Light Valley Solar

The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (Part 2)

June 2026

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN0110012
The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010
Rules 8(1)(c)

Light Valley Solar

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

Light Valley Solar

The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (Part 2)

Regulation Reference	The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 Rules 8(1)(c)
Planning Inspectorate Case Reference	EN0110012
Author	Light Valley Solar Limited

Version	Date	Status of Version
1.0	June 2026	25th June 2026 submission

Table of Contents

1 **Introduction** 5
1.1 Purpose of the Document 5
1.2 Structure of the Report 5
2 **The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations by topic** 39
2.1 General Feedback 39
General Feedback 39
2.2 Agricultural Land and Soils 45
Agricultural Land and Soils – General Comments 45
Agricultural Land and Soils – Detailed 55
2.3 Air Quality 58
Air Quality 58
2.4 Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection 62
Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection – General Comments 62
Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection – Detailed 74
2.5 Arboriculture 86
Arboriculture – General Comments 86
Arboriculture – Detailed 89
2.6 Aviation 92
Aviation 92
2.7 Battery Safety 95
Battery Safety – General Comments 95
Battery Safety – Detailed 101
2.8 Biodiversity and Ecology 109
Biodiversity and Ecology – General Comments 109
Biodiversity and Ecology – Detailed 136
2.9 Climate Change Resilience and Greenhouse Gas Emissions 150
Climate Change Resilience and Greenhouse Gas Emissions – General Comments 150
Climate Change Resilience and Greenhouse Gas Emissions – Detailed 158
2.10 Community Benefits 161
Community Benefits 161
2.11 Construction and Decommissioning 164
Construction and Decommissioning – General Comments 164
Construction and Decommissioning – Detailed 175
2.12 Consultation and Engagement 181
Consultation and Engagement 181
2.13 Cultural Heritage 193
Cultural Heritage – General Comments 193
Cultural Heritage – Detailed 200

2.14 Electromagnetic Fields (EMFs) 206
Electromagnetic Fields (EMFs) 206
2.15 Glint and Glare 207
Glint and Glare 207
2.16 Human Health 210
Human Health – General Comments 210
Human Health – Detailed 213
2.17 Landscape and Visual 218
Landscape and Visual – General Comments 218
Landscape and Visual – Detailed 232
2.18 Major Accidents and Disasters 261
Major Accidents and Disasters 261
2.19 Materials and Waste & Minerals 263
Materials and Waste & Minerals 263
2.20 Noise and Vibration 264
Noise and Vibration – General Comments 264
Noise and Vibration – Detailed 269
2.21 Ornithology 282
Ornithology – General Comments 282
Ornithology – Detailed 287
2.22 Project Description 291
Project Description – General Comments 291
Project Description – Detailed 306
2.23 Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism 324
Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism – General Comments 324
Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism – Detailed 338
2.24 Transport and Access 357
Transport and Access – General Comments 357
Transport and Access – Detailed 371
Transport and Access – Detailed Comments relating to West Haddlesey 410
2.25 Water Resources and Flood Risk 419
Water Resources and Flood Risk – General Comments 419
Water Resources and Flood Risk – Detailed 427
2.26 Land Interest Specific Feedback 439
Land Interest Specific Feedback 439

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Document

1.1.1 An application (the Application) was made to the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero for a Development Consent Order (DCO) under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008) for Light Valley Solar (The Proposed Development). The Application was submitted by Light Valley Solar Limited (the Applicant) on 10 February 2026 and was accepted for examination on 9 March 2026. At this stage, the start date for the Examination into the Application is yet to be confirmed.

1.1.2 The period for registering as an Interested Party through the submission of a RR ran from Thursday 19 March 2026 to Thursday 30 April 2026. The Planning Inspectorate (PINS) has published a total of 1,464 RRs submitted to the Examining Authority by Interested Parties relating to the Application for the Proposed Development. These were published on the PINS website on Monday 11 May 2026.

1.1.3 The Applicant is submitting the second part of the response to RRs, which includes their response to RRs submitted by members of the public, those who have submitted RRs who are noted within the Book of Reference **[APP-022]** and any non-statutory parties that are not responded to within this document no later than Thursday 25 June 2026.

1.2 Structure of the Report

1.2.1 This document provides a response from the Applicant to the matters raised in the Relevant Representations and is structured as follows:

- **Table 1.1** sets out the list of acronyms used for management documents that form part of the Applicant's submission and may have been referred to by the Applicant in responding to RRs. The wider range of acronyms used by the Applicant can be found in the **Contents, Glossary and Abbreviations [APP-038]**.
- **Table 1.2** lists all of the RRs as summarised in the RR Examination Library published by the Planning Inspectorate on 13 May 2026.
- **Section 2** of this document sets out responses to the RRs, split out by topic. Each comment has a Comment Reference number. Some topics have been split by general comments and detailed comments for ease of navigation.

1.2.2 References to the Application documentation are provided in accordance with the referencing system set out in the Planning Inspectorate's Light Valley Solar Examination Library.

1.2.3 All documents submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 10 February 2026 carry '/APP/' within their document reference. Submissions made to the Planning Inspectorate post-submission and during the pre-examination stage carry '/AS/' instead of '/APP/' within the document reference, to reflect the submission being made during the pre-examination stage.

Table 1.1: List of Acronyms for Submission Document

Term of Abbreviation	Definition
DCO	Development Consent Order
CR	Consultation Report (shorthand for appendices)
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ES	Environmental Statement
BNG	Biodiversity Net Gain
FRADS	Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy
oCEMP	Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan
oPSRP	Outline Pollution and Spillage Response Plan
oOEMP	Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan
ODS	Outline Drainage Strategy
oSRMP	Outline Soil Resource Management Plan
oMWMP	Outline Materials and Waste Management Plan
oPROWMP	Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan
oLEMP	Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan
oBMAMP	Outline Bird Mitigation Area Management Plan
oSSCEP	Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan
oBSMP	Outline Battery Safety Management Plan
oCTMP	Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan
oDEMP	Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan

