

# Light Valley Solar

Consultation Report

## Appendix 12: Section 42 Applicant Response

Document Reference: EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01.12

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 12: Section 42 Applicant Response

---

<b>Regulation Reference</b>	APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)
<b>Planning Inspectorate Case Reference</b>	EN00110012
<b>Application Document Reference</b>	EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01.12
<b>Author</b>	Light Valley Solar Limited

Version	Date	Status of Version
1.0	February 2026	DCO Submission

## Table of Contents

<b>Phase Two consultation Section 42 Applicant response tables</b> .....	<b>4</b>
Phase Two Section 42 and Section 43 Applicant response table.....	4
Phase Two Section 44 Applicant response table .....	345
<b>Section 42, Section 43 and Section 44 Targeted Consultation Applicant response tables</b> .....	<b>391</b>
Section 42 Targeted Consultation Applicant response table .....	391
Section 43 Targeted Consultation Applicant response table .....	441
Section 44 Targeted Consultation Applicant response table .....	442

## Phase Two consultation Section 42 Applicant response tables

### Phase Two Section 42 and Section 43 Applicant response table

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Health and Safety Executive	Protective Provisions / Ground Conditions	<p>According to HSE's records, the proposed Light Valley Solar project components as specified in the Light Valley Solar Additional Event Maps, July 2025, drawing number 24003651_PLN_INFO_4489.1, drawing title 'Information Plan', does appear to cross the Consultation Zones of several Major Accident Hazard (MAH) pipelines, which are associated with the following pipeline operators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HSE Ref #7701, Transco Ref 1953, Operator Northern Gas Networks, Knottingley / Chapel Haddlesley. (Note: Light Valley Solar Project's, Solar Development Site 4 and Cable Corridors Options Area are impacted by this MAH pipeline)</li> <li>• HSE Ref # 4032673, Transco Ref 2784,</li> </ul>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that National Gas Transmission and Northern Gas Networks have assets within its proposed Order Limits and is engaging with both National Gas and Northern Gas Networks to ensure their assets are appropriately protected.</p> <p>The Land Rights Negotiations Tracker <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.04]</b> submitted with the Application sets out the Proposed Development's requirement for the land in which National Gas and Northern Gas Networks have an interest.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>Operator National Grid Gas Plc, Asselby/Pannal. (Note: Light Valley Solar Project's, Solar Development Site 8 and Cable Corridors Options Area are impacted by this MAH pipeline)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HSE Ref # 7699, Transco Ref 1951, Operator Northern Gas Networks, Chapel Haddlesley / Selby. (Note: Light Valley Solar Project's, Solar Development Cable Corridors Options Area are impacted by this MAH pipeline)</li> <li>• HSE Ref # 7737, Transco Ref 1989, Operator National Gas, 7 Feeder Pannal / Cawood. (Note: Light Valley Solar Project's Cable Corridors Options Area is impacted by this MAH pipeline)</li> </ul>		<p>The Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of both pipeline operators within the draft DCO submitted with the Application and will continue to engage with National Gas and Northern Gas Networks to determine if amendments are needed to these Protective Provisions or any associated Side Agreements.</p> <p>The design of the Proposed Development has accounted for the position of Northern Gas Networks' assets by ensuring there are adequate stand offs from the components of the Proposed Development. Where interaction with Northern Gas Networks and National Gas' assets is possible,</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				appropriate construction and operational methodologies will be employed as specified within the protective provisions within the draft DCO.
Health and Safety Executive	Site Selection and Alternatives	<p>Since the works will entail underground cabling and access routes, HSE strongly recommends that at the earliest opportunity, the applicant liaises with the pipeline operators above. There are three particular reasons for this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) the pipeline operator may have a legal interest in developments in the vicinity of the pipeline. This may restrict developments within a certain proximity of the pipeline;</li> <li>ii) <b>the standards to which the pipeline is designed and operated may restrict major traffic routes within a certain proximity of the pipeline.</b> Consequently, there may be a need for the operator to modify the pipeline or its operation, if the development proceeds;</li> <li>iii) to establish the necessary measures</li> </ul>	Yes	<p>The Applicant has contacted the pipeline operators in order to understand their legal interest, to understand any restrictions arising from the pipeline standards and any necessary measures required to alter/upgrade the pipeline to appropriate standards.</p> <p>The Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of both pipeline operators within the draft DCO submitted with the Application, and will continue to engage with National Gas and Northern Gas Networks to determine if amendments are</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>required to alter/upgrade the pipeline to appropriate standards.</p> <p>Based on the information in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report, Chapters 1 to 4, June 2025, EN0110012, it is unlikely that HSE would advise against the development. Please note that the advice is based on HSE's existing policy for providing land-use planning advice and the information which has been provided. HSE's advice in response to a subsequent planning application may differ should HSE's policy or the scope of the development change by the time the Development Consent Order application is submitted.</p>		<p>needed to these Protective Provisions or any associated Side Agreements.</p>
Health and Safety Executive	Human Health	<p>Would Hazardous Substances Consent be needed?</p> <p>The presence of hazardous substances on, over or under land at or above set threshold quantities (Controlled Quantities) will probably require Hazardous Substances Consent (HSC) under the Planning</p>	No	<p>The Applicant can confirm that there is unlikely to be any significant effects as a result of interactions between the nearest COMAH site and the Proposed Development. Therefore, further assessment of the risk and effects</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>(Hazardous Substances) Act 1990 as amended. The substances, alone or when aggregated with others for which HSC is required, and the associated Controlled Quantities, are set out in The Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 2015 as amended.</p> <p>HSC would be required to store or use any of the Named Hazardous Substances or Categories of Substances at or above the controlled quantities set out in Schedule 1 of these Regulations.</p> <p>Further information on HSC should be sought from the relevant Hazardous Substances Authority.</p> <p>Consideration of risk assessments Regulation 5(4) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 requires the assessment of significant effects to include, where relevant, the expected significant effects arising from the proposed development's vulnerability to</p>		<p>from COMAH sites was scoped out of the ES. The Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of both pipeline operators within the draft DCO submitted with the Application, and will continue to engage with National Gas and Northern Gas Networks to determine if amendments are needed to these Protective Provisions or any associated Side Agreements.</p> <p>A Ground Conditions Preliminary Risk Assessment <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.03]</b> has been carried out, and an Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.06]</b>) prepared; no significant effects associated with battery fires or</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>major accidents. HSE's role on NSIPs is summarised in the following Advice Note 11 Annex on the Planning Inspectorate's website - Annex G – The Health and Safety Executive. This document includes consideration of risk assessments on page 3.</p>		<p>other electrical fires are anticipated. General best practice and mitigation measures will be in place via the outline Construction Environment Management Plan (oCEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b>). Overall, the Proposed Development can suitably avoid, manage and mitigate any risk associated with hazardous substances, in accordance with EN-1 and Policy ENV2.</p>
<p>Health and Safety Executive</p>	<p>Human Health</p>	<p>Explosives sites Explosives Inspectorate has no comment to make as there are no HSE licenced explosives sites in the vicinity of the proposed development.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p>
<p>Health and Safety Executive</p>	<p>Human Health</p>	<p>Electrical Safety No comment from a planning perspective.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
National Air Traffic Services	Project Description	We refer to the consultation received by surface mail dated 25th June 2025. NATS operates no infrastructure within 10 km of the proposal site. Accordingly it anticipates no impact from the proposal and has no comments to make on the consultation.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Escrick Parish Council	Landscape and Visual	Councillors have reservations regarding the current plans and would like to request that the boundary is moved further back from the road by at least a field.	Yes	A setback of approximately one field width has been incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development from the Escrick Conservation Area. This design measure is illustrated in ES Volume 2 Figure 2.1: Indicative Site Layout Plan <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.02.01]</b> and the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]</b> ) and secured through the outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP,

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p><b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]</b>), and reflects the Applicant's commitment to respecting the setting of designated heritage assets and the wider landscape character of the York Fringe East Landscape Character Area (LCA). In addition, a minimum 10 m setback from Skipwith Road is proposed, which will include screening planting to soften views and reinforce the green infrastructure framework; this is secured via the oLEMP <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]</b>. Further details on screening planting are included in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]</b>.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Escrick Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	<p>Within the PEIR (Preliminary Environmental Information Report June 2025), in Section 5.3 Agricultural Lands and Soils, 5.3.1 states that "The best quality agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a) is known as 'Best and Most Versatile (BMV) and is given a greater level of protection in planning policy than lower quality (Grades 3b, 4 and 5). Section 5.3.2 states that of the agricultural land surveyed to date (Sites 1-4), 2% is confirmed as Grade 1, 18% classified as Grade 2, 34% confirmed as Subgrade 3a and 46% is confirmed as Subgrade 3b.</p> <p>Councillors are supportive of a development that protects the Best and Most Versatile agricultural land (land which should be protected under planning policy) and agree with development on the basis of using only the Subgrade 3b areas and above.</p>	Yes	<p>The quantity and quality of land within the Solar Development Sites is set out in Section 5.7 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b>. Detailed ALC surveys indicate that approximately 54% of the total land within the Solar Development Sites is classed as BMV agricultural land. Approximately 20% (179.4 ha) of the Sites have BMV land Grades 1 and 2. Approximately 34% (307 ha) of the land is confirmed as Subgrade 3a. Representative soil and ALC surveys undertaken within the CRC indicate that 51% of land within the CRC can be classed as BMV agricultural land (Grade 1 at 3%, Grade 2 at 4% and Grade 3a at 44%). The full ALC information is included within ES Volume 3</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>Appendix 5.1: Agricultural Land Classification  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.05.01]</b>.</p> <p>While food security is not identified as an issue within the suite of Energy National Policy Statements or the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the significance of removing this land from solely food production is assessed in Section 5.9, and the cumulative assessment of the removal of agricultural land on food security is assessed in Section 5.14.</p>
Escrick Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	It is unclear within the PEIR whether actual recent site surveys have been undertaken in relation to Solar Development Site 1 or if they are relying on the Provisional ALC mapping that was carried out between October 1988	No	The Applicant can confirm that Solar Development Site 1 has been surveyed in detail, including at PEIR stage, where ALC surveys were carried out across all of Solar

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		and late 1999. We seek clarification of the basis of the identification of Subgrade 3b on this Site. We have had sight of evidence that good quality crops are being grown on areas that have been marked as Subgrade 3b.		Development Sites 1, 2, 3 and 4 and most of Solar Development Site 6, undertaken at a density of one observation per 2 ha, as agreed with Natural England. Following this, soil and ALC surveys were undertaken across the remainder of Solar Development Site 6, all of Solar Development Sites 7 and 8, and within the Cable Route Corridor where possible. Taken together, these ALC surveys have informed ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b> .
Church Fenton Parish Council	Project Description	Church Fenton Parish Council has considered the detailed proposals presented by Light Valley Solar regarding the major solar farm project to be constructed close to the Parish, as part of your ongoing consultation process (Phase Two, running	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>between Thursday 26 June and Thursday 7 August 2025).</p> <p>The Council resolved at its meeting on 10th July 2025 to provide the following comments:</p> <p>The Parish Council wishes to affirm its strong support for the expansion of renewable energy sources, and solar generation in particular, as a vital component of addressing climate change and contributing to national energy security. We recognise the pressing need to transition towards sustainable energy solutions and appreciate the initiative to develop projects that contribute to this goal.</p> <p>The Council has made a commitment to consider the environmental impact of all its activities, and we note that while the proposed project will not directly impact the parish, construction traffic will likely be apparent. The Council recognises the on-going growth and dependency of our society upon energy supplies.</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		Therefore, the Council wishes to express its support for the project.		
North Duffield Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	Councillors object to development that uses good agricultural land. They would like to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land (land which should be protected under planning policy) and would prefer to see this type of development to be built on industrial land.	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. Policy in NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-3 recognises that solar development may take place on agricultural land, but that applicants should not site their scheme on Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land without justification and, where demonstrated to be necessary, that the poorer quality land should be preferred over higher quality. ES Volume 1 Chapter 5 Agricultural Land and Soils</p> <p><b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05.00]</b> further sets out the national policy context, while the Planning Statement</p> <p><b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.02]</b> provides the justification for use of BMV land.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Network Rail	Site Selection and Alternatives	<p>Impact on Infrastructure</p> <p>Since your proposal would involve interaction with Network Rail's operational railway, it is strongly advised that you take all potential areas of concern to Network Rail into account, in their documentation for consideration at planning. Therefore, it is imperative that Network Rail's Asset Protection team in the eastern region be consulted directly by you, to ensure that all risks to our railway infrastructure are safely managed from all construction-related activities associated with your proposed development.</p>	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant acknowledges that Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd (NRIL) has assets within its proposed Order Limits and is engaging with the Network Rail Asset Protection team to confirm the interface with the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of NRIL within the draft DCO submitted with the Application, and will continue to engage with NRIL to determine if amendments are needed to these Protective Provisions or any associated Side Agreement.</p>
Network Rail	Protective Provisions	Investigation and Mitigation	No	The Applicant acknowledges that Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd has

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>Network Rail would have an interest in understanding the full impact of your proposed development on all our infrastructure in the vicinity. This further understanding should identify improvements and/or mitigations required to facilitate your proposed development. As such, these will need to be funded by you to ensure the safe and efficient running of our operational railway.</p> <p>A Basic Asset Protection Agreement and/ or a Structures Agreement /Asset Protection Agreement with Network Rail may be required before you can proceed with any design or construction work alongside, above or below Network Rail's Infrastructure. Therefore, we request that you engage with Network Rail's Asset Protection Eastern team (<a href="mailto:AssetProtectionEastern@networkrail.co.uk">AssetProtectionEastern@networkrail.co.uk</a>).</p> <p>Network Rail have their own standard</p>		<p>assets within its proposed Order Limits and is engaging with Network Rail to confirm the interface with the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The Land Rights Negotiations Tracker <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.04]</b> submitted with the Application sets out the Proposed Development's requirement for the land in which Network Rail has an interest.</p> <p>The Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of Network Rail within the draft DCO submitted with the Application and will continue to engage with Network Rail to determine if amendments are needed to these Protective Provisions or any associated Side Agreement.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>protective provisions for third-part development that could potentially have an impact on Network Rail's operational railways, land and/or assets, and these must be included on the face of the DCO, as a minimum. To request a copy of our protective provisions and discuss any other agreements that will need to be entered with Network Rail, it is recommended that you contact both Mandip Sond and Stephen Sprei through each of their respective email addresses:</p>		
Canal & River Trust	Biodiversity	<p>Habitats and biodiversity associated with two parts of our network, at the River Ouse and the River Aire, have the potential to be impacted by the proposals.</p> <p>Within table 6-1 on page 10 of the document, it is stated that impacts to watercourses will be scoped in. We note that the text states that the River Aire will not be directly impacted. We presume this refers to the site boundary not crossing the River, reducing</p>	No	<p>Indirect impacts on the River Aire have been scoped into ES Volume 1 Chapter 15: Water Resources and Flood Risk  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.15]</b>                      and the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b>).</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		direct impacts. We do request that indirect impacts on the river during construction should be scoped into the Construction Environmental Management Plan to ensure that the river is protected from dust, vibrations, temporary lighting and noise.		The Applicant notes that it has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of the CRT within the draft DCO submitted with the Application, and will continue to engage with the CRT to determine if amendments are needed to these Protective Provisions or any associated Side Agreements.
Canal & River Trust	Biodiversity	We note the list of species that will be assessed within table 6-1 and have no issue with the species identified.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Canal & River Trust	Biodiversity	Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) could result in vibrations that could impact waterborne species. We note that the Environmental Report will seek to assess for this impact (e.g. paragraph 6.9.60).	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The effect of HDD on waterborne species has been fully assessed within ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]</b> . While the use of HDD beneath the River Ouse is specifically designed to avoid direct in-channel works, thereby substantially reducing the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>risk of physical habitat disruption, the procedure may still generate localised noise and vibration, particularly around entry and exit pits, which could affect lamprey species during critical life stages such as larval (juvenile) stages and migration. This effect would be temporary and localised and reduced further by avoiding HDD during the core migratory periods; this and other relevant mitigation measures are further detailed in and secured through the oCEMP <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b>.</p>
Canal & River Trust	Landscape and Visual	Our network is utilised by boaters, including for leisure and sport. Neighbouring towpaths are used by walkers and cyclists. We note that table 10-1 highlights that Canal and River users will be included as sensitive receptors in the LVIA assessment, which we	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>consider to be appropriate.</p> <p>Section 10.14 include an initial assessment of impacts at certain viewpoints. We have no issue with the conclusions that impacts to VP51 would be 'negligible adverse' which is logical given the distance of the wider scheme from the canal. The initial assessment of VP26 also raises no significant issue from the Trust.</p>		
Canal & River Trust	Landscape and Visual	<p>We do question the initial assessment of VP22 due to the proximity of this site to site 4 and the works to the south of site 4. The exact nature of 'blue-green' enhancement next to the river shown on the submitted plans are not fully clear, and we therefore are unsure as to the wider impact of the scheme on wider views from the river. To assist, it would be helpful for the assessment to include a baseline view from this location and commentary as to the precise nature of works in proximity to the river.</p>	No	<p>The assessment of Viewpoint VP22 has been informed by fieldwork and reflects the exclusion of the southern part of Solar Development Site 4 from solar infrastructure. This area will remain undeveloped, contributing to the retention of openness and reducing the magnitude of change experienced by visual receptors. The baseline view from VP22 is included in the ES, supported by Landscape</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Institute Type 1 annotated photography, in accordance with LI TGN 06/19.
Canal & River Trust	Landscape and Visual	Chapter 10 infers that the LVIA will not include an assessment of impacts from the River Ouse due to the absence of viewpoints to be taken from the river. We understand that the crossing at the Ouse is underground. However, there is potential for temporary works in proximity, including compounds, fencing, access, and work needed to install the underground cable to temporarily impact the landscape as viewed from the River, and more clarity on this would be useful.	No	The Applicant can confirm that no construction compounds are proposed in proximity to the River Ouse. Construction works in this area are limited to the installation of underground cables, which will be undertaken using trenchless techniques designed to minimise ground disturbance. This approach aligns with GLVIA3 paragraph 4.31, which recommends that significance of effects be assessed post-primary mitigation, including consideration of reversibility and duration. Further refinement of these design measures and their associated effects are provided in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10:

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Landscape and Visual <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]</b> .
Canal & River Trust	Water Resources and Flood Risk	<p>Previous comments from the Trust highlighted a need to ensure that any new discharges to our watercourses are identified. The content of table 15-15 suggests that this will be carried out. In addition, we note that our network is included in the list of likely waterway receptors in table 15.7 (Selby Canal, and the Rivers Aire and Ouse).</p> <p>Paragraph 15.9.16 highlights that Construction works may require abstraction to provide a source of water for processes including dampening down and dust suppression. We wish to highlight that abstractions could result in a draw of water that could affect passing vessels and would require consideration in addition to the impact on hydromorphology processes and biodiversity otherwise identified in this</p>	Yes	<p>No new outfalls to CTR watercourses are proposed at this stage, nor to any Main Rivers including the Selby Canal, River Aire or River Ouse.</p> <p>The Water Resources Assessment <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.04]</b> has been developed. The intention is to use mains water, tankering and/or repurpose existing abstractions rather than new abstractions from the water environment.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the requirement for reception / launch pits and this has been passed to the designers.</p> <p>The 10 m standoff from all water</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>paragraph. We therefore request that this is considered. Any abstraction from our network would require co-ordination with the Trust's Code of Practice to ensure the safety of passing vessels. This would be required in addition to any consent from the Environment Agency.</p> <p>The reception and launch pits for Horizontal Direction Drilling present a potential source of pollution (through release of sediment) that could impact the water environment. We request that steps should be taken to ensure that the launch and reception pits are set out not less than 50 m away from the bank of any watercourse to avoid any impacts on the water's edge and introduction of sediments into the channel.</p> <p>Reference in Section 15.9 with regards to oil storage regulation would help to limit risks of contamination to the water environment. Fuel storage on site should be no less than 10 m</p>		<p>courses has been incorporated into layouts. The requirement for no oil storage within 10 m of watercourses (50 m for the River Ouse) is included in ES Volume 3: Outline Drainage Strategy <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.04 ]</b> and ES Volume 3: Flood Risk Assessment <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01 ]</b> and is secured through the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b>).</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		from water's edge to forestall direct pathway for spillage into the channel.		
Canal & River Trust	Construction and Decommissioning	<p>Horizontal Directional Drilling</p> <p>The Trust have previously raised comment with regards to the risks of horizontal directional drilling below the River Ouse, and the need to protect the river bank and bed from vibrational impacts below. We request that any future CEMP highlights that specific risk assessments, method statements and environmental management plans, based on location specific topography, ground and groundwater conditions, will be undertaken and agreed with consultees, stakeholders and regulators prior to commencement. We request that this matter should be covered as part of Protective Provisions for the Trust within the DCO.</p>	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant notes that it has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of the CRT within the draft DCO submitted with the Application, and will continue to engage with the CRT to determine if amendments are needed to these Protective Provisions or any associated Side Agreements.</p>
Canal & River Trust	Construction and	<p>Works Next to the River Aire</p> <p>We are unsure as to the exact nature of works proposed to the south of Solar</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and can confirm that the southern Section of Solar Development Site</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
	Decommissioning	Development Site 4, which lie in close proximity to the River Aire. We would welcome additional clarity so that any impact, including loading onto the river bank, can be fully understood.		4 has been removed from the Order Limits.
Canal & River Trust	Protective Provisions	<p>Protective Provisions and the Code of Practice</p> <p>As you may be aware, the Trust will require any works in, under, over, or in close proximity to, the Trust's waterway infrastructure, to be carried out in accordance with the Trust's Third Party Works Code of Practice (which can be found at <a href="https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/business-and-trade/undertaking-works-on-our-property-and-our-code-of-practice">https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/business-and-trade/undertaking-works-on-our-property-and-our-code-of-practice</a>). The Trust created the Code of Practice to provide to all third parties working in and around the Trust's network with expectations, standards and processes to ensure the integrity and safety of the network, safeguard operations and</p>	No	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that the Canal &amp; River Trust has assets within its proposed Order Limits and is engaging with the Canal &amp; River Trust to confirm the interface with the Proposed Development. The Applicant's land referencing team has identified that the interaction includes a cable route crossing over the River Ouse.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the Canal &amp; River Trust's Third Party Works Code of Practice. The Applicant notes that it has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of the CRT within the draft DCO</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>conserve its heritage and the natural environment, in line with its statutory duties and charitable objectives. Where nationally significant infrastructure projects have the potential to interact with, or impact, the Trust's network, the Trust secures protective provisions within the DCO. The standard protective provisions for the Trust ensure undertakers work with the Trust to design, construct, operate and maintain their new infrastructure in a way that minimises impact on the Trust's network. They secure collaborative working and cost recovery through the Trust's Code of Practice. As your project advances, I recommend the project team consider the enclosed set of standard provisions for the Trust. Please find these enclosed in our response.</p> <p>We expect most concerns raised by the Trust, about the Light Valley Solar NSIP, will be adequately addressed through these</p>		<p>submitted with the Application, and will continue to engage with the CRT to determine if amendments are needed to these Protective Provisions or any associated Side Agreements.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>protective provisions. Based on the Trust's current understanding of the Light Valley Solar proposal, these protective provisions appear suitable but may require amending as your proposals are refined or are altered in the run up to the application and through examination.</p> <p>We welcome discussion of these with you, as more details about the project are identified and shared with the Trust. In our experience, early agreement of protective provisions can mean the Trust need only be minimally involvement in the examination process. Please note that if significant negotiation of these protective provisions is envisaged, the Trust will require a costs undertaking for any legal costs incurred.</p>		
Riccall Parish Council	Consultation and Engagement	Residents report poor consultation engagement. Many did not receive notification postcards and only became	No	The Applicant issued 12,500 postcards setting out the details of the Phase One consultation. The Applicant then mapped a Core

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>aware of the project through local Facebook groups, neighbours, and opposition posters.</p>		<p>Consultation Zone (CCZ) for the Phase Two consultation, which local authorities were consulted 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.</p> <p>The Applicant undertook its preapplication consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC), which was informed through consultation with the relevant local authority. This is described in Consultation Report Chapter 6: Preparation for Statutory Consultation  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/5.1]</b>.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>To encourage engagement and 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 events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's project team, and hosted free-to-use communications channels for enquiries (Evidence of the materials produced for both the Phase One, Phase Two and Targeted Consultation, can be found in Appendix 2, 6, and 9 of the Consultation Report.  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/5.1]</b>)</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Alongside postcards, the Applicant also published details of the consultation in two local newspapers and the Guardian.
Riccall Parish Council	Consultation and Engagement	Consultation diagrams misrepresented land classification (omitting Grades 4 and 5), contributing to confusion.		The agricultural land within the Solar Development Sites amounts to approximately 900.2ha, ranging in quality from Grade 1 to Subgrade 3b. More information regarding the Agricultural Land and Soil classification can be found in ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils <b>[EN110012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b> .
Riccall Parish Council	Consultation and Engagement	Concerns that consultations have been developer-driven and insufficiently transparent.		The Applicant has sought to update its proposals following each stage of consultation, reflecting the results of continuing assessments and the feedback received at each stage of consultation. This has resulted in updated proposals being presented in the second phase of consultation

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>and the targeted consultation. Feedback received to these phases of consultation has resulted in modifications to the Application reflected in the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/5.1]</b>.</p>
Riccall Parish Council	Human Health	Residents strongly express that open countryside contributes to local mental	No	The potential for effects on population health and wellbeing associated with impacts on open

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		health, especially in villages with few amenities.		land has been considered in the Scoping Report (ES Volume 3 Appendix 1.1 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.01.01]</b> ). Due to the nature of the affected land and PRoW, it was concluded that changes in access to green space would not have the potential to give rise to significant effects on physical or mental health at the population level.
Riccall Parish Council	Human Health	Concern that the loss of open land will significantly harm community wellbeing.	No	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 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.01.01]</b> ) 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

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>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 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.01.02 ]</b>).</p> <p>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) <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]</b> and secured through the oLEMP <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]</b>. These routes will increase access to nature and the countryside. In addition, access to existing routes will be maintained throughout the</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				construction phase, with three permanent diversions planned, as secured through the outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.09]</b> ).
Riccall Parish Council	Project Description	Skepticism about the developer's long-term commitment to responsible land management.	No	Details of land management and monitoring are set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]</b> ) which will be secured through the DCO. A breach of any requirement in the DCO would be a criminal offence. This demonstrates that the obligations and commitments will be abided by the Applicant throughout its lifetime.
Riccall Parish Council	Project Description	References to past criticism of Macquarie Group (former owners of Thames Water), expressing fears about corporate motives and profit-driven management.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. IGP is owned by three investment funds, which are managed by Macquarie Asset Management on

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>behalf of a range of investors, including a number of UK pension funds, as further detailed within the Funding Statement <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.02]</b>. 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.</p> <p>Private investment goes beyond generating returns for investors; it brings essential capital, expertise, and innovation to UK solar projects, which can help deliver upgrades</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>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. Importantly, involving UK pension funds ensures that money is invested back into projects that create jobs, support growth, and enhance services for people across the country. Funding structures like this are designed to build resilient, future-ready infrastructure that benefits everyone.</p>
<p>Riccall Parish Council</p>	<p>Landscape and Visual</p>	<p>At over 1,000 hectares, the development is viewed as industrialising rural North Yorkshire.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]</b> details how the Proposed Development has been designed to be considerate of the wider</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>landscape, with strategic siting of the BESS and other components to minimise visual impacts and blend in with the landscape and topography. Other measures include ensuring residential offsets of minimum 30 m, planted screening and retention of hedgerows as far as practicable, retention and restoration of field boundaries, and the sparing use of security fencing which would be made up of deer mesh and wooden posts to reduce landscape and visual impacts. These measures are further detailed in and secured through the oLEMP <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]</b> and the Works Plans <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.03]</b>.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Riccall Parish Council	Landscape and Visual	Concerns that the project will visually and environmentally overwhelm small communities.	No	<p>The LVIA presented in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual</p> <p><b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]</b> recognises that there will be some adverse impacts on people's views as a consequence of the construction and operation of the Proposed Development. The LVIA does not conclude that the Proposed Development would overwhelm local communities. Further visual material is presented in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10 to assist stakeholders in understanding the degree of likely visual changes, including photomontages</p> <p><b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.10.04 ]</b> from selected viewpoints.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>The Applicant has continued to develop the design presented in the application for development consent, to seek opportunities to further reduce effects on the local landscape and people's views and place-attachment. The Proposed Development has been designed to avoid or minimise the loss of other existing landscape features of value, such as trees, woodland, and hedgerows wherever practicable. Any loss 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. The design also sites infrastructure away from sensitive receptors, and identifies opportunities for landscape</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				restoration and enhancement, by introducing planting which repairs or reinforces existing vegetation patterns and contributes to biodiversity net gain. These measures are further detailed in and secured through the oLEMP <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]</b> .
Riccall Parish Council	Cumulative	Fears that this will encourage further energy infrastructure expansion in the area.	No	The Applicant acknowledges this comment and can confirm that it will not add any further sites to the Proposed Development. Any further energy infrastructure would be dependent on new, independent grid connections being available.
Riccall Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	Much of the proposed site covers Grade 3A (good quality) and 3B (moderate quality) farmland currently in active agricultural use.	Yes	The quantity and quality of land within the Solar Development Sites is set out in Section 5.7 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b> .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>Detailed ALC surveys indicate that approximately 54% of the total land within the Solar Development Sites is classed as BMV agricultural land. Approximately 20% (179.4 ha) of the Sites have BMV land Grades 1 and 2. Approximately 34% (307 ha) of the land is confirmed as Subgrade 3a. Representative soil and ALC surveys undertaken within the CRC indicate that 51% of land within the CRC can be classed as BMV agricultural land (Grade 1 at 3%, Grade 2 at 4% and Grade 3a at 44%). The full ALC information is included within ES Volume 3 Appendix 5.1: Agricultural Land Classification [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.05.01].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>Policy in NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-3 recognises that solar development may take place on agricultural land, but that applicant's should not site their scheme on Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land without justification and, where demonstrated to be necessary, that the poorer quality land should be preferred over higher quality. ES Volume 1 Chapter 5 Agricultural Land and Soils  <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05.00]</b> further sets out the national policy context, while the Planning Statement  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.02]</b> provides the justification for use of BMV land.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Riccall Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	Residents raise concern about the UK's reliance on imported food (currently 46%) and the risks of sacrificing productive farmland to industrial development.	Yes	<p>The quantity and quality of land within the Solar Development Sites is set out in Section 5.7 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b>. While food security is not identified as an issue within the suite of Energy National Policy Statements or the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the significance of removing this land from solely food production is assessed in Section 5.9, and the cumulative assessment of the removal of agricultural land on food security is assessed in Section 5.14. ES Volume 1 Chapter 5 further sets out the national policy context, while the Planning Statement <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.02]</b></p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				provides the justification for use of BMV land.
Riccall Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	Many stress that Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land should be preserved.	Yes	<p>Policy in NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-3 recognises that solar development may take place on agricultural land, but that applicant's should not site their scheme on Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land without justification and, where demonstrated to be necessary, that the poorer quality land should be preferred over higher quality. The quantity and quality of land within the Solar Development Sites is set out in Section 5.7 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils</p> <p><b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05].</b></p> <p>The significance of removing this land from solely food production is assessed in Section 5.9, and the</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				cumulative assessment of the removal of agricultural land on food security is assessed in Section 5.14. ES Volume 1 Chapter 5 further sets out the national policy context, while the Planning Statement <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.02]</b> provides the justification for use of BMV land.
Riccall Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	Can LVS provide independent verification of land quality classifications used in consultation diagrams?	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The ALC surveys used as part of the Application has been reviewed and agreed by Natural England (See Section 5.7 of ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b> ).
Riccall Parish Council	Site Selection and Alternatives	Strong objection to the use of greenfield sites when brownfield sites, car parks, industrial	No	The Applicant acknowledges suggestions and preferences for use of alternative sites, and can

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		rooftops, and innovative alternatives (e.g. over railway lines) exist.		<p>confirm that alternative sites were considered, assessed, and have been reported on within the Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) (ES Volume 3 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]</b>). 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.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises suggestions of local brownfield sites; however, these are often fragmented sites considerable distances from each other, neither</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>providing the space for solar generation required or ease of connectivity between sites.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises expressions of preference for rooftop solar; on this, the Applicant supports rooftop solar and believes that to meet clean energy and legally binding targets by 2030, a combination of rooftop and ground-mounted solar will be required.</p>
Riccall Parish Council	Site Selection and Alternatives	Residents reference public sector-owned car parks and disused sites (such as the Rigid Paper Mill) as underutilised alternatives.	No	The Applicant acknowledges suggestions and preferences for use of alternative sites, including car parks and 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

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p><b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01 ]</b>. The SSAR considered, along with proximity to Monk Fyston 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.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises suggestions of local brownfield sites; however, these are often fragmented sites considerable distances from each other, neither providing the space for solar generation required or ease of connectivity between sites.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Riccall Parish Council	Site Selection and Alternatives	Why were brownfield sites, industrial rooftops, and innovative solar deployment strategies deprioritised?	No	<p>The Applicant can confirm that there was no deprioritisation of alternatives; ES Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]</b> details the site selection process. 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. From this, an area of search was established to determine the site options for the</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Proposed Development; the Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) (ES Volume 3 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]</b> ) provides an assessment of alternative sites.
Riccall Parish Council	Biodiversity	Direct observations from residents highlight existing biodiversity, including deer, kingfishers, badgers, wild orchids, and a range of birdlife.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment, protected and notable species are considered in ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]</b> .
Riccall Parish Council	Biodiversity	Fear that solar farm construction will irreversibly fragment habitats and displace local wildlife.	No	The Applicant notes this comment, protected and notable species and the fragmentation of existing habitats are considered in ES Volume 1 Chapter 6 Biodiversity <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]</b> .
Riccall Parish Council	Biodiversity	What specific, binding mitigation measures will be implemented to protect and support local wildlife during and after construction?	No	Specific mitigation measures are outlined in ES Volume 1 Chapter 6 Biodiversity <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]</b> and within the specific wildlife

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				assessment reports referred to in the chapter. Mitigation and best practice measures specifically regarding ecological receptors and the construction phase are secured through the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b> ).
Riccall Parish Council	Traffic and Movement	Anticipated 2–3 year construction phase raises concerns about heavy goods vehicle movements.	No	A Transport Assessment (TA) has been undertaken and is available in Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]</b> . This reviews the current highway network and determines if any highway mitigation is required to accommodate the traffic that would be generated by the Proposed Development over the construction phase. The assessment also takes into account any existing

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>developments as part of the cumulative assessment scenario. Details regarding HGVs, including the number of expected movements and mitigation measures, such as timing movements and deliveries outside of peak times, are provided within the oCTMP  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12].</b></p>
Riccall Parish Council	Traffic and Movement	Risks identified for narrow rural roads and congested routes such as the A19.	No	<p>An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. This takes into account the existing highway capacity of each route and identifies if any highway mitigation is required to accommodate traffic from the Proposed Development during the construction phase.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				A number of improvement measures, including vegetation clearance to improve visibility and the creation of passing places have been set out in order to reduce risks identified on the rural roads.
Riccall Parish Council	Traffic and Movement	Concerns about general road safety and potential long-term impact on village infrastructure.	No	A Transport Assessment (TA) has been undertaken and is available in ES Volume 3 Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01 ]</b> . This reviews the current highway network and determines if any highway mitigation is required to accommodate the traffic that would be generated by the Proposed Development over the construction phase and minimise the impact on local infrastructure. The assessment also takes into account any existing developments as part

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				of the cumulative assessment scenario.
Riccall Parish Council	Traffic and Movement	Please provide a full construction timetable and traffic management strategy to address road safety and congestion concerns.	No	An indicative construction programme and outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b> ) has been submitted as part of the DCO Application. Further details will be set out in the detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan once designs have been completed and contractor are appointed.
Riccall Parish Council	Construction and Decommissioning	Requests for clear plans and budgets for land restoration following trenching and construction.	No	Details regarding the construction phase, including plans for land restoration following cable trenching, are included within ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]</b> . In addition, the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>(oCEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b>) secures measures to ensure the land above the cable trenches is returned to its previous condition and usage.</p> <p>An Outline Soil Resource Management Plan (oSRMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.14]</b>) has also been prepared as part of the DCO 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.</p> <p>It is worth noting that if consented, the DCO would require the removal</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				of the solar farm at the end of the project's life. Failing to decommission in accordance with the DCO would constitute a breach of the DCO which is a criminal offence.
Riccall Parish Council	Construction and Decommissioning	<p>Questions raised about the embodied carbon cost of manufacturing, transporting, and installing 20 km of cabling and trench infrastructure.</p> <p>What is the total estimated carbon footprint of the 20 km trench, piping, and cabling works?</p>	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment, and has undertaken a Greenhouse Gas (GHG) assessment, included within ES Volume 1 Chapter 9: Greenhouse Gas Emissions <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.09]</b>. The assessment concludes that the total benefits beyond the boundary and calculated avoided emissions per year are 48,700 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO<sub>2</sub>e) for the Proposed Development's 60-year operational phase, totalling 2,920,000 tCO<sub>2</sub>e in total. As the emitted carbon over the course of the Proposed Development's life is</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>estimated to be approximately 1,840,000 tCO<sub>2e</sub>, this results in a total net saving of 1,090,000 tCO<sub>2e</sub>. A full breakdown of the results can be found within ES Volume 3 Appendix 9.1: GHG Emissions Assessment  <b>[EN00110012/APP/LVS/06.03.09.01].</b></p>
Riccall Parish Council	Construction and Decommissioning	<p>Will fencing along the cable corridor be temporary or permanent following construction?                      If permanent, what are the visual and environmental justifications?</p>	No	<p>During the construction phase, temporary protective fencing will be installed to mitigate construction-related impacts along the Cable Route Corridor. This will be removed prior to the commencement of operation, as detailed in and secured through the oCEMP  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02].</b>                      Further detail on infrastructure required during each phase of works is provided in ES Chapter 2:</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The Proposed Development <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]</b> .
Riccall Parish Council	Construction and Decommissioning	What are the detailed plans and allocated budget for restoring agricultural land after cable trench installation?	No	<p>Details regarding the construction phase, including plans for land restoration following cable trenching, are included within ES Chapter 2: The Proposed Development <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]</b>. In addition, the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b>) secures measures to ensure the land above the cable trenches is returned to its previous condition and usage. An Outline Soil Resource Management Plan (oSRMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.14]</b>) has also been prepared as part of the DCO Application. A Detailed Soil</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				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.
Riccall Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	Many residents who responded support renewable energy in principle but are strongly opposed to this particular proposal due to its scale, location, environmental impact, and perceived commercial motivations.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Riccall Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	While Riccall Parish Council acknowledges the national need for renewable energy, the feedback received from our community demonstrates overwhelming concern and opposition to the current Light Valley Solar proposal.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Riccall Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	Has a full lifecycle carbon assessment been conducted for the project?	No	<p>The Applicant has undertaken a Greenhouse Gas (GHG) assessment, included within ES Volume 1 Chapter 9: Greenhouse Gas Emissions <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.09]</b>. The assessment concludes that the total benefits beyond the boundary and calculated avoided emissions per year are 48,700 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO<sub>2</sub>e) for the Proposed Development's 60-year operational phase, totalling 2,920,000 tCO<sub>2</sub>e in total. As the emitted carbon over the course of the Proposed Development's life is estimated to be approximately 1,840,000 tCO<sub>2</sub>e, this results in a total net saving of 1,090,000 tCO<sub>2</sub>e. A full breakdown of the results can be found within ES Volume 3 Appendix 9.1: GHG Emissions</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Assessment [EN00110012/APP/LVS/06.03.09.01].
Riccall Parish Council	Community Benefits	Will LVS commit to establishing a community benefit fund or other investment to support affected villages?	No	The Applicant is committed to ensuring that communities benefit from the Proposed Development, including by receiving direct funding to important causes in the local area via a community benefit fund.
Riccall Parish Council	Cumulative	Has LVS assessed the cumulative environmental and community impact of this proposal alongside other existing and approved energy schemes in the surrounding area?	Yes	The Applicant can confirm that, 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, including housing estates and other infrastructure projects, that fall within the relevant zones of

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				influence for each topic to evaluate potential combined effects. Information regarding cumulative effects can be found in ES Volume 1 Chapter 17: Cumulative and In-Combination Effects <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.17]</b> .
UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA and OHID)	Human Health	Environmental Public Health We have considered the submitted documentation and can confirm that we are satisfied with the approach taken in preparing the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and the conclusions drawn. We wish to make no further comment at this time.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
The Coal Authority	Site Selection and Alternatives	Based on the Site Location Plan (dated June 2025) published on the Light Valley Solar consultation website, our records indicate that although there are coal mining features in the surrounding area there are none noted within the project boundary.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>We note that the PEIR at Section 16.5.9 acknowledges that underground coal workings are present at depth beneath some areas of the project. They note however that no development is proposed within the defined Development High Risk Area and as these areas are not present they consider that there is a very low risk to the proposed development from coal mining related ground subsidence.</p>		
The Coal Authority	Project Description	<p>On the basis of our records, and the area identified in the Site Location Plan, we would concur with the conclusions reached by the authors of the PEIR and raise no objections to this development project.</p>	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
South Milford Parish Council	Project Description	<p>South Milford Parish Council would like to register our objections to the Light Valley Solar proposal with regards to the Phase 2 Statutory Consultation</p>	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
South Milford Parish Council	Consultation and Engagement	<p>1. Lack of meaningful consultation</p> <p>Sites 6 and 7 were late additions to the proposal. Many local residents are reporting that they did not receive the Light Valley Solar postcards, informing them of the proposal and outlining the consultation process. The Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) does not contain the same level of detail for sites 6 and 7 as it does for the other sites. The document is incomplete - there are gaps in the data, some of the information has been estimated or is awaiting survey results.</p>	No	<p>The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/5.1]</b>.</p> <p>The PEIR referenced where surveys were ongoing and made assumptions for assessments as is appropriate for this stage. The document was a reflection of current proposals prior to the final application being produced in advance of submission.</p> <p>The assessments referred to as ongoing in the PEIR have been</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				completed and submitted as part of the Environmental Statement.
South Milford Parish Council	Cumulative	<p>2. The cumulative infrastructure burden impacting the area</p> <p>We are concerned regarding the cumulative impact on the area of the extensive number of National Infrastructure Projects (including the scale and scope of the solar and battery proposals), combined with the other large-scale industrial and residential developments planned in the area, impacting on the local community, saturating the surrounding landscape and swamping what is already considered by North Yorkshire Council to be an over-capacity road network.</p>	Yes	<p>Information regarding cumulative effects can be found in ES Volume 1 Chapter 17: Cumulative and In-Combination Effects <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.17]</b>. 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.</p>
South Milford Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	<p>3. Loss of greenfield countryside</p> <p>The countryside around South Milford is</p>	Yes	The quantity and quality of land within the Solar Development Sites is set out in Section 5.7 of ES

