confirm that the turn identified by the respondent on Carr Lane has been assessed as suitable for wide-load turning, with any widening works taking place within the highway boundary. For further information on this, see swept path analysis contained within the Abnormal Load Assessment report (included in Annex C of ES Volume 3 Appendix 14.1: Transport

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Assessment **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**).
Traffic and transport	LVTC_OFF_042	The widening of Carr lane would affect the sewerage works and the main sewer from the village.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The methods used will protect any existing utilities during the temporary works, which would take place within the highway boundary; further information is included within the Abnormal load assessment report (included in Annex C of Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3 **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**). The outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]**) includes a commitment to return any public highways to the original condition they were in before the works. Any amendments to the highway for construction access will be subject to further design development, which will take into account existing utility

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				information. The works will need agreement with North Yorkshire Council.
Traffic and transport	LVTC_OFF_021	Carr Lane which is directly affected by the changes you propose to the access for lorries to the cabling corridor. This road is small and not load bearing for a number of reasons, primarily due to the field drainage ditches either side which prevent my property from flooding and also due to the sewerage network for the whole village being under the road.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. It is expected that the methods used will protect any existing utilities during the temporary works. Any amendments to the highway for construction access will be subject to further design development, which will take into account existing utility information. The works will need agreement with North Yorkshire Council.
Traffic and transport	LVTC_E_046, LVTC_OFF_042	Long lane is restricted against HGVs on the stretch into the village.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				existing condition of the road and any existing weight limit restrictions. It is proposed that the northern section of Long Lane is utilised by an Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) to access the Cable Route Corridor. It does not use the southern section of Long Lane, close to the village, that is subject to a weight restriction.
Traffic and transport	LVTC_OFF_042	The corner passing the church is already a hazard and impossible to pass an HGV on the corner.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. The routes take into consideration HGV restrictions and take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid travelling through residential areas.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The majority of vehicles will not travel through Wistow Village. The exception is Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) Movements. The Abnormal load assessment report (included in Annex C of ES Volume 3 Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**) notes that AILs would access the Cable Route Corridor to/from the south via the B1223 Selby Road and Garman Carr Lane. The route does not pass the Church.
Traffic and transport	LVTC_OFF_010	Roads through Wistow are totally unsuitable for these proposals. Lanes such as Long Lane have a 7.5 ton weight restrictions with the lane width unsuitable for large construction vehicles. Drains on long lane already suffer damage from car traffic hence the restrictions. The	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and any existing weight limit restrictions. The Applicant notes that the weight

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		impact on the lanes and housing is of real concern to the residents of Wistow.		restriction identified by the respondent applies to regular HGV traffic rather than planned AIL movements. The weight restrictions are environmental (vehicle pollution) in nature. It is proposed that the northern section of Long Lane is utilised by an Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) to access the Cable Route Corridor. It does not use the southern section of Long Lane, close to the village, that is subject to a weight restriction. The Applicant further notes that a number of weight-restricted roads in the vicinity are restricted on environmental grounds and apply to frequent HGV movements. AIL movements are infrequent, and use specialist, escorted vehicles to which certain restrictions do not apply.
Traffic and transport	LVTC_OFF_042	Pinfold hill is the only place parents can park when taking children to school.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. The routes take into consideration HGV restrictions and take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid travelling through residential areas. The majority of vehicles will not travel through Wistow Village and via Pinfold Hill. The exception is Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) Movements. The Abnormal load assessment report (included in Annex C of ES Volume 3 Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**) notes that AILs would access the Cable Route Corridor to/from the south via the B1223 Selby Road and Garman Carr Lane, connecting via Pinfold Hill. Arrangements to transport the AIL will

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				be subject to agreement with the highway authorities, and it is expected that the timing will be arranged to avoid school drop off and pick up times.
Traffic and transport	LVTC_OFF_042	Lordship Lane is single width with several tight corners and a 90 degree bend flanked by houses one on each side: HGVs have great difficulty negotiating this.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. AIL vehicles are not the same as HGVs, they are specialist vehicles consisting of specialist modular trailers with multiple axis and advanced steering. Lordship Lane was assessed as part of the Abnormal Load Assessment, with swept path analysis for all AIL routes undertaken and included within the Abnormal Load Assessment report (included in Annex C of ES Volume 3 Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**). The implementation of temporary passing places will ensure AIL movements and more regular construction traffic can safely use the road alongside other road users.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic.
Traffic and transport	LVTC_OFF_034	Change 23.: how do you propose to widen the junction given existing property boundaries?	No	The Applicant notes this comment. Swept path analysis of the route and junction has been undertaken to confirm that it is feasible for use. The swept path analysis has shown that there will be no direct impacts on any properties, but some temporary works may be required within highway. The change has been proposed to allow Cable Route Corridor access, with AILs making a left turn from the A63 (from the east) to Gateforth Lane. Any remedial works, such as plating, would be within the highway boundary. It is important to note that, unlike HGVs, AIL vehicles are specialist vehicles consisting of specialist modular trailers with multiple axis and advanced steering.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. The oCTMP was prepared following the Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3 Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment **[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**) which assessed road and route suitability, considering aspects including safety and capacity. The TA includes an abnormal load assessment report which is attached in Annex C and provides further details regarding the assessment of road suitability for AIL movements, including swept path analysis of the junction.
Traffic and transport	LVTC_OFF_034	Change 25.: how will access be maintained on Hough Lane to Hambleton Hough and the properties located within?	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The proposed change is for temporary works on the highway to accommodate the movement of an Abnormal

