

Light Valley Solar

Potential Main Issues for the Examination

Document Reference: EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.07

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

Light Valley Solar

DCO Submission

Potential Main Issues for the Examination

Regulation Reference	APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)
Planning Inspectorate Case Reference	EN0110012
Application Document Reference	EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.07
Author	Light Valley Solar Limited

Version	Date	Status of Version
1.0	February 2026	DCO Submission

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Overview	1
1.2	Purpose of this Document	1
2	Potential Main Issues for Examination	2
	References	8

List of tables

Table 2-1	Potential Main Issues for the Examination	4
-----------	---	---

1 Introduction

1.1 Overview

- 1.1.1 This Potential Main Issues for Examination (PMIE) document has been prepared to accompany an application for a Development Consent Order (DCO) (the DCO Application) by Light Valley Solar Limited (the 'Applicant') for Light Valley Solar. The DCO Application is made to the Secretary of State for the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (SoS), pursuant to the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008) (Ref 1).
- 1.1.2 The Proposed Development, the subject of the DCO Application, comprises a solar photovoltaic (PV) electricity generating station connecting over 100 megawatts (MW) to the Monk Fryston Substation, including associated development comprising Battery Energy Storage System (BESS), substations, grid connection infrastructure and other infrastructure integral to the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases.
- 1.1.3 The entirety of the Order Limits is within the administrative area of North Yorkshire Council (NYC) and comprises predominantly agricultural land between the villages of Escrick, Monk Fryston, Hambleton and South Milford, with a grid connection point proposed at Monk Fryston Substation.
- 1.1.4 A full description of the Proposed Development is provided within Chapter 2: Project Description (ES Volume 1) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02].

1.2 Purpose of this Document

- 1.2.1 This document has been prepared and submitted in compliance with the Planning Inspectorate's Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: 2024 Pre-application Prospectus (September 2024) ('the Pre-application Prospectus') (Ref 2) and Regulation 5(2)(q) of the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 (Ref 3).
- 1.2.2 The Pre-application Prospectus expects the Applicant to produce and maintain an Issues Tracker throughout the pre-application stage which is culminated into a list of Potential Main Issues for the Examination (PMIE) submitted to PINS as an application document (this document).
- 1.2.3 The function of this PMIE document is to facilitate more robust preparation for examination and a smoother and more proportionate examination experience for all parties. The guidance states that the PMIE document should be a short document which, where possible, is agreed by relevant statutory bodies and local authorities. The PMIE document is separate from the Initial Assessment of Principal Issues (IAPI) developed by the Examining Authority but may influence its content.
- 1.2.4 This PMIE seeks to provide the Examining Authority (ExA) with a concise summary of the main issues that remain unresolved or of concern to key

stakeholders at the time of the DCO application's submission. In preparing this document, where relevant, the Applicant has drawn on feedback from the pre-application consultation and engagement process in accordance with Sections 42, 47 and 48 of the 2008 Act, and identified the principal issues or areas of potential disagreement based on input from: relevant statutory bodies, the host local authority, those with an interest in the land, people living in the vicinity of the Proposed Development who may be affected both indirectly and directly, and wider community and organisations. Full details of the outcomes and responses from the consultation are provided in the Consultation Report [EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01].

- 1.2.5 The guidance also states that the PMIE document will inform the Applicant's production of Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) with relevant stakeholders, which will be prepared by the Applicant during the pre-examination stage, should the DCO application be accepted for Examination by the Planning Inspectorate (PINS). Before the conclusion of the Examination process, the Applicant will continue to seek to address any remaining issues through SoCGs, which will stay active throughout Examination. A final stance will be submitted before the Examination is concluded.

2 Potential Main Issues for Examination

- 2.1.1 This PMIE does not provide an exhaustive list of matters that may be examined. Dialogue with relevant stakeholders will continue post submission and the Applicant will continue to endeavour to resolve matters identified in Table 2-1 and any others that may arise.
- 2.1.2 The table identifies the issues which the Applicant considers to be main issues for the examination. These issues have been raised by and discussed with statutory bodies and the host local authority (North Yorkshire Council) throughout the pre-application stage, and in most cases a resolution has been agreed between the Applicant and stakeholders. Where these issues have also been raised by local communities throughout the pre-application stage, this has been noted in the table.
- 2.1.3 The issues in Table 2-1 are specific to the Proposed Development. The Applicant recognises that other issues have been raised during the pre-application stage by the local community. These have included matters such as:
- Impacts from dust
 - Use of local roads for construction vehicles
 - BESS Safety
 - Managing Construction and Decommissioning impacts to human and ecological receptors
 - Impacts to agricultural land; and
 - Changes to a countryside landscape.
- 2.1.4 The Applicant notes that these issues are common to solar, and other large-scale, developments more generally. The Applicant has responded to all matters raised

by local communities (as reported in the submitted Consultation Report [EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01]) and will respond to these (and any other issues) in Examination, where the Examining Authority considers it appropriate to do so. However, for the purposes of this PMIE, they are not considered 'main issues' specifically and so they have not been included in Table 2-1.