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>productive farmland, a proportion of which is considered to be Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land. Losing this vast amount of valuable arable land for 60 years will increase the risk to our food security long-term. It is not clear, from the documentation available or from the subsequent community information events, just how or why Light Valley Solar have selected this rich farmland over and above the available brownfield sites in the area.</p>		<p>Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils  <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b>.                      The significance of removing this land from solely food production is assessed in Section 5.9, and the cumulative assessment of the removal of agricultural land on food security is assessed in Section 5.14.</p> <p>ES Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]</b> references the Site Selection Assessment Report (ES Volume 3) <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01 ]</b> which confirms assessment of previously developed land/brownfield land was carried out within a 25 km radius of the Monk Fryston Substation point of</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>connection. The search did not identify any available suitable land of an adequate area to facilitate a 500 MW connection solar project, either individually or in combination with other sites. ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils  <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b> further sets out the national policy context, while the Planning Statement  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.02]</b> provides the justification for use of BMV land.</p>
Hambleton Parish Council	Project Description	Hambleton Parish Council STRONGLY OBJECTS to the vast proposals put forward for Light Valley Solar. Hambleton village is mainly affected by works that will be carried out for cabling routes,	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		however this does not lessen its objection to the proposals on the whole.		
Hambleton Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	Dozens of residents have contacted the PC with their objections to the proposals, including our local farmers who do not appreciate being forced into giving up their land - which is what will happen if they refuse access - and as you talk at the drop-in sessions, it sounds like you have no intention of letting anything stop you from progressing this development.	No	<p>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.</p> <p>The Applicant has submitted a Book of Reference <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.03]</b>, a Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.04]</b> and Statement of Reasons <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.01]</b> with the DCO application, which together demonstrate the necessary land and rights that must be secured for the delivery,</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				operation, and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. The Applicant remains committed to working with landowners to secure the land rights required to facilitate the Proposed Development by voluntary agreement as detailed in the Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.04].</b>
Hambleton Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	A large percentage of the land proposed for this development falls under Best and Most Versatile Land (BMV). When Government Guidance reinforces the need to protect BMV land and prioritise food production, this land should not be claimed and compulsory purchased for this scheme when more suitable options exist. Both the NPPF and the National Policy Statement for	Yes	The quantity and quality of land within the Solar Development Sites is set out in Section 5.7 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05.00].</b> The significance of removing this land from solely food production is assessed in Section 5.9, and the cumulative assessment of the removal of agricultural land on food

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) emphasise the importance of using lower-grade or previously developed land for renewable energy schemes. Light Valley Solar's assertion of a 'biodiversity gain' cannot justify the permanent loss of quality, productive agricultural land - particularly in rural communities like the locations in this proposal, which have long upheld traditions of sustainable farming. With the permanent soil degradation, it is unlikely to ever return to agricultural land, therefore the development is not just for the duration of the LVS project lifespan – it is indefinite</p>		<p>security is assessed in Section 5.14. Detailed ALC surveys indicate that approximately 54% of the total land within the Solar Development Sites is classed as BMV agricultural land. Approximately 20% (179.4 ha) of the Sites have BMV land Grades 1 and 2. Approximately 34% (307 ha) of the land is confirmed as Subgrade 3a. Representative soil and ALC surveys undertaken within the CRC indicate that 51% of land within the CRC can be classed as BMV agricultural land (Grade 1 at 3%, Grade 2 at 4% and Grade 3a at 44%). The full ALC information is included within ES Volume 3 Appendix 5.1: Agricultural Land Classification <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.05.01]</b>. ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p><b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b> further sets out the national policy context, while the Planning Statement  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.02]</b> provides the justification for use of BMV land.</p> <p>The effects on soils are assessed in Section 5.9 of ES Volume 1, Chapter 5 Agricultural Land and Soils  <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b> and secured by adherence to the outline Soil Resources Management Plan  <b>[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.14].</b></p>
Hambleton Parish Council	Landscape and Visual	The proposed development is entirely unsuitable in both <b>scale and location</b> , posing a serious and lasting threat to our surrounding	No	The Applicant respectfully disagrees. As detailed in the Statement of Need <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.03]</b> , in December 2024, the government

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>communities, environment, cultural heritage, and food security.</p>		<p>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. As such, solar installations are deemed Critical National Infrastructure (CNI).</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>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 solar project, either individually or in combination with other sites.</p>
Hambleton Parish Council	Landscape and Visual	The villages directly impacted by this proposal possess historical heritage and valuable community assets, including Grade I and II listed buildings, Roman archaeological sites,	No	The Applicant recognises the value attached to locally designated landscapes in the LVIA and this has guided the design of the Proposed Development; this is further detailed

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>centuries old farming traditions, designated Conservation Areas, <b>Green Belt land and Locally Important Landscape Areas. This development threatens to cause irreversible harm to these cultural, ecological and historical assets, undermining the character and identity of the local community</b></p>		<p>in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]. Paragraph 5.10.12 of NPS EN-1 states that whilst particular attention should be paid to such landscapes, "<i>locally valued landscapes should not be used in themselves to refuse consent, as this may unduly restrict acceptable development.</i>" The Applicant is seeking consent to build and operate the Proposed Development for 60 years, after which it would be legally required to decommission and remove the built infrastructure from the landscape.</p> <p>As set out in ES Volume 3 Appendix 3.1: Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR, [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.01]), the Proposed Development</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>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.</p> <p>As set out in Section 2.4 of the Applicant's Policy Compliance Document [EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.12], the</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (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.
Hambleton Parish Council	Cultural Heritage	The proposed development is entirely unsuitable in both scale and location, posing a serious and lasting threat to our surrounding communities, environment, <b>cultural heritage</b> , and food security.	No	The impact of the Proposed Development on the heritage resource, including impacts incurred through changes in their setting is fully considered within ES Volume 1 Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.08]</b> . The Proposed Development has undertaken extensive surveys including geophysical surveys <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/0.6.03.08.03]</b> and trial trenching <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.04]</b> to identify potential impacts. Where impacts are identified an

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.11]</b>) accompanies the application. The AMS details the overarching methodology for undertaking a programme of archaeological mitigation within the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The AMS will be updated post submission and during the Examination process following the completion of the programme of final geophysical survey in the Cable Route Corridor, which will inform decisions on the need for any further archaeological mitigation areas within the Cable Route Corridor.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Hambleton Parish Council	Cultural Heritage	<p><b>The villages directly impacted by this proposal possess historical heritage and valuable community assets, including Grade I and II listed buildings, Roman archaeological sites, centuries old farming traditions, designated Conservation Areas, Green Belt land and Locally Important Landscape Areas. This development threatens to cause irreversible harm to these cultural, ecological and historical assets, undermining the character and identity of the local community</b></p>	No	<p>The impact of the Proposed Development on the heritage resource, including impacts incurred through changes in their setting is fully considered within ES Volume 1 Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.08]</b>. The Proposed Development has undertaken extensive surveys including geophysical surveys <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/0.6.03.08.03]</b> and trial trenching <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.04]</b> to identify potential impacts. Where impacts are identified an Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.11]</b>) accompanies the application. The AMS details the overarching</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>methodology for undertaking a programme of archaeological mitigation within the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The AMS will be updated post submission and during the Examination process following the completion of the programme of final geophysical survey in the Cable Route Corridor, which will inform decisions on the need for any further archaeological mitigation areas within the Cable Route Corridor.</p>
Hambleton Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	The proposed development is entirely unsuitable in both scale and location, posing a serious and lasting threat to our surrounding communities, environment, cultural heritage, and <b>food security</b> .	Yes	<p>The quantity and quality of land within the Solar Development Sites is set out in Section 5.7 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b>.</p> <p>While food security is not identified</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>as an issue within the suite of Energy National Policy Statements or the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the significance of removing this land from solely food production is assessed in Section 5.9, and the cumulative assessment of the removal of agricultural land on food security is assessed in Section 5.14.</p>
Hambleton Parish Council	Cumulative	<p>The PEIR documentation neglects to account for the cumulative impact of the existing industrialisation in the surrounding area on these assets. Without clear limits, the landscape risks being permanently altered—at the expense of both its character and the well-being of the communities who call it home</p>	No	<p>Information regarding cumulative effects can be found in ES Volume 1 Chapter 17: Cumulative and In-Combination Effects <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.17]</b>. In addition, through developing the ES, each topic chapter, including Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]</b>, has included a cumulative impact assessment, considering other</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				committed developments in the area and potential added impacts. The assessment has taken into account nearby developments that fall within the relevant zones of influence for each topic to evaluate potential combined effects.
Hambleton Parish Council	Cumulative	Specifically in Hambleton, the construction of cabling corridors will cause major disruption within the village. With planning permission already granted for over 250 new homes across two sites— and an additional 100 expected to be approved—the resulting congestion on local roads will pose an unacceptable risk to residents' safety. The A63, which already operates beyond safe capacity as it passes through the heart of our village, is set to become a primary route for	No	Information regarding cumulative effects can be found in ES Volume 1 Chapter 17: Cumulative and In-Combination Effects <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.17]</b> . In addition, through developing the ES, each topic chapter, including Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.14]</b> , has included a cumulative impact assessment, considering other committed developments in the area and potential added impacts to aspects such as traffic. The

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>construction traffic. This is particularly concerning given that pedestrian refuge signage has already been removed to accommodate equipment for the Yorkshire GREEN Supergrid Transformers and the SSE BESS site transformers. The additional traffic generated by the Light Valley Solar project will only worsen these conditions, significantly increasing the danger to our community</p>		<p>assessment has taken into account nearby developments that fall within the relevant zones of influence for each topic to evaluate potential combined effects.</p>
Hambleton Parish Council	Community Benefits	<p>Hambleton Parish Council represents the views of residents who have submitted comments regarding the Light Valley Solar (LVS) proposals. The Council believes that the LVS project offers no benefit to the village and would, in fact, cause significant harm. Accordingly, Hambleton Parish Council formally objects to the proposals</p>	No	<p>The Applicant respectfully disagrees and can confirm its commitment to ensuring that communities benefit from the Proposed Development including by receiving direct funding to important causes in the local area. As a low-cost form of generation, if the Proposed Development is connected to the electricity</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>outlined above and fully supports the objections raised by neighbouring Parish Councils</p>		<p>transmission network, it will contribute to lowering the cost of energy for all, including locally.</p> <p>During the development of the Proposed Development, the Applicant consulted on community benefits and will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community.</p> <p>Furthermore, ES Volume 1 Chapter 13: Socioeconomics <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13]</b> identifies that the Proposed Development is expected to generate 520 net construction jobs over the 36 months, accounting for displacement and multiplier effects. Of these jobs, it is estimated that 260 would be retained within the</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>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. In addition, 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.</p> <p>Other benefits of the Proposed Development include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connectivity and public access improvements, including enhancements to the local</li> </ul>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>PRoW network and the creation of additional permissive paths.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local recruitment and procurement and supporting local education and skills uplifting, including promotion of apprenticeship schemes, workforce training, and STEM education initiatives.</li> <li>• Ecological and landscape enhancement, including creating additional areas of hedgerow (including infilling existing hedgerow), grassland, woodland planting.</li> <li>• Significant BNG contributions and habitat creation/ enhancement, including commuting corridors through the development and wetland areas for ground nesting birds.</li> </ul>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retention and enhancement watercourses, ponds and ditches, including providing connectivity for species such as otter, water vole, and amphibians.</li> <li>Installation of habitat features, including bat and bird boxes.</li> </ul>
Hillam Parish Council	Project Description	<p>Hillam Parish Council strongly objects to the proposed Light Valley Solar project—a 500 MW solar farm spanning over 1,020 hectares of predominantly high-quality agricultural land between Escrick, Monk Fryston, Hambleton, Chapel Haddlesey, South Milford, and other neighbouring villages.</p> <p>Despite Hillam's close proximity to several of the proposed sites, the village is barely</p>	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant can confirm that Hillam has been acknowledged across the ES <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01]</b> and included in relevant application submission documents, assessments, and management plans.</p> <p>ES Volume 3 Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]</b></p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		acknowledged in the developer's materials.		<p>] acknowledges Hillam as part of the wider assessment of the road network, and as such is acknowledged in ES Volume 1 Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.14] and the oCTMP [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12].</p> <p>Regarding the materials presented during Phase Two Statutory Consultation, the Applicant had a range of consultation materials and maps present at the consultation events, detailing different aspects of the Proposed Development site. As such, Hillam was acknowledged in some materials but not others.</p>
Hillam Parish Council	Project Description	As a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP), Light Valley Solar must demonstrate	No	Compliance with relevant policy is addressed within all ES topic assessment chapters and within the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>compliance with national policies such as NPS EN-1 and EN-3. These policies support renewable energy in principle but require careful balancing of landscape, agricultural, and community impacts. This proposal fails on all fronts—undermining food production, rural character, and environmental integrity</p>		<p>Policy Compliance Document <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.12]</b> submitted as part of the application.</p>
Hillam Parish Council	Site Selection and Alternatives	<p>The scale and location of this development are wholly inappropriate and threaten to inflict lasting harm on our community, local environment, heritage, and food security.</p>	No	<p>Full details of the site selection and design process are included within ES Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]</b>.</p> <p>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</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>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. From this, an area of search was established to determine the site options for the Proposed Development; the Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) (ES Volume 3 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01 ]</b>) 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</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Way, and aspects including vehicle access and visual impacts.
Hillam Parish Council	Landscape and Visual	<p>Hillam is a historic and rural community valued for its countryside views, heritage, and village setting.</p> <p>The proposed development, particularly Sites 2, 3, 4 and 6, would bring industrial-scale solar infrastructure unacceptably close to nearby residential areas, with significant visual and environmental impacts. The project would introduce solar panels, battery storage units, fencing, and security cameras into open, tranquil landscapes that define our village identity.</p>	No	<p>The LVIA presented in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual</p> <p><b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]</b> recognises that there will be long term changes to the character of parts of the landscape and on some people's views of the landscape for the duration of the operation of the Proposed Development. This is consistent with paragraph 5.10.5 of the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (NPS EN-1), which states that "virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will have adverse effects on the landscape, but there may also be beneficial landscape character impacts arising from mitigation." The existing</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>network of hedgerows and woodland would be retained and strengthened and solar panels and other proposed infrastructure would be located within fields, preserving the existing landscape pattern. The Applicant has continued to develop the design presented in the application for development consent, to seek opportunities to further reduce effects on the local landscape.</p>
Hillam Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	<p>Unacceptable Loss of Agricultural Land and Risk to Food Security</p> <p>The proposed solar farm would remove over 1,000 hectares of productive farmland from use, including extensive areas designated as Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a). This</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. The quantity and quality of land within the Solar Development Sites is set out in Section 5.7 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b>. While food security is not identified as an issue within the suite of</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>land is vital to the national agricultural economy and food supply, especially at a time when global disruptions, climate uncertainty, and political instability have highlighted the UK's vulnerability.</p> <p>Government guidance—including the December 2024 UK Food Security Report, the May 2024 Written Ministerial Statement, and Defra's 2025 Land Use Framework—reinforces the need to protect BMV land and prioritise food production.</p>		<p>Energy National Policy Statements or the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the significance of removing this land from solely food production is assessed in Section 5.9, and the cumulative assessment of the removal of agricultural land on food security is assessed in Section 5.14.</p>
Hillam Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	<p>National planning policy is clear: significant developments should avoid high-quality farmland wherever possible. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3)</p>	Yes	<p>The quantity and quality of land within the Solar Development Sites is set out in Section 5.7 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 5 Agricultural Land and Soils <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b>. The significance of removing this land from solely food production is</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>both emphasise the importance of using lower-grade or previously developed land for renewable energy schemes. Yet Light Valley Solar fails to justify why less sensitive sites were not selected. The project's claim of biodiversity gain does not outweigh the permanent loss of food-producing land—especially not in rural communities like Hillam, which have historically supported sustainable farming.</p>		<p>assessed in Section 5.9, and the cumulative assessment of the removal of agricultural land on food security is assessed in Section 5.14.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges suggestions and preferences for use of alternative sites, including brownfield sites, and can confirm that alternative, less sensitive 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]).</p>
Hillam Parish Council	Cultural Heritage	<p>Heritage assets near the project area, including listed buildings and conservation areas, would be adversely affected.</p>	No	<p>The impact of the Proposed Development on the heritage resource, including impacts incurred through changes in their setting is fully considered within ES</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>Volume 1 Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.08]</b>.                      The Proposed Development has undertaken extensive surveys including geophysical surveys <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/0.6.03.08.03]</b> and trial trenching <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.04]</b> to identify potential impacts. Where impacts are identified an Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.11]</b>) accompanies the application. The AMS details the overarching methodology for undertaking a programme of archaeological mitigation within the Proposed Development.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>The AMS will be updated post submission and during the Examination process following the completion of the programme of final geophysical survey in the Cable Route Corridor, which will inform decisions on the need for any further archaeological mitigation areas within the Cable Route Corridor.</p>
Hillam Parish Council	Cumulative	<p>The PEIR and Scoping Report identify potential harm to visual amenity and setting, yet fail to fully consider cumulative impacts from other nearby infrastructure schemes, including Yorkshire Green, the proposed limestone quarry on the A63, and additional development in Monk Fryston and South Milford.</p>	No	<p>Information regarding cumulative effects can be found in ES Volume 1 Chapter 17: Cumulative and In-Combination Effects <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.17]</b>. In addition, through developing the ES, each topic chapter, including Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]</b>, has included a cumulative impact assessment, considering other committed developments in the</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				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.
Hillam Parish Council	Site Selection and Alternatives	There are more appropriate locations for solar infrastructure—such as rooftops, brownfield sites, and degraded land—which would avoid the environmental and social costs of building on agricultural greenfield sites. National guidance encourages solar on less sensitive land, and emerging policies such as the New Homes (Solar Generation) Bill support these alternatives. Light Valley Solar's justification based on connection to the Monk Fryston substation does not excuse the inappropriate	No	The Applicant acknowledges preferences for rooftop solar and is supportive of an increase in rooftop installations. However, the Applicant recognises that to achieve decarbonisation of the UK's energy system and wider economy, and to meet legally binding Net Zero targets, a combination of rooftop and ground-mounted solar installations will be required. The Applicant acknowledges suggestions and preferences for use of alternative sites, including brownfield sites, and can confirm

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>site selection near Hillam and surrounding villages.</p>		<p>that alternative sites were considered, assessed, and have been reported on within the Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) (ES Volume 3 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01 ]</b>). The SSAR considered, along with proximity to Monk Fyston 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.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises suggestions of local brownfield sites; however, these are often fragmented sites considerable distances from each other, neither providing the space for solar</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				generation required or ease of connectivity between sites.
Hillam Parish Council	Traffic and Movement	<p>The construction and operation of the project will cause significant disruption to local residents.</p> <p>Increased traffic on the A63 (which our local MP Keir Mather has raised grave concerns about with regards to existing volumes of traffic and road safety), A162, and local roads such as Common Lane and Hillam Lane will bring noise, dust, and congestion—exacerbated by other projects in the area.</p>	No	<p>A Transport Assessment (TA) has been undertaken and is available in Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01 ]</b>). This assesses the road network capacity, including the A63, the A162 and local roads including Common Lane and Hillam Common Lane, and determines if any highway mitigation is required. The assessment takes into account any existing developments as part of the cumulative assessment scenario. The ES forecasts that construction activities could add a further 95 vehicles per day onto the A63 during the peak of construction. With the Cable Route Corridor, this has increased to 198.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				This additional traffic would be a temporary uplift of 2.4% on the section through Monk Fryston based on recent (July_2025) traffic survey data.
Hillam Parish Council	Water Resources and Flood Risk	The construction phase alone would result in air quality concerns, soil compaction, vegetation loss, and <b>potential increases in surface water runoff</b> due to changes in land structure. The cumulative impact on road safety, health, and infrastructure is unacceptable.	No	Surface water runoff from the development will be managed through a robust surface water drainage strategy, as set out in the ES Volume 3 Appendix 15.4: Outline Drainage Strategy <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.04 ]</b> . The approach ensures that any increase in runoff will be appropriately controlled, following current national and local best practice guidance, such that the development will not increase flood risk on-site or to areas downstream.
Hillam Parish Council	Air Quality	The construction phase alone would result in <b>air quality concerns</b> , soil compaction,	No	The industry standard guidance indicates that following best

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		vegetation loss, and potential increases in surface water runoff due to changes in land structure. The cumulative impact on road safety, health, and infrastructure is unacceptable.		practice mitigation measures (provided in ES Volume 3 Appendix 16.1: Construction Dust Assessment <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.01]</b> which supports the Application), the resulting effect would be not significant. Construction dust would not have the same type of impact as the other items in this comment however, so unlikely to have a cumulative effect.
Hillam Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	The construction phase alone would result in air quality concerns, <b>soil compaction</b> , vegetation loss, and potential increases in surface water runoff due to changes in land structure. The cumulative impact on road safety, health, and infrastructure is unacceptable.	Yes	The effects on soils are assessed in Section 5.9 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b> and secured by adherence to the outline Soil Resources Management Plan (oSRMP, <b>[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.14]</b> ).

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Hillam Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	The project risks long-term damage to the soil profile, particularly across Sites 6 and 7, where the PEIR acknowledges a high risk of permanent soil degradation through compaction and poor drainage.	Yes	The effects on soils are assessed in Section 5.9 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b> and secured by adherence to the outline Soil Resources Management Plan <b>[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.14].</b>
Hillam Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	The government has made clear that energy developments should not come at the cost of essential land for agriculture or the wellbeing of rural communities. Recent ministerial statements and planning decisions have repeatedly rejected similar large-scale solar farms on BMV land. Approving this scheme would set a dangerous precedent, disregarding established planning safeguards in favour of short-term returns for developers and investors.	No	The Applicant acknowledges these concerns. The legislation, policy, standards and guidance and how they interact with the Proposed Development can be found in Tables 52 – 54 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05].</b>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Hillam Parish Council	Biodiversity	The construction phase alone would result in air quality concerns, soil compaction, <b>vegetation loss</b> , and potential increases in surface water runoff due to changes in land structure. The cumulative impact on road safety, health, and infrastructure is unacceptable.	No	<p>The majority of important habitats will be retained and protected. Arable land lost as a result of the Proposed Development will be replaced with grassland of high ecological importance. An oCEMP [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02] has been produced which secures mitigation and protective measures for protected species and habitat during construction.</p> <p><u>The Biodiversity Net-Gain Report (ES Volume 5: BNG Report [EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.09])</u> sets out that the Proposed Development will deliver biodiversity net gain of 78.30% for habitat units, 72.12% for hedgerow units and 10.42% for watercourse units. The delivery of BNG is secured via DCO Requirement.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Hillam Parish Council	Water Resources and Flood Risk	The construction phase alone would result in air quality concerns, soil compaction, vegetation loss, and <b>potential increases in surface water runoff due to changes in land structure</b> . The cumulative impact on road safety, health, and infrastructure is unacceptable.	No	Surface water runoff from the Proposed Development will be managed through a robust surface water drainage strategy, as set out in the Outline Drainage Strategy (ES Volume 3) <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.04]</b> . The approach ensures that any increase in runoff will be appropriately controlled, following current national and local best practice guidance, such that the Proposed Development will not increase flood risk on-site or to areas downstream.
Hillam Parish Council	Water Resources and Flood Risk	The area is also vulnerable to surface water issues, especially given the clay and sandy soil composition, and the loss of vegetation during construction could exacerbate flood risks	No	Per the response above, surface water runoff and quality during construction is a key consideration and is addressed through the Outline Drainage Strategy <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.04]</b>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				] and the oCEMP [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02], such that the Proposed Development will not increase flood risk on-site or to areas downstream during the construction phase.
Hillam Parish Council	Community Benefits	Despite the scale of this proposal, the developer has provided no meaningful or defined benefit for Hillam or its residents. Vague promises of “community enhancement” and footpaths do not justify the permanent industrialisation of the countryside	No	<p>Where the Proposed Development is anticipated to benefit the local community more specifically, this is done through providing on site benefits, such as permissive paths to increase access to the countryside, providing improved landscape planting through reinforcing existing hedgerows and planting of new trees, providing biodiversity net gains through habitat improvements.</p> <p>At this time, the Applicant is awaiting the upcoming government guidance on community benefits,</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				following their consultation into the subject in 2025, as the Applicant intends its offering to be aligned to what the government sets out.
Hillam Parish Council	Socioeconomics	Residents' quality of life, property values, and access to open landscapes would be significantly harmed.	No	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised regarding potential impacts on residents' quality of life, property values, and access to open landscapes. The design has been informed by a range of environmental and social considerations aligned with the concerns raised, including landscape and visual impact assessments. Mitigation measures, such as strategic planting and buffer zones, have been incorporated to help reduce potential effects on residential amenity and landscape character. Further information on this can be found in ES Volume 1 Chapter 13:

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>Socioeconomics  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13]</b>                      and ES Volume 1 Chapter 10:                      Landscape and Visual  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13]</b>.</p> <p>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. Should any parties consider that their property has decreased in value as a direct result of the physical impacts from the operation of the Proposed Development, such as noise and vibration, they may be eligible to claim for compensation under Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>Regarding access to open space, 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) <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]</b> and secured through the oLEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]</b>), increasing access to nature and the countryside. It is expected that PRowWs will remain open throughout the construction phase with management to ensure the safety of all PRow users so far as is practicable to do so, as detailed in and secured through the outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRowWMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.09]</b>).</p>
Keir Mather MP	Agricultural Land and Soils	The use of agricultural land for the project. The vast majority of constituents who	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. The quantity and quality of land

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>reached out to me were very worried about the project's use of the 'best and most versatile' agricultural land, which they view as having the potential to threaten the UK's food security.</p>		<p>within the Solar Development Sites is set out in Section 5.7 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b>. While food security is not identified as an issue within the suite of Energy National Policy Statements or the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the significance of removing this land from solely food production is assessed in Section 5.9, and the cumulative assessment of the removal of agricultural land on food security is assessed in Section 5.14.</p> <p>Detailed ALC surveys indicate that approximately 54% of the total land within the Solar Development Sites is classed as BMV agricultural land.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>Approximately 20% (179.4 ha) of the Sites have BMV land Grades 1 and 2. Approximately 34% (307 ha) of the land is confirmed as Subgrade 3a. Representative soil and ALC surveys undertaken within the CRC indicate that 51% of land within the CRC can be classed as BMV agricultural land (Grade 1 at 3%, Grade 2 at 4% and Grade 3a at 44%). The full ALC information is included within ES Volume 3 Appendix 5.1: Agricultural Land Classification <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.05.01]</b>. ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b> further sets out the national policy context, while the Planning Statement <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.02]</b></p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				provides the justification for use of BMV land.
Keir Mather MP	Biodiversity	The knock-on impact on wildlife, with potential for the damage of wildlife habitats, alongside the long-term disruption of local wildlife populations caused by the 'hum' of the panels as they operate.	No	Impact of the Proposed Development on protected and notable species and habitats is considered in ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]</b> , including any impacts from noise and vibration during the operation of the Proposed Development.
Keir Mather MP	Traffic and Movement	Disruption through the development process, including to local roads	No	The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b> ) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. This takes into account the existing highway capacity of each route and identifies if any highway mitigation is required to accommodate traffic from the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Proposed Development during the construction phase. The oCTMP will seek to minimise any impact to the local highway network.
Keir Mather MP	Site Selection and Alternatives	Concern that the number of proposed sites has increased between Phases 1 & 2, as well as concern at the prospect of further expansion later in the development process.	No	The Applicant can confirm that no further sites will be added to the Proposed Development. Solar Development Site 5 was removed following Phase One consultation; flood modelling was carried out and confirmed the site was not suitable for development due to potential flood depths. Solar Development Sites 6, 7 and 8 were brought forward following this and as a result of landowner agreement. Whilst additional sites were added, the overall size of the project is smaller than first presented at Phase One. The design process for the Proposed Development is detailed further in ES Volume 1

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]</b> .
Keir Mather MP	Agricultural Land and Soils	Concern about the perceived risk of chemicals in the panels leaching out into the local environment, which could further damage natural habitats	No	The Applicant notes these concerns but notes that no chemicals are anticipated to leach into the local environment from the panels. 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. Chemicals would not be used in the cleaning of the panels, which will be cleaned with water, as detailed in and secured through the outline

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP, <b>[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.03]</b>). In addition, the Applicant has prepared an outline Pollution and Spillage Response Plan (oPSRP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.08]</b>) which sets out the intended strategies for managing pollution and spillage incidents within the Order Limits.</p>
Keir Mather MP	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Concern that the cabling corridor might interfere with flood defence and the field drainage ditches on Wistow Lordship, putting villages like Wistow at a heightened flood risk.	No	The cable will be buried below ground with no change to existing field drainage regimes once built, including no loss of floodplain storage, impedance of water flows, or increase in flood risk. During construction, measures will be in place to prevent any negative impacts associated with construction of the cable corridor on field drainage ditches and is

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>outlined in the Outline Drainage Strategy (ES Volume 3) <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.04 ]</b> and outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b>). The oCEMP secures the commitment to maintain and repair field drainage.</p> <p>The Proposed Development has engaged with the Environment Agency regarding interfaces with their assets and relevant environmental permits will be secured with the EA for any works beneath the River Ouse and associated set-back flood defences to the north of Wistow Lordship. The cable corridor shall be constructed beneath the River Ouse and other committed</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>locations via trenchless methods. Pre and post-construction surveys will be carried out to ensure the flood defence is not impacted by the proposed works.</p> <p>An assessment of interactions between the cable corridor and flood defence assets is included the Flood Risk Assessment (ES Volume 3)  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01 ]</b>.</p>
Monk Fryston Parish Council	Site Selection and Alternatives	<p>Inappropriate energy strategy</p> <p>Failure to address the most up to date UK Government position on clean energy and failure to consider all reasonable alternatives. The proposals fail to consider the many alternatives available, brownfield, rooftop, and industrial sites in the face of government policy stipulating prioritisation for solar generation.</p>	No	<p>The Applicant can confirm that alternative sites were considered, assessed, and have been reported on within the Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR, ES Volume 3  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01 ]</b>). The SSAR considered, along with proximity to Monk Fryston</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>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. The Applicant recognises suggestions of local brownfield sites; however, these are often fragmented sites considerable distances from each other, neither providing the space for solar generation required or ease of connectivity between sites. Full details of the site selection process are included within ES Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03].</b></p> <p>The Applicant has prepared a Statement of Need</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p><b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.03]</b> which assesses the Proposed Development in relation to the Government's clean energy policy and position, as well as setting 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 <i>"a secure, reliable, affordable, Net Zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar"</i>. The draft revised Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (December 2025) states that that the UK has huge potential for solar power and that</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>solar energy is at the heart of the Clean Power 2030 Mission [Paras 2.10.1 &amp; 2.10.2]. The Proposed Development therefore directly contributes towards meeting the national net zero and energy security requirements for the near future.</p> <p>The majority of the Proposed Development lies outside the Green Belt. 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 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.12]</b>, the Applicant is satisfied that the Proposed Development is</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				demonstrably located on 'grey belt' land, and is not inappropriate development under current policy.
Monk Fryston Parish Council	Site Selection and Alternatives	Loss of greenbelt Total disregard for over hundreds of hectares of greenbelt land.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Monk Fryston Parish Council	Traffic and Movement	Highways and traffic  The planned highway and traffic routes are not practical or safe for the current users such as walkers, horse riders , cyclists, and school children. The construction routes on small lanes with the wholly unsuitable Fryston Common Lane being used as access to Solar Development Site 2	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Following consultation feedback and in discussion with NYC highways it was agreed that an access on the A63 would be preferable as the main access into Solar Development Site 2 to remove construction traffic from Fryston Common Lane. The outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]</b> ) has been updated to show access into Solar Development Site 2 via the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				A63, with Fryston Common Lane retained for emergency access only.
Monk Fryston Parish Council	Landscape and Visual	The proposed plan is on flat land with full views from homes, public footpaths and single roads being lost as the height of the panels and fencing would obscuring all views.	No	The LVIA presented in PEIR Chapter 10 recognises that there will be some adverse impacts on people's views as a consequence of the construction and operation of the Proposed Development. The PEIR LVIA did not conclude that views would be lost or that the height of panels and fencing means that all views would be obscured. Further visual material is presented in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]</b> to assist stakeholders in understand the degree of likely visual changes, including photomontages from

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				selected viewpoints. The Applicant has continued to develop the design presented in the application for development consent, to seek opportunities to further reduce effects on the local landscape and people's views and place-attachment.
Monk Fryston Parish Council	Socioeconomics	Spanning over 1,000 hectares, this development would irreversibly transform the character of the open countryside affecting the amenity currently enjoyed by residents, walkers, horse riders, cyclists and school children.	No	The scale of the Proposed Development is acknowledged, and the Applicant recognises the value of the existing countryside to local communities and recreational users. While the development footprint remains unchanged, the layout has been carefully designed to retain key landscape features and public rights of way, and to minimise disruption to recreational access.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>The Environmental Statement includes a detailed assessment of landscape and visual impacts, and outlines mitigation measures intended to preserve the character of the area as far as practicable (See ES Volume 1 Chapter 13: Socioeconomics <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13]</b>).</p>
<p>Monk Fryston Parish Council</p>	<p>Agricultural Land and Soils</p>	<p>Loss of agricultural land</p> <p>The development would remove over 1,000 hectares from agricultural use and food production for a period of up to 60 years with a detrimental effect on future food security.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The quantity and quality of land within the Solar Development Sites is set out in Section 5.7 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b>. While food security is not identified as an issue within the suite of Energy National Policy Statements or the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the significance of removing this land from solely food production is</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>assessed in Section 5.9, and the cumulative assessment of the removal of agricultural land on food security is assessed in Section 5.14.</p> <p>Detailed ALC surveys indicate that approximately 54% of the total land within the Solar Development Sites is classed as BMV agricultural land. Approximately 20% (179.4 ha) of the Sites have BMV land Grades 1 and 2. Approximately 34% (307 ha) of the land is confirmed as Subgrade 3a. Representative soil and ALC surveys undertaken within the CRC indicate that 51% of land within the CRC can be classed as BMV agricultural land (Grade 1 at 3%, Grade 2 at 4% and Grade 3a at 44%). The full ALC information is included within ES Volume 3</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>Appendix 5.1: Agricultural Land Classification  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.05.01]</b>. ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils  <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b> further sets out the national policy context, while the Planning Statement  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.02]</b> provides the justification for use of BMV land.</p>
<p>Monk Fryston Parish Council</p>	<p>Agricultural Land and Soils</p>	<p>Industrialisation                      Converting over 1,000 hectares of arable farmland to industrial use</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The quantity and quality of land within the Solar Development Sites is set out in Section 5.7 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils  <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b>. While food security is not identified as an issue within the suite of Energy National Policy Statements or the National Planning Policy</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>Framework (NPPF), the significance of removing this land from solely food production is assessed in Section 5.9, and the cumulative assessment of the removal of agricultural land on food security is assessed in Section 5.14.</p>
<p>Monk Fryston Parish Council</p>	<p>Biodiversity</p>	<p>Wildlife Damage to biodiversity forcing changes to local wildlife habits.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Impact of the Proposed Development on protected and notable species and habitats is considered in ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06].</b></p> <p>The Applicant has produced a Biodiversity Net-Gain Report (ES Volume 5: BNG Report <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.09]</b>) which confirms a BNG of 78.58% is expected for habitats, 73% for hedgerows, and 10.42% for</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				watercourses. The delivery of BNG is secured via DCO Requirement.
Monk Fryston Parish Council	Noise and Vibration	<p>Noise</p> <p>Noise from construction traffic and noise from the operation of the battery storage cooling equipment affecting local properties.</p>	No	<p>The assessment of construction traffic noise and operational noise from the battery storage systems (BESS) is presented in ES Volume 1 Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.11]</b>.</p> <p>The construction traffic noise assessment methodology, in line with DMRB and CRTN, is set out in Section 11.5 Methodology and the assessment of likely impacts and effects is provided in Section 11.9. The assessment concludes that adverse effects from construction traffic noise are not significant.</p> <p>For operational noise from the BESS, the assessment is undertaken in accordance with</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>British Standard 4142:2014+A1:2019 <i>Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound</i>, as presented in Section 11.5. The assessment of likely impacts and effects is provided in Section 11.9 and 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, such as noise barriers and strategic siting of the BESS away from residential receptors, from an early stage in the design process. Details of</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				mitigation measures are presented in Section 11.8 of Chapter 11.
Monk Fryston Parish Council	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Flood risk Flood risks near the River Aire	No	Flood risk from all relevant sources have been carefully considered within the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), included in ES Volume 3 Appendix 15.1: Flood Risk Assessment <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01 ]</b> . 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. Regarding the River Aire, which now lies 460 m south of Solar Development Site 4, the FRA concludes that the overall increase in flood risk beyond the Order Limits is expected to be negligible,

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>while Table 6-2 provides a breakdown of the flood risks to the Sites themselves.</p> <p>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 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.04]</b> to ensure that flood risk is not increased as a result of the development. The Applicant has and continues to engage with key stakeholders on issues related to flood risk and drainage.</p>
Monk Fryston	Cultural Heritage	<p>Harm to heritage assets</p> <p>Detrimental effect on the settings of many</p>	No	The impact of the Proposed Development on the heritage resource, including impacts

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Parish Council		heritage assets (conservation areas and listed buildings)		<p>incurred through changes in their setting is fully considered within ES Volume 1 Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.08]</b>. The Proposed Development has undertaken extensive surveys including geophysical surveys <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/0.6.03.08.03]</b> and trial trenching <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.04]</b> to identify potential impacts. Where impacts are identified an Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.11]</b>) accompanies the application. The AMS details the overarching methodology for undertaking a programme of archaeological</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>mitigation within the Proposed Development.</p> <p>AMS will be updated post submission and during the Examination process following the completion of the programme of final geophysical survey in the Cable Route Corridor, which will inform decisions on the need for any further archaeological mitigation areas within the Cable Route Corridor.</p>
<p>Monk Fryston Parish Council</p>	<p>Battery Storage</p>	<p>Fire risk and contamination</p> <p>BESS fires are notoriously difficult to deal with resultant significant contamination risk when tackled.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant's outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.06]</b>) 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.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>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) as part of UL 9540A tests and / or 3rd party full scale destruction testing. This testing involves burning the full BESS system to validate safe equipment spacing and performance test active and passive mitigation systems integrated into the BESS design. The objective of the test is to evaluate the thermal exposure impacts from a developed BESS enclosure, to determine propagation risk to adjacent BESS or equipment. Testing also defines the length of burn, duration of Peak</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>Heat Release Rate, maximum burn temperatures, etc.</p> <p>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 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.05 ]</b> 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<sub>3</sub>), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) and</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>particulates, were modelled using Atmospheric Dispersion Modelling Software (ADMS) to determine the effects 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.</p> <p>The Plume Study concludes that there are no significant 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 of a site incident to sensitive receptors within a 1 km radius. Toxic gas</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				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) will incorporate all necessary emergency response procedures and actions based upon thermal runaway test data supplied by the BESS system provider.
Thorpe Willoughby Parish Council	Project Description	Thorpe Willoughby Parish Council STRONGLY OBJECTS to the proposals put forward by Light Valley Solar.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Thorpe Willoughby Parish Council	Construction and Decommissioning	We believe that the works that will be carried out constructing the solar farms and their cable corridors will cause major disruption to our village and residents and that of our neighbouring villages.	No	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding local disruption caused by the construction phase. An outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b> ) and outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b> ) have been prepared and included with the DCO Application; both management plans aim to reduce impacts relating to the construction phase, and secure mitigation measures outlined in the ES. ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development <b>[EN0110012/APP/06.01.02]</b> provides further detail regarding the construction phase.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Thorpe Willoughby Parish Council	Construction and Decommissioning	With the permanent soil degradation, it is unlikely to ever return to agricultural land, therefore the development is not just for the duration of the LVS project lifespan – it is indefinite.	No	The Applicant notes that it is well established that soil health improves when arable land is converted to permanent pasture, as will be the case with the Proposed Development, with increases in soil organic matter, soil carbon and soil moisture. Farmers have been encouraged and paid by successive governments to convert arable land to grassland with low fertiliser input. As detailed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]</b> and further detailed and secured through the Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04]</b> ), the process of decommissioning will involve the removal of all solar