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Indivisible Load (AIL). The works will not restrict access. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared which outlines traffic management measures during construction, and roles and responsibilities. The Site Manager will have overall responsibility for activity onsite and will ensure that properties are not obstructed by construction activities.
Traffic and transport	LVTC_OFF_034	Where changes are of long term benefit to the community (such as 23 and 25), can these be made permanent?	No	The Applicant notes this comment. At this time all changes to roads, such as plating, packing and widening, would be temporary.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Traffic and transport	LVTC_OFF_033	Currently, the dam lane change 19 back traffic onto Leeds Road during the morning working commute time. This is exaggerated when the railway crossing is closed, causing traffic to back up on Leeds Road to the TW school.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. A Transport Assessment (TA) has also been prepared (ES Volume 3 Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment **[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**) to assess the road network conditions and assess the impact of development movements on the network. The TA reports that during the construction phase there could be an additional 28 HGVs travelling on Dam Lane during construction, and an overall traffic uplift of 2% on this road based on 2025 traffic survey data. This is the worst-case scenario. As detailed in and secured through the oCEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]** construction deliveries by HGV will be scheduled to arrive between 09:30-16:30 unless this not practically possible following delays or an emergency (or if deliveries are required for activities requiring 24 hour activity such as HDD).

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The deliveries will be coordinated to avoid construction vehicle movements during the traditional AM peak hour (08:00-09:00) and PM peak hour (17:00-18:00). These provisions are set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]**) and are secured by a Requirement in the draft DCO **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/03.01]**. The proposed highway changes are to facilitate this temporary uplift in traffic during the construction period.
Traffic and transport	LVTC_OFF_033	The same applies to change 20 in that the commuters using Leeds Road will increase with the new housing developments, and the changes that are proposed will potentially have an impact on this traffic and the byproduct of this is it will increase the difficulties of	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. The routes take into consideration HGV restrictions and take into account the existing condition of the road and seek,

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		people crossing from the firtrees side to get to the village green, school shops. What plans are there to provide a safe crossing for these villagers?		where practicable, to avoid travelling through residential areas. Henry Moore Lane provides an access to a Cable Route Corridor access location. The proposed changes are to facilitate the movement of an Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL). Arrangements to transport the AIL will be subject to agreement with the highway authorities, and it is expected that the timing would be arranged to avoid peak times.
Traffic and transport	LVTC_E_010	I would object if any of the hedges to the front of our property at 2 Lodge Farm Cottages were destroyed to make way for a passing place, and hope that you would have the courtesy to let us know if you are going to do this.	No	The Applicant can confirm that works to create passing places would be undertaken within the highway boundary, with no interaction with residential properties. The Applicant intends to minimise and avoid vegetation cutting back and removal where practicable. Surveys have and will continue to be undertaken to establish whether trees and hedgerows are overgrown at the time of construction and if they need to

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				be cut back to facilitate any of the localised changes. Where it has been determined that trees or hedgerows do need to be cut back, further surveys and visual inspections would be undertaken to ensure we are not disturbing existing habitats.
Traffic and transport	LVTC_E_010	I would like to raise an objection to the compound which you are proposing to build off Black Fen Lane. Black Fen Lane is a narrow, winding single track road which is just not made for heavy and frequent traffic. I cannot understand why you want to build a compound on this very minor road when the compound could be built off the B1223. This is the main road between Selby and Wistow and has plenty of	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. The proposed compound is located on the B1223 Selby Road, not Black Fen Lane.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		spare land that could be used.		
Biodiversity and ecology	LVTC_E_010	Not only that, but the copse opposite the proposed site is a haven for Roe Deer. I am very concerned that the sudden and constant activity around this area will frighten off the deer, not to mention the other wildlife such as buzzards, red kites, hare, rabbits, bats, owls.	No	The effects of the Proposed Development on ecology and habitat are assessed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]**. Table 6-6 sets out that commuting routes through the site for deer e.g. ditches, hedgerows, and their surrounding buffers, have been included throughout the Proposed Development and fencing has been designed to work around these commuting routes.
Site Selection and Alternatives	LVTC_E_017	Firstly, the area that you have highlighted in change 11 has now been built on. There is a very large agricultural building currently being erected.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment and can confirm it is aware of the building in question. The proposed Cable Route Corridor access location has been relocated further west to avoid conflict with the agricultural business.
Traffic and transport	LVTC_E_017	Carrying out work and routing traffic the way you have simply will not work on a	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. The proposed Cable Route Corridor access location has been relocated

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		practical level. There are 2 straw storage building that will always require access for loading and unloading, next to 1 of the buildings for most of the winter there will be sugar beet stored again requiring access for loading and unloading. Our farmyard will also need constant access for loading and unloading hay and haylage along with access being always kept clear in case of emergency as we have horses. A few hundred yards down the road is the pig farm which houses approximately 1500 pigs at a time so requires constant access for deliveries and collections of livestock, bulk feeders, tractors and trailers.		further west to avoid conflict with the agricultural business.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Traffic and transport	LVTC_E_017	A better option would be to use the route highlighted in 2 of my attached photos. This has no effect on any residential properties and doesn't interfere with the current businesses that operate in and around Wistow Lordship.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. The Cable Route Corridor access has been relocated further west to avoid conflict with the agricultural business. However, to avoid vehicles routing through Wistow village, it is still proposed that construction access is gained via Lordship Lane.
Traffic and transport / Socioeconomics	LVTC_E_017	By using the area across from our farm, you will completely ruin our quality of life and put our horses at risk. We breed and produce top class showjumping horse that are very highly strung and cannot cope with any type of building work, loud noises, large machinery etc. For example, while the new agricultural building was being erected, we have had to relocate our horses. This is manageable for 1 week but	Yes	The Cable Route Corridor access that is proposed on Lordship Lane has been relocated further west to avoid conflict with the business. The Cable Route Corridor access is forecast to generate 7 HGV movements (14 two-way) per day during the period that the Cable Route Corridor access is in use (short-term). An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]**) has also been prepared which includes measures to minimise any impacts during