Table 1.2: Relevant Representations

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-0001	Abbiegail Shipley
RR-0002	Adam Broughton
RR-0003	Adam Coultas
RR-0004	Adam Duncan Clarke
RR-0005	Adam Moody
RR-0006	Adam Wardle
RR-0007	Adele York
RR-0008	Adorian Serbescu
RR-0009	Adrian Barker
RR-0010	Aidan Sutcliffe
RR-0011	Aileen Brown
RR-0012	Alan Britton
RR-0013	Alan Jarrett
RR-0014	Alan Pearse
RR-0015	Alan Powell
RR-0016	Alan Rowland
RR-0017	Alan Shilton
RR-0018	Alan Taylor
RR-0019	Alan Tomlinson
RR-0020	Alex Bailey
RR-0021	Alex Ellway
RR-0022	Alex Hardman
RR-0023	Alex Innes
RR-0024	Alex Johnson
RR-0025	Alex Middleton
RR-0026	Alex Readman
RR-0027	Alex Todd
RR-0028	Alexander Philip Marsh
RR-0029	Alexander Russell
RR-0030	Ali Daly-Smith
RR-0031	Alice Hodge
RR-0032	Alison Camfield
RR-0033	Alison Harrop
RR-0034	Alison jackson
RR-0035	Alison Midgley-Schofield
RR-0036	Alison Myers
RR-0037	Alison Oliver
RR-0038	Alison Palenski
RR-0039	Alison Roberts
RR-0040	Alison Schofield
RR-0041	Alison Taylor
RR-0042	Alison Wolstenholme
RR-0043	Alison Yvonne Bingham
RR-0044	Allan Brown
RR-0045	Alyson Sheppard

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-0046	Amanda Barkess
RR-0047	Amanda Chew
RR-0048	Amanda Finn
RR-0049	Amanda Horsley
RR-0050	Amanda Kathryn Buckland Jones
RR-0051	Amanda McCarthy
RR-0052	Amanda Shaw
RR-0053	Amanda Standley
RR-0054	Amanda Waterfield
RR-0055	Amanda Wilson
RR-0056	Amber Blades
RR-0057	Ami-Leigh Rimmer
RR-0058	Amy Mankin
RR-0059	Amy Neill
RR-0060	Amy Wadsworth
RR-0061	Amy Webster
RR-0062	Amy Westwood
RR-0063	Amy Woodfine
RR-0064	Andrea Hartley
RR-0065	Andrea Rhodes
RR-0066	Andrea Ward
RR-0067	Andrea Watson
RR-0068	Andrea Williams
RR-0069	Andrew Atkinson
RR-0070	Andrew Brown
RR-0071	Andrew Bushell
RR-0072	Andrew Charnick
RR-0073	Andrew Croasdale
RR-0074	Andrew Harrod
RR-0075	Andrew James Burr
RR-0076	Andrew James Hume
RR-0077	Andrew Johnson
RR-0078	Andrew Mark Copley
RR-0079	Andrew Mence
RR-0080	Andrew Neil
RR-0081	Andrew Roberton
RR-0082	Andrew Roberts
RR-0083	Andrew Robinson
RR-0084	Andrew Sheldon-Thomson
RR-0085	Andrew Skilbeck
RR-0086	Andrew Thompson
RR-0087	Andrew Walker
RR-0088	Andrew Watson
RR-0089	Andy Reed
RR-0090	Andzelika Skarupa-McShane
RR-0091	Angela Bell

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-0092	Angela Burton
RR-0093	Angela Fisher
RR-0094	Angela Ford
RR-0095	Angela Kokes
RR-0096	Angela McDonnell
RR-0097	Angela Wade
RR-0098	Ann Dolan
RR-0099	Ann Howie
RR-0100	Ann Petherick
RR-0101	Anna Hopwood
RR-0102	Anna Jaques
RR-0103	Anna Sienkiewicz
RR-0104	Annabel Amy
RR-0105	Annabelle Thomas
RR-0106	Anne Edwards
RR-0107	Anne Eggleston
RR-0108	Anne Jackson
RR-0109	Anne M Thompson
RR-0110	Anne Martin
RR-0111	Anne Mone
RR-0112	Anne Readman
RR-0113	Anne Smith
RR-0114	Anne Snowdon
RR-0115	Anne Temple
RR-0116	Annette Exley
RR-0117	Annette Saxon
RR-0118	Annette Strickland
RR-0119	Annmarie Matthews
RR-0120	Anooj Kotecha
RR-0121	Anthea Judith Round
RR-0122	Anthea Whitton
RR-0123	Anthony Cole
RR-0124	Anthony Crabtree
RR-0125	Anthony Myers
RR-0126	Anthony Pickering
RR-0127	Anthony Sanderson
RR-0128	Anthony Walker
RR-0129	Anupa Kotecha
RR-0130	April Griffiths
RR-0131	Arthur Mone
RR-0132	Ashlea Hudson
RR-0133	Ashleigh Shepherd
RR-0134	Austin Patrick CONWAY
RR-0135	Autumn Boulton
RR-0136	Avril Margaret Nichols
RR-0137	Ayah Alfawaris

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-0138	Babs Capaldi
RR-0139	Barbara Gravenor
RR-0140	Barbara Howson
RR-0141	Barbara Moore
RR-0142	Barry Neal
RR-0143	Barry Thurgood
RR-0144	BBM Revolution Cycle Club
RR-0145	Beate Helmke
RR-0146	Becky Kilvington
RR-0147	Belinda Cashman
RR-0148	Belinda Horton
RR-0149	Ben Parker
RR-0150	Ben Thompson
RR-0151	Ben Walton
RR-0152	Benjamin Barrett
RR-0153	Benjamin John Henry
RR-0154	Benjamin Reasbeck
RR-0155	Benoit Valla
RR-0156	Beth Lilley-Draper
RR-0157	Bev Ineson
RR-0158	Beverley Morgan
RR-0159	Beverly Cross
RR-0160	Bianca Schofield
RR-0161	Bill Holmes
RR-0162	Birkin Parish
RR-0163	Birkin Parochial Church Council
RR-0164	Brandon Ward
RR-0165	Brian Billingham
RR-0166	Brian Clough
RR-0167	Brian Gregory
RR-0168	Brian Hartington
RR-0169	Brian Hawkins
RR-0170	Brian Howard
RR-0171	Bridget Englefield
RR-0172	British Horse Society
RR-0173	Bryn Sage
RR-0174	Burton Salmon Parish Council
RR-0175	C E CJ E Clark
RR-0176	Calum Stainthorpe
RR-0177	Canal C River Trust
RR-0178	Carl Hale
RR-0179	Carl Huntington
RR-0180	Carl Worsley
RR-0181	Carla Candler
RR-0182	Carly Hayburn-HayHut
RR-0183	Carol Ann Hewan