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>infrastructure, including the solar PV modules, and BESS and all associated infrastructure (including On-Site Cabling). Following this, the Sites will be returned to their original use and ALC grade. In addition, the outline Soil Resource Management Plan (oSRMP, <b>[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.14]</b>) has been developed to secure soil resources during construction, operation and decommissioning, including the return of the land within the Cable Route Corridor to its original use and ALC grade.</p>
<p>Thorpe Willoughby Parish Council</p>	<p>Landscape and Visual</p>	<p>Our residents and local farmers are very concerned about the proposal and the lasting irreparable damage we believe that it will cause to our landscape.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The LVIA presented in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]</b> recognises that there will be long term changes to the character of parts of the landscape for the</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>duration of the operation of the Proposed Development. This is consistent with paragraph 5.10.5 of the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (NPS EN-1), which states that "<i>virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will have adverse effects on the landscape, but there may also be beneficial landscape character impacts arising from mitigation.</i>" The existing network of hedgerows and woodland would be retained and strengthened and solar panels and other proposed infrastructure would be located within fields, preserving the existing landscape pattern. The Applicant has continued to develop the design presented in the application for development</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				consent, to seek opportunities to further reduce effects on the local landscape.
Thorpe Willoughby Parish Council	Consultation and Engagement	At the drop-in session at the Hambleton Village hall the representatives were very confident that this was going to happen regardless of what we or our residents thought, which is very concerning. It felt as though the decision has already been made and that the sessions were just a box ticking exercise.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. Consultation is a core part of the pre-application process, for the Proposed Development this involved consulting on initial proposals through a Phase One (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 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01]</b> describes this process and the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Applicant's regard to feedback received. The Consultation Report forms a key component of the DCO Application and is a key consideration of PINS in making a decision on whether to grant a DCO.
Thorpe Willoughby Parish Council	Site Selection and Alternatives	We believe that the proposed development is entirely unsuitable in both scale and location.	No	The Applicant respectfully disagrees. ES Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]</b> references the Site Selection Assessment Report (ES Volume 3) <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]</b> which confirms the Applicant has considered and assessed alternative locations and sites, including assessment of previously developed land/brownfield land. This was carried out within a 25 km radius of the Monk Fryston Substation point of connection. The

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				search did not identify any available suitable land of an adequate area to facilitate a 500 MW connection solar project, either individually or in combination with other sites.
Thorpe Willoughby Parish Council	Cultural Heritage and archaeology	(Light Valley Solar) will pose a serious and lasting threat to our surrounding communities, <b>cultural heritage</b> , food security and environment.	No	The impact of the Proposed Development on the heritage resource, including impacts incurred through changes in their setting is fully considered within ES Volume 1 Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.08]</b> .
Thorpe Willoughby Parish Council	Cultural Heritage	The villages directly impacted by this proposal possess historical heritage and valuable community assets, including Grade I and II listed buildings, Roman archaeological sites, centuries old farming traditions, designated Conservation Areas, Green Belt land and Locally Important Landscape Areas.	No	The impact of the Proposed Development on the heritage resource, including impacts incurred through changes in their setting is fully considered within ES Volume 1 Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>This development threatens to cause irreversible harm to these cultural, ecological and historical assets, undermining the character and identity of the local community.</p>		<p><b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.08].</b> The Proposed Development has undertaken extensive surveys including geophysical surveys <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/0.6.03.08.03]</b> and trial trenching <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.04]</b> to identify potential impacts. Where impacts are identified an Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.11]</b>) accompanies the application. The AMS details the overarching methodology for undertaking a programme of archaeological mitigation within the Proposed Development. The AMS will be updated post submission and during the Examination process following the</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				completion of the programme of final geophysical survey in the Cable Route Corridor, which will inform decisions on the need for any further archaeological mitigation areas within the Cable Route Corridor.
Thorpe Willoughby Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	(Light Valley Solar) will pose a serious and lasting threat to our surrounding communities, cultural heritage, <b>food security</b> and environment.	Yes	The quantity and quality of land within the Solar Development Sites is set out in Section 5.7 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 5 Agricultural Land and Soils <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b> . While food security is not identified as an issue within the suite of Energy National Policy Statements or the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the significance of removing this land from solely food production is assessed in Section 5.9, and the cumulative assessment of the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				removal of agricultural land on food security is assessed in Section 5.14.
Thorpe Willoughby Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	A large percentage of the land proposed for this development falls under Best and Most Versatile Land (BMV). When Government Guidance reinforces the need to protect BMV land and prioritise food production, this land should not be claimed and compulsory purchased for this scheme when more suitable options exist. Both the NPPF and the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) emphasise the importance of using lower-grade or previously developed land for renewable energy schemes.	Yes	The quantity and quality of land within the Solar Development Sites is set out in Section 5.7 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 5 Agricultural Land and Soils <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b> . While food security is not identified as an issue within the suite of Energy National Policy Statements or the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the significance of removing this land from solely food production is assessed in Section 5.9, and the cumulative assessment of the removal of agricultural land on food security is assessed in Section 5.14.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>ES Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]</b> references the Site Selection Assessment Report (ES Volume 3) <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]</b> which confirms the Applicant has considered and assessed alternative locations and sites, including assessment of previously developed land/brownfield land. This 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 solar project, either individually or in combination with other sites.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>The Planning Statement <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.02]</b> submitted as part of the Application assesses the Proposed Development against national and local planning policy relating to agricultural land and soils, including BMV. All relevant planning policy is set out in the accompanying Policy Compliance Document <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.12]</b>.</p>
<p>Thorpe Willoughby Parish Council</p>	<p>Biodiversity</p>	<p>(Light Valley Solar) will pose a serious and lasting threat to our surrounding communities, cultural heritage, food security and <b>environment</b>.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that environmental impacts have been assessed across the technical topic chapters of the ES <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01]</b>.</p>
<p>Thorpe Willoughby Parish Council</p>	<p>Agricultural Land and Soils</p>	<p>Light Valley Solar's assertion of a 'biodiversity gain' cannot justify the permanent loss of quality, productive agricultural land - particularly in rural communities like the locations in this</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges this concern, the quantity and quality of land within the Solar Development Sites is set out in Section 5.7 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		proposal, which have long upheld traditions of sustainable farming.		<p>Land and Soils [EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]. The significance of removing this land from solely food production is assessed in Section 5.9, and the cumulative assessment of the removal of agricultural land on food security is assessed in Section 5.14. Detailed ALC surveys indicate that approximately 54% of the total land within the Solar Development Sites is classed as BMV agricultural land. Approximately 20% (179.4 ha) of the Sites have BMV land Grades 1 and 2. Approximately 34% (307 ha) of the land is confirmed as Subgrade 3a. Representative soil and ALC surveys undertaken within the CRC indicate that 51% of land within the CRC can be classed as BMV agricultural land (Grade 1 at 3%, Grade 2 at 4% and Grade 3a</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>at 44%). The full ALC information is included within ES Volume 3 Appendix 5.1: Agricultural Land Classification <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.05.01]</b>. ES Volume 1 Chapter 5 further sets out the national policy context, while the Planning Statement <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.02]</b> provides the justification for use of BMV land.</p> <p>As noted in ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]</b> and the Biodiversity Net-Gain Report (ES Volume 5: BNG Report <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.09]</b>), intensively farmed agricultural land tends to contain lower levels of biodiversity. By temporarily removing land from agricultural use,</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>the Proposed Development presents an opportunity to enhance biodiversity. It is intended that the Proposed Development will have a biodiversity net-gain of at least 70%; the BNG Report 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</p> <p><b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]</b>, which further details and secures these measures, such as the retention and strengthening of the hedgerow network, extensive landscape planting, wooden and</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				deer mesh fencing, and the provision of grassland habitat in watercourse buffer zones.
Thorpe Willoughby Parish Council	Biodiversity	The scale of the development will mean that a significant amount of habitat is lost or significantly altered. The wildlife in the area such as hares and deer will be impacted by the development and the environmental reports produced by the developers does not seem to accurately reflect the impact on our wildlife.	Yes	Impact of the Proposed Development on protected and notable species and habitats is fully considered in ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]</b> . The majority of important habitats will be retained and protected; any arable land will be replaced with grassland which is of higher ecological importance. Brown hare have been considered in the assessment, and 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

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				designed to work around these commuting routes.
Thorpe Willoughby Parish Council	Traffic and Movement	In Thorpe Willoughby, the construction of cable corridors will cause major congestion disruption to our village. All of the construction traffic (mainly HGV's) is set to use the A63, which already operates beyond safe capacity as it stands and is set to get even more congested with recent planning permission granted in Thorpe Willoughby for 280 new homes and Hambleton for 250 homes with another 100 homes expected to be granted in the coming months. Therefore the amount of traffic that will be travelling across this route will be completely unacceptable.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. A Transport Assessment (TA) has been undertaken and is included within ES Volume 3 Appendix 14.1 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]</b> . This reviews the current highway network and determines if any highway mitigation is required to accommodate the traffic that would be generated by the Proposed Development over the construction phase. The assessment also takes into account any existing proposed developments - such as new housing developments - as part of the cumulative assessment scenario. Following the TA and the cumulative assessment, the Applicant has produced an outline Construction Traffic Management

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>) which details and secures mitigation measures which also account for the cumulative traffic effect. These include timing deliveries outside of peak hours, with the majority of deliveries expected in the hours between 09:30 – 16:30. Other measures include the provision of shared transport (minibuses) for staff and strategic routing of construction traffic; for example, vehicles approaching the Cable Route Corridor access at Riccall will approach the junction on the A19 from the south, using a roundabout south of the access to approach and left turn into the junction only, thereby preventing the need to cross the A19. This routing is incorporated into ES Volume 2</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Figure 14.4: Construction Routing <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.14.04]</b> .
Thorpe Willoughby Parish Council	Cumulative	the A63, which already operates beyond safe capacity as it stands and is set to get even more congested with recent planning permission granted in Thorpe Willoughby for 280 new homes and Hambleton for 250 homes with another 100 homes expected to be granted in the coming months.	No	Information regarding cumulative effects can be found in ES Volume 1 Chapter 17: Cumulative and In-Combination Effects <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.17]</b> . 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.
Thorpe Willoughby	Noise and Vibration	The noise levels will pose a significant impact on our community in both the construction	No	A three-dimensional noise model has been developed for

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Parish Council		<p>phase and also once operational. The environmental report states that the noise impact has been assessed and will be minimal but as the topography of the area is very flat with minimal barriers between fields we believe that sound will travel a significant distance and even more so on windy days.</p>		<p>construction and operational 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 and structures. Propagation of sound has been modelled using proprietary software in accordance with BS ISO 9613-2:2024 Acoustics - <i>Attenuation of sound during propagation outdoors - Part 2: Engineering method for the prediction of sound pressure levels outdoors</i>. This standard assumes downwind propagation conditions, i.e. wind blowing from the source to the receiver, representing a cautious assumption for meteorological conditions.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>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  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.11]</b>.                      The assessment references British Standard BS 5228:2009+A1:2014 <i>Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites - Noise (Part 1)</i>.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that with the implementation of a suitable Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) adverse effects from construction noise and vibration are not significant. An outline CEMP <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b> is submitted with the Application.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>The assessment of operational noise is undertaken in accordance with British Standard 4142:2014+A1:2019 <i>Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound</i> and methodology is presented in Section 11.5. The assessment of likely impacts and effects is provided in Section 11.9.</p> <p>The study area extends 1km from the main Solar Development Sites as predicted sound levels beyond this distance are unlikely to result in a significant effect.</p> <p>This assessment concludes that although exceedances are predicted at the closest sensitive receptors, the effects of operational</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				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, such as noise barriers and strategic siting of the BESS away from residential receptors, from an early stage in the design process. Details of mitigation measures are presented in Section 11.8 of Chapter 11.
Thorpe Willoughby Parish Council	Community Benefits	The Parish Council believes that the Light Valley Solar project offers no benefit to our village or that of our neighbours and will instead cause significant harm.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Burton Salmon Parish Council	Project Description	Burton Salmon Parish Council objects to this proposal	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Burton Salmon Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	The use of agricultural land is not considered acceptable when there are alternative brownfield sites available for such development. It is concerning that a significant amount of prime agricultural land will be taken out of use for food production if this proposal goes ahead.	Yes	<p>The quantity and quality of land within the Solar Development Sites is set out in Section 5.7 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b>. While food security is not identified as an issue within the suite of Energy National Policy Statements or the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the significance of removing this land from solely food production is assessed in Section 5.9, and the cumulative assessment of the removal of agricultural land on food security is assessed in Section 5.14.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges suggestions and preferences for use of alternative sites, including</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>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 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01 ]</b>). The SSAR considered, along with proximity to Monk Fyston 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. The Applicant recognises suggestions of local brownfield sites; however, these are often fragmented sites considerable distances from each other, neither providing the space for solar</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				generation required or ease of connectivity between sites.
Burton Salmon Parish Council	Construction and Decommissioning	There will be significant disturbance to local residents both in terms of noise and traffic, with a concerning number of HGV's expected to use local roads during the installation phase, causing environmental issues, such as dust and pollution.	No	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding local disruption caused by the construction phase. An outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b> ) and outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b> ) have been prepared and included with the DCO Application; both management plans aim to reduce impacts relating to the construction phase, and secure mitigation measures outlined in the ES. ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development <b>[EN0110012/APP/06.01.02]</b>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>provides further detail regarding the construction phase.</p> <p>A Construction Dust Assessment (CDA) is included in ES Volume 3 Appendix 16.1: Construction Dust Assessment <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.01 ]</b> 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 dustier activities, and requirement to produce a Dust Management Plan</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				(DMP) are secured by the CDA and oCEMP.
Burton Salmon Parish Council	Landscape and Visual	The development will have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area, with the benefits from the planting to mitigate the loss of vegetation not expected to be realised until year fifteen of operation.	Yes	The Applicant has sought to avoid and minimise the loss of existing vegetation in the design of the Proposed Development as a first principle. As such, the majority of existing vegetation within and on the edges of the Solar Development Sites and Cable Route Corridors would be retained. It is acknowledged that proposed planting designed to strengthen the green infrastructure framework and to provide additional visual screening would take time to establish with paragraph 10.6.9 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]</b> assuming a growth rate of 30cm per

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>year. Therefore, whilst residual effects have been assessed at year 15 of operation, in reality impacts would reduce over this time period and further beyond. This is consistent with the recommendations set out in paragraph 4.31 of the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, 3rd Edition. Judgements on the significance of visual effects are based on the sensitivity of visual receptors and the magnitude of impact, including duration and reversibility (GLVIA3, para 6.38–6.40; LITGN-2024-01).</p>
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Project Description	Thank you for consulting Yorkshire Wildlife Trust (YWT) regarding this application. YWT's mission is to create a Yorkshire rich in wildlife for the benefit of everyone with more wildlife, more wild places and more people	No	The Applicant notes this comment. ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]</b> and Chapter 12: Ornithology

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>having a strong connection to nature. Yorkshire needs a recovery of wildlife on land and sea. Although YWT does not currently have a formal policy on solar developments, it broadly supports measures to reduce consumption of non-renewable energy sources, including the use of sustainable technologies as well as through energy efficiency. Solar power proposals have the potential to impact on wildlife in several ways (both positive and negative), many of which could apply to any large-scale development and some which are specific to solar energy.</p>		<p><b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.12]</b> set out the potential impacts the Proposed Development will have on the biodiversity of the area, as well as the positive net gain forecast for BNG (see BNG Report, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.09]</b>). A substantial area has been set aside on Solar Development Site 1 which is assessed as having a beneficial impact for biodiversity, as shown on the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]</b>).</p>
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Biodiversity	<p>YWT have welcomed the engagement with the design team at an early stage in the design process of this scheme, to gain a mutual understanding of the technical constraints and the impacts upon the environment. In a recent meeting with the Ecology team, regarding the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) we</p>	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		welcomed the commitment to including adequate buffer zones to riparian zones <sup>1</sup> and woodland considering the presence of these habitats across the order limits. We also acknowledge adequate buffer zones included in the scheme design, due to the known presence of badger sets throughout the site.		
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Biodiversity	We also welcome the commitment to avoiding removing any trees in the proposed cable route, however we would be grateful to be contacted regarding this matter if tree loss is anticipated and advise of compensatory measures.	No	Once final tree loss is known, a meeting can be set up to discuss compensatory measures. Worst-case scenario tree and hedge loss has been calculated for the cable route in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.02 ]</b> , assessed as part of ES Volume 1 Chapter 16: Other Environmental Matters <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.16]</b> . The report also sets out the approach to avoiding tree loss for

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>visibility accesses and visibility splays along the cable route.</p> <p>The Applicant will replant trees and hedges lost along the cable route within the cable route corridor where possible, subject to detailed design works, as set out in and secured through the outline Construction Environment Management Plan (oCEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b>).</p>
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Biodiversity	We were pleased to see the Applicant has committed to producing an outline Landscape Management Plan (oLEMP), "Areas within buffer zones and undeveloped parts of the Solar Development Sites will undergo targeted habitat creation and enhancement and will be managed in line with an outline Landscape Management Plan (oLEMP)." Indicating how proposed habitat creation, mitigation methods and	No	The Applicant notes this comment

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		compensation scheme design, will be managed over the lifetime of the solar farm.		
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Biodiversity	Additionally, the Ecology team reported the results of robust survey findings, which will be ongoing throughout the survey period (March-October 2025) in advance of the DCO examination period beginning. We welcome continued engagement with the Ecology team regarding the design of the cable route, which is emergent.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and has continued to maintain lines of communication.
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Biodiversity	We were pleased to see that targeted surveys for water vole in locations where the cable route will be crossing watercourses are ongoing while the design is being finalised. The ornithological consultant in conversation with YWT confirmed that North Yorkshire Council had agreed a monthly ornithological survey programme with them, we support this and would be interested in consulting further whilst these surveys are ongoing and the emergent mitigation design is developed. We are	No	The Applicant notes this comment and has continued to maintain lines of communication. The results of the surveys of water voles, including at points where the cable crosses watercourses, are detailed within ES Volume 3 Appendix 6.7: Water Vole Report <b>[EN0110012/APP/06.03.06.07]</b> . The report concludes that the majority of ditch survey points were found to be unsuitable for water

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>pleased to see that the applicant has committed to this in the PEIR, "Due to an incomplete baseline the requirement for additional mitigation will be further assessed at ES stage."</p>		<p>vole, although some suitability for the species was present in places, with five ditch survey points recording evidence of water vole (D2.1, D3.2, D4.8b, D6.3c, and D9.16). However, the only location where confirmed water vole field signs were recorded as well as a confirmed water vole burrow was within D2.1. The only other record of a burrow was within D9.16, where a probable water vole burrow and feeding remains were recorded. As summary of the results is provided in Table 11 of the report.</p> <p>As such, water vole are known to be present within D2.1 and may be present in four other locations within the Order Limits, however this is not confirmed. Appropriate</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>mitigation measures will be undertaken to maintain their favourable conservation status as discussed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]</b>. These include ensuring a Natural England water vole licence is in place before any proposed works within the 10 m buffer zone of D2.1 and putting in place PWMs where required when trenchless techniques for the cable are being undertaken. These measures are secured through the oCEMP <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b>. The additional mitigation reduces the impacts to Neutral (not significant). In light of this, and taking into account the proposed creation/enhancement of habitats of</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>importance to water vole, an overall residual Significant positive effect is identified.</p> <p>Monitoring of water vole through the completion of protected species surveys at various times post development is detailed in and secured through the oLEMP <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]</b>. This will help to understand if water vole are still present on site compared to the predevelopment baseline.</p>
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Biodiversity	Additionally we support the conclusion of the EclA Scoping report that an ES should be produced and would request we are consulted when this material is made available.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and has continued to maintain lines of communication. The ES submitted with the DCO Application will be made publicly available on the Planning Inspectorate's website, and it is open to YWT to

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				participate in the examination of the Application as an interested party.
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Biodiversity	YWT wish to continue to comment on the proposals, particularly in relation to proximity to statutory and non-statutory protected wildlife sites such as SACs, SPAs and Ramsar sites (and any land functionally linked to these sites), SSSIs and Local Wildlife Sites. We will also comment on the proposed mitigation, and habitat creation proposals including the long term management of these habitats, including post decommissioning, as discussed with the Ecology team.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and has continued to maintain lines of communication.
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Construction and Decommissioning	Our planning team's concerns over decommissioning are consistent across all solar schemes we comment on as a nonstatutory consultee. Solar farms are treated as temporary developments, with operational lifetimes of 30–40 years. If, upon decommissioning, these sites revert to arable	No	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns around decommissioning of the Proposed Development. An Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP, [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04]) has

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>land, any contribution to nature recovery is potentially lost. In contrast, habitats within a Local Nature Recovery Strategic network are far more likely to be retained beyond the 30 years of a BNG agreement, creating the legacy for nature recovery aspired to in BNG's founding principles.</p>		<p>been prepared as part of the DCO Application to outline the mitigation measures relevant to decommissioning for the Proposed Development. This plan includes appropriate ecological commitments to ensure that land is restored, following the end of the operational life of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Impact of the Proposed Development on protected and notable species and habitats, including at decommissioning is assessed in detail within ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]</b>. At the time of decommissioning environmental legislation in force at the time will need to be followed, which will act to protect species and habitats during decommissioning.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>At the time of decommissioning, 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. The Applicant will not have control over the land once it is returned to landowners.</p>
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Biodiversity	<p>Regarding BNG, due to the stage of the scheme design, the BNG targets have not been finalised. Due to the scale of the scheme, we would expect to see the applicant offering more than the 10% that is proposed to be mandatory for NSIPs. This is to ensure the applicant is making a commitment to biodiversity enhancements and habitat creation, across the proposed order limits.</p>	No	<p><u>The Biodiversity Net-Gain Report (ES Volume 5: BNG Report [EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.09]) sets out that the Proposed Development will deliver biodiversity net gain of 78.30% for habitat units, 72.12% for hedgerow units and 10.42% for watercourse units. The delivery of BNG is secured via DCO Requirement.</u></p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Environment Agency	Project Description	We are aware that this project is still in its early stages however further information is required for the Environment Agency (EA) to provide a definitive response to relevant environmental impacts. This is important so we can provide the best possible advice to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS). It is strongly recommended that any further reports, statements or surveys that require our review and/or agreement are submitted as soon as possible to resolve any issues before the Development Consent Order (DCO) is submitted.	No	The Applicant acknowledges that the PEIR represents a preliminary position and confirms that engagement has continued with the Environment Agency. Information has been shared at the earliest opportunity to seek to resolve any issues before DCO Application submission.
Environment Agency	Biodiversity	Further mitigation is required to ensure protected species will not be adversely impacted.	No	The Applicant notes this response. The impact of the Proposed Development on protected and notable species and habitats is fully considered in ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]</b> including any required mitigation. Habitat enhancement measures will

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>be for the benefit of all species, while monitoring of protected species through the completion of protected species surveys at various times post development is detailed in and secured through the oLEMP  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]</b> alongside the wider enhancement measures. Monitoring will help to understand if protected species are still present on site compared to the predevelopment baseline.</p> <p>During construction, where protected species are identified, PWMs will be in-place, including the halting of construction activity upon identification, as detailed in and secured through the oCEMP  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02].</b></p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Environment Agency	Water Resources and Flood Risk	<p>Geomorphology The physical characteristics of waterbodies may be adversely affected if bridges are designed inappropriately.</p>	Yes	<p>For high to moderate value watercourse along the cable corridor, trenchless techniques will be used where possible, this is likely to involve HDD under rivers. HDD will have a minimum 10 m avoidance buffer around these watercourses. This will reduce/remove the requirement for bridges over major watercourses.</p> <p>The relevant drainage authorities have been consulted and Protective Provisions for Ouse &amp; Derwent IDB and Selby Area IDB are included in the draft DCO  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/03.01]</b> submitted with the Application. The Protective Provisions with Ouse &amp; Derwent IDB are agreed, and the Applicant will continue to engage with Selby Area IDB to determine if</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>amendments are needed to these Protective Provisions.</p> <p>Selby IDB have expressed a requirement for no new culverts over any IDB watercourse. Therefore proposed access tracks utilise existing watercourse crossings as far as is reasonably practicable, but there may be a need for a small number of new culvert crossings on low value watercourses.</p> <p>More widely, there is a commitment for a minimum offset of 10 m from the bank top for all watercourses and their associated riparian zones from all infrastructure (including fencing) and construction works.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>The old terminology has been updated within the preliminary and final ES Volume 3, Water Environment Regulations (Water Framework Directive) Compliance Assessment <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.02]</b> to use the new terminology.</p> <p>Comments on the ES Volume 3, Water Environment Regulations (Water Framework Directive) Compliance Assessment <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.02]</b> have been incorporated at ES.</p>
Environment Agency	Water Resources and Flood Risk	The water demands of the project have been inadequately assessed.	No	A Water Resource Assessment <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.16]</b> has been produced which has been included in the Environmental Statement and incorporated into the assessment. This includes calculations of water requirements

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				(including dust suppression, HDD, wheel washing and BESS cooling) and potential sources of water. Both mains water supply and repurposing of existing licensed abstractions were investigated as part of this piece of work.
Environment Agency	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Additional information is required to ensure impacts on surface water quality are mitigated against.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. Flood risk from all relevant sources has been carefully considered within the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), included in ES Volume 3 Appendix 15.1: Flood Risk Assessment <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01]</b> . 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

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>current planning policy and guidance.</p> <p>The assessment has been informed by ongoing consultation with the Environment Agency, in addition to the Lead Local Flood Authority, and relevant Internal Drainage Boards. Appropriate mitigation measures are proposed within the FRA, the Outline Drainage Strategy <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.04 ]</b> and the oCEMP <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b> to ensure that flood risk is not increased as a result of the Proposed Development. 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</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>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 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. ES Volume 1 Chapter 15: Water Resources and Flood Risk <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.15]</b> provides further information.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Environment Agency	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Flood risk impacts have not been sufficiently assessed. As such this undermines the approach to flood risk mitigation as further mitigation may be required to ensure flood risk is not increased on or off site.	No	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the EA's comment that flood risk was not considered in sufficient detail at PEIR stage. Site-specific hydraulic modelling was not available at the time of the PEIR publication and this position had been discussed with the EA during earlier engagement.</p> <p>Since PEIR, the necessary site-specific modelling has been completed, and these outputs have now been used to inform the scheme design and are considered within the Flood Risk Assessment <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01]</b>. The Applicant has maintained regular engagement with the EA throughout the process and will continue to do so as design and mitigation measures are refined.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>The Applicant is proposing to disapply the requirement for separate flood risk activity permits and has provided protective provisions for the Environment Agency within the draft DCO <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/03.01]</b> in respect of this. The Applicant will continue to engage with the Environment Agency to determine if amendments are needed to these Protective Provisions or a Side Agreement.</p>
Environment Agency	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Groundwater and Contaminated Land Not all potential risks have been identified and assessed.	No	<p>The outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b>) outlines pollution prevention measures and confirms that a 10 m buffer has been applied to design</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				layouts, rising to 50 m for Canal and River Trust watercourse.
Environment Agency	Project Description	Any requests to disapply any permits or consents should be sent to us in writing as soon as possible, to allow us sufficient time for their consideration (minimum 6 months before DCO submission).	No	The Applicant has discussed proposals to disapply permits and consents with the Environment Agency as part of regular engagement. The Applicant has provided protective provisions for the Environment Agency within the draft DCO <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/03.01]</b> in respect of this. The Applicant will continue to engage with the Environment Agency to determine if amendments are needed to these Protective Provisions or a Side Agreement.
Environment Agency	Biodiversity	PEIR Report Volume 1, Chapters 1 to 4, Section 2.5.2	No	Precautionary Working Methods (PWMs), such as those detailed in

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>Issue: Underground cables will be installed using open-cut trenching.</p> <p>Impact: Compounds and trenches associated with cable installation present a risk of entrapment of mammals such as otter.</p> <p>Solution: Cover trenches whilst work is paused and securely fence any construction compounds to prevent accidental entrapment of wildlife, especially near watercourses where otter may be present. Place ramps in open trenches to enable wildlife to escape</p>		<p>the comment, to reduce the risk of mammal entrapment in open excavations are included in and secured through the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b>).</p>
Environment Agency	Biodiversity	<p>PEIR Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity, Table 6-1</p> <p>Issue: Inadequate biosecurity planning.</p> <p>Impact: Risk of accidental spread of Invasive Non-Native Species (INNS). Without an INNS Management Plan, INNS may not be appropriately managed if discovered during construction.</p> <p>Solution: A strict and robust Biosecurity Plan must be submitted within the Environmental Statement (ES), or alternatively, biosecurity</p>	Yes	<p>Biosecurity measures have been incorporated within the Invasive Species Management Plan included in the outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]</b>) to avoid accidental introduction of invasive species. A pathway-specific risk assessment has been completed identifying any pathways</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>measures could be incorporated within the Invasive Species Management Plan. A pathway specific risk assessment should be considered identifying any pathways for spread during construction, operation and decommissioning. The commitment to perform biosecurity measures should also be included within the Commitments Register.</p> <p>Additional narrative/explanation: Although an Invasive Species Management Plan is to be produced, there is no mention of biosecurity measures to avoid accidental introduction. Accidental spread of INNS is an offence under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.</p>		<p>for spread during construction, operation and decommissioning. The commitment to perform biosecurity measures has also been included within the Commitments Register  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.01.03 ]</b>.</p>
Environment Agency	Biodiversity	<p>PEIR Volume 3, Appendix 1.3: Commitments Register, Table 1-2</p> <p>Issue: The Commitments Register does not include a commitment to cease construction should a protected species be discovered, or to apply for a protected species licence.</p> <p>Impact: Risk of disturbing protected species, and/or damaging their resting places,</p>	Yes	<p>Table 1-1 of the Commitments Register  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.01.03 ]</b> has been amended to require the contractor to halt construction following the potential discovery of a protected species or evidence of a protected species (e.g. burrows)</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>as a result of the contractor not understanding when a licence is required, or not knowing to halt construction whilst the licence application is underway. Both are offences under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.</p> <p>Solution: Amend Table 1-2 to require the contractor to halt construction following the potential discovery of a protected species or evidence of a protected species (e.g. burrows) and consult the Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW). Specify that construction will only re-commence following successful application for a species mitigation licence, and the production of a species mitigation plan.</p>		<p>and consult the Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW), and specifies that construction will only re-commence following successful application for a species mitigation licence, and the production of a species mitigation plan. This commitment is secured through the oCEMP <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b>.</p>
Environment Agency	Water Resources and Flood Risk	<p>PEIR Volume 3, Appendix 15.1: Flood Risk Assessment (Including Drainage Strategy), Section 9.1.1.4</p> <p>Issue: The design of clear span bridges has not been specified, including details of the</p>	No	<p>For high to moderate value watercourse along the cable corridor, trenchless techniques will be used where possible, this is likely to involve HDD under rivers.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>offset of abutments for proposed crossings over watercourses.                      Impact: A deterioration in Water Framework Directive (WFD) water quality status.                      Solution: Confirm that bridge abutments will be set back at-least 2m from the riverbank.                      Additional narrative/explanation:                      Inappropriate design could lead to hardening of the bankside, encroachment into the watercourse and reduction in flow capacity and conveyance. It could also lead to interference in the natural function of the watercourse, interfering with sediment transport pathways and preventing channel movement. Consider setting bridge abutments 10 m back from the bank top to avoid riparian encroachment and reduction in Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) scores. For ordinary watercourses, the Internal Drainage Board will need to be consulted on any proposed crossings.                      Additional Comments: Old terminology has</p>		<p>HDD will have a minimum 10 m avoidance buffer around these watercourses. This will reduce/remove the requirement for bridges over major watercourses.</p> <p>Selby IDB have expressed a requirement for no new culverts over any IDB watercourse. Therefore proposed access tracks utilise existing watercourse crossings as far as is reasonably practicable, but there may be a need for a small number of new culvert crossings on low value watercourses.</p> <p>More widely, there is a commitment for a minimum offset of 10 m from the banktop for all watercourses and their associated riparian zones from all infrastructure (including</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>been used to describe the hydromorphological regime of waterbodies in Tables 5-2, 5-3, 5-4, 5-5 and 5-6 in the Preliminary Water Environmental Regulations (WER) Assessment. A recent change in terminology from “Supports Good” to “Not High” has been made to the hydromorphological Supporting Elements/Regime. Please ensure documents are updated accordingly to reflect this change.</p>		<p>fencing) and construction works.</p> <p>The old terminology has been updated within the preliminary and final ES Volume 3, Water Environment Regulations (Water Framework Directive) Compliance Assessment  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.02]</b> to use the new terminology.</p> <p>Comments on the ES Volume 3 Water Environment Regulations (Water Framework Directive) Compliance Assessment  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.02]</b> have been incorporated at ES.</p>
Environment Agency	Water Resources and Flood Risk	<p>PEIR Volume 1, Chapters 1 to 4, Sections 2.7.40-2.7.42</p> <p>Issue: There remains an inadequate assessment made for the water demands of the project. It is unclear if the 4,312m3</p>	No	<p>A Water Resource Assessment <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.16]</b> has been produced which has been included in the Environmental Statement</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>detailed in Section 2.7.40 includes all consumptive uses of water, or only potable and domestic uses. Water company supply from mains connections may not be practical in this area.</p> <p>Impact: Potential insufficient water supply for the project could lead to delays in the project's timeline.</p> <p>Solution: Consultation with the water company is required to determine its availability and practicality at locations required. Confirm potential sources of supply to meet consumptive water demands identified by the project. 4,312m<sup>3</sup> is a relatively small amount of water and there is good availability for water resources in this catchment. We require this to be expanded on in more detail within the ES. This will provide further reassurances that water supply has been options appraised robustly, and thereby avoid it becoming a problem at pre-commencement stage.</p>		<p><b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01]</b> and incorporated into the assessment. This includes calculations of water requirements (including dust suppression, HDD, wheel washing and BESS cooling) and potential sources of water. Both mains water supply and repurposing of existing licensed abstractions were investigated as part of this piece of work.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>Additional narrative/explanation:                      Consumptive uses of water during the construction phase for projects of this scale often include (but may not be limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• dust suppression;</li> <li>• bentonite clay mixing/drilling fluids for Hydraulic Directional Drilling (HDD);</li> <li>• wheel/concrete washing;</li> <li>• Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) cooling.</li> </ul> <p>We are encouraged to see that the quantities of water required are estimated at this stage, however we require a fuller account of what the consumptive uses will be. We are also pleased to see different sources of supply being considered.</p> <p>Additional Comments: Chapter 15, Section 15.7.52 provides a good summary of the abstraction licensing strategy in the Aire and Calder catchment and notes that surface water has good availability. Please be aware, new licence conditions may only include a</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		cessation condition relating to a minimum residual flow cessation for surface water bodies and only restrict abstraction during periods of prolonged dry weather and drought. This should nevertheless still be planned for.		
Environment Agency	Water Resources and Flood Risk	<p>PEIR Volume 1, Chapters 1 to 4, Table 2-1                      Issue: Concrete is to be used as part of the construction works, yet the risk to water quality during the construction phase is not clearly defined. Concrete/cement contains hexavalent chromium which is a substance that needs to be controlled due to it being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Classified as a specific pollutant in relation to surface water it has man annual average Environmental Quality Standard of 3.4 micrograms per litre.</li> </ul> <p>Impact: Construction of a concrete pad foundation can be a risk to water quality as concrete is a known source of hazardous substances, particularly during the curing phase. Concrete and cementitious materials</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant can confirm that concrete as a contaminant has been specifically listed in contaminants for ES and reference made to the relevant chapters / management plans. Further detail is provided in ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]</b> and the oCEMP <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b>. Additionally, see Section 15.9 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 15: Water Resources and Flood Risk <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.15]</b>.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>present in runoff presents a contamination risk to surface water, which will cause a deterioration in the WFD status of a waterbody.</p> <p>Solution: Provide further details on the use of concrete, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify all areas where concrete works are proposed</li> <li>• Specify whether these will be cast in situ or precast and delivered</li> <li>• For in situ concrete pours, including timing, weather conditions, and runoff control</li> <li>• Describe containment measures for concrete washout (e.g. lined washout pits, bunded areas)</li> <li>• Wherever possible look at a control at source approach</li> </ul> <p>These construction works should be minimised during heavy precipitation events and carried out during dry months where practicable. Management and mitigation details should be included in the outline</p>		<p>Construction drainage has been addressed in the ES Volume 3 Appendix 15.4: Outline Drainage Strategy <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.04 ]</b>, as have other potential sources of pollution requiring oil water separation (OWS).</p> <p>Other pollution management techniques associated with bespoke activities such as HDD (or other trenchless methods) is stipulated in the oCEMP which accompanies the DCO Application. The BESS will be designed to provide pollution, drainage and water control in the event of a BESS fire, managed through the oBSMP <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.06]</b>. The other pollution response techniques</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP).</p> <p>Additional narrative/explanation: Concrete/cement contains hexavalent chromium, which is a substance that needs to be controlled due to it being classified as a specific pollutant in relation to surface water.</p>		<p>would be managed through the oCEMP.</p>
Environment Agency	Water Resources and Flood Risk	<p>PEIR Volume 1, Chapters 1 to 4, Sections 2.5.28 and 2.7.12, and Table 4-6; PEIR Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water Resources and Flood Risk, Section 15.8.7</p> <p>Issue: Distances to watercourses have not been specified for HDD works.</p> <p>Impact: Deterioration in the WFD status of a waterbody.</p> <p>Solution: Determine the distance from HDD entry points to watercourses. Ideally this would still be a minimum buffer distance of 10 m from the top of bank of watercourses. Ensure plant and spoil created during HDD remain a minimum buffer distance of 10 m from the bank top of watercourses.</p>	No	<p>HDD will be a minimum of 10 m from watercourses, this is incorporated into the design layouts.</p> <p>The Bentonite Breakout Management Plan will be produced pre-construction but post DCO. A Hydrogeological Risk Assessments and development of monitoring plans will also be produced as required, at watercourse crossings. The proposed Bentonite Breakout Management Plans is cross</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>Additional narrative/explanation: Insufficient distances between launch and reception pits, and watercourses can increase the risk to surface water quality in the event of bentonite breakout. Insufficient distances between plant and spoil, and watercourses can increase the risk of trench sides collapsing, which would provide a pathway for sediment to enter watercourses. A drilling or bentonite breakout plan has not been listed in Table 4-6 as one of the management plans and strategies to be included in the DCO application, despite Chapter 15, Section 15.8.7 stating that there is a "Requirement for a Bentonite Breakout Management Plan for HDD to be produced". If not properly managed, the HDD methodology could impact surface water quality in the event of uncontrolled loss of drilling fluids (frac-out). We would recommend that the Bentonite Breakout Management Plan for HDD is listed in Table</p>		<p>referenced in the context of trenchless crossings to commitments. Further detail is provided in ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]</b> and Chapter 4: Approach to EIA <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.04]</b>.</p> <p>Additionally see Section 15.9 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 15 Water Resources and Flood Risk <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.15]</b>.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>4-6. Reference is made to the use of trenchless cable installation measures at key crossing points in Commitment C7, largely in the context of minimising direct impacts to watercourses and sensitive ecological receptors, and to the preparation of Bentonite Breakout Management Plans under the oCEMP (Commitment G1). The Commitments Register should also include commitments to Water Features Surveys and Hydrogeological Risk Assessments, as required, at watercourse crossings, and to cross reference the proposed Bentonite Breakout Management Plans in the context of trenchless crossings.</p>		
Environment Agency	Water Resources and Flood Risk	<p>PEIR Volume 1, Chapters 1 to 4, Section 2.7.39                      Issue: Omission of key fuel management measures which can be considered best practice.                      Impact: Increased risk of contaminants reaching watercourses because of</p>	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. The outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]) outlines</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>inadequate storage of fuel or soil. This will lead to deterioration in WFD water quality status.</p> <p>Solution: Consider whether additional fuel management measures are required, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Installation of an oil separator (interceptor) or other device to remove oil from water, for areas where fuel and oil are stored in bunded areas on impermeable surfaces;</li> <li>• Limiting re-fuelling to designated re-fuelling areas away from sensitive receptors;</li> <li>• Siting bunded storage areas a minimum of 10 m away from the bank top of all watercourses.</li> </ul> <p>We note that Section 2.7.39 states that fuel storage tanks will be sheltered. Clarification should be provided on whether this means the same as covered, where possible, to prevent the accumulation of rainwater and to prevent accidental damage.</p> <p>Additional narrative/explanation: Any</p>		<p>pollution prevention measures which have also been considered within the Flood Risk Assessment [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>changes or details about fuel management would also need to be amended in Chapter 15, Section 15.9.1 which describes worst case assumptions.</p> <p>Please refer to Pollution prevention for businesses - GOV.UK(<a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/pollution-prevention-for-businesses">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/pollution-prevention-for-businesses</a>) when preparing the pollution prevention plan, oCEMP, outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) and outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP).</p>		
Environment Agency	Water Resources and Flood Risk	<p>PEIR Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water Resources and Flood Risk, Section 15.9.4</p> <p>Issue: Lack of detailed mitigation measures in relation to stockpiling of construction materials and excavated soil.</p> <p>Impact: Risk of sediment contaminating surface waters and deteriorating WFD surface water quality status because of washout, if stored inappropriately.</p>	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. The oCEMP <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b> outlines pollution prevention measures and confirms that a 10 m buffer has been applied to design layouts, and 50 m for Canal and River Trust watercourses.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>Solution: Specify how the proposed pollution prevention measures will mitigate this risk. The CEMP should detail each measure to ensure that stockpiling does not occur. Spoil heaps should remain a minimum buffer distance of 10 m from the top of bank of watercourses.</p> <p>Additional narrative/explanation: As discussed in Section 15.9.4, contaminants could include fuels, oils, chemicals and concrete. If there are concerns about contaminants in the spoil sediment, this could be tested as part of the construction monitoring.</p>		
Environment Agency	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Table 2-1 describes the Solar PV Panels as “bifacial monocrystalline panels, comprising two layers of toughened, low reflectivity glass”. Some solar panels are treated with a PFAS coating. All solar panels should be made per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) free. PFAS are ‘forever chemicals’ that will negatively affect water quality, and	No	The Applicant acknowledges the comment regarding the avoidance of PFAS in solar panel coatings and has confirmed as part of the regular engagement that no panels will be manufactured with PFAS. This has been taken forward for confirmation within the Environmental