- 2.1.5 Working versions of the Issues Tracker plus a draft of this document have been shared with relevant stakeholders and North Yorkshire Council prior to submission of the DCO Application, requesting feedback or confirmation that the issues identified were correct.
- 2.1.6 The layout of Table 2-1 is based on the Potential Main Issues for Examination template set out on the Pre-application Prospectus. It presents information as follows:
- 1) Short description of the issue;
 - 2) Indication of relevant stakeholders (described as 'affected stakeholder');
 - 3) Signposting to the relevant application documents.
 - 4) Indication of likelihood of resolving the issue presented in 'RAG' format (red, amber, green)
 - 5) A position statement regarding likelihood of resolving the issue presented.
- 2.1.7 An affected stakeholder is the body or group that raised the issue and/or have been involved in seeking a resolution.
- 2.1.8 In accordance with the guidance, the RAG ratings should be understood as follows:
- 1) **Red** – unlikely to be resolved before the close of examination stage
 - 2) **Amber** – likely to be resolved before the close of examination stage
 - 3) **Green** – highly likely to be resolved before the close of examination stage

Table 2-1 Potential Main Issues for the Examination

Ref	Description of issue	Affected stakeholders(s)	Signposting (to application evidence)	RAG	Likelihood of the issue being resolved during Examination
PMI 1	Site Selection and Alternatives: Queries regarding the rationale for the location of the site have been raised during consultation. There has also been ongoing engagement with NYC regarding the extent to which the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been used to inform or guide site selection and the cable corridor routing.	Local Communities, North Yorkshire Council (Landscape)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration (ES Volume 1) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.03] Appendix 3.1: Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.03.01] Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual (ES Volume 1) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10] 		<p>The Applicant has acknowledged feedback received regarding the site selection process throughout the pre-application stage, including the adequate consideration of alternatives. Full details of the site selection methodology undertaken are provided within ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration and the SSAR, which provides an assessment of alternative sites.</p> <p>The SSAR confirms there are no more suitable and available alternative locations for the Proposed Development within a search area of 25 km radius of the Monk Fryston Substation, based on the criteria identified in that report.</p> <p>Baseline surveys for the Proposed Development including for landscape and visual commenced in Quarter 2 of 2024, following the initial site selection process. The site selection process, as set out in the SSAR, included a desktop assessment of environmental constraints, with reference to publicly available information including Landscape Character Areas, conservation areas and nearby settlements.</p>
PMI 2	Public Health: NYC Public Health team has recommended the explicit inclusion of a Human Health chapter into the	North Yorkshire Council (Public Health)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 4: Approach to EIA (ES Volume 1) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.04] Chapter 9: Greenhouse Gas Emissions (ES Volume 1) 		<p>The assessment of human health, as a standalone chapter in the ES, was scoped out of further assessment at EIA scoping stage with no potentially significant health effects concluded during the construction, operation or decommissioning phases and the nature of the Proposed Development not anticipated to have significant long term negative health impacts.</p>

Ref	Description of issue	Affected stakeholders(s)	Signposting (to application evidence)	RAG	Likelihood of the issue being resolved during Examination
	<p>EIA scope and requested for the submission to include standalone documents related to the assessment and monitoring of Human Health (e.g. Health Impact Assessment (HIA), dust mitigation, a topic paper on human health impacts). NYC also requested the Applicant provide a mechanism for monitoring the potential impacts on health and wellbeing over the 60 year life span of the Proposed Development.</p>		<p>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.09]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual (ES Volume 1) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10] Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration (ES Volume 1) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.11] Chapter 13: Socioeconomics (ES Volume 1) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.13] Chapter 14 Traffic and Movement (ES Volume 1) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.14] Chapter 17: Cumulative and In-combination Effects (ES Volume 1) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.17] Appendix 1.2 EIA Scoping Opinion (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.01.02] Appendix 16.1: Construction Dust Assessment (ES 		<p>The Applicant outlines in the EIA Scoping Report that effects on health determinants at individual receptors would be assessed elsewhere in the ES through the relevant topic assessments.</p> <p>The ES includes an assessment of likely significant effects of the Proposed Development on health, including factors such as visual effects, air quality, traffic and noise, as well as broader impacts on physical and mental wellbeing (as set out in Chapter 4: Approach to EIA).</p> <p>The Applicant has engaged extensively with NYC during the pre-application stage to ensure human health is satisfactorily covered as part of the application submission.</p> <p>The Applicant does not consider that a full HIA is required as set out in the EIA Scoping Report. Three dedicated meetings with the Council's Public Health team have taken place to discuss the scope of the Environmental Assessment and the approach to delivery of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to dialogue with NYC following the submission of the application regarding this issue.</p>