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		there is no way we could afford to do this for the duration of your project and would put our horses lives at risk along with our own as we have to handle them when they have been put in a position where they become distressed. Another example, Northern Powergrid carried out some maintenance work to our trees without prior notification, and they caused one of our horses to 'spook' which resulted in injury and their contractor had to pay the vet bill which was in the thousands. By planning works in the area you have, you will render our property useless for its intended purpose and unsaleable as it has been completely modified for breeding, raising and		construction. The oCTMP also outlines the responsibilities of those working on the site, which includes liaising with the community to understand any local issues, and this could include ensuring the site manager is aware of any other nearby activities that need to be taken into consideration during the construction period. ES Volume 1 Chapter 13: Socioeconomics **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13]** has assessed equine receptors both as local businesses and in terms of their recreational and community value. Where the assessment identified potential effects, appropriate embedded and additional mitigation has been incorporated into the Proposed Development to minimise disruption, particularly during construction, as detailed in and secured through the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP,

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		production of horses. The stables are directly across for the area you have highlighted meaning we couldn't use them. The horse walker, riding arena and paddocks are very close to the highlighted area which would mean we couldn't safely use them. I have attached a photo from the stable window and a map showing just how close all our amenities are from your proposed site. Also, our house may look far away on a satellite image map but it is only around 40 meters from the highlighted site so that would have a huge impact on our quality of life.		**[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**). With these measures applied, no significant residual effects on equine receptors are expected.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Protective provisions	LVTC_E_020	Require the Applicant (through Regulation 17 requests / Examining Authority questions) to submit: a) a full alternatives appraisal (A-roads/rail/PDL/hamlet-avoidance), b) ALC/BMV mapping and quantified loss assessment, c) a hamlet impact assessment and binding CTMP that prohibits construction traffic through the hamlet/rural lanes, and d) a brownfield/rooftop/PDL feasibility and capacity study.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant has completed a Transport Assessment (TA, ES Volume 3 Appendix 14.1 **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]** and an outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]**) which assessed construction access routes and alternatives. The Applicant has undertaken ALC mapping, contained within ES Volume 3 Appendix 5.1: Agricultural Land Classification **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.05.01]**, with further details regarding the removal of agricultural land, and the policy context, included within ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]**. The Applicant acknowledges suggestions and preferences for use of

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				alternative sites, including brownfield sites, and can confirm that alternative sites were considered, assessed, and have been reported on within the Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) (ES Volume 3 **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]**). The SSAR considered, along with proximity to Monk Fryston Substation, planning, environmental and spatial constraints including flood risk, Green Belt, Agricultural Land Classifications and Public Rights of Way, and aspects including vehicle access and visual impacts. ES Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]** provides further detail regarding the site selection and design process. The Planning Statement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.02]** provides the policy context for the Proposed Development.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Traffic and transport	LVTC_E_020	Use A-road-led access (A19) with temporary junction improvements/marshalling rather than cutting across open fields/Green Belt.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas. This does mean using the Strategic Road Network, including the A19, to get close to accesses. However, the location of the Cable Route Corridor connection and some Site accesses does require the use of some rural roads. Use will be for a temporary period only during the duration of the works.
Traffic and transport	LVTC_E_020	Re-use disused rail/utility corridors to minimise new land-take and protect openness.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP,

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]) been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. The Solar Development Sites and Cable Route Corridor are located in rural areas not readily accessible by existing operational rail freight options. In addition, to use this approach would still require HGVs for the final delivery to the Site. This option was not assessed as it was not viable for delivery to the Site and the temporary increase in traffic during the construction period can be accommodated on the highway network.
Traffic and transport	LVTC_E_020	Site compounds/haul routes via brownfield/industrial areas and existing energy infrastructure to keep heavy vehicles out of hamlets.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				areas. The Construction Method Statement does include the use of Construction Compounds to consolidate some of the delivery trips.
Traffic and transport	LVTC_E_026	The housing developer, Banks, who have a current development on Gateforth Lane already prohibits construction vehicles from Gateforth Lane after consultation with the residents of the village.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas. Gateforth Lane was proposed as a route to access the Cable Route Corridor. In response to feedback received, an alternative route via Gateforth New Road has been included. Gateforth Lane will be maintained for the less frequent AIL movements, which use escorted specialist vehicles consisting of

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				specialist modular trailers with multiple axis and advanced steering. Gateforth Lane has been determined as suitable for AIL vehicles, with remedial works to be undertaken within the highway boundary (see the below response for further information). A Cable Route Corridor access is forecast to generate 7 HGV movements (14 two-way) per day when in use; these trips will be dispersed onto the network and movements to / from the site will only be on the network during the period that the Cable Route Corridor access is in use (short-term).
Traffic and transport	LVTC_OFF_055	The entrance to Gateforth Lane has no possibility of being widened. Private gardens are bordered by brick/stone walls and a pedestrian path. It is unclear how you propose to widen the junction for AIL.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. Swept path analysis of the route and junction has been undertaken to confirm that Gateforth Lane is feasible for use. The swept path analysis has shown that there will be no direct impacts on any properties, but some temporary works may be required within highway. The