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-0184	Carol Anne Bryson
RR-0185	Carol Beale
RR-0186	Carol Bliss
RR-0187	Carol Elaine Middleton
RR-0188	Carol Guile
RR-0189	Carol Hewitt
RR-0190	Carol Hill
RR-0191	Carol Holroyd
RR-0192	Carol Irving
RR-0193	Carol Lodge
RR-0194	Carol Thornton
RR-0195	Carole A Atkinson
RR-0196	Carole Holliday
RR-0197	Carole Stackhouse
RR-0198	Caroline Bradley
RR-0199	Caroline Burnage
RR-0200	Caroline Comer-Stone
RR-0201	Caroline Lockie
RR-0202	Caroline Megan Murray
RR-0203	Caroline Mitchell
RR-0204	Caroline Rothery
RR-0205	Caroline Wynn-Davies
RR-0206	Carolyn Frances Arundel
RR-0207	Carolyn Neal
RR-0208	Carren Armytage
RR-0209	Cate Lloyd
RR-0210	Catherine Burton
RR-0211	Catherine Ellis
RR-0212	Catherine Kennedy
RR-0213	Catherine Louise Copp
RR-0214	Catherine Maloney
RR-0215	Catherine Mills
RR-0216	Catherine Moiser-Nagaur
RR-0217	Cathryn Fennell
RR-0218	Cathy McArdle
RR-0219	Cecile Brugere
RR-0220	Celia Barnes
RR-0221	Ceri Ann Loy Carter
RR-0222	Chapel Haddlesey Parish Council
RR-0223	Chapman Bethany
RR-0224	Charlee Bewsher
RR-0225	Charles Angus Wood
RR-0226	Charles Booth
RR-0227	Charles Carstens
RR-0228	Charles Smith
RR-0229	Charles William Denham

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-0230	Charlie May Grant
RR-0231	Charlotte Anderson
RR-0232	Charlotte Dindorf
RR-0233	Charlotte Edwards
RR-0234	Charlotte Elizabeth Smith
RR-0235	Charlotte Gale
RR-0236	Charlotte Louise Baxter
RR-0237	Charlotte Segal
RR-0238	Charlotte Smith
RR-0239	Charmian Haigh
RR-0240	Chelsea Kierans
RR-0241	Cherie Andrews
RR-0242	Cherylyn Williams
RR-0243	Chloe Twidale
RR-0244	Chris Badere
RR-0245	Chris Barkess
RR-0246	Chris Brace
RR-0247	Chris Elliott
RR-0248	Chris Field
RR-0249	Chris Linley
RR-0250	Chris Stephenson-Quayle
RR-0251	Chris Williams
RR-0252	Christian Cooper-Illngworth
RR-0253	Christina Wainwright
RR-0254	Christina Watson
RR-0255	Christine Abbott
RR-0256	Christine Andrews
RR-0257	Christine Davitt
RR-0258	Christine Hemingbrough
RR-0259	Christine I Ross
RR-0260	Christine Lesley Riggall
RR-0261	Christine Majewski
RR-0262	Christine Mary Wood
RR-0263	Christine Smethurst
RR-0264	Christopher Armitage
RR-0265	Christopher Bateson
RR-0266	Christopher Janik
RR-0267	Christopher Johnstone
RR-0268	Christopher Paul Carden
RR-0269	Christopher Ross Mitchell
RR-0270	Christopher Suter
RR-0271	Christopher Whyke
RR-0272	Claire Beverley Cole
RR-0273	Claire Demaret
RR-0274	Claire Edwards
RR-0275	Claire Huntington

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-0276	Claire Tune
RR-0277	Clare Hodgkiss
RR-0278	Clare Lesley Hughes
RR-0279	Clare Stansby
RR-0280	Clare Thomas
RR-0281	Cliff Whitwell
RR-0282	Clive Hoyland
RR-0283	Colin Smith
RR-0284	Collette Murphy
RR-0285	Cordelia Shaw
RR-0286	Cormac Goode
RR-0287	Craig Bellwood
RR-0288	Craig Hall
RR-0289	Craig Patrick
RR-0290	Craig Richard Storton
RR-0291	Craig Warner
RR-0292	Daisy Simms
RR-0293	Dale Robson
RR-0294	Dan Graf
RR-0295	Dan Milton
RR-0296	Daniel Birch
RR-0297	Daniel Cunningham
RR-0298	Daniel Devonport
RR-0299	Daniel Ford
RR-0300	Daniel Gray
RR-0301	Daniel Hardiment
RR-0302	Daniel John Newbold
RR-0303	Daniel King
RR-0304	Daniel Leadbeater
RR-0305	Daniel Robertson
RR-0306	Daniel William Brown
RR-0307	Danny Crockford
RR-0308	Darren Monks
RR-0309	Darryl Hayward
RR-0310	Dave Burgess
RR-0311	David Bartlett
RR-0312	David Bilton
RR-0313	David Blagbrough
RR-0314	David Chalmers
RR-0315	David Charles Brunt
RR-0316	David Coates
RR-0317	David Ellis
RR-0318	David Fitch
RR-0319	David Frederick Cavell
RR-0320	David Grantham
RR-0321	David Graveson

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-0322	David Hannaway
RR-0323	David Harrison
RR-0324	David Ian Fermor
RR-0325	David John Jennings
RR-0326	David Knights
RR-0327	David Leng
RR-0328	David Lighten
RR-0329	David McShane
RR-0330	David Merrigan-Thompson
RR-0331	David Oliver
RR-0332	David Owen
RR-0333	David Owen Horton
RR-0334	David Paul Steer
RR-0335	David Pentin
RR-0336	David Richard Tasker
RR-0337	David Riggall
RR-0338	David Sewell
RR-0339	David Smith
RR-0340	David Speak
RR-0341	David Watson Bolton
RR-0342	David Wells
RR-0343	David White
RR-0344	David Williams
RR-0345	David Wragg
RR-0346	Davud Brown
RR-0347	Dawn Grossart
RR-0348	Dawn Jacques
RR-0349	Dawn O'Connor
RR-0350	Dean Paul Hopkins
RR-0351	Debbie Skidmore
RR-0352	Deborah Allchurch
RR-0353	Deborah Baron
RR-0354	Deborah Bateman
RR-0355	Deborah Robinson
RR-0356	Debra Coulson
RR-0357	Debra Palm
RR-0358	Deena Cross
RR-0359	Delia Andrews
RR-0360	Denise Armitage
RR-0361	Denise Greenwood
RR-0362	Derek Palmer
RR-0363	Derek Stainthorpe
RR-0364	Des McCormack
RR-0365	Diana Armstrong
RR-0366	Diana E Sewell
RR-0367	Diane Alton