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>can have health consequences if they enter drinking water. There are two small areas of Drinking Water Safeguard Zones (DWSgZs) within the 1 km study area. If panels containing PFAS are used, we suggest that there is consideration of this in the OEMP and DEMP. For example, if PFAS coating is damaged, there is a risk of persistent chemicals entering the natural environment during heavy rainfall, washing, maintenance, and removal. We recommend that the panel manufacturers are contacted to identify the materials used, and determine if regular panel washing will occur during the operation and maintenance phase. This will help identify if a pathway could be introduced between the panels and water receptors, for any chemicals in the coating. The OEMP should also incorporate measures to minimise the risk of panel coatings becoming damaged via 'thermal shock', if cleaned whilst at a high temperature due to prolonged</p>		<p>Statement. Where avoidance is not achievable, appropriate mitigation measures will be incorporated and secured through the Environmental Management Plans (EMPs). The Applicant acknowledges the comment regarding the potential use of PFAS coatings on batteries within the BESS compound and the associated increased risk of environmental release during a fire event.</p> <p>The Applicant will seek to avoid the use of PFAS coatings on BESS units. It is currently understood that the BESS containers are proposed to include internal drainage and segregated containment. Where avoidance of PFAS is not achievable, appropriate mitigation and containment measures will be</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>exposure to sunlight. We would also advise against the use of PFAS coatings on batteries to be used at the BESS compound, as this would be at increased risk of release into the environment in the event of a fire, both as airborne emissions and within firefighting runoff. Please refer to CIRIA SuDS Manual (C753) to ensure designs and management of surface water run-off are sufficient. We request to review the following documents from a water quality perspective, prior to them being finalised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• oCEMP;</li> <li>• oOEMP;</li> <li>• oDEMP;</li> <li>• Outline Drainage Strategy;</li> <li>• Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan.</li> </ul>		<p>identified and secured through the oBSMP  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.06]</b>  and associated EMPs.</p>
Environment Agency	Water Resources and Flood Risk	<p>PEIR Volume 3, Appendix 15.1: Flood Risk Assessment (Including Drainage Strategy), Section 9.1.1.4  Issue: It is proposed to use only 300mm</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant can confirm that Freeboard allowances were agreed following the conclusion of Statutory Consultation.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>freeboard above the design event for all infrastructure. Additionally, there is no consideration of the credible maximum scenario, or the possibility of breach scenarios, when proposing the finished floor levels (FFLs) of critical infrastructure on site.</p> <p>Impact: The development may not be resilient in times of a flood, and therefore may fail to remain operational.</p> <p>Solution: Implement a 600mm freeboard where possible, and consider the credible maximum and residual risk when setting the FFLs for all critical infrastructure.</p>		<p>Minimum finished floor levels (FFLs) are to be set to the 1 in 100-year + 31/30% adopted CC allowance + 300mm freeboard OR set to the height of the credible maximum scenario, whichever is higher. In the event voided structures are used, freeboard should be a minimum 600mm, as secured in the Works Plans <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.03]</b>.</p>
Environment Agency	Water Resources and Flood Risk	<p>PEIR Volume 3, Appendix 15.1: Flood Risk Assessment (Including Drainage Strategy), Section 9.1.1.4</p> <p>Issue: The design criteria for new watercourse crossings have not been specified.</p> <p>Impact: Risk of increasing flood risk if crossings are designed inappropriately.</p> <p>Solution: Provide a map indicating locations</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant confirms that there are no proposed new above-ground watercourse crossings of Environment Agency Main Rivers, in either the permanent or temporary scenarios.</p> <p>Where any new crossings are proposed over ordinary</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>of all new crossings and details of the design parameters. Additionally, an assessment should be undertaken to investigate the possible impact such crossings may have on flood risk. This assessment could be made through carrying out hydraulic modelling, including a blockage sensitivity check. All designs should follow the following best practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The soffit height of the bridge must be a minimum of 600mm above the 1 in 100yrs plus climate change allowance flood level;</li> <li>• All abutments must be set back a minimum 1m from the top of bank, and will need to be engineered to have a little impact as possible;</li> <li>• The width of the bridge deck shall be no wider than 4.2m;</li> <li>• Any loss of floodplain due to abutments and ramps will need to be compensated for;</li> <li>• All parapets and railings need to be permeable and open as possible with a</li> </ul>		<p>watercourses, these are identified within ES Volume 1 Chapter 15: Water Resources and Flood Risk <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.15]</b>, and appropriate design parameters outlined for agreement with the relevant authority (LLFA and/or IDB) within the FRA <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01 ]</b>.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>minimum 100mm spacing;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The approach ramp or steps for the bridge shall not extend further than is necessary to allow a gradient of 10% (1 metre vertical for 10 metres horizontal) on the approach.</li> </ul> <p>Additional narrative/explanation: The EA supports the approach to utilising existing crossings where possible. Please note, under GEO1 we have requested that bridge abutments are set-back at least 2m from the riverbanks, to avoid a risk of WFD water quality deterioration.</p>		
Environment Agency	Water Resources and Flood Risk	<p>PEIR Volume 3, Appendix 15.1: Flood Risk Assessment (Including Drainage Strategy), Section 7.4.1.6</p> <p>Issue: No assessment of the impacts on flood risk from the solar panel support frames.</p> <p>Impact: Risk of underestimating flood risk impacts and causing increase in flood risk offsite.</p> <p>Solution: Quantify the impact of solar panel</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the comment regarding the need to assess the potential impacts of solar panel support frames on flood risk, including floodplain storage and flow routes. This is assessed within Section 6.3 of the Flood Risk Assessment</p> <p><b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01]</b></p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>support frames on onsite and offsite flood risk within the final Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). This should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An assessment of the volume of floodplain loss by the solar panels and the impacts this may have on flood extents and flood depths;</li> <li>• An assessment of the impact solar panels may have on flood routes.</li> </ul> <p>Additional narrative/explanation: Any loss of floodplain should be compensated for on a level for level/volume for volume basis, or it should be demonstrated that there is no impact on flood risk to third parties using quantitative methods. Quantitative methods for understanding flood risk impacts of solar panel supports could take the form of detailed hydraulic modelling, and the use of flow constriction areas, or increased areas of Mannings roughness. Alternatively, volumetric approaches may be considered reasonable in areas where flood velocities are low. However volumetric approaches</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>should not be used in areas where there is notable floodplain conveyance. This is because impedance to flow, rather than loss of storage, is likely to be the determining factor in impacts on flood risk elsewhere.</p>		
Environment Agency	Water Resources and Flood Risk	<p>PEIR Volume 3, Appendix 15.1: Flood Risk Assessment (Including Drainage Strategy)                      Issue: No assessment of the impact of the development on flood defences (engineered embankments) within the site boundary, nor is there any discussion of how access for maintenance and emergency incident response will be upheld.                      Impact: Risk of adversely affecting assets which could lead to degradation, thus lowering the standard of protection which they provide. Preventing access to assets in times of flood and/or for maintenance could also cause increases in flood risk.                      Solution: Include an assessment of the development's interactions (above and below ground) and impacts on all assets within the</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant confirms that an assessment of the interactions between the cable corridor and Environment Agency flood defence assets is provided within the FRA <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01]</b>. The Applicant has made commitments within the FRA and associated documentation to ensure that the integrity, function and performance of flood defence assets are protected throughout construction and operation.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>site boundary. Confirm that access to assets will be upheld and where possible improved.</p> <p>Additional narrative/explanation: It is necessary to assess above ground interactions with assets, due to additional crossings and below ground interactions arising from cable crossings interacting with embankment foundations.</p>		
Environment Agency	Water Resources and Flood Risk	<p>PEIR Volume 3, Appendix 15.1: Flood Risk Assessment (Including Drainage Strategy), Section 4.2.1.7</p> <p>Issue: No consideration of whether solar panel support frames will be designed to withstand the forces that would be placed on them during a flood event.</p> <p>Impact: Risk of panel support frames collapsing during times of flood and in turn increasing debris and flood risk to others.</p> <p>Solution: Provide evidence in the final FRA that the solar panel support frames have been designed to withstand the forces that would be placed on them during a flood</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the comment and can confirm it has undertaken sensitivity testing to understand the impact of solar panel support frames, either via roughness testing in areas of high flood velocities or through a simple volumetric assessment where flood velocities are low. This has been completed as part of the Flood Risk Assessment (ES Volume 3 Appendix 15.1: FRA [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01]).</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>event.                      Additional narrative/explanation: It may be prudent to review the velocity, depth, and hazard data from the detailed hydraulic modelling, to confirm that the solar panel support frames are able to withstand the forces that would be placed on them during a flood event. Given that the Credible Maximum climate change scenario is important for assessing development resilience, it would be sensible and conservative to consider this scenario when assessing the potential forces placed on solar panel mounting structures.</p>		<p>Good practice measures, including maintaining panel ground clearances, avoiding solid barriers across the floodplain, and clearing any post-event debris as part of routine maintenance, will further ensure that debris does not materially increase flood risk or affect structural performance. The design of the panels will also ensure that support frames in the floodplain are engineered to withstand anticipated hydrostatic and hydrodynamic forces, as outlined in Section 6.3 of the FRA. These measures are secured through the oCEMP  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b>                      and the Works Plans  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.03].</b></p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Environment Agency	Water Resources and Flood Risk	<p>PEIR Volume 3, Appendix 15.1: Flood Risk Assessment (Including Drainage Strategy), Sections 7.2.2 to 7.2.8</p> <p>Issue: There are potential evidence gaps in the Flood Map for Planning.</p> <p>Impact: Flood risk could be underestimated.</p> <p>Solution: Review Ordinary Watercourses and Internal Drainage Board (IDB) drains which cross the solar panel development areas, and do not appear to associate Flood Zone mapping. Depending on the placement of infrastructure, in some cases more detailed hydraulic modelling may be required so that the risk from these watercourses can be properly understood.</p> <p>Additional narrative/explanation: For some of the solar development sites, there are several small Ordinary Watercourses and IDB drains that do not have any associated Flood Zones due to the small size of their respective catchments. There may be flood risk associated</p>	Yes	<p>Site-specific rainfall-runoff models have been developed for Sites 1 and 2 to assess the risk from smaller IDB drains in more detail, particularly in areas where flood risk could be under-estimated by current River models. The resulting outputs of these site-specific models is included in the final Please refer to the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)</p> <p><b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01]</b></p> <p>The FRA demonstrates, as Sites 3 and 4 are within the extents of Flood Zone 2 and 3 associated with the River Aire, the outputs of the detailed hydraulic modelling for the River Aire in these locations provides a more conservative representation of flood risk and</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>with watercourses which have smaller catchments, it is just not mapped or included within the Flood Map for Planning. For example, in the northern portion of solar development site 1, through the centre of solar development site 3, and within development site 4. With regards to solar development site 3, whilst this area is shown to be within Flood Zone 2, this extent of flooding relates to the River Aire and not the IDB drains which cross the site. Similarly for solar development site 4, the extent of Flood Zone 2 and 3 is defined by the River Aire. It may be appropriate to use the outputs of the detailed hydraulic modelling for the River Aire in these locations, as these may provide a more conservative representation of flood risk and levels, when compared to the smaller IDB watercourses. This should however be considered and supporting evidence provided within the final FRA. The new Risk of Flooding from Surface Water</p>		<p>levels to inform design.</p> <p>The most recent RoFSW dataset published by the EA has also been used to assess the risk posed by smaller IDB drains.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>(RoFSW) dataset published in January 2025 is a useful starting point for establishing the flood risk associated with smaller Ordinary Watercourses. Further information is available online at: New national flood and coastal erosion risk information - GOV.UK. However, please note that where a reliance is being placed on existing flood risk products, such as the RoFSW mapping, clear justification must be provided as to why this is a suitable proxy for representing fluvial flood risk. In some cases, more detailed hydraulic modelling may be required to understand the impacts of flood risk to the development and because of the development; this is pertinent when understanding flood risk to more sensitive infrastructure such as the BESS and substation.</p>		
Environment Agency	Water Resources and Flood Risk	PEIR Volume 3, Appendix 15.1: Flood Risk Assessment (Including Drainage Strategy), Annex H Cable Corridors, Section H.3	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges the comment and a narrative around the sequential planning of

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>Issue: It is not clear whether any mitigation will be required for construction activities within floodplain, such as the storage of spoil from trenching for the cable corridor.</p> <p>Impact: Risk of increasing flood risk through construction activities.</p> <p>Solution: Take a sequential approach for construction activities, ensuring spoil is placed outside of the functional floodplain and Flood Zone 3 where possible. This should be made clear in the final FRA.</p>		<p>construction activities is included in the FRA  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01 ]</b> and includes measures such as the storage of spoil outside of Flood Zone 3 where practicable.</p>
Environment Agency	Water Resources and Flood Risk	<p>PEIR Volume 3, Appendix 15.1: Flood Risk Assessment (Including Drainage Strategy)</p> <p>Issue: Further detail required regarding the EA Flood Storage Area which is located within the draft Order Limits.</p> <p>Impact: Risk of lowering the level of protection offered by the EA Flood Storage Area.</p> <p>Solution: Commit to not altering the land in this area and include the provision of buffer zones for the defences in place. Evidence in</p>	Yes	The Applicant can confirm that the area referred to has been removed from the Order Limits.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>the final FRA that the level of protection offered by the EA Flood Storage Area will not be altered as a result of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Additional narrative/explanation: The EA Flood Storage Area is located South East of Birkin along the River Aire (approximate central national grid reference: SE5533426468)</p>		
Environment Agency	Water Resources and Flood Risk	<p>PEIR Volume 3, Appendix 1.3: Commitments Register</p> <p>Issue: Lack of detail regarding how Commitment C15 will minimise the creation of pathways which may cause pollution to groundwater (to be secured via the oCEMP).</p> <p>Impact: Potential for piling to impact groundwater quality if the risks are not adequately identified and managed. This will lead to deterioration in WFD water quality status.</p> <p>Solution: Ensure the oCEMP refers to current industry best practice methods and</p>	Yes	<p>Commitment to the production of a Foundation Works Risk Assessment for any required piling activities, particularly the BESS and substation sites, to be secured via the oCEMP</p> <p><b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02].</b></p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>guidance. Include a Commitment to the production of a Foundation Works Risk Assessment for any required piling activities, particularly the BESS and substation sites, to be secured via the oCEMP.</p> <p>Additional narrative/explanation: Due to the presence of high sensitivity aquifers across a significant portion of the Proposed Development and the variability of superficial deposits in terms of thickness and cohesiveness, piled foundations could create new contaminant migration pathways into the underlying aquifers. The Foundation Works Risk Assessment should be undertaken before making decisions on pile type. This assessment, in line with CL:AIRE guidance should be a principal determining factor in which pile types are chosen rather than an afterthought. Please note that CL:AIRE's piling guidance was updated in March 2025: Piling and Penetrative Ground Improvement Methods on Land Affected by Contamination:</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>Guidance on Pollution Prevention. We note that the BESS and Substation developments may involve the use of raft and piled foundation solutions. No maximum anticipated depth of piling is currently provided. This activity could result in penetration fully or substantively through the underlying superficial deposits, potentially opening a migration pathway into the underlying Principal aquifer where present. We anticipate the proposed ground investigation (Commitment D5) will enable assessment of these risks. BGS mapping of superficial deposits is often inferred. Ground Investigation may be particularly pertinent in areas requiring foundation works (i.e. BESS and substation developments) and more thorough investigation may be required at proposed HDD crossing points, where sensitive groundwater receptors and designations such as groundwater dependent terrestrial ecosystems (GWDTEs)</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		and groundwater Source Protection Zones (SPZs).		
Environment Agency	Water Resources and Flood Risk	<p>PEIR Volume 3, Appendix 1.3: Commitments Register; PEIR Volume 3, Appendix 15.1: Flood Risk Assessment (Including Drainage Strategy), Sections 8.4.1.6, 8.4.1.7 and 8.4.1.14</p> <p>Issue: An infiltration drainage solution is being considered for BESS and substation.</p> <p>Impact: Risk of contaminants being released into groundwater bodies from spills and leaks during normal operation. This will lead to deterioration in WFD water quality status.</p> <p>Solution: Ensure measures to identify and manage spills and leaks during operation are in place, should an infiltration drainage solution be adopted for these structures. Consider the use of sentinel monitoring systems to provide early warning of fugitive emissions to the water environment.</p> <p>Additional narrative/explanation: Although automated fire water management systems</p>	No	<p>The Applicant confirms that the drainage strategy for the BESS includes provision for infiltration under normal operational conditions only, subject to future ground investigation and confirmation of infiltration rates according to LLFA guidance. In the event of a fire or pollution incident, appropriate measures for firewater containment and controlled discharge will be implemented to prevent contaminated runoff from infiltrating to ground or entering the wider environment. These measures are set out within the Outline Drainage Strategy</p> <p><b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.04 ]</b> and will be further detailed and secured through the oBSMP</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>are proposed to prevent discharge of fire water from a BESS fire, the potential for contaminants released from spills and leaks to enter groundwater bodies cannot be fully discounted. Firewater and other chemicals from BESS and the substation pose an unacceptable risk water quality unless they are contained sufficiently. Due to the risk of chemicals in contaminated firewater, tankering offsite would be more appropriate than treating and discharging. We ask that, where practicable, consideration is given to positioning elements of the Proposed Development with relatively high contamination potential (specifically the BESS Compound and substations) in areas where they pose the least risk of causing pollution of the underlying aquifers. We are pleased to note that Figure 2.1 shows that the potential BESS and 275Kv substations in Solar Development Site 2 are proposed to be positioned in the south-west of the Site,</p>		<p><b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.06]</b> and the oCEMP  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b>.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>where groundwater vulnerability is indicated to be relatively low compared with the remainder of the Site. This should be subject to review based on the findings of the ground investigation. The following scenario should be taken forward into any detailed design stage for BESS drainage design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A fire takes place in a BESS battery container and the fire suppression system is activated, automatically closing the drainage system. The suppression system ultimately extinguishes the fire, but the fire water is contaminated by the fire damaged batteries (PFAS, etc.). If a gravel attenuation substrate is used, consider how any sorbed contamination in this substrate is managed, as this could act as an ongoing secondary source of contamination of rainwater runoff, following the removal of contaminated firewater post-event. If the substrate is found to have an ongoing issue, consider if all containers need to be removed to enable</li> </ul>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>remediation of this material. Catchment zoning and isolation should be considered in this case. Alternatively, an above-ground attenuation system would make managing sediment or surface contamination easier. Commitment O10 commits to a drainage design allowing for fire-water containment. This should be amended to unambiguously allow for containment of all firefighting runoff reasonably anticipated to be generated in a BESS fire event, as indicated in Volume 3 Appendix 15.1 Flood Risk Assessment Section 8.4.1.6 and 8.4.1.7. Commitment G3 commits to the preparation of an oDEMP, however no reference to anticipated sub-plans is provided, as per the oCEMP. These should be identified.</p>		
Environment Agency	Water Resources and Flood Risk	<p>As shown in Volume 2 Figure 2.1 Site Location and PEIR Assessment Area, Proposed Cable Construction Compound 4 is indicated to be located directly on Principal aquifer (Sherwood Sandstone Group), or on</p>	Yes	<p>Through design review, Cable Construction Compound 4 has been positioned directly on Sherwood Sandstone as this balanced the risk between</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>potentially highly permeable Secondary A aquifer (Superficial Lacustrine Beach Deposits). There is an increased risk that spills and leaks of chemical contaminants from the construction compound could enter the underlying Aquifers and therefore result in adverse impacts to water quality. We encourage consideration of whether this proposed construction compound can be sited in another location along the Cable Corridor, where relatively low permeability superficial deposits are anticipated to be present and risks to groundwater would be reduced.</p> <p>Section 2.9.3 of Chapter 2 states that decommissioning activities would involve the removal of all solar infrastructure, including the solar PV modules, BESS and all associated infrastructure to 1.2m, and that any cable connections within Cable Corridors would remain in situ following</p>		<p>groundwater quality and flooding at the site. This site is referenced specifically in the assessment to ensure appropriate mitigation measures are undertaken to not contaminate the aquifer.</p> <p>The Applicant can confirm that the Cable Route Corridor doesn't pass through SPZ1 or SPZ2</p> <p>No fluid filled cables are used within the design, cables will be PFAS free where practicable, these measures are secured within the oCEMP  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b>.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>decommissioning. If buried cables are to be retained, it must be demonstrated that they would not pose a significant risk to Controlled Waters via degradation and/or damage from future agricultural activities. We recommend that underground cables are inherently free of PFAS where possible. Details of proposed underground cable design are not currently provided. We urge the developer to avoid the use of fluid-filled cables within the Proposed Development. In accordance with Position Statement C5 of 'the Environment Agency's approach to groundwater protection' the Environment Agency will normally object to pipelines or fluid filled cables that transport pollutants, particularly hazardous substances that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pass through SPZ1 or SPZ2 where this is avoidable;</li> <li>• Are below the water table* in principal or secondary aquifers.</li> </ul> <p>*For the purposes of the position statement,</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>the term 'water table' is taken to mean any laterally continuous groundwater including perched groundwater. Operators should consider the lifetime of the pipeline or cable in their assessment of the depth to groundwater.</p> <p>Fluid filled cables would also represent a potentially significant source of contamination if retained in-situ following the decommissioning phase, as these would ultimately degrade over time resulting in pollutant release. Although the majority of the Proposed Development lies outside designated groundwater Source Protection Zones, one cable corridor passes through the Yorkshire Water Brayton SPZ3 area. A portion of this Section of the cable corridor is shown on BGS maps to be directly underlain by Sherwood Sandstone Group mPrincipal aquifer bedrock, or else by likely high permeability Lacustrine Beach Deposits (Secondary A aquifer). This may present a</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		direct migration pathway to the underlying Principal aquifer for any mobile contamination which might be released.		
Environment Agency	DCO Process	<p>Consents strategy</p> <p>A number of permits and licences may be required to facilitate this scheme. Should you wish to disapply any element of these proposals, details of this should be provided to the EA a minimum of 6 months prior to DCO submission. We will require a consenting strategy document to be submitted in support of the proposals, which outlines a programme of managing the various consents and permits. We require confirmation of whether these will be subsumed within the DCO process, or as standalone permits. We recommend early engagement with National Permitting Service (NPS) and full use of their enhanced pre-application advice service. This will ensure the permitting requirements and implications are fully understood and addressed in good</p>	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and has prepared the Other Consents and Licences Statement <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.04]</b> which details the permits and licences required to facilitate the Proposed Development. The Applicant is proposing to disapply the requirement for separate flood risk activity permits and has provided protective provisions for the Environment Agency within the draft DCO in respect of this.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		time to inform PINS' decision-making process. Twin tracking is recommended for those applications considered fundamental to the DCO.		
Environment Agency	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Discharge to surface water and groundwater If the treatment and discharge of firewater is being consider, then you would need to apply for a permit. Given the timeframe to determine environmental permits, we encourage applicants to engage with us on permit requirements at the earliest possible stage. A permit does not mean a deterioration will be accepted for a water course, and therefore may not be granted. Only clean, uncontaminated water should be discharged to surface water or groundwater, and any permits need to be planned for well in advance of construction. Discharging runoff to watercourses has the potential to transport pollutants such as herbicides/pesticides/nitrates/phosphates and silt, and should be a last resort with	No	The Applicant acknowledges this comment; the requirements are included in the FRA <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01 ]</b> . A discharge hierarchy is presented with the Outline Drainage Strategy <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.04 ]</b> and the oBSMP <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.06]</b> . As the discharge of contaminated firewater to the environment is not permitted without an Environmental Permit, only water confirmed as uncontaminated and safe for release would be discharged in a controlled manner to the local drainage network. This approach

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		mitigation in place to reduce the impact. Additional guidance in relation to discharging and permits is available at the following links: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/discharges-to-surface-water-and-groundwater-environmental-permits">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/discharges-to-surface-water-and-groundwater-environmental-permits</a> <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/get-advice-before-you-apply-for-an-environmental-permit">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/get-advice-before-you-apply-for-an-environmental-permit</a>		ensures that environmental protection is maintained under both normal and emergency conditions. This sets out that at first instance discharge will be collected for non-potable use. Where there is the need to discharge into surface water and groundwater for which permits are be required, these will be applied for as soon as identified.
Environment Agency	Water management / Battery Storage	BESS design Additional management practices and designs for the containment of firewater includes the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of how the onward movement through a SuDS-based drainage system would ensure that the bunded lagoon does not fill up with rainwater, therefore allowing the lagoon to remain empty and ready to accommodate fire water. This is not described in the documents.</li> </ul>		The Applicant acknowledges the comments.  The drainage strategy presented at PEIR stage was indicative in nature, reflecting the fact that the outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.06]</b> ) and firewater containment strategy was still in development at that time.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sections 8.4.1.8 and 8.1.4.11 suggest that runoff at the BESS may be controlled via a penstock chamber that can be closed automatically, or manually, in the event of a fire, to prevent runoff from entering the drainage system downstream. The Applicant should ensure that the design of the BESS drainage allows for:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o the capture of all reasonably anticipated firefighting runoff, in combination with water derived from a rainfall event, pending testing and appropriate disposal.</li> <li>o The system should incorporate a penstock automatically triggered in the event of a BESS fire.                                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The oOEMP should include ongoing maintenance and testing of the penstock valve(s) as traditional penstocks, when not operated for a long period of time, have historically been known mto seize up and thus be inoperable at times of emergency.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<p>Any SuDS features proposed to also function in the containment of firewater runoff will be designed to accommodate the 1 in 100-year rainfall event, inclusive of climate change allowances, in addition to the anticipated volume of firewater runoff.</p> <p>The Applicant's OBSMP <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.06]</b> stipulates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site and BESS design principles and ERP content will ensure that North Yorkshire Fire &amp; Rescue Service (NYFRS) are expected to employ a defensive strategy i.e. only boundary cooling should be employed for cooling of adjacent BESS or</li> </ul>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarifying that the bunded lagoon could contain sufficient volumes of firewater, even in a worst-case scenario of heavy rainfall.</li> <li>• Ensuring the bunded lagoon and drainage system are cleaned after a firefighting event, before the free-flow between the lagoon and the SuDSbased drainage system is reopened.</li> </ul> <p>For further guidance, we recommend the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fire prevention plans: environmental permits - GOV.UK</li> <li>• Health and safety in grid scale electrical energy storage systems (accessible webpage) - GOV.UK</li> <li>• CIRIA's Containment systems for the prevention of pollution (C736)</li> </ul> <p>The use of BESS is not currently regulated under the Environmental Permitting Regulations (EPR). You should monitor and keep abreast of regulatory developments to</p>		<p>associated supporting equipment, this ensures that environmental pollution risks are minimised. Boundary cooling typically involves firefighters directing water fog or spray pattern discharge to ensure the incident does not spread to adjacent BESS enclosures. NFCC guidance states: "If it can be confirmed that the recommended firefighting tactic for the BESS is to defensively fire fight and boundary cool whilst allowing the BESS to consume itself, this will reduce the water requirements, and thus the drainage/environmental protection requirements significantly." A BESS design which may require direct</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>avoid potential delays during the construction/commissioning phases, should BESS come into the remit of EPR in the future.</p>		<p>NYFRS firefighting engagement tactics will not be selected for this facility;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The BESS scheme will integrate an external firefighting water capture drainage system. In the event of a fire a system of automatically self-actuating valves at the outfalls from the BESS areas will be closed, isolating the BESS areas drainage from the wider environment. Fire water runoff may contain particles from a fire; the runoff must be contained and tested before being allowed to discharge to the local watercourses. The water contained by the valves will be tested and released or, if</li> </ul>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>necessary, removed by tanker and treated offsite (in consultation with the relevant consultees at the time). Pollution analysis will always be conducted before removing from site (if polluted) or releasing into drainage systems, if safe to do so; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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 water used for external boundary cooling of BESS and</li> </ul>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>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.</p>
Mua Group	Protective Provisions	<p>Mua Group submitted a plan showing the assets that they operate that may be affected by the Proposed Development.</p>	No	<p>Mua Group's assets are outside of the Order Limits and therefore will not be affected by the Proposed Development.</p>
Forestry Commission	Biodiversity	<p>Ancient Woodlands (ASNW/PAWS) and Ancient &amp; Veteran Trees (AVT) Ancient woodlands, and ancient &amp; veteran trees, are irreplaceable. They have great value</p>	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. The Proposed Development has been designed to avoid impacts on identified ancient/veteran trees and ancient woodland. Existing</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>because they have a long history of woodland cover, with many features remaining undisturbed, including immensely complex ecological processes and relationships, above and below the ground. This applies equally to Ancient Semi Natural Woodland (ASNW), Plantations on Ancient Woodland Sites (PAWS) and ancient and veteran trees (AVT). It is Government policy to refuse development that will result in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats including ancient woodlands and/or ancient and veteran trees, unless "there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists" (National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 186c). It is not possible to fully compensate for the loss of irreplaceable habitat.</p>		<p>woodland and hedgerows will be retained wherever practicable. Vegetation removal will be minimised and limited to areas necessary for access points, cable routing, and fencing. Where removal is unavoidable, reinstatement will be undertaken. A minimum 15 m buffer or the Root Protection Area (RPA), whichever is greater, will be maintained around ancient and veteran trees. A minimum 10 m buffer or the RPA, whichever is greater, will be maintained around non-ancient woodland (as identified in the National Forestry Inventory and site surveys). For all other non-ancient/non-veteran trees, a minimum 5 m buffer or the RPA will be provided where practicable. These measures are detailed in the</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				oCEMP [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02] and oLEMP [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05].
Forestry Commission	Biodiversity	Light Valley Solar It is understood that the current Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA, June 2025), only assesses trees and woodlands associated with the proposed Solar Development Sites, and not the Cable Corridor Options. When specific cable routes are considered, a similar assessment of trees and woodlands should be undertaken. An area of ancient woodland known as Gilbertsons Plantation is discussed in the EIA Scoping Opinion of 19 December 2024. The joint Natural England and Forestry Commission Standing	No	Potential impacts on Gilbertsons Plantation are discussed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 16: Other Environmental Matters [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.16] including changes in light levels reaching the woodland, edges and its connected habitats, during any part of the day, that have the potential to cause changes in flora, with a consequent impact to invertebrates, other fauna and fungi communities. Plantations, and more widely, trees, woodlands and hedges within and within influencing distance of the Order Limits, comprising the Solar Development Sites, Cable Route

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>Advice on Ancient Woodland advises that proposals in proximity to ancient woodland should have a buffer of at least 15 m. Consideration should be given to whether this minimum buffer is sufficient to ensure no degradation of the ancient woodland habitat occurs. Given the nature of the proposal, it is important to consider that any changes in light levels reaching the woodland, edges and its connected habitats, during any part of the day, have the potential to cause changes in flora, with a consequent impact to invertebrates, other fauna and fungi communities.</p> <p>The AIA identifies 7 trees as ancient and/or veteran, along with required buffer zones. The AIA also identifies 1 tree, T310, as appearing to be a tree recorded in the Ancient Tree</p>		<p>Corridor (with associated access points and visibility splays) and highways improvements areas have been assessed as part of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (ES Volume 3 Appendix 16.2 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.02 ]</b>).</p> <p>The proposed design avoids impacts on both ancient/veteran trees identified in the survey and on the ATI, and ancient woodland. Both features will be adequately protected by exclusion during construction. Buffers around ancient/veteran trees have been established based on Natural England Standing advice; buffers around ancient woodland are at least 25 m. No construction activity will take place within the buffers.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>Inventory, which is managed by the Woodland Trust, however the AIA does not concur with the Ancient Tree Inventory/Woodland Trust on the classification of this tree as ancient or veteran. To ensure no loss and/or deterioration of an ancient and/or veteran tree, it is advisable to consult with the Woodland Trust on this matter</p>		
Forestry Commission	Biodiversity	<p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</b>                      In considering Biodiversity Net Gain for this proposal, we would strongly encourage the integration of trees and woodlands as part of the overall landscape and habitat design. Well placed tree and woodland planting can bring multiple benefits to a solar development — including visual screening, soil stabilisation, slowing of rain/water run-off, microclimate regulation and enhanced connectivity for</p>	No	<p>The inclusion of locally appropriate, climate-resilient tree species has been included in the post development landscape plans for BNG gains and wider ecological benefits. Full details of the gains are set out in the BNG Report <b>[EN011012/APP/LVS/05.09]</b>.</p> <p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>wildlife. Beyond the solar sites themselves, the proposed cable corridors present a valuable opportunity to create or extend linear woodland features, offering shelter, biodiversity value and long-term natural capital gains. We would welcome proposals that reflect not just the numerical uplift required under BNG, but that contribute meaningfully to expanding, protecting, improving and connecting trees and woodland habitats in the landscape. Where trees are proposed, we would like to highlight the value of the use of locally appropriate, climate-resilient species to maximise ecological value, overall resilience and long-term success. This approach would also align with wider government ambitions for woodland</p>		<p>gain. The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP, [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]).</p> <p>Tree and woodland planting is not proposed within the cable corridor in order to minimise the impacts of the Proposed Development on landowners and enable the land to be returned to its existing use post-construction.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		expansion, nature recovery and landscape resilience.		
Forestry Commission	Biodiversity	<p>Joint Natural England and Forestry Commission Standing Advice on Ancient Woodland</p> <p>For more information on the impacts of development on ancient woodland and how to assess these, please see the joint Forestry Commission /Natural England Standing Advice on Ancient Woodland – “Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions”, the supporting guidance included within it, and Keepers of Time – A Statement of Policy for England’s Ancient and Native Woodland (published June 2005).</p> <p>The standing advice also provides information on mitigation, including the use of buffers.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment, the Arboricultural Impact Assessment <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.02]</b>, assessed as part of ES Volume 1 Chapter 16: Other Environmental Matters <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.16]</b> has assessed the requirement for a greater than 15 m buffer from ancient woodland, considering if there are any anticipated effects of air pollution from increased traffic and/or industrial processes, or increased light and noise pollution disturbing fauna (bats feeding, invertebrates etc.).</p> <p>The Proposed Development design avoids impacts on both</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>Proposals in proximity to ancient woodland should have a buffer zone of at least 15 m from the boundary of the woodland. Where assessment shows other impacts are likely to extend beyond this distance, for example the effects of air pollution from increased traffic and/or industrial processes, increased light and noise pollution disturbing fauna (bats feeding in invertebrates etc.), the proposal is likely to require a larger buffer zone. We would be keen to engage further with the developer in relation to any mitigation and compensation strategies.</p> <p>In relation to non-ancient woodland and trees, we would like to draw your attention to paragraph 131 of the NPPF which states that planning policies and decisions should ensure</p>		<p>ancient/veteran trees identified in the survey and on the Ancient Tree Inventory (ATI), and ancient woodland. Both features will be adequately protected by exclusion during construction. Buffers around ancient/veteran trees have been established based on Natural England Standing advice; buffers around ancient woodland are at least 25 m. No construction activity will take place within the buffers other than the erecting of site security fencing, which would be made of deer wire mesh affixed to wooden posts.</p> <p>The Applicant will replant trees and hedges lost along the cable route within the cable route corridor where practicable, subject to detailed design works, as set out in</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>that existing trees are retained wherever possible.</p> <p>What is most important to the Forestry Commission in this case is that there will be no loss or detrimental impact as a result of this proposed development on ancient woodland or ancient and veteran trees, as mentioned above.</p>		<p>and secured through the outline Construction Environment Management Plan (oCEMP, [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]).</p>
NGT (National Gas)	Protective Provisions	<p>NGT has 2 feeder mains located within or in proximity to the Order limits. Details of this infrastructure is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Feeder Main – FM07 – Cawood to Susworth T West</li> <li>▪ Feeder Main – FM29 – Asselby to Pannal</li> <li>▪ Cathodic Protection Groundbeds/TR</li> <li>▪ Ancillary apparatus</li> </ul> <p>Please note that NGT has existing easements for these pipelines which provides rights for ongoing access and prevents the erection of</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that National Gas has assets and existing easements within its proposed Order Limits and is engaging with National Gas to ensure its assets are appropriately protected.</p> <p>The Land Rights Negotiations Tracker [EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.04] submitted with the Application sets out the Proposed Development's</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>permanent / temporary buildings/structures, change to existing ground levels or storage of materials etc within the easement strip.</p>		<p>requirement for the land in which National Gas has an interest.</p> <p>The Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of National Gas within the draft DCO <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/03.01]</b> submitted with the Application, and will continue to engage with National Gas to determine if amendments are needed to these Protective Provisions or any associated Side Agreement.</p> <p>The design of the Proposed Development has accounted for the position of National Gas' assets by ensuring there are adequate stand offs from the components of the Proposed Development. Where interaction National Gas' assets is possible, appropriate construction</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				and operational methodologies will be employed as specified within the protective provisions within the draft DCO.
NGT (National Gas)	Protective Provisions	<p><b>CATHODIC PROTECTION SYSTEM</b>                      To ensure a high level of safety and reliability in operation, National Gas Transmission's assets are protected by a cathodic protection system. It is essential that buried steel pipework associated with the transmission and distribution of natural gas is designed, installed, commissioned and maintained to withstand the potentially harmful effects of corrosion and that the corrosion control systems employed are monitored to ensure continued effectiveness. Installations in the vicinity of National Gas Transmission's assets which may potentially interfere</p>	Yes	As noted above, the Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of National Gas within the draft DCO submitted with the Application, and will continue to engage with National Gas to determine if amendments are needed to these Protective Provisions or any associated Side Agreement.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>with the cathodic protection system must be assessed and approved by National Gas Transmission, and appropriate control measures must be put in place where required.</p> <p>Installations which have the potential to interfere with National Gas Transmission's Cathodic protection system include (but are not limited to):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. High voltage cable crossings and parallelism</li> <li>2. High voltage ac pylon parallelism</li> <li>3. Battery Energy Storage Systems</li> <li>4. Third party pipelines with cathodic protection systems</li> <li>5. PV Solar arrays</li> </ol> <p>Further information on D.C interference can be found in UKOPA/GPG/031 Edition C Microsoft Word                      - UKOPA GPG 031 DC Interference Ed 1.docx</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
NGT (National Gas)	Protective Provisions	The safe limits for transfer voltage and impressed current that a high-pressure gas pipeline can be exposed to are outlined in T/PL/ECP/1, T/PL/ECP/2 and BS EN 50122-1. These are the safe limits for non-electrically trained personnel.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
NGT (National Gas)	Protective Provisions	<p>Where the Promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with any of NGT's apparatus, NGT will require appropriate protection and further discussion on the impact to its apparatus and rights including adequate Protective Provisions. A Deed of Consent will also be required for any works proposed within the easement strip.</p> <p>Key Considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NGT has a Deed of Grant of Easement for each pipeline, which prevents the erection of permanent / temporary buildings, or structures, change to existing ground levels,</li> </ul>	Yes	<p>The Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of National Gas within the draft DCO submitted with the Application, and will continue to engage with National Gas to determine if amendments are needed to these Protective Provisions or any associated Side Agreement.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the need for a Deed of Consent and will discuss this further with National Gas. The Applicant confirms that such an agreement will flow from the</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>storage of materials etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please be aware that written permission is required before any works commence within the NGT easement strip. Furthermore a Deed of Consent will be required prior to commencement of works within NGT's easement strip subject to approval by NGT's plant protection team.</li> <li>• Any large installations which may result in a large population increase in the vicinity of a high pressure gas pipeline must comply with the HSE's Land Use Planning methodology, and the HSE response should be submitted to National Gas Transmission for review.</li> <li>• The below guidance is not exhaustive and all works in the vicinity of NGT's asset shall be subject to review and approval from NGT's</li> </ul>		<p>protections within the Protective Provisions.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		plant protection team in advance of commencement of works on site.		
NGT (National Gas)	Protective Provisions	<p>General Notes on Pipeline Safety:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>You should be aware of the Health and Safety Executives guidance document HS(G) 47 "Avoiding Danger from Underground Services", and NGT's Dial Before You Dig Specification for Safe Working in the Vicinity of NGT Assets. There will be additional requirements dictated by NGT's plant protection team.</li> <li>NGT will also need to ensure that its pipelines remain accessible during and after completion of the works.</li> <li>Our pipelines are normally buried to a depth cover of 1.1 metres, however actual depth and position must be confirmed on site by trial hole investigation under the supervision of a NGT</li> </ul>	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges this general guidance. The Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of National Gas within the draft DCO submitted with the Application, and will continue to engage with National Gas to determine if amendments are needed to these Protective Provisions or any associated Side Agreement.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>representative. Ground cover above our pipelines should not be reduced or increased.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If any excavations are planned within 3 metres of NGT High Pressure Pipeline or, within 10 metres of an AGI (Above Ground Installation), or if any embankment or dredging works are proposed then the actual position and depth of the pipeline must be established on site in the presence of a NGT representative. A safe working method agreed prior to any work taking place in order to minimise the risk of damage and ensure the final depth of cover does not affect the integrity of the pipeline.</li> </ul>		
NGT (National Gas)	Protective Provisions	Below are some examples of work types that have specific restrictions when being undertaken in the vicinity of gas assets therefore consultation with NGT's Plant Protection	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges these examples of work types in the vicinity of National Gas' apparatus, relevantly including 'solar farm installation', which will therefore