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				change has been proposed to allow Cable Route Corridor access, with AILs making a left turn from the A63 (from the east) to Gateforth Lane. Any remedial works, such as plating, would be within the highway boundary. It is important to note that, unlike HGVs, AIL vehicles are specialist vehicles consisting of specialist modular trailers with multiple axis and advanced steering. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. The oCTMP was prepared following the Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3 Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment **[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**) which assessed road and route suitability, considering aspects including safety and capacity. The TA includes an abnormal load assessment report which

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				is attached in Annex C and provides further details regarding the assessment of road suitability for AIL movements, including swept path analysis of the junction.
Traffic and transport	LVTC_OFF_055	The widening of Old Lane next to the children's playing field suggests AIL traffic will be using Bar Lane and or Westcroft Lane. These roads are narrow residential roads and not suitable for AIL or any construction traffic.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Following feedback, it is not proposed that Old Lane is used to access the Proposed Development.
Traffic and transport	LVTC_E_028	I'm writing to propose a small, but significant amendment/improvement to your proposal in terms of access to the Cable Route Corridor which will save you time and money and keep additional traffic out of the village and the 30 mph zone	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The route through Wistow has been identified as AIL route only, with regular, more frequent HGV construction traffic not using the route. Swept path analysis of the route has been undertaken to confirm that the route is feasible. The swept path analysis has shown that there will be no direct impacts on any

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		and off unsuitably narrow lanes. I attended 2 of the consultations this summer and voiced my concern at them too. As it stands there is a plan to access the depot for the Cable Route Corridor down Carr Lane in the village of Wistow which appears to require the junction with Wistow Rd to be widened for HGVs. This lane is unsuitable for HGV access for several reasons It is only 8 feet wide with no made edge and ditches either side. It is well used by equestrians, cyclists, dog walkers, children etc.		properties, but some temporary works may be required within highway Arrangements for the transport of the AIL will need to be made under licence with the Local Highway Authority to ensure it can be done safely, and to minimise impacts. It is important to note that AIL vehicles are not the same as HGVs, they are specialist vehicles consisting of specialist modular trailers with multiple axis and advanced steering. AIL vehicles will be escorted by police, and remedial highway works to help facilitate the AIL would be temporary. Further detail regarding the number of expected AIL movements is included in Table 14-26 and 14-27 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.14]**. Swept path analysis of AIL routes is contained within the Abnormal Load

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		It is within the village boundary and the 30mph zone. As the plan is to make a temporary road along this Cable Route Corridor it would make much more sense to access via Wistow Road (where the number 5 is highlighted in green on the map above) which would keep HGV traffic out of the village, off a very small lane and away from villagers in their various leisure pursuits. It would also mean less works required to make a new junction, move telegraph poles and avoid potential disruption of the villages sewerage line and road drains thus saving significant		Assessment report (included in Annex C of ES Volume 3 Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**).

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		money for the project should it be approved.		
Cultural heritage and archaeology	LVTC_OFF_052	AIL - what assessment has been made of the potential impact heavy loads will have passing very close to the Grade I listed church of Skipwith St Helen, a building of national historical and architectural significance? The building has had to undergo tower strengthening works in the past due to mining works. What provision will be made to assess the potential damage cause by vibrations from heavy loads passing within a few yards of this ancient building and also further road subsidence (there have been sinkholes along this stretch of road in recent months)?	Yes	As presented in ES Volume 1 Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.11]**, based on guidance provided in British Standards BS5228-2 and BS7385-2, as well as the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 111, construction traffic vibration is unlikely to be of sufficient magnitude to result in adverse impacts on people. Risk of any damage (even cosmetic damage) to any buildings or other structures, including historic structures, starts to occur at levels much higher than those that are perceptible to people. As such, no vibration adverse impacts are expected upon Skipwith St Helen Church. Moreover, there are no HGV movements on Main Street, except for a relatively small number of AILs and these movements would need to be

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				arranged under licence with the Local Highway Authority.
Traffic and transport	LVTC_OFF_060	Amendment 23 I do not agree with the temporary junction widening on Gateforth Lane and A63 to allow AIL vehicles to access it as it houses the primary school and two nurseries. A lot of children and adults use this lane. Banks Homes development have already acknowledged that it is not suitable for heavy vehicles and have instructed that construction traffic should not use it as it would be a safety risk	Yes	The Applicant notes the comments. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas. Gateforth Lane was proposed as a route to access the Cable Route Corridor. In response to feedback received, an alternative route via Gateforth New Road has been included and will be used by regular construction traffic.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Regarding the AIL movements, these would be less frequent than regular HGV construction traffic and require advanced notice and planning. Swept path analysis of the route and junction has been undertaken to confirm that Gateforth Lane is feasible for AIL use. The swept path analysis has shown that there will be no direct impacts on any properties, but some temporary works may be required within highway. The change has been proposed to allow Cable Route Corridor access, with AILs making a left turn from the A63 (from the east) to Gateforth Lane. It is important to note that, unlike HGVs, AIL vehicles are specialist vehicles consisting of specialist modular trailers with multiple axis and advanced steering. AIL movements would receive a police escort. Further detail regarding the number of expected AIL movements is included in

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Table 14-26 and 14-27 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.14]**. Swept path analysis of AIL routes is contained within the Abnormal Load Assessment report (included in Annex C of ES Volume 3 Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**).
Traffic and transport	LVTC_OFF_060	Amendment 25. I do not agree with the widening of the junction for Gateforth Lane and Field Lane for the same reasons I put for amendment 23. The school and two nurseries are on Gateforth Lane so large construction vehicles should not be using it as acknowledged by Banks Homes who have instructed that construction traffic	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas. Gateforth Lane was proposed as a route to access the Cable Route Corridor. In