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-0368	Diane Kears
RR-0369	Diane Playford
RR-0370	Diane Proffitt
RR-0371	Dianne Horsman
RR-0372	Donna Potts
RR-0373	Douglas Meikle
RR-0374	Dr Julie Curran
RR-0375	Duncan Jackson
RR-0376	Edward Fletcher
RR-0377	Edward Freeman
RR-0378	Edward Pritchard
RR-0379	Edwin Glyn Jones
RR-0380	Elaine Abell
RR-0381	Elaine Braithwaite
RR-0382	Elaine Caroline Richardson
RR-0383	Eleanor Simpson
RR-0384	Elisabeth Hewson
RR-0385	Elizabeth Coopey
RR-0386	Elizabeth Garnham
RR-0387	Elizabeth Middleton
RR-0388	Elizabeth Slade
RR-0389	Elizabeth Smith
RR-0390	Elizabeth Smyth
RR-0391	Elizabeth Summers
RR-0392	Ellen Dethridge
RR-0393	Elliot J Harper
RR-0394	Elspeth Matthews-Scott
RR-0395	Emily Bellwood
RR-0396	Emily Greaves-Brayne
RR-0397	Emily Pownall
RR-0398	Emma Armstrong
RR-0399	Emma Bakes
RR-0400	Emma Bolton
RR-0401	Emma Coultas
RR-0402	Emma Dodgson
RR-0403	Emma Holliday
RR-0404	Emma Jane Osborne
RR-0405	Emma Jane Woodhead
RR-0406	Emma Keaney
RR-0407	Emma Palmer
RR-0408	Emma Pearce
RR-0409	Emma Pearson
RR-0410	Emma Pickles
RR-0411	Emma Precious
RR-0412	Emma Rene
RR-0413	Emma Smith

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-0414	Emma Sohbati
RR-0415	Emma Timmis
RR-0416	Emma Turner
RR-0417	Emma Watkins
RR-0418	Emma Wood
RR-0419	Environment Agency
RR-0420	ERASE East Riding Against Solar Expansion
RR-0421	Eric Hardy
RR-0422	Escrick Parish Council
RR-0423	Evelyn Clara Josephine Crompton
RR-0424	Evelyn Marian Otley
RR-0425	Evie Cox
RR-0426	Faith O'Donnell Stokes
RR-0427	Faye Heaps
RR-0428	Faye Sefton
RR-0429	Felicity Willerton
RR-0430	Fiona Dakeyne
RR-0431	Fiona Davidson Preston
RR-0432	Fiona Jackson
RR-0433	Fiona Jones
RR-0434	Fiona Marshall
RR-0435	Fiona Walters
RR-0436	Fiona Ward
RR-0437	Forestry Commission
RR-0438	Frances Bostyn
RR-0439	Frances Dyrdal
RR-0440	Frances Scargall
RR-0441	Francesca Dowsett
RR-0442	Francesca Shaw
RR-0443	Frank Oak
RR-0444	Freya Rose Twidale
RR-0445	Gabby Smith
RR-0446	Gail Carter
RR-0447	Gail Grant
RR-0448	Gail Stephenson
RR-0449	Gail Uttley
RR-0450	Garry Hope
RR-0451	Gary Hankinson
RR-0452	Gary Hill
RR-0453	Gary Moore
RR-0454	Gary Philip Yeadon
RR-0455	Gary Webster
RR-0456	Gavin Bell
RR-0457	Gavin Dickie
RR-0458	Gavin Twidale
RR-0459	GDPR-LVS- 001

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-0460	GDPR-LVS-002
RR-0461	GDPR-LVS-003
RR-0462	GDPR-LVS-004
RR-0463	GDPR-LVS-005
RR-0464	GDPR-LVS-006
RR-0465	GDPR-LVS-007
RR-0466	GDPR-LVS-008
RR-0467	GDPR-LVS-009
RR-0468	Gemma Dale
RR-0469	Gemma Gore
RR-0470	Gemma Hewitt
RR-0471	Gemma Price
RR-0472	Geoffrey Newson
RR-0473	Geoffrey Saunders
RR-0474	George Edward Vincent
RR-0475	George Outhwaite
RR-0476	George Turner
RR-0477	Georgia Gilbert-Smith
RR-0478	Georgia Hodgkiss
RR-0479	Georgia Tomlinson
RR-0480	Georgina Chalmers
RR-0481	Georgina Dean
RR-0482	Georgina Mars
RR-0483	Georgina Saxon
RR-0484	Gerard ODonnell
RR-0485	Gerry Kennedy
RR-0486	Giles Bennett
RR-0487	Gill Reed
RR-0488	Gillean Woodhead
RR-0489	Gillian Cooper
RR-0490	Gillian Denise Jane Haskell
RR-0491	Gillian Edwina Coverdale
RR-0492	Gillian Frances Hudson
RR-0493	Gillian Kellett
RR-0494	Gillian Saville
RR-0495	Glen Butcher
RR-0496	Glen Cross
RR-0497	Glen Hopkinson
RR-0498	Glen Williams
RR-0499	Glenis Shaw
RR-0500	Glenis Thompson
RR-0501	Gloria Capocci
RR-0502	Glyn Evans
RR-0503	Glynn Wright
RR-0504	Graham Beale
RR-0505	Graham Davy

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-0506	Graham Hatch
RR-0507	Graham Lloyd Myers
RR-0508	Graham Millard
RR-0509	Graham Moore
RR-0510	Graham Saunders
RR-0511	Grant Johnson
RR-0512	Group Cadw Tir Mon
RR-0513	Guy Johnson
RR-0514	Gwen Baker
RR-0515	Gwen Emegbo
RR-0516	H Robin Poskitt
RR-0517	Hallam Land Management Limited
RR-0518	Hambleton Parish Council
RR-0519	Hannah Binham
RR-0520	Hannah Naylor
RR-0521	Hannah Preston
RR-0522	Hannah Robinson
RR-0523	Hannah Skelton
RR-0524	Hannah Wilkinson
RR-0525	Harriet Williams
RR-0526	Harworth Estates (Agricultural Land) Limited
RR-0527	Hazel Haddock
RR-0528	HD777FRY Limited
RR-0529	Health and Safety Executive
RR-0530	Heather Murray
RR-0531	Heidi Clark
RR-0532	Heidi Redfearn
RR-0533	Helen Burley
RR-0534	Helen Cawkwell
RR-0535	Helen Davison
RR-0536	Helen Dawson
RR-0537	Helen Garnham
RR-0538	Helen Goldspink
RR-0539	Helen Gore
RR-0540	Helen Gray
RR-0541	Helen Hunter
RR-0542	Helen Husband
RR-0543	Helen Lambert
RR-0544	Helen Louise Crompton
RR-0545	Helen Mary Bernadette White
RR-0546	Helen Silverwood
RR-0547	Helen Susan Thompson
RR-0548	Helen Walker
RR-0549	Helena Ho
RR-0550	Helga Ann Richardson
RR-0551	Hemingbrough