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>team is essential:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Demolition</li> <li>▪ Blasting</li> <li>▪ Piling and boring</li> <li>▪ Deep mining</li> <li>▪ Surface mineral extraction</li> <li>▪ Landfilling</li> <li>▪ Trenchless Techniques (e.g. HDD, pipe splitting, tunnelling etc.)</li> <li>▪ Wind turbine installation - minimum separation distance of 1.5x the mast/hub height is required, and any auxiliary installations such as cable or track crossings will require a deed of consent.</li> <li>▪ Solar farm installation</li> <li>▪ Tree planting schemes</li> </ul>		<p>require consultation with National Gas' Plant Protection team.</p> <p>The Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of National Gas within the draft DCO submitted with the Application, and will continue to engage with National Gas to determine if amendments are needed to these Protective Provisions or any associated Side Agreement.</p> <p>The design of the Proposed Development has accounted for the position of National Grid's assets by ensuring there are adequate stand offs from the components of the Proposed Development. Where interaction National Grid's assets is possible, appropriate construction</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				and operational methodologies will be employed as specified within the protective provisions within the draft DCO.
NGT (National Gas)	Traffic and Movement/ Protective Provisions.	<p>Traffic Crossings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where existing roads cannot be used, construction traffic should ONLY cross the pipeline at agreed locations.</li> <li>• Permanent road crossings will require a surface load calculation, and will require a deed of consent.</li> <li>• The pipeline shall be protected, at the crossing points, by temporary rafts constructed at ground level. The third party shall review ground conditions, vehicle types and crossing frequencies to determine the type and construction of the raft required.</li> <li>• The type of raft shall be agreed with NGT</li> </ul>	Yes	<p>As per response above. The Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of National Gas within the draft DCO submitted with the Application, and will continue to engage with National Gas to determine if amendments are needed to these Protective Provisions or any associated Side Agreement.</p> <p>The design of the Proposed Development has accounted for the position of National Grid's assets by ensuring there are adequate stand offs from the components of the Proposed Development. Where interaction National Grid's assets is</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>prior to installation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No protective measures including the installation of concrete slab protection shall be installed over or near to the NGT pipeline without the prior permission of NGT</li> <li>• NGT will need to agree the material, the dimensions and method of installation of the proposed protective measure.</li> <li>• The method of installation shall be confirmed through the submission of a formal written method statement from the contractor to NGT.</li> <li>• An NGT representative shall monitor any works within close proximity to the pipeline to comply with NGT specification T/SP/SSW22</li> </ul>		<p>possible, appropriate construction and operational methodologies will be employed as specified within the protective provisions within the draft DCO.</p>
NGT (National Gas)	Protective Provisions	<p>New Asset Crossings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New assets (cables/pipelines etc) may cross the pipeline at perpendicular angle to the pipeline i.e. 90 degrees.</li> <li>• The separation distance for a cable &gt;33kV</li> </ul>	Yes	<p>As per response above. The Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of National Gas within the draft DCO submitted with the Application, and</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>is 1000mm and pre and post energisation surveys may be required at National Gas Transmission's discretion. A risk assessment/method statement will need to be provided to, and accepted by National Gas Transmission prior to the deed of consent being agreed. Where a new asset is to cross over the pipeline a clearance distance of 0.6 metres between the crown of the pipeline and underside of the service should be maintained. If this cannot be achieved the service shall cross below the pipeline with a clearance distance of 0.6 metres.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new service should not be laid parallel within an easement strip</li> <li>• Clearance must be at least 600mm above or below the pipeline</li> <li>• An NGT representative shall approve and supervise any cable crossing of a pipeline.</li> <li>• A Deed of Consent is required for any cable crossing the easement</li> </ul>		<p>will continue to engage with National Gas to determine if amendments are needed to these Protective Provisions or any associated Side Agreement.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the need for a Deed of Consent and will discuss this further with National Gas. The Applicant confirms that such an agreement will flow from the protections within the Protective Provisions.</p> <p>The design of the Proposed Development has accounted for the position of National Grid's assets by ensuring there are adequate stand offs from the components of the Proposed Development. Where interaction National Grid's assets is possible, appropriate construction</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>Where the promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with any of NGT apparatus, protective provisions will be required in a form acceptable to it to be included within the DCO. NGT requests to be consulted at the earliest stages to ensure that the most appropriate protective provisions are included within the DCO application to safeguard the integrity of our apparatus and to remove the requirement for objection. Adequate access to NGT pipelines must be maintained at all times during construction and post construction to ensure the safe operation of our network.</p>		<p>and operational methodologies will be employed as specified within the protective provisions within the draft DCO.</p>
<p>Natural England</p>	<p>Biodiversity</p>	<p>CONSERVATION OF HABITATS &amp; SPECIES REGULATION 2017 (AS AMENDED)                      1.0 Internationally designated sites                      The development site is within or may impact on the following                      European/internationally designated</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>A Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) has been completed and includes the designated sites listed <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.11]</b>.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>nature conservation sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Skipwith Common (SAC)</li> <li>• Lower Derwent Valley (SAC)</li> <li>• Lower Derwent Valley (Ramsar)</li> <li>• River Derwent (SAC)</li> <li>• Humber Estuary Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</li> <li>• Humber Estuary Ramsar</li> </ul> <p>Natural England notes that a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) has not yet been completed.</p> <p>It is Natural England's advice that the proposal is not directly connected with or necessary for the management of the European site. You should therefore determine whether the proposal is likely to have a significant effect on any European site, proceeding to the appropriate assessment stage where significant effects cannot be ruled out.</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>The HRA screening should consider potential likely significant effects on the European Sites specified above. We recommend you consider potential likely significant effects on these sites arising from the impact pathways identified in Natural England's EIA Scoping response and detailed below, in addition to any other potential impact pathways identified during the assessment</p>		
Natural England	Biodiversity	<p>As discussed with the applicant through our Discretionary Advice Service (DAS), the following can be scoped out of any further assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strensall Common (SAC)</li> <li>• Thorne &amp; Hatfield Moors (SPA)</li> <li>• Thorne Moor (SAC)</li> <li>• Hatfield Moor (SAC)</li> <li>• Kirk Deighton (SAC)</li> <li>• Denby Grange Colliery Ponds (SAC)</li> </ul>	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Natural England	Ornithology	<p>1.1 Humber Estuary SPA and Lower Derwent Valley SPA</p> <p>SPAs are classified for rare and vulnerable birds. Many of these sites are designated for mobile species that may also rely on areas outside of the site boundary. These supporting habitats may be used by SPA bird populations or some individuals of the population for some or all of the time.</p> <p>These supporting habitats can play an essential role in maintaining SPA species populations, and proposals affecting them may therefore have the potential to affect the European site.</p> <p>We note that bird survey results will be presented in the Environmental Statement (ES), following the completion of surveys in April to September 2025. Natural England therefore cannot provide</p>	No	<p>The Applicant acknowledges Natural England's advice. All breeding, wintering and passage bird surveys were completed prior to submission of the Environmental Statement and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), and the results have been fully incorporated into ES Volume 1 Chapter 12: Ornithology <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.12]</b> and the HRA <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.11]</b>.</p> <p>The assessment explicitly considers the use of supporting habitats outside SPA boundaries by mobile species associated with the Lower Derwent Valley and Humber Estuary SPA and Ramsar sites, through a detailed and precautionary assessment of Functionally Linked Land (FLL).</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>detailed advice at this stage. We advise that the wintering/passage bird survey results should be considered in the context of the Lower Derwent Valley SPA and Humber Estuary SPA in the HRA, and we will provide detailed comments on potential impacts on SPA birds once consulted. However, we advise that based on the information presented in Chapter 12 – Ornithology, mitigation for loss of functionally linked land will be required. The results should be presented and assessed in the context of percentages of the Humber Estuary SPA and Lower Derwent Valley SPA populations, according to the most recent WeBS 5-year average count. Natural England has generally advised that if <math>\geq 1\%</math> of a Humber Estuary bird species</p>		<p>Survey results are presented and assessed as a proportion of the most recent WeBS 5-year average SPA populations for both European sites, in line with Natural England guidance. Where species vulnerability or declining population trends warranted, interpretation has not relied solely on the 1% threshold.</p> <p>Both direct loss of FLL and indirect effects, including changes to habitat suitability arising from disruption of open vistas, connectivity, noise and visual disturbance during construction, have been assessed. Construction, operational and decommissioning disturbance effects are addressed using conservative noise and visual screening assumptions, informed</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>population could be affected by a proposal, alone or in combination with other plans or projects, then further consideration is required. However, where species are particularly vulnerable due to declines in the Humber population, then it may not be appropriate to rely on the 1% of the designated site population as the critical threshold. Mitigation measures may be required where lower numbers of vulnerable species are using a site that is proposed for development.</p> <p>Page 3 of 10</p> <p>The assessment should consider both direct loss of functionally linked land due to siting of the solar panels, and the potential for loss of suitability of adjacent land for birds due to disruption of open</p>		<p>by baseline conditions and embedded mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation for the loss of FLL has been incorporated into the scheme design, most notably through the provision of a dedicated Bird Mitigation Area, which is secured to be fully functional prior to the non-breeding season. This area has been designed to provide equivalent or enhanced foraging, roosting and refuge habitat for SPA/Ramsar species displaced by the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The assessment has been informed by the Natural England evidence review on solar farms and birds (NEER012, 2016), which supports the conclusion that, where appropriately designed and</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>vistas and impacts on connectivity of feeding/roosting areas. Potential for noise and visual disturbance to adjacent functionally linked land during the development construction phase should also be assessed.</p> <p>Natural England produced a 2016 review of available literature on the impact of solar farms on birds (NEER012) which may be useful when undertaking the HRA.</p>		<p>managed, solar developments do not give rise to adverse effects on SPA bird populations and can deliver habitat enhancement relative to arable baselines.</p>
Natural England	Biodiversity	<p>1.2 Humber Estuary SAC &amp; River Derwent SAC</p> <p>Natural England welcomes the commitment to further assess potential habitat suitability of the relevant waterways for river lamprey and sea lamprey. We also note that an assessment of the potential impacts which may occur due to Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) will be considered in the ES (6.9.60). We generally welcome that HDD will</p>	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. Risks and associated mitigation relating to HDD (i.e. potential water quality issues from break-out / frac-out and noise / vibration) form part of the assessment. The assessment will consider the Ouse as a known migration route for lamprey (all lamprey reaching the upper catchment must pass through</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>be used to prevent direct watercourse impacts. However we advise that the assessment of potential impacts on River Derwent SAC and Humber Estuary SAC river and sea lamprey migration routes should include consideration of potential water quality impacts including HDD bentonite breakout during construction. Noise and vibration impacts to the lamprey should also be considered.. The assessment should be informed by</p> <p>more detailed information regarding the proposed grid connection corridor and waterway crossing points. Natural England's Impact Risk Zones (IRZs) (available on Magic Map) identify the River Ouse as a lamprey migration route, however connected watercourses may also support the feature. We note that further surveys are proposed and that further information will be provided in the ES. We advise that this information should be used to inform the HRA.</p>		<p>the Ouse). Habitat surveys and eDNA monitoring of other watercourse has confirmed low suitability for notable fish (inc. lamprey) with only minor species record. This information has been used to inform relevant parts of ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]</b>, HRA <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.11]</b> and WER Assessment (ES Volume 3 Appendix 15.2 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.02 ]</b>).</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Natural England	Biodiversity	<p>1.3 Humber Estuary Ramsar and Lower Derwent Valley Ramsar</p> <p>Natural England's advice on Humber Estuary Ramsar and Lower Derwent Valley Ramsar broadly coincides with the above advice for Humber Estuary SPA, Lower Derwent Valley SPA, and Humber Estuary SAC.</p>		The Applicant notes this comment.
Natural England	Air Quality	<p>1.4 Air quality</p> <p>We note the statement that the development does not currently propose construction traffic to move within 200m of designated sites, however this is subject to change before the final submission. If it is determined that construction traffic movements are required within 200m of a European Site, potential impacts from air quality on the relevant internationally designated sites should be assessed</p>	TBC	<p>The Applicant acknowledges this comment.</p> <p>A construction traffic assessment has been screened out due to the daily movements falling below the IAQM/EPUK criteria, with no significant increases in traffic movements during the construction phase on a site-wide basis. As such, further assessment of impacts at ecological receptors have not been quantified (ammonia), however, the industry</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>in the HRA. This may be supported by information provided in the PEIR, where relevant.</p> <p>We advise that the assessment of air quality impacts from traffic should be informed by Natural England's guidance NEA001. As detailed in guidance document NEA001, designated sites within 200m of a road which will experience a significant increase in traffic movements should be assessed for impacts due to air pollution from traffic.</p> <p>We advise that ammonia emissions from road traffic could make a significant difference to nitrogen deposition close to roads. As traffic composition transitions toward more petrol and electric cars (i.e., fewer diesel cars on the road) – catalytic converters may aid in reducing NOx</p>		<p>standard guidance indicates that following best practice mitigation measures (provided in ES Volume 3 Appendix 16.1: Construction Dust Assessment [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.01] which supports the Application), the resulting effect of construction traffic movements on sensitive ecological receptors would be not significant.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>emissions but result in increased ammonia emissions – therefore consideration of the potential for impacts is needed</p> <p><a href="https://www.aqconsultants.co.uk/news/february-2020-(1)/ammonia-emissions-from-roads-forassessing-impacts">https://www.aqconsultants.co.uk/news/february-2020-(1)/ammonia-emissions-from-roads-forassessing-impacts</a> There are currently two models which can be used to calculate the ammonia concentration and contribution to total N deposition from road sources. One of these models is publicly available and called CREAM Air Quality Consultants - News - Ammonia Emissions from Roads for Assessing Impacts on Nitrogen-Sensitive Habitats (aqconsultants.co.uk), and there is another produced by National Highways.</p> <p>Page 4 of 10 Where there may be construction</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>compounds located within 200m of designated sites, there will be the requirement to consider the impacts air pollution from Non-road Mobile Machinery on the notified habitats.</p>		
<p>Natural England</p>	<p>Biodiversity</p>	<p>1.5. In-combination assessment                      Natural England notes that Section 17.6 of Chapter 17 Cumulative and In-Combination Effects states that the Cumulative Effects Assessment will be finalised for the ES. We advise that the HRA should include an in-combination assessment following the screening stage. The in-combination requirement makes sure that the effects of numerous proposals, which alone would not result in a significant effect, are assessed to determine whether their combined effect would be significant enough to require</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The HRA includes an in-combination assessment at Section 10, following the screening stage and appropriate assessment of the Proposed Development alone. <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.11]</b>.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>more detailed assessment. Therefore, where there are small effects which are not significant alone, these should be assessed alongside small effects of other projects which were not significant alone.</p> <p>A further in-combination assessment should be carried out following the appropriate assessment stage (where required), to assess the residual effects of developments together. If mitigation or compensation has completely avoided or removed the effect that this would not act in-combination with other projects.</p> <p>We advise that when considering in-combination impacts of loss of functionally linked land, the results of surveys undertaken for those developments should also be taken into</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		account to understand whether there is a cumulative loss of land which can support wintering or passage birds.		
Natural England	Biodiversity	<p>WILDLIFE AND COUNTRYSIDE ACT 2.0 Nationally designated sites</p> <p>The nationally designated sites relevant to this application are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sherburn Willows SSSI</li> <li>• Burr Closes, Selby SSSI</li> <li>• Skipwith Common SSSI</li> <li>• Fairburn &amp; Newton Ings SSSI</li> </ul>	No	The Applicant notes this comment
Natural England	Biodiversity	<p>As discussed with the applicant through our Discretionary Advice Service (DAS), the following can be scoped out of any further assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pocklington Canal SSSI</li> <li>• Acaster South Ings SSSI</li> <li>• Church Ings SSSI</li> <li>• Mickletown Ings SSSI</li> </ul>	No	The Applicant notes this comment

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Natural England	Air Quality	<p>Natural England advise that we are unable to agree to the 2 km radius for scoping Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) into assessment of potential impacts, until further information has been provided in the ES to ascertain whether potential air quality impacts on designated sites can be ruled out.</p> <p>As detailed in guidance document NEA001, designated sites within 200m of a road which will experience a significant increase in traffic movements should be assessed for impacts due to air pollution from traffic. Clarification should therefore be provided as to whether there are any affected road networks within 200m of the above SSSIs. The above advice provided for internationally</p>	No	<p>A construction traffic assessment has been scoped out due to construction phase traffic movements falling below the thresholds outlined in the IAQM/EPUK criteria on a site-wide basis.</p> <p>An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>) has been submitted as part of this Application which will manage the sustainable delivery of goods and materials.</p> <p>In addition, the industry standard guidance indicates that following best practice mitigation measures (provided in ES Volume 3 Appendix 16.1: Construction Dust Assessment <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.01]</b> which supports the Application),</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		designated sites, regarding air quality impacts, should be considered in the assessment of impacts to SSSIs.		the resulting effect of construction traffic movements at sensitive ecological receptors would be not significant.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Natural England	Water Resources and Flood Risk	<p>Natural England welcomes the commitment to cross the ditches that lead to Burr Closes, Selby SSSI with non-intrusive, underground techniques (e.g. horizontal directional drilling (HDD)) that would not disturb the watercourse to mitigate for potential direct impacts within the designated site.</p> <p>In addition, we advise that potential water quality and water supply impacts (such as 'frac-out' events) should be assessed in more detail in the context of nationally designated sites. This should include consideration of hydrological connectivity with the designated site, in addition to potential impacts on the relevant designated features. We note that an oCEMP will be produced alongside the ES to address general construction</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes the comments. Specific reference to Burr Closes is included in the oCEMP <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b> and Outline Drainage Strategy <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.04 ]</b> as appropriate.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>pollution impacts. We welcome this and advise measures to prevent impacts to SSSIs should be included where an impact pathway is identified. We also note that additional potential impact pathways have not been explicitly addressed. For example, source of water abstraction for the HDD , new drainage outfalls, panel cleaning methods during operation, and proposed Sustainable urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) if applicable. We therefore advise that these potential impact pathways and/or mitigation measures are explored in more detail in the context of the relevant nationally designated sites, where there may be a hydrological connection</p>		
Natural England	Biodiversity	The cable corridor route encompasses a Section of Burr Closes, Selby SSSI. We note	No	The Applicant can confirm there will be no development within Burr

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>that 6.9.73 states the final route will avoid the SSSI boundary and therefore there will be no direct habitat loss.</p> <p>This commitment should be secured within the ES submitted with the DCO. However as the SSSI is in proximity to construction activity, mitigation measures to prevent pollution impacts or damage should be outlined in the DCO application. We note the statement that these measures will</p>		<p>Closes SSSI. Mitigation measures to prevent pollution impacts or damage to the SSSI will be included in the oCEMP <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b>.</p>
Natural England	Ornithology	<p>We note that Chapter 12 of the PEIR concludes there will not be a significant impact on birds associated with designated sites Fairburn and Newton Ings SSSI and Skipwith Common SSSI. Based on the justification provided we concur this impact pathway can be ruled out from further assessment.</p>	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Natural England	Biodiversity	<p>Natural England has adopted standing advice for protected species, which includes</p>	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant has engaged with</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>guidance on survey and mitigation measures. In addition, we have reviewed the protected species information provided in the PEIR, for this project, and provide bespoke advice below.</p> <p>A separate protected species licence from Natural England or Defra may be required. Applicants should refer to the guidance at Wildlife licences: when you need to apply to check to see if a mitigation licence is required. Applicants can also make use of Natural England's charged service Pre Submission Screening Service for a review of a draft wildlife licence application. Natural England can then review a full draft licence application to issue a Letter of No Impediment (LONI) which explains that based on the information</p>		<p>Natural England in respect of the potential need for protected species licences. Further information is available in the Other Consents and Licences Statement <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.04]</b>.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>reviewed to date, that it sees no impediment to a licence being granted in the future should the DCO be issued. See Advice Note Eleven, Annex C – Natural England and the Planning Inspectorate   National Infrastructure Planning for details of the LONI process.</p>		
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	<p>It is welcomed that an ALC survey in on-going, with available data informing the PEIR and the site selection process, enabling the Proposed Development to be directed away from the highest quality agricultural land and towards land with the lowest ALC grading (Chapter 3), including the permanent infrastructure. However, a detailed ALC survey is typically expected for the full application site, including where the panels are proposed, cable route, temporary access and any areas</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges this comment. Detailed survey results have been provided to Natural England for agreement on any further survey effort required. The outline Soil Resources Management Plan (oSRMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.14]</b>) provides the commitment for the restoration of land to its pre-existing grade. Details of methodology are</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>of proposed habitat creation, as well as any areas of permanent sealing.                      Survey density may be reduced to one point per 2 hectares if the ALC grade is mapped as Grade 4 or 5 and supported by homogeneous soil type (i.e. a clay soil across the full site). However, it would be expected that during the survey, the survey density would be increased to 1 in 1 hectare to ascertain accurate BMV boundaries and identify soil properties of all types present. It would be expected for the consultant to provide clear justification where a detailed ALC survey has not been carried out across the full site.                      The continued surveying effort is welcomed however it would be expected that the survey density is</p>		<p>set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 5 Agricultural Land and Soils [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.05].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		increased as described above, and that the cable corridors are surveyed.		
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	Soil is a finite resource which plays an essential role within sustainable ecosystems, performing an array of functions supporting a range of ecosystem services, including storage of carbon, the infiltration and transport of water, nutrient cycling, and provision of food. It is recognised that a proportion of the agricultural land will experience temporary land loss. In order to both retain the long term potential of this land and to safeguard all soil resources as part of the overall sustainability of the whole development (during construction and decommissioning), it is important that the soil is able to retain as many of its many important functions and services (ecosystem services) as possible through careful soil management and appropriate soil use, with consideration on how any adverse impacts on soils can be avoided or minimised. There	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>is no discussion in the PEIR as to the potential surplus soil, and the proposed re-use of this finite resource. It is considered that as the solar panels would be secured to the ground by steel piles with limited soil disturbance, they could be removed in the future with no permanent loss of agricultural land quality likely to occur, provided the appropriate soil management is employed and the development is undertaken to high standards. Consequently, Natural England would advise that any grant of planning permission should be made subject to conditions to safeguard soil resources and agricultural land, including a required commitment for the preparation of reinstatement, restoration and aftercare plans; normally this will include the return to the former land quality (ALC grade).</p>		
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	Table 5-1: The Scoping Opinion agreed that the loss of agricultural land for Cable Corridors can be	Yes	Detailed survey results have been provided to Natural England and the results used to inform the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>scoped out of the assessment. 'provided that it can be demonstrated in the Environmental Statement (ES) that agricultural land uses can continue in the cable corridor during operation.' The applicant needs to demonstrate that along the cable corridor, there will be no soil loss or degradation which could result in the potential downgrading of ALC, which could result in a loss of BMV.</p> <p>The commitment to undertake further ALC surveying to establish the ALC grade of the currently unsurveyed areas to provide coverage of the rest of the site including establishing the boundaries of BMV agricultural land; and inform the updated EIA to be presented in the ES is welcomed.</p> <p>Page 7 of 10 However, it would be expected that the</p>		<p>environmental assessment. Details of methodology are set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 5 Agricultural Land and Soils <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b>.</p> <p>The outline Soil Resources Management Plan (oSRMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.14]</b>) provides the commitment for the restoration of land to its pre-existing grade.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>survey density is increased as described above, and that the cable corridors are surveyed as suggested in Table 5-5.</p> <p>Whilst it is expected that there will be a degree of variability in physical characteristics within a discrete area. At present there are frequent occurrences of isolated, single observation points graded a different ALC grade to the surrounding area. It may be more appropriate to map this in line with the surrounding ALC grades. However, due to the variable ALC grades identified during the semi-detailed survey, the survey should be undertaken at a detailed density to ensure an accurate mapping of the ALC grade boundaries and thus facilitate a more accurate assessment.</p> <p>Detailed</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>surveying would facilitate whether it is appropriate to map these areas of differing ALC grade or not.</p> <p>Where gradient is the limiting factor, boundaries may be accurately tied to contours. Similar precision may be possible if lateral changes of soil type are abrupt and distinct. Where soil is the dominant limiting factor, map units will normally encompass at least two, ideally three, sampling points.</p> <p>An ALC survey should be undertaken within the cable corridor order limits, so as to identify the soil types and ALC grades, and thus inform soil handling and restoration criteria.</p> <p>Natural England welcome the breakdown of ALC grades and the associated ALC Plates for each 'Site' in the proposal. This should be</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>extended to the areas of permanent development and cable corridor. This should also include a break down of ALC areas surveyed in a previous survey.</p>		
<p>Natural England</p>	<p>Agricultural Land and Soils</p>	<p>Natural England welcome the use of the EIA set out in IEMA 2022. The IEMA significance criteria are based on the well-established ICE EIA handbook and LA104 methodologies. However, the sensitivity criteria presented in the PEIR for determining receptor sensitivity is not in line with these published criteria (ICE, DMRB, IEMA). It is recommended that the impact assessment has 5 classes of receptor sensitivity rather than 4, in line with the published criteria, and include non-agricultural land. This will enable a clearer demonstration of the consideration of directing development to land of lower quality as per the NPS. All effects, even those identified as minor and below should still be mitigated where possible.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Detailed survey results have been provided to Natural England and the results used to inform the environmental assessment. Details of methodology are set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b>.</p> <p>The outline Soil Resources Management Plan (oSRMP, <b>[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.14]</b>) provides the commitment for the restoration of land to its pre-existing grade.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	<p>Natural England disagree that at this stage it can be assumed that less than 20 ha BMV agricultural land would be required for the permanent elements of the Proposed Development (para 5.9.20). As the final design has not yet been defined, and the full, detailed ALC survey has not yet been completed, this cannot be assumed. We welcome that design development of the permanent infrastructure will seek to avoid the better quality land (para 5.9.13). Furthermore, the total permanent land take needs to be assessed for significance as a whole. To support this, it is important that the land subject to permanent development is accompanied by a detailed ALC survey (1 auger per ha plus</p>	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and can confirm that less than 20ha of BMV agricultural land would be required for the BESS. The completed, detailed ALC surveys indicate that approximately 54% of the total land within the Solar Development Sites is classed as BMV agricultural land. Approximately 20% (179.4 ha) of the Sites have BMV land Grades 1 and 2. Approximately 34% (307 ha) of the land is confirmed as Subgrade 3a. Representative soil and ALC surveys undertaken within the CRC indicate that 51% of land within the CRC can be classed as BMV agricultural land (Grade 1 at 3%, Grade 2 at 4% and Grade 3a at 44%). The full ALC information is</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>representative pits).                      The applicant needs to be clearer to re-iterate that the area values provided for ALC Grades are based on an incomplete, semi-detailed survey.                      The ES should present the distribution and areas of the soil types identified, along with the proposed re-use of any surplus soil (para 5.9.24).</p>		<p>included within ES Volume 3 Appendix 5.1: Agricultural Land Classification <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.05.01]</b>. ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b> further sets out the national policy context, while the Planning Statement <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.02]</b> provides the justification for use of BMV land.</p>
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	<p>Natural England welcome the consideration of the proposed development on soil health. However, it should be noted that whilst arable reversion to grassland has been shown to benefit SOM, this benefit will only extend to the duration of the reversion. However, there could be a</p>	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Soil Resources Management Plan (oSRMP, <b>[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.14]</b>) has been submitted as part of the DCO Application and contains measures to avoid damage to soils. Detailed Soil Resource Management Plan(s)</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>disbenefit to the soil resource due to unknowns as a result of the solar development infrastructure. It is currently unclear as to what impact the solar panels may have on the soil properties such as carbon storage, structure and biodiversity. For example, as a result of changes in shading; temperature changes; preferential flow pathways; micro-climate; and vegetation growth caused by the panels. Therefore, it is unknown what the overall impact of a temporary Solar development will have on soil health.</p> <p>Natural England welcome the preparation of an outline Soil Resource Management Plan (oSRMP) to be submitted with the ES, this should be based on the site-specific soils information obtained</p>		<p>(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 that remain in place and those that are stripped, stockpiled and reinstated, to minimise soil carbon losses, maintain water infiltration and enhance soil biodiversity</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>during the ALC surveys. This oSRMP should include a commitment that a detailed SRMP is prepared prior to construction, and includes a requirement that the developer uses an appropriately experienced soil specialist to advise on, and supervise, soil trafficking and handling, including identifying when soils are dry enough to be handled. Reference should be made to Defra's Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites.</p> <p>Mitigation should specifically discuss the importance of timings of works, ensuring that the installation and decommissioning of the panels is undertaken when the soils are dry and friable so to minimise damage. It is recommended that</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>these works are undertaken between April and September to further minimise problems associated with winter working. The oSMP should also include appropriate agricultural land management and/or biodiversity enhancement during the lifetime of the development, to ensure that at the end of the operational phase, following decommissioning, the agricultural land quality is the same as the baseline ALC.</p>		
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	<p>Natural England welcome that the soils disturbed along the cable corridor will be restored to the ALC baseline. This should be included as a commitment in the oSRMP.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment, the outline Soil Resources Management Plan (oSRMP, <b>[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.14]</b>) has been submitted as part of the DCO Application and secures the return of the land within the Cable Route Corridor to the ALC baseline.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	We welcome the inclusion of decompaction during decommissioning, where required (para 5.9.24)	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04]</b> ) confirms that measures to address localised soil compaction will be identified consistent with the principles in the outline Soil Resource Management Plan (oSRMP, <b>[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.14]</b> ).
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	Natural England welcome the commitment to undertake monitoring, which will be set out in the oSRMP and oLEMP. The oSRMP should also include appropriate agricultural land management and/or biodiversity enhancement during the lifetime of the development, to ensure that at the end of the operational phase, following	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]</b> ) and the outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP, <b>[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.03]</b> ) provide for the management of

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		decommissioning, the agricultural land is reverted to its current ALC grade where appropriate.		planting within the Proposed Development.
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	Where developments have been identified with overlapping boundaries in the cumulative assessment, opportunities to minimise the disturbance of the same swathes of land should be explored, for example the laying cabling within the same trenches at the same time, where possible.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	A semi-detailed ALC survey has been undertaken across approximately 834 ha of agricultural land supported by 3 soil profile pits. The data from this survey is presented in Appendix 5. The data presented indicates only three soil pits have been investigated; two of which are located in Solar Development Site 1, the third in Solar Development Site 4. It is expected that a soil	Yes	Detailed survey results have been provided to Natural England and the results used to inform the environmental assessment. Details of methodology is set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b> .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>pit is investigated in at least each soil type observed. Furthermore, given the spatial extent of these sites, additional pits would be expected to confirm soil properties at each of the Sites. We require that land quality and soil resources information is gathered for any land that is disturbed by the development, including the cabling route. Ideally a full detailed ALC survey would have been carried out across the whole site. With the semi-detailed survey undertaken to date, it is recommended in this instance, that a semi detailed survey is acceptable where the site is clearly non-BMV (1 auger per 2 ha plus representative pits), but where BMV has been identified, or grades are variable, a detailed ALC survey would be expected (1 auger per ha plus representative pits). It is</p>		<p>The outline Soil Resources Management Plan (oSRMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.14]</b>) provides the commitment for the restoration of land to its pre-existing grade.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>important that the land subject to permanent development is accompanied by a detailed ALC survey (1 auger per ha plus representative pits). This type of survey requires an experienced ALC surveyor, in order to make the correct professional judgements, where to introduce flexibility. We would hope that the ALC survey would inform the layout of the development, i.e. avoid BMV for permanent development. A semi detailed survey may not identify all of the BMV land.</p>		
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	<p>The ALC survey will enable a soil management plan to be generated for any areas to be disturbed (temporary and permanent) to ensure correct handling and restoration of soils, and appropriate onsite use of soils for habitat enhancement and onsite reuse of any surplus soils stripped</p>	Yes	<p>Detailed survey results have been provided to Natural England and the results used to inform the environmental assessment. Details of methodology is set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>from areas of permanent development. Natural England advise that soil sampling to include SOM, pH, and macronutrients can inform appropriate soil re-use as set out in Defra's Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites. This may be particularly important to identify areas of the Site most appropriate for habitat enhancement and inform the most suitable habitats, including the most appropriate seed mix etc.</p>		<p>Land and Soils <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b>. The outline Soil Resources Management Plan (oSRMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.14]</b>) provides the commitment for the restoration of land to its pre-existing grade.</p>
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	<p>At this stage a detailed review of the data has not been undertaken, however the presented data methodology appears reasonably robust, following the MAFF (1988) Agricultural Land Classification for England and Wales: Guidelines and Criteria for Grading the Quality of Agricultural Land. Initial</p>	Yes	<p>Detailed survey results have been provided to Natural England and the results used to inform the environmental assessment. Details of methodology is set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b></p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The name, qualification and experience of the lead surveyor undertaking the ALC survey work is not given. This is important to demonstrate the likely competence of the lead surveyor.</li> <li>• The survey has not graded Sites 6, 7 or 8, nor the route of trench line for the underground cabling; an ALC survey should be undertaken for these areas as part of the baseline soil and ALC information given that soil disturbance will take place in these areas.</li> <li>• A detailed ALC survey would be expected on land identified as BMV and across land subject to permanent development.</li> </ul>		<p>and associated Appendix ES Volume 3: Agricultural Land Classification <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.03.05.01]</b>. The outline Soil Resources Management Plan (oSRMP, <b>[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.14]</b>) provides the commitment for the restoration of land to its pre-existing grade.</p>
Natural England	Biodiversity	Natural England welcomes the commitment to delivering a minimum of 10% on-site	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant has produced a

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). It is best practice for BNG proposals to be considered early on within project option and design phases. Early identification of areas of habitat creation and enhancement is recommended. Provision of as much BNG information as possible at an early stage will help ensure gains are maximised.</p> <p>We advise it is best practice to submit a biodiversity gain plan and completed biodiversity metric with the application, with enhancements then being secured by requirements in the DCO.</p> <p>We recommend using the latest version of the Defra biodiversity metric to calculate BNG (Statutory biodiversity metric tools and guides - GOV.UK (<a href="http://www.gov.uk">www.gov.uk</a>)) and adhere to the rules and principles</p>		<p>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</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>set out within the metric guidance. To encourage best practice, we also recommend referring to the following: BS 8683:2021 Process for designing and implementing Biodiversity Net Gain and CIEEM/IEMA/CIRIA good practice principles (2016) and guidance (2019). Created and enhanced habitats should seek, where practical and reasonable, to be local to any impact. They should also deliver strategically important outcomes for nature conservation. We recommend that opportunities should be sought to link delivery to relevant plans or strategies. This could include Green Infrastructure Strategies or Local Nature Recovery Strategies.</p>		
Natural England	Biodiversity	We note Chapter 16, paragraph 16.3.6 identifies Common Wood and Gilbertson's Wood Ancient	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The Proposed Development avoids