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		should not use it as it would be a safety risk.		response to feedback received, an alternative route via Gateforth New Road has been included. A Cable Route Corridor access is forecast to generate 7 HGV movements (14 two-way) per day when in use; these trips will be dispersed onto the network and movements to / from the site will only be on the network during the period that the Cable Route Corridor access is in use (short-term).
Traffic and transport	LVTC_OFF_063	The alternative routes set out are from the old A1 at Brotherton and via the A19. This must be the A19 from the North Via Selby, as the PEIR has stated the junction on the M62 should not be used as that is also at capacity.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. The majority of vehicles are expected to access the Strategic Road Network via the A1(M) to the west of the A19 to the east. However, some trips, including the Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL)

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Movements are expected to access the M62 at Junction 33. It was noted in the PEIR that National Highways had advised that construction traffic should seek to avoid the M62 at Junction 34 due to existing delays.
Traffic and transport	LVTC_OFF_063	In order to get to South Milford from either of these routes, to avoid Monk Fryston roundabout, the only way is over the railway bridge on Lumby Lane out of Monk Fryston, which has a 7.5t weight limit, plus a right angle turn which is unsuitable for construction traffic.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas. There are no proposals to access the Proposed Development via Lumby Lane. Potential alternative routes are shown on ES Volume 2 Figure 14.4: Construction Routing **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.14.04]**.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				This includes an alternative route to the strategic network via Birkin, that would avoid the roundabout junction. Any amendments to construction routing would need to be discussed with NYC and outlined in the updated CTMP. An abnormal load assessment report has been prepared and is attached in ES Volume 3 Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**. This identifies the routes the AIL is expected to take. To ensure minimal impact upon on the local road network, AIL vehicle movements will be undertaken during off-peak times and delivered in convoy, whenever practicable, to minimise incidents of disruption. This will be subject to the agreement and instructions of the Local Planning and Highway Authorities and the Police.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Traffic and transport	LVTC_OFF_079	Any use of Ingthorne Lane in connection with the LVS proposed development would impact significantly on the access / egress for residents living in Milford Junction - as Ingthorne Lane is their only option.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas. There are no proposals to access the Proposed Development via Ingthorne Lane. The Cable Route Corridor travels close to Ingthorne Lane but access to the corridor would be gained via the main access into Site 2, located on the A63.
Traffic and transport	LVTC_E_042	Unnecessary Loss of Mature Trees and Hedgerows: The repeated references to "possible cutting back or removal of trees or hedges" across every single change		The Applicant can confirm that it intends to minimise and avoid vegetation removal where practicable.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		(access points, visibility splays, passing places, AIL routes, and cable route) indicate a blanket policy of vegetation removal that will permanently scar the local landscape. These features are irreplaceable ecological corridors and provide critical habitat, carbon sequestration, and visual screening. Their loss cannot be mitigated by standard replanting schemes.		Surveys have and will continue to be undertaken to establish whether trees and hedgerows are overgrown at the time of construction and if they need to be cut back to facilitate any of the localised changes. Where it has been determined that trees or hedgerows do need to be cut back, further surveys and visual inspections would be undertaken to ensure we are not disturbing existing habitats. Any unavoidable tree losses as a result of the Proposed Development will be mitigated with replacement planting as close to the location, type and character of the existing vegetation, as far as reasonably practicable, to reduce effects resulting from such losses.
Traffic and transport	LVTC_E_042	Increased Road Safety Risks on Narrow Lanes Forcing abnormal indivisible loads and construction traffic onto narrow rural roads via new	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP,

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		passing places and widened visibility splays will endanger residents, cyclists, horse riders, and pedestrians. These lanes were never designed for HGV traffic. The proposed changes do not guarantee safe passage and will lead to conflict, congestion, and accidents.		**[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas. As stated in the oCTMP, visibility will be maximised between construction vehicles and other road users at crossing points and by managing vegetation within sight lines and advanced signage will be provided to warn users of the potential presence of construction vehicles. The Environmental Statement includes an assessment of fear and intimidation in ES Volume 1 Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.14]**. This calculates a degree of hazard score, which takes into account the average

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				two-way flow, the HGV composition and the vehicle speed. The report shows that the majority of road links within the assessed study area have a 'Small' or 'Moderate' level of fear and intimidation in both the baseline (existing) and 'with construction' scenarios. There are roads that are classified as having a 'great' level of fear and intimidation in the baseline. These are routes with higher traffic flows and include Wheldrake Lane, Wistow Road and Dam Lane. Across all assessed links, there is no increase in the level of fear and intimation; all routes assessed are within the same category with the Proposed Development as they are in the baseline. Therefore, the temporary increase in traffic during the construction phase is not expected to significantly alter the levels of fear and intimidation.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Cultural heritage and archaeology	LVTC_E_043	I note from your targeted consultation a continued intention to modify road in vicinity of St. Helens Church and West Field. Having attended your stage two consultation and discussed with your representative the significance of the community archaeological works being undertaken in that area It is somewhat surprising to see no reference to it in your proposals and indeed the extension of the affected area within the village to potentially cover a significant part of the potential site.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Assessment of the potential impacts of the Highways Improvements Areas (HIA) works at the eastern extent of Skipwith has been undertaken, as outlined in ES Volume 1 Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/ 06.01.08]**. Works will be restricted to the carriageway in front of the designated structures and will not result in physical impacts to any heritage asset or change their setting in such a way that will impact their significance. The route outside of St. Helen's church will be used for AIL only. Other HGV traffic will not be routed along Main Street. As a result, there is no risk of vibration damage to the church tower as a result of the Proposed Development.
Traffic and transport	LVTC_E_043, LVTC_E_061	It also concerns me you have not focused on alternate routes of access to your work	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP,