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-0552	Hillam Parish Council
RR-0553	Historic England
RR-0554	Holly Astley
RR-0555	Holly Hanson
RR-0556	Holly Woodhouse
RR-0557	Howard Roddie
RR-0558	Howard Walker
RR-0559	Husam Khoury
RR-0560	Iain Brown
RR-0561	Ian Byron
RR-0562	Ian Crompton
RR-0563	Ian Curran
RR-0564	Ian Dyer
RR-0565	Ian Harrison
RR-0566	Ian Leslie Patrick
RR-0567	Ian Mansell
RR-0568	Ian Mason
RR-0569	Ian Meeson
RR-0570	Ian Michael Hartley
RR-0571	Ian Proffitt
RR-0572	Ian Tallack
RR-0573	Inga Bune
RR-0574	Irene Brunt
RR-0575	Irene Burton
RR-0576	Isabella Rogerson
RR-0577	Jack McKenna
RR-0578	Jackie Brayshaw
RR-0579	Jackie Clarke
RR-0580	Jackie Dunn
RR-0581	Jackie Hume
RR-0582	Jackie Jackson
RR-0583	Jackie Longbottom
RR-0584	Jacob Simpson
RR-0585	Jacqueline Thorpe
RR-0586	James Ashley Garnett
RR-0587	James Bell
RR-0588	James Billingham
RR-0589	James Booth
RR-0590	James Brown
RR-0591	James Glendinning
RR-0592	James Greenaway
RR-0593	James McBride
RR-0594	James McDermott
RR-0595	James Murray
RR-0596	James Sherwood
RR-0597	James Watson

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-0598	James Woods
RR-0599	Jamie Goldspink
RR-0600	Jamie Richardson
RR-0601	Jan Moreau
RR-0602	Jane Blackburn
RR-0603	Jane Burnell
RR-0604	Jane Catherine Carden
RR-0605	Jane Challis
RR-0606	Jane Hill
RR-0607	Jane Mercer
RR-0608	Jane Redgrave
RR-0609	Jane Woodhead
RR-0610	Jane Wright
RR-0611	Janelle Marie Smirnovas
RR-0612	Janet Howley
RR-0613	Janet Irene Yeadon
RR-0614	Janet Lynn Patrick
RR-0615	Janet Margaret Curran
RR-0616	Janet Margaret Thompson
RR-0617	Janet Moreau
RR-0618	Janet Poskitt
RR-0619	Janet Smith
RR-0620	Janet Tallack
RR-0621	Janice Waldron
RR-0622	Janine Adamson
RR-0623	Jasmine Senior
RR-0624	Jason Davy
RR-0625	Jayne Alexander
RR-0626	Jayne Griffiths
RR-0627	Jean Hall
RR-0628	Jean Hope
RR-0629	Jeanette Smith
RR-0630	Jeannette Dossett
RR-0631	Jeffrey Carr
RR-0632	Jeffrey David Philippi
RR-0633	Jennie Lawton
RR-0634	Jennifer Almond
RR-0635	Jennifer Anne Drewe
RR-0636	Jennifer Britain
RR-0637	Jennifer Grant
RR-0638	Jennifer Hart
RR-0639	Jennifer Mary Knights
RR-0640	Jennifer Smith
RR-0641	Jenny Archer
RR-0642	Jenny Rogers
RR-0643	Jeremy Bloom

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-0644	Jeremy Charles Lamb
RR-0645	Jeremy Gerken
RR-0646	Jeremy Moiser
RR-0647	Jessica Taylor
RR-0648	Jessica Truelsen
RR-0649	Jessica Whitehead
RR-0650	Jezz Booker
RR-0651	Jill Charlotte Parkin
RR-0652	Jill Hudson
RR-0653	Jill Moore
RR-0654	Jill Susan Cook
RR-0655	Jill Underwood
RR-0656	Jillaine Watson
RR-0657	Jillian Marsden
RR-0658	Jo Coulthard
RR-0659	Joan McDermott
RR-0660	Joanna Linda Arnold-Stratford
RR-0661	Joanna Wawrzynska
RR-0662	Joanne Atkinson
RR-0663	Joanne Catherine MacDonald
RR-0664	Joanne Elizabeth Williams
RR-0665	Joanne Evans
RR-0666	Joanne Marsh
RR-0667	Joanne Masters
RR-0668	Joanne Sears
RR-0669	Joanne Stockdale
RR-0670	Joanne Taylor
RR-0671	Jodie Elliott
RR-0672	Jodi-Mai Atkinson
RR-0673	Joe Ellis
RR-0674	John Blackburn
RR-0675	John David Middleton
RR-0676	John David Reid
RR-0677	John Drakett
RR-0678	John Elliott
RR-0679	John Hague
RR-0680	John Hinchliffe
RR-0681	John Lancaster
RR-0682	John Leetham
RR-0683	John Matthews
RR-0684	John Nicholas Stoker
RR-0685	John Robert Garside
RR-0686	John Stuart Cook
RR-0687	John Thompson
RR-0688	John Trevor Dufton
RR-0689	John Wetherell

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-0690	John Whitehead
RR-0691	Jon Marks
RR-0692	Jonathan Timmis
RR-0693	Jonathan Tookey
RR-0694	Joseph Birch
RR-0695	Joseph McMullan
RR-0696	Joseph Stuart
RR-0697	Josephine M Holman
RR-0698	Josie Baines
RR-0699	Josie Holman
RR-0700	Joy Winn
RR-0701	Joy Wood
RR-0702	Joyce Bugg
RR-0703	Judith Ann Denton
RR-0704	Judith Davies
RR-0705	Judith Eason
RR-0706	Judith Musgrave
RR-0707	Judith Smith
RR-0708	Julia Birkett
RR-0709	Julia Estelle Rule Horton
RR-0710	Julia Howard
RR-0711	Julia Talbot
RR-0712	Julian Selman
RR-0713	Julian Watson
RR-0714	Julie Beales
RR-0715	Julie Bedford
RR-0716	Julie Blythe
RR-0717	Julie Christine Wilkinson
RR-0718	Julie Doorne
RR-0719	Julie Firth
RR-0720	Julie Foster
RR-0721	Julie Foster
RR-0722	Julie Goldthorpe
RR-0723	Julie Hague
RR-0724	Julie Jackson
RR-0725	Julie Magee
RR-0726	Julie Mary Lewis
RR-0727	Julie Maskell
RR-0728	Julie Morton
RR-0729	Julie Paul
RR-0730	Julie Swift
RR-0731	Juliette Atkinson
RR-0732	Juvina Janik
RR-0733	Kaiden Roberton
RR-0734	Kara Taylor-Rowe
RR-0735	Karen Elsworth