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>Woodland Sites as adjacent to the Development Area. Impacts to ancient woodland and ancient and veteran trees should be considered in line with paragraph 180 of the NPPF. Natural England maintains the Ancient Woodland Inventory which can help identify ancient woodland. Natural England and the Forestry Commission have produced standing advice for decision makers in relation to ancient woodland and ancient and veteran trees. Natural England will only provide bespoke advice on ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees where they form part of a Site of Special Scientific Interest or in exceptional circumstances. However we note and welcome the statement in 16.4.8 that appropriate buffers</p>		<p>impacts on both ancient/veteran trees identified in the survey and on the Ancient Tree Inventory (ATI), and ancient woodland. Both features will be adequately protected by exclusion during construction. Buffers around ancient/veteran trees have been established based on Natural England Standing advice; buffers around ancient woodland are at least 25 m. No construction activity will take place within the buffers.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>will be developed</p> <p>and identified within the ES. We advise any mitigation measures should be secured in the DCO, this could be within a document such as the CEMP.</p>		
<p>NGET (National Grid)</p>	<p>Protective Provisions</p>	<p>NGET will require an adequate form of Protective Provisions included within the Order.</p> <p>Existing Infrastructure Substation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· MONK FRYSTON 275 kV Substation</li> <li>· MONK FRYSTON 400 kV Substation</li> </ul> <p>Associated overhead and underground apparatus including cables</p> <p>Overhead Lines</p> <p>4YS 400 kV OHL EGGBOROUGH - MONK FRYSTON 1</p> <p>EGGBOROUGH - MONK FRYSTON 2</p> <p>National Grid House</p> <p>Warwick Technology Park</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The design of the Proposed Development has accounted for the position of National Grid's assets by ensuring there are adequate stand offs from the components of the Proposed Development. Where interaction with National Grid's assets is possible, appropriate construction and operational methodologies will be employed as specified within the protective provisions within the draft DCO <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/03.01]</b>.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>Gallows Hill, Warwick CV34 6DA</p> <p>National Grid is a trading name for: National Grid Electricity Transmission plc Registered Office: 1-3 Strand, London WC2N 5EH Registered in England and Wales, No 2366977 4ZT 400 kV OHL FERRYBRIDGE 'C' - FERRYBRIDGE 'B' - MONK FRYSTON FERRYBRIDGE 'C' - MONK FRYSTON 4ZS 400 kV OHL FERRYBRIDGE 'C' - FERRYBRIDGE 'B' - SKELTON GRANGE 1 FERRYBRIDGE 'C' - SKELTON GRANGE 2 4ZZ 400 kV OHL MONK FRYSTON - PADIHAM BRADFORD WEST - MONK FRYSTON XK 275 kV OHL FERRYBRIDGE 'C' - FERRYBRIDGE 'B' - SKELTON GRANGE 1 FERRYBRIDGE 'C' - FERRYBRIDGE 'B' - SKELTON GRANGE 2</p>		<p>The Applicant acknowledges NGET's enclosed plans and that NGET has existing assets within its proposed Order Limits. The interface includes the Proposed Development's point of connection at National Grid's Monk Fryston Substation. The Applicant is engaging with NGET to ensure its assets are appropriately protected.</p> <p>The Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.04]</b> submitted with the Application sets out the Proposed Development's requirement for the land in which NGET has an interest.</p> <p>The Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of NGET within the draft DCO</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>XC 275 kV OHL MONK FRYSTON - POPPLETON 1                      MONK FRYSTON - POPPLETON 2                      I enclose plans showing the location of NGET's existing apparatus in the scoping area.</p>		<p>submitted with the Application, and will continue to engage with NGET to determine if amendments are needed to these Protective Provisions or any associated Side Agreement.</p>
<p>NGET (National Grid)</p>	<p>Protected Provisions</p>	<p>Yorkshire GREEN involves the upgrade and reinforcement of the high-voltage electricity network in Yorkshire to improve the transfer of clean energy across the country. Yorkshire GREEN will allow cleaner energy to flow into homes and businesses that need it in Yorkshire and beyond. It will provide a new connection and reinforcement on the electricity transmission system, whilst supporting ambitious net zero targets set by the UK Government. Delivery of Yorkshire GREEN will see the</p>		<p>The Applicant notes this comment; the Yorkshire Green project was considered as part of the cumulative assessment at PEIR stage and has been included as a development in the cumulative assessments carried out for each topic where relevant.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>following work undertaken: We are building two new electricity substations. One will be at Overton and one at Monk Fryston.</p>		
<p>NGET (National Grid)</p>	<p>Cumulative</p>	<p>Monk Fryston Substation The new Monk Fryston Substation will be located adjacent to (and connecting into) the existing Monk Fryston Substation, which otherwise would be unable to accommodate the additional energy flowing from the upgraded overhead lines. The new substation will be accessed off Rawfield Lane, which is located near the villages of Monk Fryston, Lumby and Fairburn, between Leeds and Selby. The new substation at Monk Fryston will have a footprint of approximately 80,000m<sup>2</sup> (8 hectares), which will take the overall footprint of both substations at Monk Fryston combined to 147,000m<sup>2</sup></p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Yorkshire Green project was considered as part of the cumulative assessment at PEIR stage and has been included as a development in the cumulative assessments carried out for each topic where relevant.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>(14.7 hectares). The structures within the new substation are still being designed but, in line with the Development Consent Order, they will be no greater than 15 m in height.</p> <p>The new substation will contain four Supergrid Transformers (SGT) to convert the voltage of the overhead lines (400kV) to connect into the substation (275 kV) and will include approximately 600m of underground cables to connect the overhead line circuits to the new substation (all within the new substation boundary).</p>		
<p>NGET (National Grid)</p>	<p>Protected Provisions</p>	<p>New and upgraded overhead lines</p> <p>We will be building new overhead lines to carry electricity to our new substations, as well as upgrading</p> <p>Sections of existing overhead lines between Shipton and Monk Fryston to allow them to operate at a</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant understands the interface between works for Yorkshire GREEN and the Proposed Development at the Monk Fryston Substation, which may require the Applicant and NGET to coordinate access. As noted above,</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>higher voltage. This means they will be able to carry more electricity.                      This work will see 28 km of existing overhead lines reconducted and strengthened, 10 km of new overhead lines installed, 1km of new underground cables installed and the construction of 33 new pylons.                      We received planning consent for Yorkshire GREEN in March 2024, preparatory works began in autumn 2024 and construction is expected to be completed by 2028. Further information and plans can be found on our project website:  <a href="https://www.nationalgrid.com/the-great-grid-upgrade/yorkshire-green">https://www.nationalgrid.com/the-great-grid-upgrade/yorkshire-green</a></p>		<p>the Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of NGET within the draft DCO submitted with the Application, and will continue to engage with NGET to determine if amendments are needed to these Protective Provisions or any associated Side Agreement.</p>
<p>NGET (National Grid)</p>	<p>Protective Provisions</p>	<p>It should be noted that there maybe further interactions with additional new strategic infrastructure where the projects are in their early</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges NGET's response and its role in maintaining a secure electricity system.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>development.</p> <p>NGET requests that all existing and future assets are given due consideration given their criticality to distribution of energy across the UK. We remain committed to working with the promoter in a proactive manner, enabling both parties to deliver successful projects wherever reasonably possible. As such we encourage that ongoing discussion and consultation between both parties is maintained on interactions with existing or future assets, land interests, connections or consents and any other NGET interests which have the potential to be impacted prior to submission of the Proposed DCO.</p>		<p>The Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of NGET within the draft DCO submitted with the Application, and will continue to engage with NGET to determine if amendments are needed to these Protective Provisions or any associated Side Agreement.</p>
NGET (National Grid)	Protective Provisions	National Grid's Overhead Line/s is protected by a Deed of Easement/Wayleave Agreement	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The design of the Proposed Development has accounted for the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		which provides full right of access to retain, maintain, repair and inspect our asset		position of National Grid's assets by ensuring there are adequate stand offs from the components of the Proposed Development.
NGET (National Grid)	Protective Provisions	Statutory electrical safety clearances must be maintained at all times. Any proposed buildings must not be closer than 5.3m to the lowest conductor. National Grid recommends that no permanent structures are built directly beneath overhead lines. These distances are set out in EN 43 – 8 Technical Specification for "overhead line clearances Issue 5 (2019)", which publicly available.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this response with regards to safety clearances and location of permanent structures. As noted above, the Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of NGET within the draft DCO submitted with the Application, and will continue to engage with NGET to determine if amendments are needed to these Protective Provisions or any associated Side Agreement.</p> <p>An Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP, [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]) has</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>been prepared as part of the DCO Application to outline the mitigation measures relevant to construction for the Proposed Development. A detailed CEMP will be prepared by the appointed Contractor(s), substantially in accordance with the outline plan, and will be submitted for approval by North Yorkshire Council in advance of construction commencing. This will consider appropriate safety measures for construction works.</p>
<p>NGET (National Grid)</p>	<p>Protective Provisions</p>	<p>If any changes in ground levels are proposed either beneath or in close proximity to our existing overhead lines, then this would serve to reduce the safety clearances for such overhead lines.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this response with regards to changes in ground levels and safe clearances. As noted above, the Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of NGET within the draft DCO submitted with the</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		Safe clearances for existing overhead lines must be maintained in all circumstances.		Application, and will continue to engage with NGET to determine if amendments are needed to these Protective Provisions or any associated Side Agreement. An Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b> ) has been prepared as part of the DCO Application to outline the mitigation measures relevant to construction for the Proposed Development. A detailed CEMP will be prepared by the appointed Contractor(s), substantially in accordance with the outline plan, and will be submitted for approval by North Yorkshire Council in advance of construction commencing. This will consider appropriate safety measures for construction works.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
NGET (National Grid)	Protective Provisions	The relevant guidance in relation to working safely near to existing overhead lines is contained within the Health and Safety Executive's ( <a href="http://www.hse.gov.uk">www.hse.gov.uk</a> ) Guidance Note GS 6 "Avoidance of Danger from Overhead Electric Lines" and all relevant site staff should make sure that they are both aware of and understand this guidance.	No	The Applicant acknowledges this guidance. An Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b> ) has been prepared as part of the DCO Application to outline the mitigation measures relevant to construction for the Proposed Development. A detailed CEMP will be prepared by the appointed Contractor(s), substantially in accordance with the outline plan, and will be submitted for approval by North Yorkshire Council in advance of construction commencing. This will consider appropriate safety measures for construction works.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
<p>NGET (National Grid)</p>	<p>Protective Provisions</p>	<p>Plant, machinery, equipment, buildings or scaffolding should not encroach within 5.3 metres of any of our high voltage conductors when those conductors are under their worse conditions of maximum “sag” and “swing” and overhead line profile (maximum “sag” and “swing”) drawings should be obtained using the contact details above.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. As noted above, the Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of NGET within the draft DCO submitted with the Application, and will continue to engage with NGET to determine if amendments are needed to these Protective Provisions or any associated Side Agreement.</p> <p>An Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b>) has been prepared as part of the DCO Application to outline the mitigation measures relevant to construction for the Proposed Development. A detailed CEMP will be prepared by the appointed Contractor(s), substantially in accordance with the</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				outline plan, and will be submitted for approval by North Yorkshire Council in advance of construction commencing. This will consider appropriate safety measures for construction works.
NGET (National Grid)	Landscape and Visual	If a landscaping scheme is proposed as part of the proposal, we request that only slow and low growing species of trees and shrubs are planted beneath and adjacent to the existing overhead line to reduce the risk of growth to a height which compromises statutory safety clearances.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment, and this suggestion is considered within ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]</b> .  The request is incorporated into the outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]</b> ).
NGET (National Grid)	construction and decommissioning	Drilling or excavation works should not be undertaken if they have the potential to disturb or	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The design of the Proposed Development has accounted for the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		adversely affect the foundations or “pillars of support” of any existing tower. These foundations always extend beyond the base area of the existing tower and foundation (“pillar of support”) drawings can be obtained using the contact details above		position of National Grid’s assets by ensuring there are adequate stand offs from the components of the Proposed Development. Where interaction with National Grid’s assets is possible, appropriate construction and operational methodologies will be employed as specified within the protective provisions within the draft DCO <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/03.01]</b> .
NGET (National Grid)	Protective Provisions	National Grid Electricity Transmission high voltage underground cables are protected by a Deed of Grant; Easement; Wayleave Agreement or the provisions of the New Roads and Street Works Act. These provisions provide National Grid full right of access to retain, maintain, repair and inspect our assets. Hence, we require that no permanent / temporary	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. As noted above, the Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of NGET within the draft DCO submitted with the Application, and will continue to engage with NGET to determine if amendments are needed to these Protective Provisions or any associated Side Agreement.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>structures are to be built over our cables or within the easement strip. Any such proposals should be discussed and agreed with National Grid prior to any works taking place.</p>		<p>The design of the Proposed Development has accounted for the position of National Grid's assets by ensuring there are adequate stand offs from the components of the Proposed Development. Where interaction with National Grid's assets is possible, appropriate construction and operational methodologies will be employed as specified within the protective provisions within the draft DCO.</p>
<p>NGET (National Grid)</p>	<p>Protective Provisions</p>	<p>Ground levels above our cables must not be altered in any way. Any alterations to the depth of our cables will subsequently alter the rating of the circuit and can compromise the reliability, efficiency and safety of our electricity network and requires consultation with National Grid prior to any such changes in both level and construction being implemented</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. As noted above, the Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of NGET within the draft DCO submitted with the Application, and will continue to engage with NGET to determine if amendments are needed to these Protective Provisions or any associated Side Agreement.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>The design of the Proposed Development has accounted for the position of National Grid's assets by ensuring there are adequate stand offs from the components of the Proposed Development. Where interaction with National Grid's assets is possible, appropriate construction and operational methodologies will be employed as specified within the protective provisions within the draft DCO.</p>
<p>NGET (National Grid)</p>	<p>Consultation and Engagement</p>	<p>NGET requests to be consulted at the earliest stages to ensure that the most appropriate protective provisions are included within the DCO application to safeguard the integrity of our apparatus and to remove the requirement for objection. All consultations should be sent to the following</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant has consulted NGET throughout the pre-DCO application process. As noted above, the Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of NGET within the draft DCO submitted with the Application, and will continue to engage with NGET to determine if amendments are needed to these</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		email address: <a href="mailto:box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com">box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com</a>		Protective Provisions or any associated Side Agreement.  The Applicant has noted the comment regarding preference for communication.
Sherburn in Elmet Town Council	Project Description	At this stage, the Council neither objects to nor supports the scheme. Our position will be determined once the questions and requests set out below have been addressed and a formal planning application is submitted	No	The Applicant notes this response.
Sherburn in Elmet Town Council	Consultation and Engagement	We formally request that Sherburn in Elmet Town Council (and North Yorkshire Council) are considered as consultees throughout the formal application stage.	No	Sherburn in Elmet Town Council and North Yorkshire Council have been considered consultees throughout the preapplication stages, including the Phase One, Phase Two, and Targeted Consultations.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				The respondent will have the opportunity to register as an interested party should the Application be accepted for Examination by the Planning Inspectorate.
Sherburn in Elmet Town Council	Traffic and Movement	The Council is concerned that the transport-sensitivity assessment omits the B1222 and A162, both of which are critical links for Sherburn. For reference, North Yorkshire Council's traffic counters recorded an average of more than 12,000 vehicle movements per day on the A162 in April 2025. We request that these routes are included within the applicant's road sensitivity assessments and that cumulative impacts from this development are assessed alongside both existing and approved/expected industrial and residential growth. We would welcome an	No	A Transport Assessment (TA) has been undertaken and is included within ES Volume 3 Appendix 14.1 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]</b> . This reviews the current highway network and determines if any highway mitigation is required to accommodate the traffic that would be generated by the Proposed Development over the construction phase. This includes a review of the highway network that was included in the PEIR. The TA has included the B1222 Bishopdyke Lane and the A162 in its assessment (Links

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		assessment from NY/National Highways based on the data available from NY Council.		21 and 22). The assessment also takes into account any existing developments as part of the cumulative assessment scenario.
Sherburn in Elmet Town Council	Traffic and Movement	Secondly, we are concerned that requirements to deliver improvements at the Monk Fryston roundabout (A63/A162) are non-committal at this stage. The delivery of capacity and safety improvements must be secured via a planning condition, with works completed before construction begins. Previous schemes have promised similar upgrades which were later diluted or abandoned, and this must not happen again.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. Information received from North Yorkshire Council indicates that these works could be complete by the time construction starts on the proposed development (2028). It is acknowledged that if the works are not complete then alternative options to minimise construction traffic travelling through this junction will be required, for example enforcing restrictions to prevent vehicles travelling at peak times, or the use of alternative routes identified in the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]).

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
<p>Sherburn in Elmet Town Council</p>	<p>Site Selection and Alternatives</p>	<p>Paragraph 160 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that large-scale energy development within the Green Belt is inappropriate unless “very special circumstances” exist. Why can less harmful sites outside the Green Belt not accommodate the proposed scheme?                      Consistent with our first response to the North Yorkshire Local Plan, the Town Council’s preference is for rooftop, car-park and industrial-estate solar to be maximised before high-quality agricultural land or Green Belt is utilised. Where it is avoidable through alternative options, agricultural land should not be used. While we recognise that current planning policy does not mandate this, for local transparency we urge the applicant to publish how much suitable roofspace and previously developed land has been deemed unviable,</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that alternative sites were considered, assessed, and have been reported on within the Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) (ES Volume 3 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01 ]</b>). 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.                      The Applicant recognises expressions of preference for rooftop solar; on this, the Applicant supports rooftop solar and believes that to meet clean energy and legally binding targets by 2030, a</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>or whether this avenue has been explored at all</p>		<p>combination of rooftop and ground-mounted solar will be required.</p> <p>ES Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]</b> provides further detail regarding the site selection and design process. The Planning Statement <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.02]</b> provides the policy context for the Proposed Development.</p>
<p>Sherburn in Elmet Town Council</p>	<p>Landscape and Visual</p>	<p>We are concerned that parts of the proposal lie too close to existing settlements and, in some cases, result in the complete isolation of individual homes. We therefore ask that the genuine concerns of residents and this Council are taken into consideration for any final schemes put forward.</p> <p>For example, the current plans show</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>ES Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]</b> and the Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) (ES Volume 3 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]</b>) describe the process that has been applied by the Applicant to select the site of the Proposed Development. This is a rural and</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>individual and smaller collections of properties encircled by panels, in cases even forcing some residents to drive through installations to reach their homes. We urge the applicant to take these concerns seriously, reconsidering the thresholds used to determine proximity to residential dwellings. It is our view that buffers must be increased so that no household is left functionally isolated</p>		<p>generally sparsely populated area but it is acknowledged that some parts of the draft Order Limits are located closer to people's homes. The existing network of hedgerows and woodland would be retained and strengthened, and solar panels and other proposed infrastructure would be located within fields, preserving the existing landscape pattern. Setbacks have therefore been incorporated into the design which, together with existing vegetation that will be retained and proposed planting, would avoid or minimise impacts on residential visual amenity. The Applicant has continued to develop the design presented in the application for development consent, to seek opportunities to further reduce effects on the local landscape and</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				people's views and place-attachment. The approach to planting is set out in the outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]</b> ).
Sherburn in Elmet Town Council	Community Benefits	Under current legislation and energy market functions, schemes such as this deliver little-to-no benefit in terms of cost savings locally (this is due to energy markets being largely governed by wholesale gas prices, regardless of source). While we appreciate that individual schemes cannot address this pricing flaw, to foster genuine community buy-in we would always encourage schemes such as this to demonstrate transparently that every reasonable step has been taken first to avoid and, where avoidance is impossible, to minimise and locally offset the scheme's residual impacts. Such opportunities include community	No	<p>The Applicant has developed the Proposed Development based on the offer of a connection point at the National Grid Monk Fyston substation. As such, it could only be brought forward as a transmission-connected project.</p> <p>All communities benefit from transmission-connected energy. Great Britain was the first place in the world to have a national electricity grid, ensuring that wherever people lived, they could get electricity. The grid balances supply and demand across the</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		energy schemes, rather than national-gridfirst approaches.		country. Regardless of how much energy is being produced in your local area, you will still get power.
Sherburn in Elmet Town Council	Biodiversity	The Council will look to responses from Natural England, NYC's Ecologist and other statutory consultees regarding the environmental impacts of any final scheme, including impacts on protected species, wildlife, soils, water management	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
SSE Hydrogen Developments Limited and Ferrybridge Next Generation Power Station	Site Selection and Alternatives	From our discussions to date, you will be aware that SSE Hydrogen Developments Limited (part of the Thermal Division of the FTSE-listed SSE plc) ('SSE') are preparing a Development Consent Order (DCO) Application for a new low carbon power station ('Ferrybridge Next Generation Power Station' ('Ferrybridge')) (the 'Proposed Development') (PINS Reference: EN0110011). The Proposed Development is located at the	No	The Applicant notes this comment and is grateful for the engagement with SSE regarding the proposed Ferrybridge Next Generation Power Station.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>former Ferrybridge C Power Station Site, Kirkhaw Lane, Knottingley, West Yorkshire ('the Main Site') – within the administrative area of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council (WMDC).</p> <p>The Proposed Development will be built with a clear route to decarbonisation, consistent with SSE's Net Zero Transition Plan which committed to the development and progression of new low-carbon flexible power including hydrogen-fuelled generation. It is intended that the power station will be fired on hydrogen once a secure hydrogen supply is commercially available. The power station will also be able to run on natural gas or a blend of the two fuels.</p> <p>The Proposed Development will include up to two power generation units which connect</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>to the national electricity transmission system at the existing Ferrybridge 275kV National Grid substation. These are located at several kilometres to the west and in a different local planning authority area from the LVS project</p>		
<p>SSE Hydrogen Developments Limited and Ferrybridge Next Generation Power Station</p>	<p>Site Selection and Alternatives</p>	<p>Two potential pipeline routes are currently under consideration against technical, engineering and environmental criteria but only one of those routes will be developed. At this stage, the pipeline corridors are wider than will be required or used to construct the pipeline, to allow appropriate environmental surveys to be completed to which in turn will refine the pipeline route. As shown on the plan at Appendix A, the northern pipeline route extends from Ferrybridge to Gateforth, via the north of</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges SSE Hydrogen Developments Limits proposal and has been engaging with SSE in order to minimise impacts should both schemes be consented. Engagement will continue.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>Birkin. The southern pipeline route runs from Ferrybridge to Gateforth, but via the south of Birkin in proximity to the northern bank of the River Aire.</p> <p>Within the area identified for the potential construction of the northern pipeline corridor of the Proposed Development, there is overlap with the area currently designated for the construction of infrastructure in the LVS project. The southern pipeline overlaps the area identified in the LVS project for ecological mitigation as part of the wider development. We have illustrated this on the enclosed plan (Appendix B).</p>		
SSE Hydrogen Developments Limited and Ferrybridge Next Generation	Site Selection and Alternatives	<p>SSE note that Light Valley Solar Ltd is currently in the statutory consultation phase for the LVS project, which is set to close on 7 August 2025, with plans to submit the DCO application in Q1 of 2026.</p> <p>SSE is also working towards the submission</p>	No	The Applicant acknowledges SSE Hydrogen Developments Limits proposal and the benefits of coordination. Dialogue has continued with this objective.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Power Station		<p>of its DCO application for the Proposed Development in Q1 2026 and intends to conduct statutory consultation from September-October 2025. Since both projects are proposing nationally significant infrastructure in the same local area, we recognise the importance of coordinating efforts to minimise consultation fatigue and avoid confusion where possible. Additionally, there will be implications for Local Planning Authorities, statutory nature conservation bodies and local communities having to engage with two DCO applications with similar locations.</p>		
SSE Hydrogen Development s Limited and Ferrybridge	Protective Provisions	<p>In line with national policy, SSE is committed to working collaboratively with Light Valley Solar Ltd to ensure that there is a solution for co-existence and co-location of both projects. Based upon the 'Outline Environmental</p>	No	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the interface between SSE's project and the Proposed Development and is committed to working collaboratively with SSE. The</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Next Generation Power Station		<p>Masterplan' for Solar Development Site 4, shown for Light Valley Solar Phase Two Consultation, there are several features within the overlapping development boundaries of the LVS project and the Proposed Development that may potentially need to be navigated. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- LVS layout of solar panels, substation, cable routes and associated infrastructure</li> <li>- FBNG proposed pipeline routes and future maintenance access</li> <li>- Existing watercourse, hedgerows, trees and proposed landscaping and habitat creation</li> <li>- Existing public rights of way and any proposed permissive paths</li> <li>- Existing utility connections above and below ground</li> <li>- Existing and proposed access points and tracks.</li> </ul>		Applicant is engaging with SSE and will enter into the relevant contractual documentation to ensure each project's assets are protected.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
SSE Hydrogen Development s Limited and Ferrybridge Next Generation Power Station	Consultation and Engagement	We would welcome joint working with Light Valley Solar Ltd on these matters to demonstrate best practice within the energy industry. The teams have already worked together to share survey works and proposed project timelines including consultation. These discussions are summarised in Table 1 below.	No	The Applicant acknowledges this response and will work with the respondent where necessary at further points in the application and development process.
SSE Hydrogen Development s Limited and Ferrybridge Next Generation Power Station	Consultation and Engagement	The key next steps that we see as beneficial to working together to achieve our common goals are as follows: - Continued design and engineering engagement to discuss respective construction programmes and proposed pipeline corridor route within the overlapping development area and opportunities to co-ordinate where possible to address the interactions outlined above - Engagement with respective planning and	No	The Applicant acknowledges this comment and has been engaging with SSE.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>environment leads for the projects to discuss survey results and any proposed mitigation for development within the overlapping site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Legal engagement regarding documenting the coexistence of the projects</li> <li>- Preparation of a report which outlines the inter-relationships between the two projects, the approach taken to work collaboratively on matters including those outlined and suggested in this consultation response and any agreed mitigation measures. This 'inter-relationships' document would be included with the DCO submission and shared with key stakeholders.</li> </ul>		
SSE Hydrogen Development s Limited and Ferrybridge	Consultation and Engagement	SSE would welcome the opportunity for continued dialogue on the process, timescales and ways the projects can work together to reduce the potential burden on consultees that might	No	The Applicant will continue to engage with the respondent where necessary throughout the application and development process.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Next Generation Power Station		otherwise be felt by the combined effect of our application timeline		
SSE Hydrogen Developments Limited and Ferrybridge Next Generation Power Station	Cumulative impacts	We would appreciate the opportunity to engage with you regarding the potential interaction points to minimise cumulative impacts, maximise the benefits of coexistence of both schemes and those for local communities and to ensure consistency across the applications throughout associated technical and environmental assessments.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and has welcomed ongoing engagement with SSE.</p> <p>Through developing the ES, each topic chapter, where relevant, has included a cumulative impact assessment, considering other committed developments in the area, including SSE Hydrogen Developments Limited and Ferrybridge Next Generation Power Station, and assessing potential added impacts to aspects such as traffic. Further information regarding cumulative effects can be found in ES Volume 1 Chapter 17: Cumulative and In-Combination</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Effects <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.17].</b>
Wistow Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	Solar farms tend to be located on bare agricultural land and in open countryside. Where possible the use of high-quality agricultural land should be avoided to protect food security. The Councils preference is for brownfield sites to be utilised in the first instance, but, should agricultural land be required this should be low grade unproductive land.	Yes	The quantity and quality of land within the Solar Development Sites is set out in Section 5.7 of ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.05].</b> The significance of removing this land from solely food production is assessed in Section 5.9, and the cumulative assessment of the removal of agricultural land on food security is assessed in Section 5.14.
Wistow Parish Council	Cable Route Corridor	The use of extensive underground cable corridors to connect solar farms to the national grid gives rise to speculation that additional solar farms will be added to the network in the future. Such action may open the flood gates	No	The Applicant can confirm that no further Solar Development Sites will be added to the Proposed Development.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>to the parish becoming blighted by multiple solar farms along the 2 mile stretch of cabling within the Parish. Where permanent cables have to be installed within the parish, the Council will seek assurances from the developer that no additional solar farms or spurs will be connected to the network in the future.</p>		
Wistow Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	<p>Approximately 2 miles of the proposed cable corridor traverses through the parish of Wistow and interacts with hundreds of acres of high-grade agricultural land. The Council therefore requests an assurance from the developer that all agricultural land and soils will be reinstated to its pre-existing condition upon completion of the project, and that land is returned to its owners as soon as practicable after construction.</p>	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. The Soil Resource Management Plan submitted as part of the Application includes measures to reinstate land affected by installing the cable to its pre-existing condition (See Outline Soil Resources Management Plan (oSRMP) <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.14]</b>)</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Wistow Parish Council	Traffic and Movement	<p>Much of the access required to construct cable corridors is taken from minor and unclassified roads, which were not designed to accommodate articulated or heavy goods vehicles.</p> <p>Where access is required along such roads, the Council requests that the roads surface, markings and turning paths are upgraded prior to commencement of the works, and that road is returned to a condition which is equal or better than before, upon completion of the works.</p>	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes will be agreed with NYC. This takes into account the existing condition of each route, and identifies if any upgrades are required to accommodate traffic from the Proposed Development during the construction phase. The oCTMP secures the commitment to return roads, lanes and tracks to a condition no worse than before.</p>
Wistow Parish Council	Traffic and Movement	<p>The construction of a 2-mile cable corridor across the parish will generate a significant volume of construction traffic and vehicle movement through the area.</p> <p>In the interests of safety, the Council request that HGV's are prohibited from travelling</p>	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>through the village of Wistow along the B1223, and that access to the corridor should be taken from Monk Lane in Selby and Selby Common.</p>		<p>traffic. These routes will be agreed with NYC. This takes into account the existing condition of each route and seeks, where practicable, to avoid residential areas.</p>
<p>Wistow Parish Council</p>	<p>Traffic and Movement</p>	<p>A construction compound is proposed to be built off Carr Lane, Wistow. Access to this location along Carr Lane and from Selby Road is very restricted and unsuitable for articulated vehicles. It is also a high traffic area for pedestrians, horse riders, joggers and cyclists. In the interests of safety, the Council request that this compound be relocated to a site on the southern side of the corridor and along the approach from Monk Lane in Selby.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>) 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, the compound location has been relocated onto the B1223 Wistow Road.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Wistow Parish Council	Construction and Decommissioning	While the intention is for construction compounds to be temporary in practice, they are very permanent in their construction and design. Where temporary construction compounds are to be located within the Parish, the Council will request assurances from the developer that any compounds will be removed upon completion, and the land returned to its pre-existing condition	No	The Applicant acknowledges the concern around construction compounds. These will be temporary for the duration of the construction phase and will be removed prior to the commencement of operation. An Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b> ) and Outline Soil Resource Management Plan (oSRMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.14]</b> ) have been prepared as part of the DCO Application to outline the construction-related and soil management mitigation measures relevant for the Proposed Development. A Detailed Soil Resource Management Plan(s) (SRMP) and CEMP will be

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>prepared by the appointed Contractor(s), substantially in accordance with the outline plans, which will outline the adoption and implementation of good practice measures for the construction phase of the Proposed Development to minimise damage to soils. These will be submitted for approval by North Yorkshire Council in advance of construction commencing.</p>
<p>Wistow Parish Council</p>	<p>Construction and Decommissioning</p>	<p>Where heavy civils works are to be conducted within the parish, the Council will request that the works are undertaken in accordance with accepted guidelines.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding potential impacts from construction of the Proposed Development. An Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b>) has been prepared as part of the DCO Application to outline the mitigation</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>measures relevant to construction for the Proposed Development. A detailed CEMP will be prepared by the appointed Contractor(s), substantially in accordance with the outline plan, and will be submitted for approval by North Yorkshire Council in advance of each stage of works.</p>
<p>Wistow Parish Council</p>	<p>Socioeconomics</p>	<p>When a solar farm is of sufficient size and scale to be a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project, it is the Council's preference that the majority of the projects supply chain and labour force is sourced locally.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant appreciates the Council's preference for local sourcing and employment. The Applicant is actively exploring opportunities to engage with local suppliers and workforce during the construction and operational phases.</p> <p>An outline Skills, Supply chain and Employment Plan (oSSCEP, [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.13]) is</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				provided as part of the DCO Application, identifying opportunities for economic improvement, including through sourcing labour and materials locally where practicable. The Applicant remains open to further dialogue with the Council and local stakeholders to support this aim.
Wistow Parish Council	Water Resources and Flood Risk	<p>Approx 2 miles of the projects Cable Corridor is located within the Parish, and several waterways and dykes are bisected by the works.</p> <p>The Council therefore request that an extensive drainage, watercourse impact assessment and management plan is conducted prior to the commencement of the works, and that these assessments are made available to the Council.</p> <p>The Council also seeks assurances that all waterways disturbed by the project are</p>	No	<p>The Applicant has assessed flood risk, which is included in ES Volume 3 Appendix 15.1: Flooding Risk Assessment (FRA, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01 ]</b>). In addition, an Outline Drainage Strategy <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.04 ]</b> has been prepared and is included with the FRA.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		returned to the pre-existing condition after completion of the works.		
Wistow Parish Council	Socioeconomics	<p>Several footpaths and bridleways will be temporarily severed by the proposed cable corridor.</p> <p>In the interests of safety, the Council requests an assurance that pedestrian access will be maintained along all pre-existing footpaths and bridleways at all times through the duration of the works, and adequate diversions put in place if this is not possible.</p>	No	<p>The Applicant notes these comments. A public rights of way management plan accompanies the ES and will set out how access along PRowS will be maintained as far as practicable during construction and operation, and the duration of any temporary closures kept to a minimum (See Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRowMP) <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.09]</b>).</p> <p>Signage will be placed at all PRow intersections with the Proposed Development to inform the public about planned works, closures, and alternative routes. The location and content of signs (and the</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				mechanisms for agreeing variations/additions) will be set out in the Detailed PRow Management Plan (PRowMP) with Local Authority PRow officers. 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, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]</b> ).
Wistow Parish Council	Biodiversity	<p>The linear nature of the proposed corridor will sever many wildlife/nature corridors and habitats within the parish.</p> <p>The Council therefore requests that these are identified in advance of the works and mitigation measures put in place to minimise the disturbance to local wildlife.</p>	No	Important habitats and linear features have been excluded as far as possible from the cable working area, and existing gaps in linear features will be utilised where possible to reduce loss. If any small areas of habitat loss are required,

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				the habitat will be reinstated where possible, or mitigated for within the Proposed Development.
Wistow Parish Council	Community Benefits	<p>The scale and duration of the works to be undertaken within the parish presents a significant loss of amenity to local residents, with several properties and trails being blighted by the works for an extended period.</p> <p>The Council therefore requests compensation from the developers; in the form of a contribution towards the upkeep of existing local amenities, in order to compensate for this disturbance to the community.</p>	No	The Applicant is committed to providing a Community Benefit Fund and will engage locally to shape the Fund so that it works for the community. All comments received will be considered alongside other feedback to receive funding from the Community Benefit Fund.
Wistow Parish Council	Consultation and Engagement	The scale of the works being proposed, means that there will be a significant amount of construction activity within the area for an extended period of time. The Council therefore request a community liaison officer	No	The Applicant will ensure local residents and councils, including the respondent, are notified of changes to the programme of works

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>be made available to residents and the Council for the duration of the works, and for the Council to be notified of any changes to the programme of the works.</p>		<p>should the Proposed Development be consented.</p> <p>A Community Liaison Group will be established prior to the commencement of the Proposed Development, with the terms of reference for the Group to be approved by NYC as relevant planning authority.</p>
National Highways	Traffic and Movement	<p>The Applicant should assess and detail the traffic impact at each Strategic Road Network (SRN) junction to determine if there will be unacceptable road safety or operational impacts.</p>	Yes	<p>A Transport Assessment (TA) has been undertaken and is included within ES Volume 3 Appendix 14.1 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]</b>. This assesses the road network capacity, existing transport conditions, reviews the current highway network and determines if any highway mitigation is required to accommodate the traffic that would be generated by the Proposed Development over the</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				construction phase and minimise the impact on local infrastructure.
National Highways	Traffic and Movement	The Applicant should contact National Highways' Abnormal Loads Team at an early stage to discuss the details of any Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL), if relevant.	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. An abnormal load assessment report has been prepared and is attached in Annex C of Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3)</p> <p><b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]</b>. This has been undertaken by an abnormal load specialist to inform construction design. The relevant team within National Highways have been made aware of the AIL requirements for this project.</p> <p>The operator of the abnormal load will apply for a permit and follow the necessary procedures of informing the highway authorities and police, prior to travelling to and from site.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
National Highways	Traffic and Movement	The Applicant should provide daily profile figures for construction traffic generation.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. Section 5 of Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) <b>[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]</b> outlines the trip generation methodology and details how many HGV loads / employee trips each Solar Development Site and cable route corridor area is expected to generate each day.
National Highways	Traffic and Movement	The Applicant should clarify and clearly identify which SRN junctions construction vehicle trips will be assigned to for each Solar Development Site.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. ES Volume 1 Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.14]</b> provides further detail regarding construction traffic routes, which are shown in ES Volume 2 Figure 14.4: Construction Routing <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.14.04 ]</b> .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>Furthermore, an outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. This considers the existing highway capacity of each route and identifies if any highway mitigation is required to accommodate traffic from the Proposed Development during the construction phase.</p>
National Highways	Traffic and Movement	The Applicant should include the number of construction trips assigned to the SRN during each peak period (AM and PM) for review.	No	<p>The Applicant acknowledges this comment. Section 5 of the Transport Assessment (TA) <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]</b> indicates that approximately 10% of trips could arrive/depart in the AM and PM hours. Traffic flow diagrams are included to show</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				where the construction traffic has been assigned onto the network, including the SRN.
National Highways	Traffic and Movement	<p>The Applicant should produce a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) that includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The number of trips on the SRN during construction</li> <li>2. Delivery vehicle routes, including abnormal loads</li> <li>3. Mitigation and management of construction impacts on the road network</li> </ol>	No	An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b> ) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. This takes into account the existing highway capacity of each route and identifies if any highway mitigation is required to accommodate traffic from the Proposed Development during the construction phase.
National Highways	Traffic and Movement	The Applicant should ensure that any traffic management proposals on the SRN are agreed in advance with the relevant	No	The Applicant notes this comment. There are no traffic management proposals on the SRN, with the exception that there may be a

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		National Highways Team.		requirement to transport abnormal loads. National Highways will be consulted in advance regarding any proposals to transport abnormal loads on the SRN.
National Highways	Traffic and Movement	The Applicant should clarify alternative construction traffic routes if planned improvements (such as the A63/A162 Monk Fryston roundabout) are not complete prior to the start of construction.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]</b> ) outlines in Section 3 that if the proposed improvements are not in place prior to commencement of construction, alternative routing may need to be agreed with NYC to access those Solar Development Sites that use the A63 / A162 junction. Alternatively, there would be an agreement to restrict construction movements to outside the network peaks.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
National Highways	Traffic and Movement / Construction	The Applicant should ensure that any construction activities to be undertaken outside of the core working hours are discussed and agreed with National Highways, in addition to the Local Planning Authority.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. Details of working arrangements are included in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, [EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]).

## Phase Two Section 44 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
Cable Route Corridor	LV2_PFF_062	As landowners / farmers in Monk Fryston we are supportive of your Proposed Development, the benefits it will bring, and in the context of the national drive towards renewable energy. Having said that, it is clear that the proposed cable routes for your Proposed Development will pass over significant areas of our land and so are of particular interest to us.	Yes	The Applicant remains committed to working with landowners to secure the land rights required to facilitate the Proposed Development by voluntary agreement as detailed in the <b>Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker [EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.04]</b> .
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_PFF_062	As a significant and very specific further concern to us is the fact that a much needed bypass development (IE to provide a large new housing development funding an associated bypass / relief road for the village) has been in preparation by a respected local developer over the past few years. Your Proposed Development would potentially overlap over a large	No	The Applicant notes this comment and can confirm that it is aware of the Monk Fryston Bypass scheme. The Applicant notes that since the conclusion of Phase Two consultation the lands team has discussed the bypass with the respondent and agreed mutually and based on the information currently available that the bypass scheme is uncertain with no tangible progress being made towards it at this time. The bypass 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
		<p>portion of the housing / bypass scheme, potentially rendering it unworkable. Negotiations over the land from us (and from our adjacent neighbour) for the housing / bypass Proposed Development reached an advanced stage, and hence we have detailed knowledge of the proposal.</p>		<p>therefore not included as part of Appendix 17.1: Long List of In-Combination Effects and Cumulative Developments <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.17.01]</b>.</p>
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_PFF_062	<p>Our queries for you are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are you aware of the Monk Fryston housing / bypass scheme?</li> <li>- If so, what considerations have been made / discussed to allow both Proposed Developments to proceed at some point and hence avoid curtailing the bypass scheme?</li> <li>- If no consideration has already been made, will you now consider doing so in the long term interest of the village?</li> </ul>	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and can confirm that it is aware of the Monk Fryston Bypass scheme. The Applicant notes that since the conclusion of Phase Two consultation the lands team has discussed the bypass with the respondent and agreed mutually and based on the information currently available that the bypass scheme is uncertain with no tangible progress being made towards it at this time.</p> <p>The Applicant welcomes discussions with the developer of the bypass scheme should the proposals become active again.</p>

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
Public Rights of Way	LV2_PFF_062	We would be extremely pleased to see a network of paths / cycle ways as extensive and accessible as possible, ideally not fully enclosed, but with a variety of open views wherever possible	Yes	The Applicant can confirm that, spread over several sites, the Proposed Development will create approximately 8 km (5 miles) of new permissive paths, while it is expected all existing PRoWs will remain open during construction. Three permanent PRoW diversions are planned at Solar Development Site 1, mainly in response to feedback received. These diversions have been designed to maintain connectivity and accessibility for local users, as well as provide a more protected area for the new non-breeding bird mitigation area at the southern area of Solar Development Site 1. The Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM, <b>[EN0110012/LVS/APP/06.02.03.01]</b> ) includes the routes of all new and diverted PRoWs, secured in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]</b> ).
Community Benefits	LV2_PFF_062	Anything that is raised by the local parish council will have the support of the community and should be	No	The Applicant notes this response and will continue to engage with parish councils.

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
		given the greatest consideration for this reason.		
LANDS INTEREST / Construction and Decommissioning	LV2_PFF_058	I attended the meeting on the 19th July which was informative and concerning. My concern is the proposed construction site which according to the site plan butts up to my field. There would only be the single track road 'Fairfield Lane' separating them. There are 15 horses on my field and some have health problems and some are very young. To have the compound so close could cause unnecessary stress to the horses as it will no doubt be noisy, dusty and obviously in constant use with heavy machines.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes concerns raised regarding horses, including domestic and equine related facilities, and has welcomed discussions on this matter with the respondent.</p> <p>ES Volume 1 Chapter 13: Socioeconomics <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13]</b> 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, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b>). With these measures applied, no significant residual effects on equine receptors are expected.</p>

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
				<p>The Applicant has submitted the Book of Reference <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.03]</b>. This includes persons who may be entitled to compensation if the Development Consent Order is granted.</p> <p>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.</p>
LANDS INTEREST	LV2_PFF_058	I have enclosed the A4 sheet that you keep putting near my gate. On it there is an area coloured blue. I did ask at the meeting and was informed it was because you did not know who owned it. As you can see from the map it is partly on my land and partly on Paul Scholey's land. It does not state why this area marked in blue is of so much interest to you. Are there plans for	No	<p>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.</p> <p>The notice requests for any party with an interest in the land to come forward to make claim to their interest and provide contact details, which can be done by using the contact details included on the notice. These interests then receive formal notification of</p>

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
		<p>this small area? If so, what are they?</p>		<p>the project if the unregistered land intersects with the draft Order Limits for consultation. Should the unregistered land intersect with the draft Order Limits and a claim of ownership has been issued, along with supporting evidence, the land will be included within the voluntary agreement to secure the land rights required to facilitate the Proposed Development. The Applicant remains committed to working with landowners to secure the land rights as detailed in the <b>Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker [EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.04]</b>.</p> <p>Unregistered land has been identified along Fairfield which is within the draft Order Limits for the purpose of construction access. Should a claim of ownership be issued, the land will be included within the voluntary agreement to secure the land rights required to facilitate the Proposed Development.</p>

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 Movement	LV2_PFF_058	Fairfield Lane is the only access to the livestock and although you put traffic monitoring cable across Fairfield Lane it did not monitor all visitors to us as it was not there long enough for the less regular i.e. farrier, dentist, food deliveries (hay and haylage) and also the vet which can be day and night. There are many other people using the road as it is safe for the many horse riders, cyclists, dog walkers, families out walking.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>There were two tranches of traffic data collection, the first surveys were undertaken between 28th January and 3rd February 2025 and the second from 1st July to 7th July 2025. The network diagrams are included in ES Volume 3 Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]</b>; the assessment methodology is further outlined in ES Volume 1 Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.14]</b>.</p> <p>An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>) 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 Fairfield Lane. As a result, there would need to be access via Fairfield Lane during the period that access to that</p>

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
				<p>cable route corridor location is required. This would only be short term.</p> <p>Access for other road users will be safely maintained, as addressed and secured through the outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.09]</b>).</p>
Site Selection and Alternatives	LV2_OFF_144	Options such as, brownfield land, contaminated land, central reservations on motorways, roofscapes of industrial or agricultural buildings, railway lines and infrastructure and re-purposing land. As long as greenfield sites continue to gain permission, they will always be the cheaper option for developers.	No	<p>The Applicant acknowledges suggestions and preferences for use of 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 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]</b>). 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.</p>

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
				<p>The Applicant recognises expressions of preference for rooftop solar; on this, the Applicant supports rooftop solar and believes that to meet clean energy and legally binding targets by 2030, a combination of rooftop and ground-mounted solar will be required.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises suggestions of local brownfield sites; however, these are often fragmented sites considerable distances from each other, neither providing the space for solar generation required or ease of connectivity between sites.</p>
Cumulative	LV2_OFF_144	Once the corridor connections routes are in place, there is the potential to fill up all the countryside between Monk Fryston and Escrick with more solar panel sites. If solar panel sites are to be supported, they should preferably be concentrated around such substations with strategic planning through the development plan process to mitigate the visual harm	No	<p>The Applicant can confirm that no further Solar Development Sites will be added to the Proposed Development or along the Cable Route Corridor.</p> <p>Following the confirmation of a connection agreement with National Grid, potential sites in the local area were investigated, with proximity to Monk Fryston substation being a key consideration, along with environmental and spatial constraints, Green Belt,</p>

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
		with longer term substantial woodland planting around them.		Agricultural Land Classifications and visual impacts. ES Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]</b> provides further detail regarding the site selection and design process, while ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]</b> details the proposed measures to help mitigate visual impacts, including planted mitigation.
Agricultural Land and Soils	LV2_OFF_144	However, we oppose large scale solar farms on greenfield sites and agricultural land. Such Proposed Developments use up valuable good quality agricultural land which should be retained for farming purposes in the future and for preserving the open countryside for its own sake.	No	The Site Selection Assessment Report (Appendix 3.1, ES Volume 3) <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]</b> 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. The Applicant has demonstrated compliance with UK legislation and policy pertaining to appropriate land use in the <b>Planning Statement [EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.02]</b> .

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
				<p>Furthermore, within Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils (ES Volume 1) <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b>, it states that:</p> <p><i>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. Although the assessment assumes that vegetation will be managed with machinery, there are no known restrictive covenants that would prevent land beneath the panels being grazed by livestock.</i></p> <p>The opportunity to graze within the Proposed Development boundary has been secured within the Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.03]</b>.</p>
Agricultural Land and Soils	LV2_OFF_144	The majority of the land encompassed in this Proposed Development is Grade 2 best and	No	The Applicant notes this comment. ES Volume 3 Appendix 5.1: Agricultural Land Classification

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
		<p>most versatile agricultural land. Planning Policy advises that Solar Proposed Developments should be steered away from this quality agricultural land. Given the substantial distance of Solar Development Site 1 from the substation and that it is the BMV, it should be excluded from this Proposed Development in its entirety.</p>		<p><b>[EN00110012/APP/06.03.05.01]</b> confirms that approximately 54% of the land within the Solar Development Sites is best and most versatile (BMV) land in Grades 1, 2 and 3a (with Grade 2 accounting for 18%, not the majority) and 45% is non-BMV land in Subgrade 3b. 1% is non-agricultural land.</p> <p>Solar Development Site 1 has similar proportions of BMV/non-BMV, although most of the BMV land is Subgrade 3a, with Grade 2 accounting for only 9%.</p> <p>The 495 ha of BMV land, of which approximately 17.5 ha would be 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</p>

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
				<p>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.</p> <p>The applicable policy tests are those set out in section 5.11 of NPS EN-1 (December, 2025), namely whether the use of agricultural land is justified and necessary and whether the loss of BMV land has been minimised through site selection. The Applicant has demonstrated compliance with this policy in the Planning Statement <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.02]</b>, in paragraphs 7.6.5 to 7.6.10.</p> <p>Further, ES Volume 3 Appendix 3.1: Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]</b>) 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</p>

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
				a 500 MW solar project, either individually or in combination with other sites.
Cultural Heritage	LV2_OFF_144	Solar Development Site 1 at Escrick will have an impact on the setting of several Heritage Assets including the Escrick Village Conservation Area and the setting of Queen Margarets school (Grade II* Listed). Solar Development Site 1 forms part of the wider setting for the historic village and the surrounding heritage assets.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Refinements to the Order Limits and embedded mitigation with the design of the Proposed Development has reduced impacts from the Proposed Development on the setting of heritage assets within the Escrick estate. ES Volume 1 Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage [EN0110012/APP/LVS/ 06.01.08] has assessed that natural screening and topography will mean that, for the majority of heritage assets within the village and estate (including the building of Escrick Park), there will no effects or the potential for occasional glimpsed views only. There is the potential for some temporary construction effects including increased traffic, movement of plant, light and construction noise, but these will be highly limited and return to neutral on completion of the construction phase. There will be changes within the setting of the Garden Temple (Grade II Listed) within the grounds of Escrick Park. This asset is located c.820m from 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
				Proposed Development and partially derives its significance from its wider setting within the modern landscaped estate. Solar Development Site 1 is now under agricultural use and did not form part of the designed landscape, although it's historic association with the estate is noted. There is potential for limited intervisibility between the asset and the Proposed Development, however this is assessed as resulting in a minor adverse impact only.
Cultural Heritage	LV2_OFF_144	The archaeological surveys in the PEIR indicate some roman interest but provide no details of the field numbers to which the survey relates or the extent of this potential interest.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Following assessments undertaken at PEIR-stage, the Proposed Development has undertaken further, extensive surveys including geophysical surveys <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.03]</b> and trial trenching <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.04]</b> to identify potential impacts. Full details regarding the archaeological surveys undertaken are included within ES Volume 1 Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.08]</b> .