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		site which could easily be substituted for any access through Skipwith village, there is a farm track to north of village under the ownership of the land owner that is a principle beneficiary of your project that could easily be temporally upgraded and used for access by your vehicles .		**[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas. The routes that have been identified seek to minimise any impacts on Skipwith Village. Regular HGV construction traffic will not be routed through the village, however swept path analysis has identified the route as suitable for the less frequent AIL movements. An abnormal load assessment report has been prepared and is attached in ES Volume 3 Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**. This identifies the routes the AIL is expected to take. To ensure minimal impact upon on the local road network, AIL vehicle

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				movements will be undertaken during off-peak times and delivered in convoy, whenever practicable, to minimise incidents of disruption. This will be subject to the agreement and instructions of the Local Planning and Highway Authorities and the Police. AIL vehicles are not the same as HGVs, they are specialist vehicles consisting of specialist modular trailers with multiple axis and advanced steering and would receive a police escort. The swept path analysis is contained within the Abnormal Load Assessment report (included in Annex C of the Transport Assessment).
Water resources and flood risk / Traffic and transport	LVTC_E_044	I must also point out that Wistow Lordship in winter regularly floods. The roads often become impassable to vehicles, meaning they are not suitable again for increased traffic. Any development of those roads	Yes	The Applicant appreciates the concerns raised around increased construction traffic in / near to Wistow Lordship and the potential to exacerbate existing winter flooding issues. The Proposed Development has been informed by the Flood Risk Assessment

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		would push that water further towards residential houses as well as damaging agricultural land.		(FRA) (ES Volume 3 Appendix 15.1: **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01]**) and the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]**). These documents set out and secure a series of measures designed to ensure that construction activities do not increase flood risk on-site or to surrounding areas, including the limiting or suspending of construction activities during periods of heavy rainfall or when conditions indicate an increased risk of flooding. This precautionary approach ensures that the presence of construction traffic and equipment does not worsen existing winter flooding issues. A Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan (FWEP) will be implemented for the duration of the works. This plan shall established clear procedures for

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				monitoring weather conditions, responding to Environment Agency flood alerts, and ensuring that personnel, plant and materials are managed appropriately during periods of elevated flood risk.
Traffic and transport	LVTC_E_044, LVTC_E_046	Change 10 specifically marks the junction of Church Hill (not Selby Road, which switch over on the junction) and Pinfold Hill. You say the change has been done to accommodate temporary road widening. There is nothing here that can be widened or removed. There are no hedges, and the only tree is a protected ancient willow tree (The TPO code is 5/2003. It's a weeping willow and was designated in August 2003). The remainder	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The route through Wistow via Pinfold Hill has been identified as an AIL route. Arrangements for the transport of the abnormal load will need to be made under licence with the Local Highway Authority to ensure it can be done safely, and to minimise impacts. To inform the construction routing, swept path analysis of the route has been undertaken to confirm that the route is feasible. The swept path analysis has shown that there will be no direct impacts on any properties, with any remedial works, including packing and plates, taking place within the

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		of this area is brick: walls and properties. Our property, The Old Coach House, sits immediately opposite this turn, right on the road. Do you propose 'temporarily' removing it and rebuilding it?		highway boundary, and being temporary in nature. The analysis shows that to make the turn onto Pinfold Hill, and the same with Garman Carr Lane, the AIL would oversail the pavement. Any temporary highway works to make this movement safely and without any damage to the highway will form part of the arrangements with the highway authority. The AIL vehicles consist of specialist vehicles consisting of specialist modular trailers with multiple axis and advanced steering and will receive a police escort.
Traffic and transport	LVTC_E_047	There are alternatives you could put in place which do not disturb our village: for example routing the traffic across the Escrick Estate's land on the Skipwith Road between the village and Escrick itself. Or you could bring the traffic across from	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. The use of the estate roads was

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		the A19 via Hollicars area or King Rudding Lane. We should not have to see alterations to our village (even temporary ones) to facilitate your construction when there are obvious alternatives to be had. The proposals are totally disproportionate to the benefits you will get from them.		considered but were not found to be appropriate for use due to the presence of ancient woodland. The routes that have been identified seek to minimise any impacts on Escrick and Skipwith Village.
Cultural heritage and archaeology	LVTC_E_049 (Skipwith Heritage Group)	St.Helen's Parochial Church Council are concerned about the impact on the church by the heavy vehicles from the Light Valley Solar project in the main street. We are particularly concerned about the vibration from these vehicles, particularly on the church tower. We support the comments by Skipwith Heritage Group and would	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment and welcomes feedback from Skipwith Heritage Group and St. Helens Parochial Church. The route outside of St. Helen's church will be used for AIL movements only. Other HGV traffic will not be routed along Main Street. As a result, there is no risk of vibration damage to the church tower as a result of the Proposed Development. A full assessment of potential effects is

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		like to be kept informed of further developments		reported within ES Volume 1 Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.08]**.
Cultural heritage and archaeology	LVTC_E_049 (Skipwith Heritage Group)	Skipwith Heritage Group respectfully request a commitment from Light Valley Solar and associated stakeholders to involve SHG throughout the road enhancement work in Skipwith village including the planning phase, civil works and just as crucially the restoration phase. In return you will receive a sympathetic and collaborative commitment from this end. Skipwith Heritage Group wants nothing more than to protect the historical integrity of the village which we are all incredibly proud of.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment and welcomes feedback from Skipwith Heritage Group. The route through Skipwith and outside of St. Helen's church will be used for AIL movements only, and the route has been assessed as part of the Transport Assessment and accompanying Abnormal load assessment report (included in Annex C of ES Volume 3 Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**). Other HGV traffic will not be routed through the village or along Main Street, as confirmed and secured through the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**). The Applicant can confirm that Skipwith Heritage Group has been formally