Ref	Description of issue	Affected stakeholders(s)	Signposting (to application evidence)	RAG	Likelihood of the issue being resolved during Examination
			Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.01]		
PMI 3	Traffic and Transport: NYC Highways team have raised, in engagement meetings, that the A63/A162 roundabout has been identified as currently operating at capacity. NYC is progressing a scheme to improve the capacity of roundabout.	North Yorkshire Council (Highways)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic and Movement (ES Volume 1) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.14] Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12] 		<p>The Applicant is monitoring the NYC's proposals for upgrades to the A63/A162 roundabout as a possible option for construction traffic routing. The roundabout is expected to be upgraded prior to the earliest commencement of the construction phase in 2028.</p> <p>It is outlined in the oCTMP that, in the event that the A63/A162 roundabout has not been upgraded prior to the commencement of the construction phase, the additional trips generated would represent a small proportionate increase only and would not change the conclusions of the ES. Nevertheless, the Applicant has identified that alternative construction access routes are available and construction vehicles would be directed to take these alternative routes.</p> <p>The Applicant understands that NYC are considering the Proposed Development's position on this matter.</p>
PMI 4	Cumulative Effects: During engagement meetings with various teams from NYC (such as Planning, Landscape, Highways, Public Health, Ecology)	North Yorkshire Council, Local Communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 17: Cumulative and In-Combination Effects (ES Volume 1) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.17.00] Chapter 6: Agricultural Land and Soils (ES Volume 1) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.05] Chapter 14: Traffic and 		<p>The Applicant acknowledges the feedback received on this issue and recognises the presence of other developments in the local area.</p> <p>The topic chapters and Chapter 17: Cumulative and In-combination Effects presents the findings of the potential cumulative and in-combination effects arising from the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development.</p>

Ref	Description of issue	Affected stakeholders(s)	Signposting (to application evidence)	RAG	Likelihood of the issue being resolved during Examination
	the impact of the Proposed Development cumulatively in relation to other nearby development was raised as an issue. Queries expressing concern about the cumulative impact of the Proposed Development alongside other local projects, including housing, infrastructure, and farms, were also raised by respondents during consultation.		<p>Movement (ES Volume 1) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.14]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual (ES Volume 1) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10] 		<p>Each ES topic has undertaken a cumulative assessment considering other relevant committed developments in the relevant study area.</p> <p>The following conclusions are noted from these assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 6: Agricultural Land and Soils states that cumulatively, taking into account the BMV loss of other developments assessed, the loss of BMV land in Selby would be 3.4%. Although this is considered locally significant, it amounts to 0.3% of the BMV land in the Yorkshire and Humber region, which would not be significant at that scale. Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement confirms that the Proposed Development alone, and cumulatively, will not cause unacceptable or severe impacts to the road network. Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual concludes that cumulatively, there is no effect of significance for landscape or visual receptors. However, significant cumulative effects on four Landscape Character Areas (LCAs) during construction and decommissioning have been identified, as well as significant cumulative effects for two LCAs during year 1 of operation, prior to mitigation establishing. No significant cumulative landscape or visual effects beyond year 1 of operation have been identified.

References

- Ref 1 UK Government (2008) Planning Act 2008 [Online]. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2008/29/contents> [Accessed on 27/01/2026]
- Ref 2 Planning Inspectorate (November 2025) Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: 2024 Pre-application Prospectus [Online]. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/nationally-significant-infrastructure-projects-2024-pre-application-prospectus> [Accessed on 29/01/2026]
- Ref 3 UK Government (2009) The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 (as amended) [Online]. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2009/2264/contents/made> [Accessed on 29/01/2026]



Light Valley
Solar

W: Lightvalleysolar.co.uk
E: info@lightvalleysolar.co.uk