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 revised Order Limits exclude some areas which could potentially contain high concentrations of potential archaeological remains based on the results of the geophysical survey, including a potential Romano-British settlement to the north-west of the Solar Development Site 1. No trail trenching was undertaken in this area to verify the presence, or date, of these results.
Cultural Heritage	LV2_OFF_144	The results of the geo physical survey have not been provided in the PEIR nor have any details of the archaeological interest.	Yes	The results of geophysical surveys <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.03]</b> and trial trenching <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.04]</b> are included within the ES appendices (Volume 3).
Cultural Heritage	LV2_OFF_144	It is likely that there is roman archaeological significance along this moraine. This could be more widespread within the northern part of Solar Development Site 1 and could extend much further into Solar Development Site 1 area. It is therefore suggested that further investigation takes place and the	Yes	Extensive surveys including geophysical surveys <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.03]</b> and trial trenching <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.04]</b> have been undertaken across Solar Development Site 1 to establish the presence and nature of the archaeological resource in this area. The Order Limits have been revised to exclude the areas of highest archaeological potential.

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
		results are made public for further consideration and comment before this indicative layout is agreed.		
Biodiversity	LV2_OFF_144	We are concerned over how successfully the grass grow underneath and how will it be maintained.	Yes	The outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]</b> ) provides details of how the grassland beneath the panels will be created and maintained. This includes managed cutting of the grass, removing any cutting and debris to allow for grass to grow. There is also a presumption against the use of herbicides, allowing grass to grow organically.
Ornithology	LV2_OFF_144	We have concerns over the wider impacts of fields of solar panels on the flight paths of birds from Derwent Ings and Skipwith Common and further afield.	No	The Applicant notes these concerns. Glint and glare effects on birds are assessed as negligible, as stated within ES Volume 3 Appendix 16.4: Glint and Glare Assessment <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.04]</b> . 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

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
				similar UK solar projects have not identified avian impacts from glint or glare. See Section 12.17 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 12 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.12]</b> .
Biodiversity	LV2_OFF_144	The panel fencing around the individual fields will restrict the movement of deer who migrate between multiple woodland sites in the area.	Yes	<p>The effects of the Proposed Development on ecology and habitat, including specific species and habitats, are assessed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]</b>.</p> <p>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.</p>
Landscape and Visual/ Biodiversity	LV2_OFF_144	Solar farms disrupt and erode rural landscapes and can cause environmental and ecological damage.	No	<p>The Applicant notes this concern. The design of the Proposed Development has been iteratively refined to avoid, reduce and mitigate adverse landscape, visual, environmental and ecological effects wherever practicable. A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and</p>

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
				<p>is reported in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]</b>.</p> <p>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 current legislation, policy, standards and guidance set out in Chapter 10, Section 10.3.</p> <p>Strategic opportunities to incorporate environmental enhancements have been identified through the design development process to date. These are shown on the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]</b>) and secured in the Design Parameters and Commitments Document <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.06]</b>.</p>

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
				<p>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 Volume 1 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.</p> <p>With regards to ecology, the effects of the Proposed Development on ecology and habitat, including specific species and habitats, are assessed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06].Mitigations</b></p>

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
				include fencing that allows small mammals to pass through, buffer zones for ecologically sensitive features such as hedgerows and watercourses, and extensive landscape planting to provide habitat. These measures are further detailed in and secured through the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]</b> ) and Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.03]</b> ).
Landscape and Visual	LV2_OFF_144	The panels are indicated to tilt up and down to angle towards the sun throughout the day. Any visual assessment should take into consideration the amount of time during the day when panels will be in the higher position. The visual impact will be much greater when tiled upwards.	Yes	<p>A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and is reported in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]</b>.</p> <p>As detailed in the paragraph 10.6.3, the LVIA has assessed an option where the proposed solar panels would extend to up to 4.5 m above ground level in the tallest position during short periods of time near sunrise and sunset as the worst-case scenario. The final</p>

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
				design will seek to minimise panel height wherever practicable, taking into account technical requirements, site topography, and operational efficiency.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_OFF_144	Moreover, the hedgerows suggested on the indicative plans will take many years to establish to screen from public view.	Yes	As set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]</b> , the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) assesses visual effects during the operational phase at both Year 1 and Year 15, explicitly recognising that landscape mitigation takes time to establish and that effects may be more apparent during early operation and in winter conditions.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_OFF_144	Additionally, the impact will be even greater that during the winter months when the angle will be higher for longer and when hedgerows are bare. The impact along Skipwith Road will be significant as hedgerows are currently intermittent.	Yes	As set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]</b> , the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) assesses visual effects during the operational phase at both Year 1 and Year 15, explicitly recognising that landscape

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
				<p>mitigation takes time to establish and that effects may be more apparent during early operation and in winter conditions.</p> <p>As shown on Works Plans <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.03]</b> and on the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]</b>), the Proposed Development will be located at an offset from the Skipwith Road with new hedgerow planting and hedgerow reinforcement proposed to further mitigate adverse visual effects.</p>
Landscape and Visual	LV2_OFF_144	The suggested parameters should include provision for smaller non tilting panels in more open and visually prominent locations.	Yes	<p>A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and is reported in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]</b>.</p> <p>As detailed in the paragraph 10.6.3, the LVIA has assessed an option where the proposed solar panels would extend to up to 4.5 m</p>

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
				above ground level in the tallest position during short periods of time near sunrise and sunset as the worst-case scenario.
Landscape and Visual	LV2_OFF_144	The density of the panels should be given more consideration. If they are high density and concentrated together, these would have a far greater visual impact.	Yes	<p>A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and is reported in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]</b>.</p> <p>The LVIA has assessed the Proposed Development based on a reasonable worst-case scenario, which includes consideration of the maximum design parameters for solar panel layout and associated infrastructure with a minimum of 2.5 metres between rows of panels. This is secured in the Design Parameters and Commitments document <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.06]</b>.</p>
Landscape and Visual / Public	LV2_OFF_144	The visual experience of walking in the rural area and using public footpaths will be harmed. It will	Yes	A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and

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
Rights of Way and Paths		change to a more industrial environment.		<p>is reported in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]</b>.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The design of the Proposed Development has been informed by an environmentally-led approach, with users of Public Rights of Way considered throughout site selection and layout refinement. This has included providing offsets from Public Rights of Way, watercourses and woodland; retaining existing vegetation; and incorporating</p>

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
				<p>substantial new planting to screen and filter views.</p> <p>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) <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b> and the Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04]</b>.</p> <p>The LVIA demonstrates that the users of Public Rights of Way would experience adverse changes to views during construction and operation (Section 10.9; Appendix 10.3: Visual Baseline and Effects <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.10.03]</b>). However, the assessment shows that these effects will reduce over time as mitigation planting establishes, with the majority of</p>

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
				visual effects on residential receptors negligible adverse by Year 15 of operation (Tables 10.22 and 10.26; Section 10.8).
Consultation and Engagement	LV2_OFF_144	The public consultation exercise was misleading in providing images of smaller panels, space between panels, lush green grass beneath them and sheep in the fields. The reality could be far different.	No	<p>The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the claim the materials used at consultation events were intended to mislead. Images of operational, UK solar farms were sought which resembled what the Proposed Development may look like. The images used were not declared as intended to show what the Proposed Development would look like once constructed.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comment regarding the use of images including sheep grazing and can confirm that 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. Grass is able to grow in shade and partial shade conditions and is the most prevalent</p>

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
				vegetation within existing solar farms growing under as well as between the rows of panels.
Noise and Vibration	LV2_OFF_144	(Solar Development Site 1) Potential noise and disturbance from movement of hundreds of panels as they tilt towards the sun. At quiet times of the day when ambient background noise is low, this could be a source of noise and disturbance	No	<p>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 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.11]</b>.</p> <p>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 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.11.03]</b> and Figure 11.3: Operational Noise Modelling Results <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.11.03]</b>.</p> <p>As noted in the ES, the proposed Solar Development Sites may use tracking systems. Tracking systems operate with small motors and generate very low levels of noise.</p>

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
				<p>Manufacturer data for a typical tracker motor indicates a sound pressure level of approximately 50 dB(A) at 1 m. These motors usually operate intermittently for short duration and only during the daytime. Given their low output and limited operation, the noise contribution from tracking motors is considered negligible.</p> <p>The assessment of operational noise concludes that impacts at sensitive receptors, are not significant.</p>
Noise and Vibration	LV2_OFF_144	Potential for Noise from the battery storage site which is in close proximity to our property.	No	<p>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 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.11]</b>.</p> <p>The assessment of operational likely significant impacts and effects are provided in Section 11.9. Details of noise modelling results and assumptions are presented in ES</p>

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
				<p>Volume 3 Appendix 11.3: Operational Noise and Vibration Assumptions and Results <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.11.03]</b> and ES Volume 2 Figure 11.3: Operational Noise Modelling Results <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.11.03]</b>.</p> <p>Details of mitigation measures to control operational noise are presented in Section 11.8 of the ES chapter. As far as practicable, these include selection of sites away from surrounding receptors (which have been centred within the available area to optimise separation from surrounding receptors and reduce potential adverse impacts), location and orientation of plant and implementation of noise barriers.</p> <p>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</p>

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
				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.
Traffic and Movement	LV2_OFF_144	We have concerns over the volume and routing of traffic during the construction phase. Monitoring of traffic routing should be included. Hours of construction should be restricted to reasonable day time hours and weekdays.	Yes	The Applicant can confirm that construction worker shifts will be scheduled so that workers are not travelling during the network peak hours of 08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00. ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]</b> 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. In addition, as part of the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b> ), travel planning measures, including the provision of shared transport for construction workers,

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
				such as minibuses, have been developed. The oCTMP also secures the monitoring of construction traffic. Further details regarding construction traffic are outlined within ES Volume 1 Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.14]</b> .
Landscape and Visual	LV2_OFF_144	It is welcomed that the northern row of fields in site 1 shown with cross green hatching are now to be set back area for heritage, landscape and other agricultural land considerations. This is welcomed. However, we note the plan is only indicative and subject to change. The DCO should therefore contain provision to ensure that this set back area cannot be used for siting of panels in the future.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment and can confirm that the northern row of fields have been removed from the Order Limits. The Applicant can confirm that it does not intend to site solar panels on the fields in future.
Traffic and Movement	LV2_OFF_139	Traffic is awful along the A63 - a straight stretch of road with many accidents already, adding to this an access point is dangerous to any road users on a main route	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment.  A Transport Assessment (TA) has been prepared (Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) <b>[EN0110012]</b>

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
				<p><b>/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]</b> to accompany the Application.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The Proposed Development is forecast to increase traffic on the A63 through Monk Fryston by 1% during the construction period. This small temporary uplift in traffic will not significantly impact on future traffic conditions. Therefore, it was concluded that there should not a noticeable impact on the A63 from the Proposed Development.</p> <p>An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by</p>

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
				<p>construction traffic. This includes the A63 to access Solar Development Site 2.</p> <p>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.</p>
Public Rights of Way and Paths	LV2_OFF_139	A walk through the fields to the back route to Monk Fryston is regularly used and would like to be maintained	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment, and can confirm it 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 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13]</b> and the outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.09]</b>) submitted as part of the Application. New and existing</p>

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
				<p>permissive paths are visually shown on the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]</b>) and secured in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]</b>).</p>
<p>Agricultural Land and Soils / Landscape and Visual</p>	<p>LV2_OFF_101</p>	<p>Taking far too much land out of agricultural use.</p>		<p>The applicable policy tests are those set out in section 5.11 of NPS EN-1 (December, 2025), namely whether the use of agricultural land is justified and necessary and whether the loss of BMV land has been minimised through site selection. The Applicant has demonstrated compliance with this policy in the Planning Statement <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.02]</b> within paragraphs 7.6.5 to 7.6.10.</p> <p>The Site Selection Assessment Report (ES Volume 3 Appendix 3.1 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01]</b>) 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</p>

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
				suitable land of an adequate area to facilitate a 500 MW solar project, either individually or in combination with other sites.
Agricultural Land and Soils	LV2_OFF_075	I consider it is taking too much prime agricultural land when there is a need for good food production and quality food.	No	<p>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, 576,000 ha of arable land in England were left uncropped (source: Department for Environment, Food &amp; Rural Affairs, Agricultural land use in England on 1 June 2025).</p> <p>It should also be noted that food security is not a consideration within the suite of Energy National Policy Statements or the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in land use planning terms. Further, the Government's UK Solar Roadmap (2024) states that solar development is not</p>

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
				<p>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.</p>
Public Rights of Way and Paths	LV2_OFF_075	<p>I do not want this to go ahead, people are already able to walk in the countryside if they wish without covering acres and acres in solar panels.</p>	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
LANDS INTEREST	LV2_E44_002	<p>1. Owner and occupier of Gilbertson House, which operates as an Air B&amp;B business, relying on an unspoilt rural aspect for its commercial viability.</p> <p>2. Owner of Gilbertson Cottage, currently let as short-term holiday accommodation and under active consideration for further development as a bespoke wedding venue.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes the comments.</p> <p>The Applicant has submitted the Book of Reference <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.03]</b>. This includes persons who may be entitled to compensation if the Development Consent Order is granted.</p> <p>The Applicant remains committed to adhering to the statutory process for any compensation claims submitted and will review and assess</p>

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
		<p>I respectfully request to be kept informed of all forthcoming consultation materials, environmental information reports, feedback deadlines, and public events relating to the Light Valley Solar DCO process.</p>		<p>each claim in accordance with the relevant legislation under which it is made.</p>
Socioeconomic / Landscape and Visual	LV2_E44_002	<p>Visual and Landscape Impact Gilbertson House and Gilbertson Cottage rely on an unspoilt rural aspect for their commercial appeal. The proximity of large ground-mounted PV arrays will erode this setting, reducing marketability and guest experience. I request a bespoke Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) focused on the immediate boundary of my properties, together with consideration of additional mitigation (e.g., raised bunds, native hedgerow screening).</p>	Yes	<p>A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and is reported in ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10]</b>.</p> <p>The LVIA includes the assessment relating to the visual receptors at Gilbertson House and the landscape receptors of Solar Development Site 1 and the Local Character Area (LCA) in which the Gilbertson House is located.</p> <p>Mitigation measures include offset from the residential properties, substantial new</p>

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
				planting, reinforcement of existing vegetation, careful siting and height control of infrastructure, secured within the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]</b> . 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 negligible levels.
Socioeconomics	LV2_E44_002	<p>Property Value &amp; Business Viability I have commissioned a RICS-registered valuer to quantify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The potential decrease in open-market value of Gilbertson House and Gilbertson Cottage; and</li> <li>• The projected revenue loss to the existing Airbnb operation and the proposed wedding-venue development.</li> </ul> <p>Under Section 55 of the Planning</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant has submitted the Book of Reference <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.03]</b>. This includes persons who may be entitled to compensation if the Development Consent Order is granted.</p> <p>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</p>

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
		<p>Act 2008 and the Land Compensation Act 1961, where statutory blight arises, I reserve the right to claim compensation. Please confirm your approach to blight registration and compensation arrangements.</p>		<p>available for loss of value due to visual impacts or diminished views—this is consistent with established planning law.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>Planning policy</p>	<p>LV2_E44_002</p>	<p>Amenity &amp; Mental Well-being In accordance with Section 16 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, your Environmental Statement must include a dedicated Human Health chapter. I request a standalone Health Impact Assessment (HIA) addressing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anxiety, stress and loss of enjoyment resulting from a 2–3 year construction programme;</li> </ul>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The potential for effects on population health and wellbeing, including mental health, associated the Proposed Development was considered but scoped out of the EIA Scoping Report <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.01.01]</b>, with the approach confirmed in the EIA Scoping Opinion (ES Volume 3, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.01.02]</b>).</p> <p>This included consideration of health determinants such as environmental amenity, access to green space, physical activity and social interaction, and community safety. It was concluded that the magnitude of change</p>

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
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise, dust emissions and increased vehicular traffic during works; and</li> <li>• Proposed mitigation measures (e.g., restricted working hours, noise bunds, dust management plans).</li> </ul>		<p>to these health determinants would not have the potential to give rise to significant effects on the physical or mental health at the population level.</p> <p>However, health impacts are also assessed within chapters of the topics mentioned. ES Volume 3 Appendix 16.1: Construction Dust Assessment <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.01]</b>, has considered potential human health impacts as a result of the construction of the Proposed Development, and through the 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.</p>
Community Benefits	LV2_E44_002	My properties generate dual-income streams from holiday letting and special-event hosting. To offset projected business losses, I request establishment of a ring-fenced Community Benefit Fund, scaled to the quantified revenue impacts.	Yes	The Applicant has submitted the Book of Reference <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.03]</b> . This includes persons who may be entitled to compensation if the Development Consent Order is granted.

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
		<p>Details of fund governance and disbursement criteria should be provided.</p>		<p>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.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to ensuring that communities benefit from the project including by receiving direct funding to important causes in the local area. 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.</p>
<p>Traffic and Movement/ Protective Provisions.</p>	<p>LV2_E44_002</p>	<p>Consultation lacked precise haul-route plans. Please supply:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Full drawings of temporary and permanent access routes passing</li> </ol>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes the comments. Full details regarding construction traffic routes are detailed in ES Volume 2 Figure 14.4: Construction Routing</p>

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
		<p>Gilbertson House;</p> <p>2. A construction-traffic management plan, including expected vehicle types and frequency; and</p> <p>3. Proposals for micro siting underground Cable Route Corridors to avoid excavation within 30 m of my property boundary.</p>		<p><b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.14.04]</b>. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b> accompanies the DCO Application.</p> <p>Details regarding the Cable Route Corridor are included in ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]</b>, with the approach to constructing the CRC further detailed within ES Volume 3 Appendix 2.1: Cable Route Construction Method Statement <b>[EN00110012/APP/LVS/06.03.02.01]</b>.</p>
Human Health / Socioeconomics	LV2_E44_003 (LV2_E_047)	<p>I would like to express my absolute disapproval of this Proposed Development going ahead. This is greatly effecting me personally already. I am not a well person and have had to make the decision to sell my property where I also have my business and make my living and because of my health issues and had a buyer but they are now greatly put off because of your</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes the comments. The Applicant has submitted a Book of Reference <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.03]</b>, Planning Statement <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.02]</b> and Statement of Reasons <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.03]</b>, with the Development Consent Order (DCO) application, which together demonstrate the necessary land and rights that must be secured for the delivery, operation, and decommissioning of the Proposed</p>

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
		<p>proposed Proposed Development potentially going ahead as it runs directly next to my property at Granary Farm Hillam LS25 5HX.</p>		<p>Development, as well as demonstrates the urgent need for this infrastructure.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
Socioeconomics	LV2_E44_003 (LV2_E_047)	<p>If this proposed Proposed Development goes ahead it will greatly devalue my property and yet i will get no compensation for this. It</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant has submitted the Book of Reference <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.03]</b>. This includes persons who may be entitled to</p>

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
		<p>is totally unacceptable that this can affect someone who has worked hard all their life to be put in a position like this. My property was supposed to be like my pension for later in life and you doing what you are is just disgraceful and for it to effect someone like it could me and also many others is totally unacceptable.</p>		<p>compensation if the Development Consent Order is granted.</p> <p>The Design Parameters and Commitments document <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.06]</b> secures measures to mitigate impacts on nearby properties, including a minimum 30 metre buffer from the curtilage of properties to the fencing around Solar Development Sites.</p> <p>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.</p>
LANDS INTEREST	LV2_E44_003 (LV2_E_047)	<p>In my current situation I am not supposed to be exposed to any stressful situations but obviously the thought of this Proposed Development going ahead is causing great distress. I have had letter after letter off you contacting me with regards to doing surveys</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes the comment. Where agent details have been provided, correspondence or copies of correspondence have been issued to the agent. The Applicant must issue Statutory notices to the Interested Parties.</p>

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
		<p>on my land when you were given details of my land agent whom is dealing with this on my behalf but yet you still chose to contact me too and it is appears to me that you feel intimidating people and almost stretching it to bullying is acceptable behaviour well it isn't and I will ask you once again to deal with my land agent Brian Bartle for any future contact.</p>		<p>The Applicant does not consider it has been intimidating or bullying, and affirms that this was not its intent.</p> <p>The Applicant remains committed to working with landowners and, if applicable, their agents, to facilitate survey requests. Voluntary agreements have been sought from those within the Draft Order Limits for survey access.</p>

## Section 42, Section 43 and Section 44 Targeted Consultation Applicant response tables

### Section 42 Targeted Consultation Applicant response table

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
NATS Safeguarding	Project Description	We refer to the consultation on the localised and specific changes to the application. NATS operates no infrastructure within 10 km of the proposal site. Accordingly it anticipates no impact from the proposal and has no comments to make on the Development.	No	The Applicant notes this response.
Canal & River Trust	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Have reviewed the changes proposed to the scheme as part of the Targeted Consultation, the Trust does not wish to make comment on the proposed changes.	No	The Applicant notes this response.
Yorkshire Consortium Drainage Boards	Water Resources and Flood Risk	We have reviewed those changes and can confirm that the comments we made in July 2025 (attached) and directly to Arup in August 2025 (attached) remain the same.	No	The Applicant notes this response.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Natural England	Ornithology	<p>The development site is within or may impact the Humber Estuary SPA (Special Protection Area), SAC (Special Area of Conservation) &amp; Ramsar and the Lower Derwent Valley SPA &amp; Ramsar. SPAs are classified for rare and vulnerable birds. Many of these sites are designated for mobile species that may also rely on areas outside of the site boundary, as well as the sites themselves. If these proposed changes result in additional significant land take it should be considered within the bird assessment for the project. It should be considered whether additional land parcels will be suitable for notified SPA birds, and whether the location is sufficiently covered by desk study information or the surveys undertaken for the project.</p>	No	<p>The ornithological assessment is based on a systematic desk study and comprehensive breeding and non-breeding bird surveys, undertaken in accordance with recognised guidance and reported in ES Volume 1 Chapter 12: Ornithology <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.12]</b> and its supporting appendices, including Appendix 12.1 (Breeding Birds), Appendix 12.2 (Non-breeding Birds), and the Breeding Bird Survey Report for Solar Development Sites 6–8 and the Cable Route Corridor <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.12.03]</b>.</p> <p>Potential effects on mobile SPA/Ramsar bird species, including use of land outside designated site boundaries, have been explicitly considered through the assessment of Functionally Linked Land and are addressed in both the Environmental Statement and the Habitat Regulations Assessment. Land take associated with the Proposed Development, including relevant field parcels, has therefore been fully</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>assessed in relation to SPA qualifying features and supporting habitats.</p> <p>The Applicant has also maintained ongoing engagement with Natural England regarding the protection, mitigation and enhancement of bird species associated with the Lower Derwent Valley and Humber Estuary SPA and Ramsar sites. This engagement has informed the scope of surveys, assessment approach and the development of mitigation, including the Bird Mitigation Area, ensuring that all relevant habitats and land parcels are appropriately covered by desk study and field survey evidence.</p>
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	Soil is a finite resource which plays an essential role within sustainable ecosystems, performing an array of functions supporting a range of ecosystem services, including storage of carbon, the infiltration and transport of water, nutrient cycling, and provision of food. Natural England	Yes	The value of soil is recognised in ES Volume 1, Chapter 5 Agricultural Land and Soils <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b> and the outline Soil Resource Management Plan (oSRMP, <b>[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.14]</b> ) has been developed to secure soil resources during construction, operation and decommissioning. An ALC survey (ES Volume 3 Appendix 5.1: Agricultural Land Classification

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		recommends that ALC surveys are undertaken at an early stage if the proposed changes result in additional significant land take.		<b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.05.01]</b> has been undertaken and the scope and findings have been discussed with Natural England.
Health and Safety Executive (HSE)	Site Selection and Alternatives	<p>According to HSE's records, the proposed Light Valley Solar Project Targeted Consultation components as specified in the Light Valley Solar Targeted Consultation Maps, 16th October – 20th November 2025, at Light+Valley+Solar_Targeted+Consultation_Maps.pdf, does appear to cross the Consultation Zones of several Major Accident Hazard (MAH) pipelines, which are associated with the following pipeline operators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HSE Ref # 4519206, Transco Ref 1952, Northern Gas Networks, Lambkin Hill / Knottingley (Part Barwick/Knott.).</li> <li>• HSE Ref #7701, Transco Ref 1953, Northern Gas Networks, Knottingley / Chapel Haddlesley.</li> </ul>	No	The Applicant has continued to engage with the HSE and relevant operators. The Draft DCO <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/03.01]</b> includes protective provisions for the benefit of the operators.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HSE Ref # 4032673, Transco Ref 2784, National Gas, Asselby / Pannal.</li> <li>• HSE Ref # 7738, Transco Ref 1990, National Gas, 7 Feeder Cawood / Eastoft.</li> </ul> Since the works will entail underground cabling and access routes, HSE strongly recommends that at the earliest opportunity, the applicant liaises with the pipeline operators above.		
Health and Safety Executive (HSE)	Project Description	Based on the information in the Targeted Consultation Information Change Note, October 2025 it is unlikely that HSE would advise against the development.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Health and Safety Executive (HSE)	Human Health	The presence of hazardous substances on, over or under land at or above set threshold quantities (Controlled Quantities) will probably require Hazardous Substances Consent (HSC) under the	No	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that it will comply with the relevant legislation as set out. The Applicant notes that the consultation for which this feedback was submitted was a targeted phase of consultation on a series of minor, localised changes to the boundary of the Proposed

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>Planning (Hazardous Substances) Act 1990 as amended.                      The substances, alone or when aggregated with others for which HSC is required, and the associated Controlled Quantities, are set out in The Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 2015 as amended.</p>		<p>Development, pertaining to road safety and AIL access measures.</p>
<p>Health and Safety Executive (HSE)</p>	<p>Human Health</p>	<p>Regulation 5(4) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 requires the assessment of significant effects to include, where relevant, the expected significant effects arising from the proposed development's vulnerability to major accidents. HSE's role on NSIPs is summarised in the following Advice Note 11 Annex on the Planning Inspectorate's website -</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. A preliminary assessment of the potential for significant effects arising from the Proposed Development's vulnerability to major accidents was undertaken at Scoping Stage with reference to Advice Note 11. The assessment concluded that no significant effects were expected and has subsequently been scoped out of the ES, which was agreed with PINS. Design changes since Scoping have been reviewed and there has been no change to the conclusion. The EIA Scoping Report is available within ES Volume 3 Appendix 1.1  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.01.01].</b></p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		Annex G – The Health and Safety Executive. This document includes consideration of risk assessments on page 3.		<p>Following submission of the report, PINS issued the EIA Scoping Opinion (ES Volume 3 Appendix 1.2)</p> <p><b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.01.02]</b> on the proposed scope on the 19 December 2024. Chapter 16 acknowledges that the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) has the potential to cause air quality impacts in the rare result event of a fire incident; a BESS Emissions Modelling technical report has been included in ES Volume 3 Appendix 16.5: BESS Fire Emissions Modelling</p> <p><b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.05]</b>. The report concludes that, based on the factors including distance to the nearest locations of human exposure and the anticipated short-term nature of a fire incident, that there would be no significant air quality effects as a result of a BESS fire incident. An outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP, <b>[EN110012/APP/LVS/07.06]</b>) has been produced as part of this application and identifies how the Applicant will use good industry practice to reduce risk to life,</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>property, and the environment in the rare event of a BESS fire.</p> <p>Furthermore, an outline Pollution and Spillage Response Plan (oPSRP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.08]</b>) has been prepared and sets out the intended strategies for managing pollution and spillage incidents on site. Prior to the construction phase, the Principal Contractor (PC) will develop detailed incident response procedures as part of the final PSRP. These procedures will begin with an investigation phase and follow the core principles of: Stop, Contain, Notify and Clean-Up. If a pollution incident is identified then the incident response procedure will be initiated.</p>
Health and Safety Executive (HSE)	Human Health	Explosives Inspectorate has no comment to make as there are no HSE licenced explosives sites in the vicinity of the proposed development.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
The Coal Authority (Mining)	Ground Conditions	We have reviewed the area for the solar panels, cable runs and substations as identified on the Site	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Remediation Authority)		Location Plan and can confirm there does not appear to be any coal mining related features recorded at surface or shallow depth in these areas.		
The Coal Authority (Mining Remediation Authority)	Ground Conditions	We previously noted that based on the conclusions of the authors of the EIA Scoping Report, that the risk of ground instability due to former coal mining to the proposed development was very low we raised no objections. I can confirm that based on the changes proposed we still have no objections and we have no additional comments to make.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Thorpe Willoughby Parish Council	Project Description	Thorpe Willoughby Parish Council <b>STRONGLY OBJECTS</b> to the 40 proposed 'minor changes' as you refer to them or as we like to call them 'after thoughts' that have been put forward recently. These 'minor changes' will involve the digging up of our hedgerows and trees, widening of roads and access points and temporarily removing road		The Applicant notes this response.  The Applicant followed an iterative design process as outlined in ES Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]</b> . This process has allowed the proposals and design to be updated throughout the pre-application process as a result of technical

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		furniture. We feel as though these 'minor changes' are actually hugely important and should have been included in the original proposal. How did someone forget to include this originally?		surveys, engagement with statutory bodies and feedback from the local community.
Thorpe Willoughby Parish Council	Biodiversity	Hedgerows provide support for biodiversity by creating habitats and food sources for the wildlife. By taking out large sections of these hedgerows you will cause irreversible damage to the local wildlife and we cannot support this.	Yes	<p>The effects of the Proposed Development on ecology and habitat, including specific species and habitats, are assessed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]</b>. With regard to hedgerows, these features will largely be retained and protected through development.</p> <p>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 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</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				surveys and visual inspections would be undertaken to ensure we are not disturbing existing habitats.
Environment Agency	Project Description	We have reviewed the Information Change Note and agree that in general, all the changes are minor and it is not anticipated they will have a substantial impact	No	The Applicant notes this response.
Environment Agency	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Revisions 9, 11, 12, 13, 17, 19, 27, 31, 32, 34: These changes relating to the temporary widening of the existing road or construction of new access roads are all within the floodplain. An increase in flooding (albeit minor) could result if this is not properly considered. We would expect all revisions be designed to have minimal impacts on floodplains and for any impacts to be mitigated for through the provision of floodplain compensation. The new access road proposed within the floodplain should be designed to be	No	The Applicant notes this comment, and it is addressed in ES Volume 3 Appendix 15.1: Flood Risk Assessment (FRA, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01]</b> ). The Outline Drainage Strategy <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.04]</b> sets out how access tracks will be designed to ensure that existing drainage performance is maintained and to mitigate any potential flood risk impacts. The detailed drainage strategy must be approved by the relevant planning authority.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		resilient to the design flood event if it is essential for safe access and egress. If these access roads are to be set at ground level (as not required in times of a flood) they will not remove floodplain capacity and will not need to be mitigated for. If however, they are to be built up to be above the design flood level to remain safe and dry this may need to be included in flood modelling.		
Thorganby Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	Most of the land which would be affected around the Escrick site (LVS Solar Development Site 1) is classified as BMV/ALC Grade 2 (the second highest land rating in the UK), and is used for arable production rather than grazing pasture. The removal of this land from productive farming would have a negative impact on UK domestic food production and therefore UK food security – increasing reliance on overseas producers and leading to increased CO2 emissions	Yes	As demonstrated in the ALC survey (ES Volume 3 Appendix 5.1: Agricultural Land Classification <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.05.01]</b> ), most of the land in Solar Development Site 1 is BMV land (54%) but it is mostly good quality Subgrade 3a land (45%) with only 9% as very good quality Grade 2 land.  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

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>resulting from transportation of food into the UK via sea and air freight.</p>		<p>for agricultural production. In the same year, 581,000 ha of arable land in England were left uncropped (source: Department for Environment, Food &amp; Rural Affairs, Agricultural land use in England on 1 June 2024).</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>Thorganby Parish Council</p>	<p>Socioeconomics</p>	<p>Whilst landowners may be content to sell up and pocket the proceeds, Parishioners have expressed serious concerns over how many</p>		<p>As set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 13: Socioeconomics <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13]</b> it is explained how "no job losses are anticipated</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>tenant farming families are either going to be made jobless/homeless, or have the acreage they farm reduced below sustainable business levels. Add to this the reduction in work for the many independent and small-scale farming contractors based throughout the region and we foresee a great deal of economic hardship resulting from the significant loss of arable lands under this proposed scheme. These are not careers or skills that are easily transferrable into other areas, so we do not consider that any "employment opportunities" associated with the development would be sufficient to remedy the likely hardships which would be brought about by the scheme.</p>		<p>across the majority of farms within the Order Limits. One farm which has signed an Option Agreement with the Applicant has identified the potential for a single job loss; however, this has been deemed negligible in the context of the wider assessment and has therefore been scoped out of further consideration."</p>
Thorganby Parish Council	Biodiversity	<p>North Yorkshire is predominantly a rural county, and as such is recognised as having a large number of often sensitive and internationally recognised wildlife</p>	Yes	<p>The Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) has been completed to assess the impact of the development on international sites <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.11]</b>. Effects on national and local sites are assessed within</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		sanctuaries. Within this immediate area we have both the Lower Derwent Valley National Nature Reserve, a SSSI/Ramsar site of internationally recognised importance for migrating wildfowl, and the Skipwith Common National Nature Reserve.		ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]</b> . It is concluded that effects to international, national and local sites would be not significant in EIA terms.
Thorganby Parish Council	Biodiversity / Ornithology	The Lower Derwent Valley NNR has been recognised by the UK Government as a Special Protection Area and a Ramsar site - Ramsar Sites are wetlands of international importance designated under the Convention on Wetlands. The area sees tens of thousands of migrating birds visiting each year, and there is a great danger of massive solar arrays causing disturbance to migratory flightpaths, creating “false lake” effects and thereby causing death, injury and displacement amongst the birdlife normally seen in the area – totally contrary to the	Yes	<p>The HRA has been completed to assess the impact of the development on international sites <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.11]</b>. Effects on national and local sites are assessed within ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]</b>. It is concluded that effects to international, national and local sites would be not significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>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</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		safeguards put in place to establish the protected status of the area.		have not identified avian impacts from glint or glare. See Section 12.17 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 12: Ornithology <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.12]</b> .
Thorganby Parish Council	Biodiversity	In respect of Skipwith Common NNR - Skipwith Common is one of the last remaining areas of northern lowland heath in England. An incredible variety of plants and animals depend on the Common for their survival. The 270ha of open heath, ponds and mire is an ancient landscape, with its roots in pre-history. Skipwith Common's heathland has stayed almost the same for thousands of years – with its physical geography closely linked to the surrounding area and likely to suffer if watercourses and drainage around the site are disturbed.		<p>The HRA has been completed to assess the impact of the development on international sites <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.11]</b>.</p> <p>Effects on national and local sites and assessed within ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]</b>.</p> <p>The HRA finds no pathway for adverse effects to be caused to Skipwith Common SAC, and ES Chapter 6 confirms that negligible effects on Skipwith Common SAC and SSSI are anticipated during construction, which are not significant.</p>
Thorganby Parish Council	Traffic and Movement	During the lengthy construction phase of such a large-scale proposal, there is inevitably going to be a massive increase of HGV traffic onto narrow, often poorly surfaced	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>) has been prepared to identify the routes that</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>country roads. One consequence of this is going to be a rapid degradation of already challenging roads, making driving more hazardous and damage to vehicles far more likely as HGVs break up road edges and create more potholes.</p>		<p>will be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road.</p> <p>With regards to the condition of the road, there is a commitment within the oCTMP <b>[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]</b> for a pre-commencement condition survey and a commitment to resolving any damage to the highway that can be attributed to construction activities.</p>
<p>Thorganby Parish Council</p>	<p>Traffic and Movement</p>	<p>There are already times when commuting traffic makes the rural road network congested, and residents having to share narrow road space with large vehicles is only going to exacerbate this problem – and over a very lengthy period of time.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment (TA) has been prepared (Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) <b>[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]</b>) 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.</p> <p>The TA report shows that the majority of routes within the assessed study area (36 of</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>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.</p> <p>Where traffic flows have increased by more than 10%, an outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>) has been prepared which includes measures to minimise any impacts during construction by reducing HGV movements during the peak hours and managing employee movements.</p> <p>Overall, it is considered that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the CTMP, and there are not expected to be any significant impacts on the transport network.</p>
Thorganby Parish Council	Traffic and Movement	At certain times of the farming year, especially around harvest, the rural	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>road network also sees a huge increase in farming traffic and large vehicles such as combined harvesters, and whilst residents of these areas are used to this and make allowances for sharing the road with contractors moving from farm to farm and between fields, to add a large amount of additional construction HGV traffic is likely to bring some areas to a standstill.</p>		<p>A Transport Assessment (TA) has been prepared (Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) <b>[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]</b>) 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.</p> <p>An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>) has also been prepared which includes measures to minimise any impacts during construction by reducing HGV movements during the peak hours and managing employee movements. The oCTMP 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 activities that could impact on deliveries to the Proposed Development.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Thorganby Parish Council	Biodiversity	The proposed road and junction changes planned to accommodate heavy vehicles and exceptionally large vehicles are going to entail loss of hedgerows and mature trees, with subsequent impact both on wildlife and the nature of the countryside around the sites.	Yes	<p>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.</p> <p>Worst-case scenario tree and hedge loss has been calculated for the cable route in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA); the results of the AIA are presented in ES Volume 3 Appendix 16.2 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.02]</b>. The report also sets out the approach to avoiding tree loss for visibility accesses and visibility splays along the cable route.</p> <p>The applicant will replant trees and hedges lost along the cable route within the Cable Route Corridor, subject to detailed design works, as set out in the outline Construction</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b> ).
Thorganby Parish Council	Biodiversity	Loss of habitat for mammals, birds and insect life is going to devalue the flora and fauna of the area in a manner which is unlikely ever to be improved in a dramatically changed landscape, regardless of ancillary planting schemes which are unlikely to mature for decades and, given the proposed 60-year lifespan of this development, we foresee a desertification effect of the ground under the solar arrays and those areas affected by associated infrastructure and cabling routes.	Yes	<p>The effects of the Proposed Development on ecology and habitat are assessed in ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]</b>.</p> <p>It is anticipated that the Proposed Development will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG units. Full details of the gain are set out in the BNG assessment <b>[EN011012/APP/LVS/05.09]</b>.</p> <p>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, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]</b>).</p>
Thorganby Parish Council	Public Rights of Way	There is going to be a loss of amenity in terms of footpaths, bridleways and other rights of way currently enjoyed over varying types of countryside being subsumed into an industrial landscape offering no	Yes	The Applicant has committed to the maintenance of public rights of way and the provision of new permissive paths, these plans can be found in ES Volume 1 Chapter 13: Socioeconomics <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13]</b> . The

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		enjoyable recreational facilities in comparison with that available to residents and visitors at present.		<p>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, helping to screen the Proposed Development from PRowS.</p> <p>In addition, 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, <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/07.09]</b>) submitted as part of the Application.</p>
Thorganby Parish Council	Socioeconomics	There is, it would seem, little to recommend in terms of turning an area from a green, pleasant and rural landscape into a mono-culture of extremely large solar panels, and there is no way of disguising the fact		The Applicant has submitted the <b>Book of Reference [EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.03]</b> . This includes persons who may be entitled to compensation if the Development Consent

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>that this is going to make the area less appealing and therefore the properties owned and invested in by many families are likely to be both harder to sell and will achieve lower sale prices than if the development was not prevalent in the area. What compensation is the developer going to offer to those affected and what mechanism will exist to fairly value properties?</p>		<p>Order is granted and the Proposed Development developed.</p> <p>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. The Applicant will pay compensation where a person can demonstrate a loss in line with the law. Compensation is determined in accordance with the statutory compensation code, which is underpinned by the Land Compensation Act 1961 and associated legislation.</p>
<p>Thorganby Parish Council</p>	<p>Climate Change and Energy Need / Project Description</p>	<p>Retail energy markets are largely governed by wholesale gas prices, which is mainly imported, and therefore we feel that this proposed scheme would deliver zero benefit in terms of cost savings to the residents whose locale is being so dramatically altered. The energy produced under such a scheme would be fed into the National Grid</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding local residents' energy costs. While the Proposed Development does not influence retail electricity pricing, it contributes to national renewable energy and security objectives. Solar is one of the cheapest forms of energy and can be quickly deployed to add capacity to the National Grid which, in combination with other renewable energy projects, would help to bring down costs by</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>and retailed according to market forces, and therefore this area simply becomes a “factory floor” for energy production and transitions from being a rural economy to an industrial economy – with no mandate for such change from those most affected.</p>		<p>reducing the UK’s reliance on fossil fuels and decoupling the UK’s energy system from the international market.</p> <p>The government has been undertaking a Review of Electricity Market Arrangements (REMA) to decouple consumer electricity prices from volatile, gas-driven wholesale markets. Key strategies include splitting the market into "variable" (renewables) and "firm" (gas/nuclear) power, implementing green power pools, and expanding Contracts for Difference (CfD) to ensure consumers pay for the lower average cost of renewables rather than the high marginal cost of gas.</p>
<p>Thorganby Parish Council</p>	<p>Cumulative impacts</p>	<p>We have seen outline plans for other planned sites to the east of Thorganby, meaning that this area is set to be surrounded by such developments and many more communities to the east of the River Derwent are likely to be negatively affected as these developments join together. Regionally, this becomes a far larger impact than the 2500</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges this concern. 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, including housing estates and other infrastructure projects, that fall within the relevant zones of</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		acres covered by the LVS proposal, and should be recognised as a "bigger picture".		<p>influence for each topic to evaluate potential combined effects. Conclusions from the assessments have been taken on board, for example, in assessing construction traffic routes as part of the Transport Assessment (TA) (ES Volume 3 Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]</b>) expected construction traffic movements for other nearby developments have been factored into the predicted future baseline for the local road network. As such, these cumulative considerations have helped inform the development of the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>).</p> <p>Information regarding cumulative effects can be found in Environmental Statement (ES) Volume 1 Chapter 17: Cumulative and In-Combination Effects <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.17]</b>.</p>
Thorganby Parish Council	Site Selection and Alternatives	We have seen no explanation as to why the many brownfield sites left in the wake of industrial shrinkage	No	The Applicant acknowledges suggestions and preferences for use of alternative sites, including brownfield sites, and can confirm