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				added to its stakeholder contacts list and will be informed of any further developments.
Public Rights of Way	LVTC_E_055	The inland drainage board require vehicle access to the side of the dykes crossing the sites to ensure they are periodically (generally each year) cleared. Surely it would be possible to include this ongoing access requirement into new public promissory recreational access footpaths and link them into existing tracks and roads so they form circular routes.	Yes	The Applicant can confirm that any new access proposals for the inland drainage board to maintain their drainage works will be subject to approval by the relevant board. Existing PRoWs and proposed Permissive Paths within the Order Limits of the Proposed Development are shown on the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**) and will provide improved recreational access and connectivity during the operational phase of the Proposed Development.
Cultural heritage and archaeology	LVTC_E_057	My property Church Cottage has a substantial part of its foundations built with negligible foundations due to its age.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges this concern. As presented in ES Volume 1 Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.11]**, based on guidance provided in British Standards BS5228-2 and BS7385-2, as well as the Design Manual for Roads

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		It concerns me that your intentions might cause structural damage.		and Bridges (DMRB) LA 111, construction traffic vibration is unlikely to be of sufficient magnitude to result in adverse impacts on people. Risk of any damage (even cosmetic damage) to any buildings or other structures, including historic structures, starts to occur at levels much higher than those that are perceptible to people. As such, no vibration adverse impacts are expected. The AIL route will be used for passing 1-2 loads only. The noise and vibration assessment has not identified any possibility for significant effects as a result of these routes. Further details regarding AIL movements can be found within the Abnormal Load Assessment report (included in Annex C of ES Volume 3 Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**). In addition, an outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP,

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic and provides further detail regarding mitigation measures to minimise impacts associated with construction traffic.
Traffic and transport	LVTC_E_058	My understanding is that you intend to widen the road directly outside our property purely to allow large goods vehicles to access your site through the village. It is not clear from the material we have had the time to look at exactly what your plans are, however, it appears you intend to remove the pavement and the grass verge that runs in front of our property, allowing for vehicles to drive right up to our fence and hedges. To be clear we oppose such plans and think	No	The Applicant notes this comment and can confirm that all remedial works, such as temporary plates and packing, would be within the highway boundary. It is not proposed to remove any pavements, instead a temporary hard surface would be put down to allow the AIL vehicle to pass without removing pavements or damaging the verge. The route via Birkin Lane onto Main Street has been identified as an AIL route. Arrangements for the transport of the AIL need to be made under licence with the Local Highway Authority to ensure it can be done safely, and to minimise impacts.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		that they are totally unnecessary, they introduce a risk to the road safety and will significantly damage our plant life, create noise pollution and air pollution that is likely to directly impact the health of the occupants of Bridge End House.		To inform the construction routing, swept path analysis of the abnormal load has been undertaken to confirm that the route is feasible. The swept path analysis has shown that there will be no direct impacts on any properties. The analysis shows that to make the turn onto Main Street from Birkin Lane the abnormal load would oversail the pavement. Any temporary highway works to make this movement safely and without any damage to the highway will form part of the arrangements with the highway authority. Further information, including the swept path analysis, is contained within the Abnormal Load Assessment report (included in Annex C of ES Volume 3 Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]**). The AIL vehicles, unlike HGVs, are specialist in design, consisting of

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				specialist modular trailers with multiple axles and advanced steering ability.
Traffic and transport	LVTC_E_058	Creating a dedicated access road from the A63 directly down Fox Lane would reduce the impact upon the local communities and ensure safe access for future years when the site will require routine maintenance. This also allows the same access to more than sites 3 and 4. I am sure that you will raise the issue of cost, however putting money above the safety and health of people, wildlife and vegetation cannot support this project as an environmental project, but more of one for profit over quality of life.		The Applicant notes this comment. Fox Lane is an existing route that can be used to connect the A63 to Hillam Common Lane. There are no proposals to upgrade Fox Lane as other routes are just as suitable to accommodate the temporary uplift in traffic that will be generated by the Proposed Development.
Project description	LVTC_E_060 (British Horse Society)	Permissive Paths – to create publicly accessible routes within the Solar Development	Yes	The Applicant can confirm that new permissive paths will provide the same access rights as the routes they

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		Sites for walking and cycling" This statement does not include horse riders this is discriminatory and does not meet the NPPF 105.		connect. For example, where a permissive path links two bridleways, it will be available to horse riders; where it links footpaths, it will be a footpath. The Applicant can confirm that new permissive paths for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders within Sites 4, 6 and 7 are being proposed, and are shown on the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**).
Public Rights of Way	LVTC_E_060 (British Horse Society)	The Applicant MUST take the following into account and should note that separate permission for works on or over a Public Right of Way MUST be requested from the relevant Council's Rights of Way Team prior to any work commencing, and that	No	The DCO will authorise the works required to PRoW within the Proposed Development, including the permanent diversion of a small number of PRoW. Any damage will be addressed, as detailed and secured through the outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP, **[EN010012/APP/LVS/07.09]**) submitted as part of the Application.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		permission may be refused. Any damage to a Public Right of Way resulting from works must be made good by the applicant. The applicant, and any future owners, residents etc, must have private rights to take motorised vehicles over a PRoW other than a BOAT. To do so without lawful authority is an offence under the Road Traffic Act 1988. The bridleway cannot simply be diverted without consultation.		
Public Rights of Way	LVTC_E_060 (British Horse Society)	We would like to see all permissive paths within the red line boundary being made available to all non-motorised vulnerable road users including horse riders, thereby meeting the requirements of National Planning Policy.		The Applicant confirms that permissive paths will reflect the status of the routes they connect, ensuring access for horse riders where appropriate. This approach supports non-motorised users and aligns with national policy.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Traffic and transport	LVTC_E_060 (British Horse Society)	Should this scheme go ahead it is imperative that visibility and signage are improved on all access roads.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared and includes measures to minimise impacts during construction by reducing HGV movements during the peak hours and managing employee movements. It also covers signage requirements. Clear construction warning signs will be placed on the roads leading to the Proposed Development access points. The Site entrance will also be appropriately signed. Details of the signage proposals will be set out in the detailed CTMP.
Public Rights of Way	LVTC_E_060 (British Horse Society)	The British Horse Society believes that the proposals for the Solar Farm will create a huge loss of amenity value to the Public Rights of Way affected by these plans this loss of amenity must be mitigated by the Solar Farm	No	The Applicant can confirm that no PRoWs will be closed, with new permissive paths being provided to improve connectivity. Permissive paths will be decommissioned at the end of the Proposed Development's operational