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-0736	Karen Garner
RR-0737	Karen Hey
RR-0738	Karen Hunt
RR-0739	Karen Jeannette Owens
RR-0740	Karen Lilley
RR-0741	Karen Lota
RR-0742	Karen Murray
RR-0743	Karen Smith
RR-0744	Karen Smith
RR-0745	Karl Hahm
RR-0746	Karl Wright
RR-0747	Kate Kenward
RR-0748	Kate Mill
RR-0749	Kate Pittel
RR-0750	Kate Purves
RR-0751	Kate Roberts
RR-0752	Kate Standley
RR-0753	Kate Ward
RR-0754	Kate Warne
RR-0755	Kath Halloran
RR-0756	Katherine Jayne Pearson
RR-0757	Katherine Morris
RR-0758	Kathleen Lloyd-Bradford
RR-0759	Kathleen White
RR-0760	Kathryn Hartington
RR-0761	Kathryn Hinchliffe
RR-0762	Kathryn Lazenby
RR-0763	Kathryn Walker
RR-0764	Katie Hale
RR-0765	Katie Haxton
RR-0766	Katie Holmes
RR-0767	Katie Howie
RR-0768	Katie Warner
RR-0769	Kay Rowe
RR-0770	Kay Taylor
RR-0771	Kay Williams
RR-0772	Keir Mather MP
RR-0773	Keith Graham
RR-0774	Keith Malcolm Robert Ferris
RR-0775	Keith Waddington
RR-0776	Kelvin Christopher Somers
RR-0777	Kenneth Glew
RR-0778	Kerrie Tomlinson
RR-0779	Kerry Thompson
RR-0780	Kerry Warner-Malik
RR-0781	Kevin Dixon

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-0782	Kevin Peter Dolan
RR-0783	Kim Lupton
RR-0784	Kimberly Jane Jones
RR-0785	Kirsten Lund
RR-0786	Kirsty Meese
RR-0787	Kirsty Murray
RR-0788	Kirsty Wheatley
RR-0789	Kirsty Whitehead
RR-0790	Konrad Kaminski
RR-0791	Kristian Smith
RR-0792	Kyle Peake
RR-0793	Kylie Glendinning
RR-0794	Lainy Wilkie
RR-0795	Larry Sherratt
RR-0796	Laura Billingham
RR-0797	Laura Burgess-Monks
RR-0798	Laura Clark
RR-0799	Laura Goodyear
RR-0800	Laura Green
RR-0801	Laura Hana
RR-0802	Laura Smith
RR-0803	Laura Thompson
RR-0804	Laura Wolstenholme
RR-0805	Lauren Mehr
RR-0806	Laverne Eldridge
RR-0807	Lawrence Waite
RR-0808	Leanne Blakey
RR-0809	Leanne Marie Vickers
RR-0810	Lee Thomas
RR-0811	Leisa Marris
RR-0812	Leon Sorrell
RR-0813	Leonna Rockcliffe-Wallace
RR-0814	Lesley Dennon
RR-0815	Lesley Furness
RR-0816	Lesley Holmes
RR-0817	Lesley Irving
RR-0818	Lesley Jane Robinson
RR-0819	Lesley Sharman
RR-0820	Lesley Wilson
RR-0821	Lianne Gill
RR-0822	Liesel Raw
RR-0823	Linda Derry
RR-0824	Linda Homan
RR-0825	Linda Jones
RR-0826	Linda Kellett
RR-0827	Linda Leetham

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-0828	Linda Loy
RR-0829	Linda May Davies
RR-0830	Linda McFadden
RR-0831	Linda Reader
RR-0832	Linda Thacker
RR-0833	Linda Thorn
RR-0834	Linda Valerie Wolstenholme
RR-0835	Linda Walker
RR-0836	Lindsey Fake
RR-0837	Lisa Anne Widdop
RR-0838	Lisa Calvert
RR-0839	Lisa Furness
RR-0840	Lisa Marie Ward
RR-0841	Lisa Quinn
RR-0842	Lisa Sage
RR-0843	Lisa Somers
RR-0844	Lisa Vause
RR-0845	Liz Banks
RR-0846	Liz Casling
RR-0847	Lois Elizabeth Crump
RR-0848	Lois Hillam
RR-0849	Loredana Serbescu
RR-0850	Lori Blake
RR-0851	Lorraine Bayliss
RR-0852	Lorraine Howell
RR-0853	Louise Billingham
RR-0854	Louise Glynne-Walton
RR-0855	Louise Lindgren
RR-0856	Louise Oleary
RR-0857	Lucie Stanworth
RR-0858	Lucy Brown
RR-0859	Lucy Darracott
RR-0860	Lucy Elizabeth Morgan
RR-0861	Lucy Ellen Oxberry
RR-0862	Lucy Fawdington
RR-0863	Lucy Harding
RR-0864	Lucy Hutchinson-HayHut
RR-0865	Lucy Innes
RR-0866	Luke James Barkess
RR-0867	Luke Reeder
RR-0868	Luke Scargall
RR-0869	Lydia Seetulboseea
RR-0870	Lyn Found
RR-0871	Lyn Hunt
RR-0872	Lynda Mary Billingham
RR-0873	Lynn Booker

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-0874	Lynn Bowey
RR-0875	Lynn Boyes
RR-0876	Lynn Carter
RR-0877	Lynn Dickie
RR-0878	Lynn Marie Dobson
RR-0879	Lynne Copley
RR-0880	Lynne Middleton
RR-0881	Lynne Mills
RR-0882	Lynne Stafford
RR-0883	Lynne Tracie Windsor
RR-0884	Madeleine Lee
RR-0885	Madeline King
RR-0886	Malcolm Copley
RR-0887	Malcolm David Margolis
RR-0888	Malcolm James Windsor
RR-0889	Malcolm Smales
RR-0890	Malcolm Veigas
RR-0891	Mandy Joynes
RR-0892	Marc Voss
RR-0893	Marcus Sykes
RR-0894	Margaret Anne Hindle
RR-0895	Margaret Elaine Coult
RR-0896	Margaret Elizabeth Airs
RR-0897	Margaret Hamilton
RR-0898	Margaret Hartley
RR-0899	Margaret Kinread
RR-0900	Margaret Matthews
RR-0901	Margaret Morris
RR-0902	Margaret Muir
RR-0903	Maria Ferris
RR-0904	Maria Leighton
RR-0905	Marian Carter
RR-0906	Marina Blackburn
RR-0907	Marion Martin Horton
RR-0908	Marjorie Birdsall
RR-0909	Mark Brown
RR-0910	Mark Candler
RR-0911	Mark Cunningham Smith
RR-0912	Mark Forster
RR-0913	Mark Griffiths
RR-0914	Mark James Griffin
RR-0915	Mark Lister
RR-0916	Mark Wood
RR-0917	Marthe Ludtmann-Fell-Smith
RR-0918	Martin Harker
RR-0919	Martin Nichols