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>over the past 50 years are not being considered. In addition, as a result of the geographical location of this area near to a North-South/East-West crossroads of the A1/M1 and M62, there have been many massive scale warehousing and distribution centre developments with huge buildings with rooves suitable for solar power placements. Is it simply that going onto greenfield sites is cheaper and faster than the more complex exploitation of industrial and brownfield sites?</p>		<p>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.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises expressions of preference for rooftop solar; on this, the Applicant supports rooftop solar and believes that to meet clean energy and legally binding targets by 2030, a combination of rooftop and ground-mounted solar will be required.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises suggestions of local brownfield sites; however, these are often fragmented sites considerable distances from each other, neither providing the space for</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				solar generation required nor ease of connectivity between sites.
Thorganby Parish Council	Project Description	<p>This scheme, to the best of our knowledge, is backed by an international asset management company based in Australia. The profits derived from running this scheme are intended to flow to the shareholders of this organisation and, as shareholders demand accountability in relation to maximising their income from investments, the organisation behind the scheme will have one simple motivation - to extract the maximum amount of revenue throughout the course of the scheme in order to satisfy shareholder demand. The rights and negative consequences to the residents affected, and indeed the wider UK, simply will not feature in the operational planning of such a proposal.</p>		<p>The Applicant notes this response.</p> <p>IGP 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 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.</p> <p>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</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>government resources to be channelled elsewhere. Importantly, involving UK pension funds ensures that money is invested back into projects that create jobs, support growth, and enhance services for people across the country. Funding structures like this are designed to build resilient, future-ready infrastructure that benefits everyone.</p>
<p>Thorganby Parish Council</p>	<p>Project Description</p>	<p>The scheme may be dressed up as “green and environmentally positive” but big business does not operate on such a premise - it looks for profit opportunities. There is nothing wrong with this, per se, as this is the remit of the business, but asking residents of this area to put up with all the negative consequences of such a development “in the interests of the UK, green energy and global benefits” is disingenuous.</p>		<p>The Applicant notes this comment. Section 6 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]</b> sets out the need for the Proposed Development with regards to the National Policy Statements for Energy.</p> <p>Additionally, The Applicant has prepared a Statement of Need <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.03]</b> 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</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>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 National Policy Statement for Energy EN-3 (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 2.10.1 &amp; 2.10.2]. The Proposed Development therefore directly contributes towards meeting the national net zero and energy security requirements for the near future.</p>
Thorganby Parish Council	Project Description	This is about making money – potentially to the huge detriment of the residents and regions affected by it for generations.		<p>The Applicant notes this comment. Section 6 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03]</b> sets out the need for the Proposed Development with regards to the National Policy Statement.</p> <p>Additionally, The Applicant has prepared a Statement of Need <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.03]</b> which sets out in full the need and justification for the Proposed Development. The Statement of</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>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 National Policy Statement for Energy EN-3 (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 2.10.1 &amp; 2.10.2]. The Proposed Development therefore directly contributes towards meeting the national net zero and energy security requirements for the near future.</p>
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Biodiversity	Thank you for consulting Yorkshire Wildlife Trust (YWT) on this Targeted Consultation. We commented on this application at the previous round of consultation in August 2025 and have been pleased to discuss our comments and also address our concerns, with the Applicant's Ecological	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>Consultant. We welcome continued engagement with the Applicant and expect ongoing discussions regarding our previous concerns, please refer to our response from the 5th August 2025, for further detail on the extent of these.</p>		
<p>Yorkshire Wildlife Trust</p>	<p>Biodiversity</p>	<p>At this stage we have no further comments to make on this Targeted Consultation. This is due to the lack of detailed ecological reporting to comment on included in the consultation materials. We welcome continued discussion with the Applicant to address our previous comments.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. The effects of the Proposed Development on ecology and habitat are assessed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]</b>.</p>
<p>Monk Fryston Parish Council</p>	<p>Traffic and Movement</p>	<p>Monk Fryston Parish council would request, for those areas affected, the following: Any temporary works are reinstated to their original condition/position as soon as possible</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>Any temporary works to accommodate the Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs) will be reinstated as soon as practicable after the load has passed and these alterations will be reviewed by the Local Highway Authority to ensure they are satisfactorily reinstated to the original condition; this is further detailed in</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				and secured through the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b> ).
Monk Fryston Parish Council	Biodiversity	Monk Fryston Parish council would request, for those areas affected, the following: The vegetation management doesn't impact on the local flora and fauna and that any removal of vegetation is reinstated as soon as possible.	Yes	The outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]</b> ) provides details of how the proposed habitats will be maintained to protect flora and fauna, and secures the provision for the reinstatement of removed vegetation.
Monk Fryston Parish Council	Traffic and Movement	Monk Fryston Parish council would request, for those areas affected, the following: Access points and visibility splays are returned to their original configuration.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.  Any temporary works to accommodate the Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs) will be reinstated as soon as practicable after the load has passed and these alterations will be reviewed by the Local Highway Authority to ensure they are satisfactorily reinstated to the original condition; this is further detailed in and secured through the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b> ).

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Monk Fryston Parish Council	Public Rights of Way	Monk Fryston Parish council would request, for those areas affected, the following: The works don't impact on the access or amenity of the local community.		<p>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.</p> <p>In addition, guidance has been provided on how to minimise disruption and manage temporary diversions during construction, ensuring pedestrian access is maintained wherever practicable and that safe, clearly signposted alternatives are implemented where necessary. These are set out in the outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPRoWMP) <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/07.09]</b> submitted as part of the Application.</p>
Monk Fryston Parish Council	Protective Provisions	Monk Fryston Parish council would request, for those areas affected, the following: That appropriate risk assessments and work method		<p>The Applicant can confirm that risk assessments, such as the Flood Risk Assessment <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.04]</b>, have</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		statements are carried out for the works.		<p>been undertaken and reported on where relevant. Regarding the Cable Route Corridor, a Cable Route Method Statement <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.02.01]</b> has been prepared.</p> <p>The oCEMP <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b> details and secures the delivery of a Toolbox Talk by the ECoW to all site personnel, raising awareness of sensitive ecological features (such as bird nesting areas, non-breeding birds and buffer zones) and communicating the correct working practices to minimise disturbance or harm.</p>
Monk Fryston Parish Council	Socioeconomics	Monk Fryston Parish council would request, for those areas affected, the following: There is no safety impact on people or property in the local community.	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and can confirm that the Proposed Development is not expected to cause safety issues for people or property.</p> <p>Road safety is a key consideration, and has been fully accounted for in the development of the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>), which details and secures</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				measures to ensure safety for all road users, such as ensuring construction HGVs keep only to the routes set out in ES Volume 2 Figure 14.4: Construction Routing <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.14.04]</b> .
Monk Fryston Parish Council	Traffic and Movement	The Parish Council is particularly disappointed that LVS has, in the interim since the Phase 2 consultation, not taken notice of the concerns, nor included any proposals to address the issues expressed by objectors, on the matter of the unsuitability of Fryston Common Lane to accommodate the volume of traffic proposed over the 3 year construction phase.	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic.</p> <p>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 Solar Development Site 2 assigned to the main access located on the A63.</p>
National Grid (NGET)	Protective Provisions	Due to the proximity of some of our existing or future assets, NGET wishes to express their interest in		The Applicant notes this comment and has welcomed ongoing consultation and engagement with NGET.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>further consultation while the impact on our assets is still being assessed.</p> <p>Where the Promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with or work within close proximity to any of NGET's apparatus and land, this will require appropriate protection and further discussion on the impact to its apparatus and rights.</p> <p>NGET assets form an essential part of the electricity transmission network in England and Wales.</p> <p>Please continue to consult NGET in regards to this development.</p>		
National Grid (NGET)	Protective Provisions	NGET will require an adequate form of Protective Provisions included within the Order.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Protective Provisions for NGET have been included in the Draft DCO <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/03.01]</b> .
Skipwith Parish Council	Consultation and Engagement	The answers to some of the questions we have previously put to you developing the scheme and to the landowner have been conspicuous by their absence and	Yes	The Applicant notes that it has followed an iterative design process allowing the proposals to be updated throughout the pre-application process as a result of technical surveys, engagement with statutory bodies

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>failure to provide the detailed information we have sought about timeframes, vehicle movements or start and length of the disruptions. (By way of example we refer to the email to us from Billy in your communications team.) We know nothing about where, how and for what period cabling construction materials will be stored. This leads us to the only logical conclusion that there is much being kept from us which we ought to know, kept from us in all probability because of the highly negative consequences which would be apparent if the full picture were to be revealed.</p>		<p>and feedback from the local community. As such, all full and final details regarding aspects such as vehicle movements and construction timeframes were not known earlier in the pre-application process. The PEIR included preliminary details regarding the Proposed Development, including predicted, potential vehicle movements and construction timeframes.</p> <p>All details regarding construction timeframes and Cable Route Corridor construction compounds are included in ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]</b>; details regarding vehicle movements are included in ES Volume 1 Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.14]</b> and ES Volume 2 Figure 14.4: Construction Routing <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.14.04]</b>.</p>
Skipwith Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	<p>Your assessment of the quality of land being used is deeply flawed. The residents in our community are well-connected to the land around Skipwith and have worked on it and</p>	Yes	<p>National Policy Statement EN-3 confirms, at paragraph 2.10.25, that the Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) is the only approved system for grading agricultural quality, and this should be used to establish the ALC</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>farmed it for many generations. They have a level of expertise based on their wide, deep knowledge and experience of the land in question. There is no doubt in our mind that your statement “Of the agricultural land surveyed to date in the PEIR Assessment Area, to establish the ALC grade (Sites 1-4), around 18 ha (2%) is confirmed as Grade 1 and 147 ha (18%) has been classified as Grade 2. Approximately 286 ha (34%) is confirmed as Subgrade 3a and 383 ha (46%) is confirmed as Subgrade 3b” is incorrect as far as site 1 is concerned. We reject your contention that 80% of the land in site 1 is Subgrade 3. It is much better than that. We say your analysis relied on to demonstrate otherwise is entirely selective and self-serving. Our view is that this land has been and should remain in use for agriculture, contributing to</p>		<p>grades of land. The ALC survey (ES Volume 3 Appendix 5.1: Agricultural Land Classification <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.05.01]</b>) has been undertaken by experienced soil surveyors in accordance with the long-established guidelines for classifying agricultural land. The scope and findings of the ALC survey have been discussed with Natural England, and the findings presented in ES Volume 1 Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils <b>[EN010012/APP/LVS/06.01.05]</b> are an accurate reflection of agricultural land quality in the Proposed Development.</p> <p>ES Chapter 5 considers both food security and cumulative impacts of other solar farms and developments.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>food security. Further, considering the overall context of land lost to new solar farms across Yorkshire, your proposed scheme is one too far.</p>		
<p>Skipwith Parish Council</p>	<p>Traffic and Movement / Cable corridor</p>	<p>Proposals for the cabling corridor, in particular its enabling work, the associated traffic movements and engineering work on our roads and verges are both inappropriate and unnecessary.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment (TA) has been prepared (Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) <b>[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]</b>).</p> <p>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 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.</p> <p>An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>)</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				has also been prepared and includes measures to minimise impacts during construction.
Skipwith Parish Council	Traffic and Movement	The disruption in Skipwith is disproportionate to the supposed benefits of the proposals. We question why any construction traffic should pass down Main Street. The village infrastructure should not be torn apart to facilitate extraordinarily large loads coming through it. It will not actually be possible for loads of the size envisaged to move down Main Street. Also, there are normally many vehicles parked on that road (there's no alternative for them) and farm traffic which will make the passage of construction traffic unsafe. Any access for building the cabling corridor could and should go along the route north of the village identified for construction traffic, or be created away from the village using for example the proposed development's landowner's other	No	<p>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.</p> <p>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 Abnormal Loads. Arrangements for the transport of Abnormal Loads will need</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		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 Whinchat Hall area. These would give a straight run from an established road without disturbing Skipwith village at all.		to be made under licence with the Local Highway Authority to ensure it can be done safely, and to minimise impacts.  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 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.14].</b>
Skipwith Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The output from the proposed development is stated as being “up to 500 Megawatts to the grid”. Experience of other solar farms suggests that a more realistic actual contribution to the grid is substantially less than the theoretical maximum, in some cases as low as 10%. When comparing the actual contribution your proposed development is likely to make to the grid, the disbenefits of the development outweigh this contribution to the energy needs of the grid by a high margin. We say	Yes	The Applicant notes that 500 MW is the connection capacity to Monk Fryston Substation, agreed with the National Grid; the Applicant acknowledges that solar generation output may vary across the year, particularly in winter, which is also when demand is highest. As such, and as outlined in Section 4.3 of the Statement of Need <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.03]</b> , 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. As outlined in Section 6.9 of the Statement of Need <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.03]</b> when the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>your proposed development is an entirely disproportionate response to any energy needs to be met.</p>		<p>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 importing directly from the grid rather than from the co-located solar, further offsetting the lower generation levels of the Proposed Development during winter.</p> <p>The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the sentiment that the Proposed Development is a disproportionate response to meeting the UK's energy needs. The Applicant has prepared a Statement of Need <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.03]</b> 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 National Policy Statement for Energy EN-3 (December 2025) states that that the UK</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>has huge potential for solar power and that solar energy is at the heart of the Clean Power 2030 Mission [Paras 2.10.1 &amp; 2.10.2]. The Proposed Development therefore directly contributes towards meeting the national net zero and energy security requirements for the near future.</p>
South Milford Parish Council	Traffic and Movement	<p>South Milford Parish Council wish to raise concerns on the following changes: Change 28 — in regard to cutting back of vegetation to make the permissive path and create vehicle access site on common lane.</p>	No	<p>The Applicant can confirm that it intends to minimise and avoid vegetation cutting back and removal where practicable.</p> <p>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.</p>
South Milford Parish Council	Traffic and Movement	<p>South Milford Parish Council wish to raise concerns on the following</p>	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>changes: Change 30 - with consideration for impact this will have for all houses at Milford Junction in terms of access and egress and or homes located beyond Ingthorne lane with no alternative route available.</p>		<p>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.</p> <p>There are no proposals to access the Proposed Development via Ingthorne Lane. The cable corridor travels close to Ingthorne Lane but access to the corridor would be gained via the main access into Solar Development Site 2, located on the A63.</p>
<p>South Milford Parish Council</p>	<p>Biodiversity</p>	<p>In general the changes appear to involve the cutting back and removal of a significant number of trees and hedges that are not easy to replace once construction complete.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The requirements for tree work and removal are set out in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA, ES Volume 3 Appendix 16.2 [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.02]). The majority of the trees identified for potential removal relate to the Cable Route Corridor, where a worst-case scenario assessment has been applied. The AIA sets out an approach to how such losses might be</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>minimised during construction. The majority of trees that would be removed are of low quality and value (Category C). The CEMP makes provision for the replacement of trees and hedges in mitigation for those lost.</p> <p>Pruning to facilitate the development will mainly be in the form of minor crown raising to afford construction access. Such specifications will have a minimal impact on the health and viability of trees.</p>
Riccall Parish Council	Traffic and Movement	Concerned about the proposed use of King Rudding Lane for construction traffic, including the projected increase in HGV movements and the potential effect on road safety at the A19 junctions and within the village road network.	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment (TA) has been prepared (Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) <b>[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]</b>).</p> <p>A Cable Route Corridor construction compound is located on King Rudding Lane, as well as a Cable Route Corridor construction access. This activity could add 58 additional movements onto the road, which would be a 15% increase on the 393 daily movement forecast in the 2029 base.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>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.</p> <p>The temporary uplift in traffic flows are not therefore expected to have a significant impact over the course of a typical working day. The total construction period is between 24-36 months, meaning the effects will be temporary in nature, and many of the construction locations will be used for shorter periods.</p> <p>The proposed accesses on the A19 are existing junctions, 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 at some locations.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>Subject to agreement with NYC, this could include temporary speed limit reductions. 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.</p>
Riccall Parish Council	Traffic and Movement	Concerned about the likelihood of increased U-turn movements in the vicinity of King Rudding Lane as drivers attempt to avoid construction traffic.	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment (TA) has been prepared (Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) <b>[EN0110012 /APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]</b>).</p> <p>A Cable Route Corridor construction compound is located on King Rudding Lane, as well as a Cable Route Corridor construction access. This activity could add 58 additional daily movements onto the road, which would be a 15% increase on the 393 daily movement forecast in the 2029 base.</p> <p>As the construction trips will avoid the network peaks, it is unlikely that the traffic</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>impact will be so noticeable that it would result in other vehicles altering their routes.</p> <p>Further detail regarding the number of expected AIL vehicle movements is included in Table 14-26 and 14-27 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.14]</b>.</p>
Riccall Parish Council	Traffic and Movement	Concerned about the potential removal or cutting back of trees along Checker Lane to accommodate construction access.		<p>The Applicant can confirm that it intends to minimise and avoid vegetation cutting back and removal where practicable.</p> <p>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.</p>
Riccall Parish Council	Public Rights of Way	Concerned about the impact on existing permissive paths within the		The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant has embedded mitigation measures to maintain the amenity of Public Rights of

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		parish, many of which appear affected by the proposed layout.		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 <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13]</b> . 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, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.09]</b> ) submitted as part of the Application.
Riccall Parish Council	Traffic and Movement	Concerned about the general suitability of local rural roads for sustained construction traffic and heavy vehicle movements over an extended construction period.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.  An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b> ) 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.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>With regards to the condition of the road, there is a commitment within the oCTMP <b>[EN0110012/ APP/LVS/07.12]</b> for a pre-commencement condition survey and a commitment to resolving any damage that can be attributed to construction activities.</p>
Riccall Parish Council	Traffic and Movement	<p>The Council's view that alternative access options may be more suitable, including via the former mine site or the industrial estate on Market Weighton Road, both of which may lessen the impact on residential roads and junctions.</p>	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>) has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. Generally the most direct route has been selected, whilst also taking into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas.</p>

## Section 43 Targeted Consultation Applicant response table

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
Leeds City Council	Cultural Heritage	We note the content of the PEIR (para. 5.6.2.1) and further to our EIA Scoping comments of 16 December 2024, we thank you for including the relevant listed buildings and Ledsham Conservation Area within Leeds into your assessment.	No	The Applicant notes this response.
Leeds City Council	Project Description	We have no comments to make with respect to the Targeted Consultation (i.e. 'The Changes') and will leave this to the consideration of the Host Authorities.	No	The Applicant notes this response.
City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council	Project Description	City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council has NO OBJECTION to the above planning application.	No	The Applicant notes this response.
Durham County Council	Project Description	Officers have no comments to make given the distance of the proposed site from County Durham.	No	The Applicant notes this response.

## Section 44 Targeted Consultation Applicant response table

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
LVTC_OFF_066	Protective Provisions	<p>The single-track lane leading from Skipwith Road to Field House Farm is a private access maintained by us and our predecessors for decades.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We personally paid for the tarmac resurfacing at the highway junction in June 2015, in accordance with planning requirements.</li> <li>• We continue to maintain the lane surface, verges, hedges and drainage at our own cost.</li> <li>• The lane is surfaced with road planings, which I personally maintain roughly every two months using my high-maintenance, aging JCB to fill potholes and keep it in good condition. Increased heavy vehicle use would</li> </ul>	No	<p>The Applicant notes the comments.</p> <p>The Applicant has submitted a Book of Reference <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.03]</b>, Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.04]</b> and Statement of Reasons <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.01]</b> with the Development Consent Order (DCO) application, which together demonstrate the necessary land and rights that must be secured for the delivery, operation, and decommissioning of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The Applicant remains committed to working with landowners to secure</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>quickly degrade this surface and significantly increase the maintenance burden.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is used only by us, our guests, storage customers, deliveries, and occasional agricultural vehicles.</li> </ul> <p>Our use of the lane has been open, continuous and without permission from any outside party for many decades. No rights, easements or permissions exist in favour of Light Valley Solar, Dalcour Maclaren or their contractors.</p> <p>I do not consent to the use of this private lane or adjoining land for construction access, passing places, widening, vegetation removal, surveys, temporary works compounds or any</p>		<p>the land rights required to facilitate the Proposed Development by voluntary agreement as detailed in the Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.04]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has continued to engage with the respondent and will seek a voluntary agreement for the rights required. The Applicant notes its obligation to maintain and return the track to a condition no worse than before (as secured through the oCTMP  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>), as well as payment of compensation to the person liable for the repair of the road for any loss or damage which that person may suffer, as detailed in the Draft DCO  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/03.01]</b>.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		related activity. All rights are expressly reserved.		
LVTC_OFF_066	Biodiversity	<p>Since then, numerous surveyors have attended without proper notice or permission. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water vole surveys undertaken twice close to our house, despite the surveyors themselves later acknowledging they should not have been there.</li> <li>• Badger survey where the notification email was sent at 09:42 a.m., yet the surveyor was already on site at 10:32 a.m. taking photos of my hedge, on our lane, next to the storage yard.</li> <li>• Archaeological surveys, where staff arrived unannounced and began work near the lane without any prior notice.</li> </ul>	No	<p>The Applicant notes the comments. The Applicant endeavours to provide reasonable notice for survey access in line with the terms of the voluntary agreement and apologises for any occasion where this has not been adhered to. The Applicant will continue to work with Interested Parties to ensure sufficient notice is provided for survey access.</p> <p>The Applicant has continued to engage with the respondent and will seek a voluntary agreement for the rights required. The Applicant notes its obligation to maintain and return the track to a condition no worse than before (as secured through the oCTMP</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>Light Valley Solar later apologised in writing, acknowledging that their team had turned up without informing liaison staff beforehand.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tree surveyor who attended on a separate occasion had parked in the designated passing place on the lane, despite clear signage stating No Parking. Although she was very polite and moved her vehicle when asked, this again highlights the issues caused by unannounced and unmanaged visits to our private access.</li> </ul>		<p><b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>), as well as payment of compensation to the person liable for the repair of the road for any loss or damage which that person may suffer, as detailed in the Draft DCO  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/03.01]</b>.</p>
LVTC_OFF_066		<p>These repeated incidents highlight a consistent pattern of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of coordination and inadequate supervision</li> <li>• Visitors ignoring clearly displayed signs</li> </ul>	No	<p>The Applicant notes the comments. The Applicant endeavours to provide reasonable notice for survey access in line with the terms of the voluntary agreement and apologies for any occasion where this has not been adhered to. The Applicant will continue to work with Interest Parties</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unauthorised access onto our privately maintained lane, creating security concerns for our rural business and storage yard.</li> <li>• No appreciation of the security requirements for a working caravan &amp; motorhome storage yard, self-catering units, livestock and guests</li> </ul>		<p>to ensure sufficient notice is provided for survey access.</p> <p>The Applicant has continued to engage with the respondent and will seek a voluntary agreement for the rights required. The Applicant notes its obligation to maintain and return the track to a condition no worse than before (as secured through the oCTMP <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>), as well as payment of compensation to the person liable for the repair of the road for any loss or damage which that person may suffer, as detailed in the Draft DCO <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/03.01]</b>.</p>
LVTC_OFF_066		We run a caravan and motorhome storage yard, and our lane is monitored by security beams, CCTV	No	The Applicant notes the comments. The Applicant endeavours to provide reasonable notice for survey access

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>cameras and access-trigger alerts. Every unannounced visit activates these systems, generating extra work, unnecessary alerts, and additional hours spent verifying who is on or near our land and why. This has added a significant and entirely avoidable burden to our workload and affects the security measures we work hard to maintain for our customers.</p>		<p>in line with the terms of the voluntary agreement and apologies for any occasion where this has not been adhered to. The Applicant will continue to work with Interest Parties to ensure sufficient notice is provided for survey access.</p> <p>The Applicant has continued to engage with the respondent and will seek a voluntary agreement for the rights required. The Applicant notes its obligation to maintain and return the track to a condition no worse than before (as secured through the oCTMP [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]), as well as payment of compensation to the person liable for the repair of the road for any loss or damage which that person may suffer, as detailed in</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				the Draft DCO <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/03.01]</b> .
LVTC_OFF_066	Traffic and Movement	Our lane averages around 40 vehicle movements per day, including guests on foot, walkers, delivery drivers and storage customers. Passing places are critical for safety when vehicles exit the fast-moving main road. Parking in them is dangerous.	Yes	The Applicant notes the comment.  It is proposed to use the lane to access the Cable Route Corridor. This activity could generate 7 HGV movements, and 5 car movements per day onto the lane during the period that the access is in use. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b> ) has been prepared and includes measures to minimise impacts during construction including traffic management measures and the use of qualified and experienced banksmen who will be positioned at the proposed accesses, to facilitate vehicle arrivals and departures, as well as to ensure internal vehicle

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>movements are safely controlled during the construction phase.</p> <p>The Applicant has continued to engage with the respondent and will seek a voluntary agreement for the rights required. The Applicant notes its obligation to maintain and return the track to a condition no worse than before (as secured through the oCTMP <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>), as well as payment of compensation to the person liable for the repair of the road for any loss or damage which that person may suffer, as detailed in the Draft DCO <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/03.01]</b>.</p>
LVTC_OFF_066	Traffic and Movement	These issues have occurred with only a very small number of survey vehicles; it is therefore entirely clear	No	The Applicant notes the comments.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>that the situation would become unmanageable — and unsafe — if construction traffic were permitted.</p>		<p>It is proposed to use the lane to access the Cable Route Corridor. This activity could generate 7 HGV movements, and 5 car movements per day onto the lane during the period that the access is in use. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>) has been prepared and includes measures to minimise impacts during construction including traffic management measures and the use of qualified and experienced banksmen who will be positioned at the proposed accesses, to facilitate vehicle arrivals and departures, as well as to ensure internal vehicle movements are safely controlled during the construction phase.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>The Applicant has continued to engage with the respondent and will seek a voluntary agreement for the rights required. The Applicant notes its obligation to maintain and return the track to a condition no worse than before (as secured through the oCTMP  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>), as well as payment of compensation to the person liable for the repair of the road for any loss or damage which that person may suffer, as detailed in the Draft DCO  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/03.01]</b>.</p>
LVTC_OFF_066	Construction and Decommissioning	The claim that construction use would be “temporary” is misleading. A 526-day construction programme would span multiple seasons and effectively force closure of our caravan site and self-catering accommodation for an extended period.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges the concern around construction timeframes and impact to local residents and businesses. An Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b> ) has

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>been prepared as part of the DCO Application to outline the mitigation measures relevant to construction of the Proposed Development, including measures to avoid significant impacts to residents and businesses in close proximity to the proposed works. During construction, the appointed Contractor(s) will ensure that the impacts from construction traffic on the local community (including local residents and businesses and users of the surrounding transport network) are minimised, where reasonably practicable, by implementing the measures set out in the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>).</p> <p>A detailed CEMP and CTMP will be prepared by the appointed</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>Contractor(s), substantially in accordance with the outline plans, and will be submitted for approval by North Yorkshire Council in advance of construction commencing.</p> <p>The Applicant has continued to engage with the respondent and will seek a voluntary agreement for the rights required. The Applicant has continued to engage with the respondent and will seek a voluntary agreement for the rights required.</p> <p>The Applicant notes its obligation to maintain and return the track to a condition no worse than before (as secured through the oCTMP <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>), as well as payment of compensation to the person liable for the repair of the road for any loss or damage which that person may suffer, as detailed in</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				the Draft DCO <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/03.01].</b>
LVTC_OFF_066	Socioeconomics	<p>This would cause:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Severe financial loss</li> <li>• Irrecoverable reputational damage</li> <li>• Loss of repeat bookings and word-of-mouth custom</li> <li>• Possible need to suspend trading entirely if guest safety and peace cannot be ensured</li> </ul> <p>Our business supports the wider rural economy — including The Drovers Arms, Dororthy's at Skipwith, Yorkshire Paintball Centre and other local shops and services. Any disruption to peace, safety, or the reliability of access will</p>		<p>The Applicant notes the concerns raised regarding local businesses. ES Volume 1 Chapter 13: Socioeconomics <b>[ES EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13]</b> has assessed local business receptors in terms of their economic, 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. With these measures applied, no significant residual effects on local business receptors are expected.</p> <p>The Applicant has continued to engage with the respondent and will</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		directly reduce visitor numbers and local spending.		seek a voluntary agreement for the rights required. The Applicant notes its obligation to maintain and return the track to a condition no worse than before (as secured through the oCTMP <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b> ), as well as payment of compensation to the person liable for the repair of the road for any loss or damage which that person may suffer, as detailed in the Draft DCO <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/03.01]</b> .
LVTC_OFF_066	Biodiversity / Ornithology	We manage our land carefully to support wildlife. The hedgerows and verges along the lane support nesting and feeding habitat for many species, including UK Red List birds such as grey partridge, tree sparrow, mistle thrush and lapwing.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The Proposed Development design increases and enhances hedgerows throughout the Order Limits, as well as providing tree planting. Subsequently hedge and boundary thriving species will benefit. However, it is important to note that these features are to be largely retained.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>With regards to species including lapwing, the Bird Mitigation Area created through the Proposed Development design will safeguard this species during both the breeding and non-breeding periods. Enhancement measures including proposed tree planting and the Bird Mitigation Area are shown indicatively on the Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12]</b>), while the Applicant's Biodiversity Net-Gain (BNG) Report <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.09]</b> details the gains in BNG the Proposed Development is striving to make. These measures are secured in the outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]</b>).</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
LVTC_OFF_066	Biodiversity	In addition, bats live in and around the sheds and barns next to the lane, and this area forms part of their established roosting and foraging habitat. Any disturbance, lighting or vibration in this location risks disrupting a protected species.	Yes	Survey data and any required mitigation for bats is presented within ES Volume 1 Chapter 6: Biodiversity <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]</b> .
LVTC_OFF_066	Ornithology	<p>Owls are particularly sensitive to disturbance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Barn owls nest in buildings immediately adjacent to the area proposed for access</li> <li>• Tawny owls and Little owls regularly use the trees for roosting and hunting</li> </ul>	Yes	Pre-commencement surveys are secured in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02]</b> ) to ensure that these species are safeguarded throughout the construction phase. 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

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>maintain or enhance foraging opportunities throughout the Order Limits has been secured through the Outline Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (oLEMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]</b>).</p> <p>Anecdotal evidence suggests that the owl population at present is not well monitored and there is it likely that with the above enhancements, that this will be beneficial to the species of concern.</p>
LVTC_OFF_066	Traffic and Movement	The lane is also used frequently by walkers and cyclists, including guests staying with us. Construction vehicles would introduce clear safety risks.	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement includes an assessment of fear and intimidation in the Traffic and Movement chapter (ES Volume 1 Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p><b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.14]</b>. This calculates a degree of hazard score, which takes into account the average two-way flow, the HGV composition and the vehicle speed. It then looks at the changes in the degree of hazard with the addition of construction traffic.</p> <p>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. Across all assessed links, there is no increase in the level of fear and intimidation; all routes assessed are within the same category with the Proposed Development as they are in the baseline.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>Therefore, the temporary increase in traffic during the construction phase is not expected to significantly alter the levels fear and intimidation.</p> <p>An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>) has also been prepared and includes measures to minimise impacts during construction including traffic management measures and the use of qualified and experienced banksmen who will be positioned at the proposed accesses, to facilitate vehicle arrivals and departures, as well as to ensure internal vehicle movements are safely controlled during the construction phase.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
LVTC_OFF_066	Traffic and Movement	<p>A more suitable access exists via the lane opposite Manor Farm, which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is owned by the same landowner involved with the Light Valley Solar project</li> <li>• Was recently upgraded to accommodate articulated lorries collecting timber</li> <li>• Provides a much wider entrance for turning</li> <li>• Avoids the domestic power lines running up the length of the contested route</li> <li>• Adds only around 150 m to the route</li> </ul>		<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>A number of factors have been considered when identifying access locations off the highway into the Cable Route Corridor. This includes aspects such as water courses, environmental features and utility information.</p> <p>The access identified for use is that which is the most suitable for temporary use during the Cable Route Corridor construction phase. Existing access locations have been used, where possible, to minimise the requirements for new vehicular accesses of the adopted highway. The Applicant has continued to engage with the respondent and will seek a voluntary agreement for the rights required. The Applicant notes</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoids wildlife habitats, guest access routes and business-critical infrastructure</li> <li>• Removes the issue of lane maintenance and access rights with Field House Farm</li> </ul> <p>This alternative should therefore be prioritised.</p>		<p>its obligation to maintain and return the track to a condition no worse than before (as secured through the oCTMP [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]), as well as payment of compensation to the person liable for the repair of the road for any loss or damage which that person may suffer, as detailed in the Draft DCO [EN0110012/APP/LVS/03.01].</p>
LVTC_OFF_066	Traffic and Movement	<p>Light Valley Solar has provided no valid explanation for needing access via our lane when safer, wider and more appropriate alternatives exist.</p> <p>The boundary of the Proposed Development has been drawn excessively wide, including the lane, our storage yard, and even our house and farm buildings. Although a Dalcour Maclaren representative later claimed</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>A number of factors have been considered when identifying access locations off the highway into the Cable Route Corridor. This includes aspects such as water courses, environmental features and utility information.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>the house was “not included,” they also told me the boundary could not be narrowed — an unacceptable contradiction.</p>		<p>The access identified for use is that which is the most suitable for temporary use during the Cable Route Corridor construction phase. Existing access locations have been used, where possible, to minimise the requirements for new vehicular accesses of the adopted highway.</p> <p>Regarding the boundary width, the amendment to the boundary of the Proposed Development would include space to route access to the Cable Route Corridor and associated vegetation management if needed to create safer sightlines, such as the trimming back of existing hedgerow. The amendment of the boundary of the Proposed Development is intentionally broad in this location to allow flexibility in creating passing places or routing construction traffic</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>north of the existing access track to Field House Farm if necessary and avoiding other environmental/engineering constraints where practicable.</p> <p>The Applicant has continued to engage with the respondent and will seek a voluntary agreement for the rights required. The Applicant notes its obligation to maintain and return the track to a condition no worse than before (as secured through the oCTMP <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>), as well as payment of compensation to the person liable for the repair of the road for any loss or damage which that person may suffer, as detailed in the Draft DCO <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/03.01]</b>.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
LVTC_OFF_066		<p>A revised red line boundary of the suggested development area must be provided which excludes all privately owned assets, showing a digital geo-referenced map with precise lines. The inclusion of any privately owned property within the development area is not authorised and will be blocked. This should be received before planning permission is formally submitted.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant has submitted a Book of Reference <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.03]</b>, a Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.04]</b>, and Statement of Reasons <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.01]</b> with the Development Consent Order (DCO) application, which together demonstrate the necessary land and rights that must be secured for the delivery, operation, and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. The Applicant remains committed to working with landowners to secure the land rights required to facilitate the Proposed Development by voluntary agreement as detailed in the Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.04]</b>.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>The Applicant has continued to engage with the respondent and will seek a voluntary agreement for the rights required. The Applicant notes its obligation to maintain and return the track to a condition no worse than before (as secured through the oCTMP [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]), as well as payment of compensation to the person liable for the repair of the road for any loss or damage which that person may suffer, as detailed in the Draft DCO [EN0110012/APP/LVS/03.01].</p>
LVTC_OFF_066	Traffic and Movement	I strongly object to Change 5 and to the inclusion of the Field House Farm access within the Proposed Development boundary.	No	<p>The Applicant has submitted a Book of Reference [EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.03], a Land and Rights Negotiations</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>Tracker  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.04]</b>                      and Statement of Reasons  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.01]</b> with the Development Consent Order (DCO) application, which together demonstrate the necessary land and rights that must be secured for the delivery, operation, and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. The Applicant remains committed to working with landowners to secure the land rights required to facilitate the Proposed Development by voluntary agreement as detailed in the Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.04]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has continued to engage with the respondent and will seek a voluntary agreement for the</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>rights required. The Applicant notes its obligation to maintain and return the track to a condition no worse than before (as secured through the oCTMP [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]), as well as payment of compensation to the person liable for the repair of the road for any loss or damage which that person may suffer, as detailed in the Draft DCO [EN0110012/APP/LVS/03.01].</p>
LVTC_OFF_066		<p>I formally request that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Our private access lane is removed entirely from the project boundary.</li> <li>2. It is excluded from any Development Consent Order submission.</li> <li>3. Written confirmation is provided that no part of our lane or land will be</li> </ol>	No	<p>The Applicant has submitted a Book of Reference [EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.03], a Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker [EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.04], and Statement of Reasons [EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.01] with the Development Consent Order (DCO) application, which together</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>entered or used without my express written permission.</p> <p>4. The red-line boundary is amended accordingly to exclude the lane, our storage yard, our dwelling and our outbuildings.</p>		<p>demonstrate the necessary land and rights that must be secured for the delivery, operation, and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. The Applicant remains committed to working with landowners to secure the land rights required to facilitate the Proposed Development by voluntary agreement as detailed in the Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/04.04]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has continued to engage with the respondent and will seek a voluntary agreement for the rights required. The Applicant notes its obligation to maintain and return the track to a condition no worse than before (as secured through the oCTMP <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>), as</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>well as payment of compensation to the person liable for the repair of the road for any loss or damage which that person may suffer, as detailed in the Draft DCO  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/03.01]</b>.</p>
LVTC_OFF_066	Traffic and Movement	<p>The additional piece of land highlighted along the main road is also of direct importance to us. For safety reasons, we personally maintain the verge and hedge in this location to ensure clear visibility when entering and exiting the lane. This work is essential for accident prevention and for safeguarding all road users.</p>	No	<p>The Applicant notes the comment.</p> <p>The proposed area of land identified is included in the order limits as a 'Highway Improvement Area' (refer to ES Volume 2, Figure 2.43  <b>[EN110012/APP/LVS/06.02.02.043]</b>).                      This is a section of the highway network that could have localised improvements, such as the provision of visibility splays, or temporary highway and traffic works required to safely accommodate construction vehicles.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
				<p>The Applicant has continued to engage with the respondent and will seek a voluntary agreement for the rights required. The Applicant notes its obligation to maintain and return the track to a condition no worse than before (as secured through the oCTMP  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>), as well as payment of compensation to the person liable for the repair of the road for any loss or damage which that person may suffer, as detailed in the Draft DCO  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/03.01]</b>.</p>
LVTC_OFF_066	Traffic and Movement	Our guests also regularly walk along this verge and the track to access the Unsurfaced Unclassified Road (UUR) that runs along the front of Manor Farm. This forms part of their walking route to Skipwith and the surrounding		<p>The Applicant notes this comment. As detailed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement  <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.14]</b>, the Transport Assessment (ES Volume 3) <b>[EN0110012</b></p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		<p>areas, and in turn supports several local businesses including The Drivers Arms, Skipwith Café, and the Yorkshire Paintball Centre.</p>		<p><b>/APP/LVS/06.03.14.01]</b> and the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, <b>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]</b>), vehicle movements on the lane will be low during the construction phase, while even lower during the operational phase, when only occasional maintenance visits will take place. As such, and through compliance with the oCTMP, it is not expected that there will be any change in safety.</p>
LVTC_OFF_067	Protective Provisions	<p>Hallam Land Management Limited have a long term legal agreement on land to the north of Leeds Road, east of Harry Moor Lane, Thorpe Willoughby, located to the east of Change 20. The land is subject to a resolution to grant outline planning permission, subject to the signing of a</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. The development in question has been included in ES Volume 3 Appendix 17.1: Long List of In-Combination Effects and Cumulative Developments <b>[EN0110012/APP/06.03.17.01]</b>, and as such has been included in the</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this resulted in a change to the Proposed Development or further addressed by the Applicant's application (Yes/No)	Applicant Response
		Section 106 Agreement, for up to 140 dwellings. The site access will be subject to a Section 278 in due course onto Leeds Road.		individual cumulative impact assessments for each ES topic where relevant.
LVTC_OFF_067	Protective Provisions	Land to the west of Dam Lane (Change 19) is also, in part, controlled by Hallam Land Management Limited and may be required for Water Vole Mitigation in respect of the land at Leeds Road, Thorpe Willoughby.		The Applicant notes this comment and can confirm it does not expect that the Proposed Development would impact on the use of this land for water vole mitigation.
LVTC_OFF_067	Protective Provisions	Whilst Hallam do not object to the changes, it is important that these changes do not prejudice the outline planning permission when granted and the delivery of much needed houses in a Local Authority that has seen a significant increase in their housing requirement under the Government's nationally set Standard Methodology housing requirement.		The Applicant notes this comment and welcomes the engagement and feedback provided by the respondent.