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		Company, by creating other equestrian routes. The current impact on equestrians has been dismissed by the current plans due to the supressed demand. The scheme provides an opportunity to create new paths for cyclists, walkers and equestrians and links between the communities that are short of paths and links at present, these new routes should be permanent public rights of way and not just permissive routes that will disappear when the site is decommissioned.		lifetime (60 years), this is because the land will be returned to agricultural use, which would be limited by any new permanent PRoWs and permissive paths. All existing PRoWs and new permissive paths will have a 15 m buffer on either side to any infrastructure associated with the Proposed Development, including fencing. Security fencing is intended to be used sparingly and kept as low as possible in height. Fencing will also be integrated with existing hedges or landscaping to blend more naturally with the environment. Appropriate gates and barriers will be installed at access points to control the type of users permitted on each path. Proposed permissive paths and existing PRoWs are shown on the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**), with new permissive paths secured through

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				the oLEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**.
Traffic and transport	LVTC_E_060 (British Horse Society)	Closures without alternative routes should be avoided and, if necessary, construction traffic managed to reduce the length of closures, rather than an automatic blanket closure.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. Regarding road closures, the DCO includes the power to temporarily close roads where this may be necessary for the construction of the Proposed Development. Should a temporary road closure be required for highway works, a suitable diversion would be in place and agreed with the Local Highway Authority (NYC). It is expected that some site accesses will have temporary traffic management installed during construction. Subject to agreement with NYC, this could include temporary speed limit reductions, temporary closures and temporary traffic lights. Any traffic management measures, and the placement of traffic signs would be agreed with NYC. Specific details of traffic management and temporary

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Traffic Regulations Measures to be deployed during site access works would be included in the updated CTMP to be agreed with the highway authorities prior to commencement of construction. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared and provides further detail. Regarding PRoWs, signage will be placed at all PRoW intersections with the Proposed Development to inform the public about planned works, temporary closures, and alternative routes. The location and content of signs (and the mechanisms for agreeing variations/additions) will be set out in the Detailed PRoW Management Plan (PRoWMP) with Local Authority PRoW officers; the Applicant has prepared an outline version of this management plan (oPRoWMP,

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.09]). The provision of permissive paths, including signage, maintenance and surfacing is secured in the DCO via the LEMP Requirement. The current approach is set out in the outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**).
Public Rights of Way	LVTC_E_060 (British Horse Society)	Equestrians will lose the current rural aspects, effectively being sandwiched between fences, any proposed 'Reinforce/infill existing hedgerow with native species where necessary' will take some years to establish fully so the solar panels will be visible from all the Public Rights of Way.	No	The Applicant notes this concern. All existing PRoWs and new permissive paths will have a 15 m buffer on either side to any infrastructure associated with the Proposed Development, including fencing. Therefore, routes will be located with an open corridor. Security fencing is intended to be used sparingly and kept as low as possible in height. Fencing will also be integrated with existing hedges or landscaping to blend more naturally with the environment. Appropriate gates and barriers will be installed at access points to control the type of users permitted on

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				each path, with gates designed to allow pedestrian and cyclist access while preventing horse riders where equestrian use is not intended. As noted in the oLEMP **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]**, the surfacing material (suggested grass) and width of the permissive path will be agreed in advance of operation with the host authorities. Hedgerow reinforcement and infill planting will use native species to enhance screening over time. While full maturity will take several years, this approach will reduce visibility of solar panels from PRoWs and improve the rural character in the long term. Proposed planting, new and existing PRoWs are shown on the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM, **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]**).
Traffic and Transport	LVTC_E_061	It should be clear to the developers of the project that	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment.

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		any access for building the cabling corridor could and should go along the route north of Skipwith village identified for construction traffic, or be created away from the village using, for example, the proposed development's landowner's other land, in particular from the A19 in the area of Hollicars or King Rudding Lane; alternatively along the tracks (upgraded if necessary) leading westwards from the Skipwith Road on the opposite side around the Winchat Hall area. These would give a straight run from an established road without disturbing Skipwith village at all.		An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, **[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]**) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas. There is a Cable Route Corridor access located to the north-west of Skipwith so access is required during the period when that particular section of the Cable Route Corridor is being constructed. An access located off Skipwith Road, north of Main Street, has been identified to minimise movements through the village and will be used by the majority of construction vehicles. The only construction route through the village that will use Main Street is for the movement of the Abnormal Load. Arrangements for the transport of the

Theme	Feedback ID	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Abnormal Load will need to be made under licence with the Local Highway Authority to ensure it can be done safely, and to minimise impacts.