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-0920	Martin Pattison
RR-0921	Martin Pilkington
RR-0922	Martin Riddalls
RR-0923	Martin Shaw
RR-0924	Martin Wotton
RR-0925	Martina Booth Carr
RR-0926	Martina Williams
RR-0927	Martyn John Leetham
RR-0928	Mary Gill
RR-0929	Mary Jennifer Hannon
RR-0930	Mary Ratcliffe
RR-0931	Mary Wright
RR-0932	Mat Lambeth
RR-0933	Matt Blackburn
RR-0934	Matt Burton
RR-0935	Matthew Curran
RR-0936	Matthew Harding
RR-0937	Matthew Humphrys
RR-0938	Matthew John Roberts
RR-0939	Matthew Leach
RR-0940	Matthew Orford
RR-0941	Matthew Riley
RR-0942	Matthew Stripe
RR-0943	Matthew Watkins
RR-0944	Matthew Whitehead
RR-0945	Maura Harford
RR-0946	Maureen Fieldhouse
RR-0947	Maureen Ward
RR-0948	Maureen Webb
RR-0949	Maurice Richard Cawood
RR-0950	Maxim Leighton
RR-0951	Maxine Brown
RR-0952	May Price
RR-0953	Maynard Case
RR-0954	Meg Carr
RR-0955	Megan Drinkall
RR-0956	Megan Graveson
RR-0957	Mekhi Roberton
RR-0958	Melanie Louise Lloyd-Cave
RR-0959	Melina Ardolino
RR-0960	Melissa Donovan
RR-0961	Melissa Howe
RR-0962	Meral Altilar
RR-0963	Michael Crossland
RR-0964	Michael David Roberts
RR-0965	Michael Fountain

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-0966	Michael Hill
RR-0967	Michael Hind
RR-0968	Michael John Cooke
RR-0969	Michael Limbert
RR-0970	Michael Lyons
RR-0971	Michael McGann
RR-0972	Michael Morris
RR-0973	Michael Mullins
RR-0974	Michael Peter Hewan
RR-0975	Michael Swift
RR-0976	Michael Thomas Jordan
RR-0977	Michael Thomes Jordan
RR-0978	Michael Trevor Miller
RR-0979	Michael Werritt
RR-0980	Michael Wynne
RR-0981	Michelle Hebden
RR-0982	Michelle Louise Brittain
RR-0983	Michelle McCormack
RR-0984	Michelle Oliver
RR-0985	Michelle Rashbrook
RR-0986	Michelle Scowen
RR-0987	Michelle Watkin
RR-0988	Mike Sheedy
RR-0989	Moira McKay
RR-0990	Monet Sloan
RR-0991	Monk Fryston Parish Council
RR-0992	Monkhouse
RR-0993	Mr and Mrs T A Yates
RR-0994	Mr C E Davies C Mrs J P Davies
RR-0995	Mr Daniel P Milton
RR-0996	Mr Eliot Coulson Grant
RR-0997	Mr John Pownall
RR-0998	Mr Martin Cuthbert
RR-0999	Mr Noel C McCool
RR-1000	Mr Paul Woodhead
RR-1001	Mr Peter Cook
RR-1002	Mr Shane Oxer
RR-1003	Mr Victor Parry
RR-1004	Mrs Annette Exley
RR-1005	Mrs Barbara Hardcastle
RR-1006	Mrs Carol Anne Leary
RR-1007	Mrs Christine Harvey
RR-1008	Mrs Christine Whyke
RR-1009	Mrs Diane Helen Playford
RR-1010	Mrs Elizabeth Wetherell
RR-1011	Mrs Emily Cracknell

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-1012	Mrs Georgina Carlisle
RR-1013	Mrs Heather Rotherham
RR-1014	Mrs Helen Bryan
RR-1015	Mrs Hilary Castle
RR-1016	Mrs Jean Procter
RR-1017	Mrs Karen Merry
RR-1018	Mrs Kate Thackray
RR-1019	Mrs Laura Marsland-Hughes
RR-1020	Mrs Lilian Coulson
RR-1021	Mrs Linda Mansell
RR-1022	Mrs Lynn Donovan
RR-1023	Mrs Lynne McCool
RR-1024	Mrs Margaret Wilkinson
RR-1025	Mrs Nicky Grant
RR-1026	Mrs Penelope Morfitt
RR-1027	Mrs Sharon Lamb
RR-1028	Ms Caroline J Mawston
RR-1029	Nadia Lindsay
RR-1030	Naomi Harper
RR-1031	Naomi Sherwood
RR-1032	Natalie Fearn
RR-1033	Natalie Robinson
RR-1034	Natalie Wood
RR-1035	Nathan Kotek
RR-1036	National Gas Transmission PLC
RR-1037	National Grid Electricity Transmission Plc
RR-1038	National Highways
RR-1039	Natural England
RR-1040	Neal Drayton
RR-1041	Neil Clark
RR-1042	Neil Garner
RR-1043	Neil Muir
RR-1044	Nelia Redfern
RR-1045	Network Rail Infrastructure Limited
RR-1046	Nichola Hodgkinson
RR-1047	Nichola Tomlinson
RR-1048	Nicholas Cowes
RR-1049	Nicholas Ian Morton
RR-1050	Nicholas Osborne
RR-1051	Nick Billingham
RR-1052	Nick Pratt
RR-1053	Nick Townend
RR-1054	Nick Webb
RR-1055	Nicki Campbell
RR-1056	Nicki Smith
RR-1057	Nicky Potts

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-1058	Nicola Buchan
RR-1059	Nicola Clayton
RR-1060	Nicola Elder
RR-1061	Nicola Hall
RR-1062	Nicola Hall
RR-1063	Nicola Johnstone
RR-1064	Nicola Nicholson
RR-1065	Nicola Wallace
RR-1066	Nicola Whitehead
RR-1067	Nicolas Wright
RR-1068	Nigel Allan Currey
RR-1069	Nigel Atkinson
RR-1070	Nigel John Blackman
RR-1071	Nigel Wood
RR-1072	Nikki Williamson
RR-1073	Nitasha McKenna
RR-1074	Norman Kears
RR-1075	North Yorkshire Council
RR-1076	Numesh Mulliah
RR-1077	Olga Hopkins
RR-1078	Oliver Briggs
RR-1079	Oliver Tait
RR-1080	Oliver Twidale
RR-1081	Olivia Hodgkiss
RR-1082	Open Spaces Society
RR-1083	Ouse C Derwent Internal Drainage Board
RR-1084	Pat Cook
RR-1085	Pat Croft
RR-1086	Patricia Ann Hannam
RR-1087	Patricia Barbara Chambers
RR-1088	Patricia Mary Twidale
RR-1089	Patricia Sandra Cockroft
RR-1090	Patrick Fletcher
RR-1091	Paul Adrian Joseph Taylor
RR-1092	Paul Apedaile
RR-1093	Paul Crossley
RR-1094	Paul Force
RR-1095	Paul Gill
RR-1096	Paul Jagger
RR-1097	Paul Kibble
RR-1098	Paul Norris
RR-1099	Paul Pearce
RR-1100	Paul Robinson
RR-1101	Paul Rogers
RR-1102	Paul Saxon
RR-1103	Paul Stead

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-1104	Paul Steven Winter
RR-1105	Paula Mays
RR-1106	Pauline Dawson
RR-1107	Pauline Lesley Couldwell
RR-1108	Pauline Moore
RR-1109	Pauline Russell
RR-1110	Pauline Smith
RR-1111	Pearl Agius
RR-1112	Peter Browne
RR-1113	Peter Edwards
RR-1114	Peter James Carr
RR-1115	Peter John Gregory
RR-1116	Peter Kenneth Abell
RR-1117	Peter Pemberton
RR-1118	Peter Preston
RR-1119	Peter Shaw
RR-1120	Peter Smith
RR-1121	Peter Thornton
RR-1122	Peter Tune
RR-1123	Peter Wilson
RR-1124	Peter Woodhead
RR-1125	Phil Jones
RR-1126	Philip Baron
RR-1127	Philip Davies
RR-1128	Philip Eick
RR-1129	Philip Richardson
RR-1130	Philip Watson
RR-1131	Philippa Margaret McMullan
RR-1132	Philippa Saxon
RR-1133	Phillipa Bedford
RR-1134	Phillippa Joanne Roberts
RR-1135	Rachael Cutler
RR-1136	Rachael Rockett
RR-1137	Rachael Wilson
RR-1138	Rachel Barr
RR-1139	Rachel Davis
RR-1140	Rachel Fuller
RR-1141	Rachel Holland
RR-1142	Rachel Wells
RR-1143	Ramblers
RR-1144	Ramblers Association York Group
RR-1145	Raymond Blackburn
RR-1146	Raymond Everall
RR-1147	Raymond Neal
RR-1148	Rebecca Ann Ward
RR-1149	Rebecca Dyer

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-1150	Rebecca Gilby-Young
RR-1151	Rebecca Haysom
RR-1152	Rebecca Mill
RR-1153	Rebecca Raine
RR-1154	Rebecca Reed
RR-1155	Rebecca Shann
RR-1156	Rebecca Skipp
RR-1157	Rebecca Suddes
RR-1158	Regina Joy Mason
RR-1159	Rhiannon Elizabeth Morgan
RR-1160	Rhodri Jones
RR-1161	Riccall Parish Council
RR-1162	Richard Andrew Cunningham
RR-1163	Richard Andrews
RR-1164	Richard Armstrong
RR-1165	Richard Ballantyne
RR-1166	Richard Buckley
RR-1167	Richard Dossett
RR-1168	Richard Dunn
RR-1169	Richard Geoffrey Ward
RR-1170	Richard Green
RR-1171	Richard Hind
RR-1172	Richard Hurrell
RR-1173	Richard J Potts
RR-1174	Richard James W Hardy
RR-1175	Richard Johnson
RR-1176	Richard Jonathon Browne
RR-1177	Richard Lavine
RR-1178	Richard Peter Nicholson
RR-1179	Richard Southcott
RR-1180	Richard Stephenson
RR-1181	Richard Vernon
RR-1182	Rita Habron
RR-1183	Rob Martin
RR-1184	Rob Reeson
RR-1185	Robert Adamson
RR-1186	Robert Askin
RR-1187	Robert Brooke-Walsh
RR-1188	Robert Bustard
RR-1189	Robert Davies
RR-1190	Robert Hazelgrave
RR-1191	Robert Ian Thompson
RR-1192	Robert John Aspinall
RR-1193	Robert Jones
RR-1194	Robert Lodge
RR-1195	Robert Mason

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-1196	Robert McMillan
RR-1197	Robert Morton
RR-1198	Robert Parsons
RR-1199	Robert Tams
RR-1200	Robert Thompson
RR-1201	Robert Williams
RR-1202	Robert Wright
RR-1203	Robin David Owens
RR-1204	Robin Goldsbro
RR-1205	Robyn Crockford
RR-1206	Roger Griffin
RR-1207	Roger Hodgkiss
RR-1208	Roger Samwell
RR-1209	Ronald Maunder
RR-1210	Rooftops Not Countryside
RR-1211	Ros Garratt
RR-1212	Rosamund Cuckston
RR-1213	Rosemary May
RR-1214	Rosemary Wensley
RR-1215	Rosie Tait
RR-1216	Roxanne Hawkin
RR-1217	Roy Waldron
RR-1218	Royston Hook
RR-1219	Russell John Walker
RR-1220	Ruth Kathryn Noble
RR-1221	Ruth Pickering
RR-1222	Ruth Sharon Batty
RR-1223	Ruth Wyatt
RR-1224	Ryan Davis
RR-1225	Sally Baker
RR-1226	Sally Cooke
RR-1227	Sally Dyson
RR-1228	Sally Henry
RR-1229	Sally O'Boyle
RR-1230	Sally Wilson
RR-1231	Sam Tobin
RR-1232	Sam Webster
RR-1233	Sam Wyatt
RR-1234	Samantha Ashcroft
RR-1235	Samantha Claire Hayward
RR-1236	Samantha Hudson
RR-1237	Samantha Nightingale
RR-1238	Samantha Wilson
RR-1239	Samantha Young
RR-1240	Samual Webster
RR-1241	Sandra Horne

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-1242	Sandra Jowett
RR-1243	Sandra Pickin
RR-1244	Sara Barrie
RR-1245	Sara Cunningham
RR-1246	Sarah Catt
RR-1247	Sarah Fawcett
RR-1248	Sarah Fincham
RR-1249	Sarah Force
RR-1250	Sarah Hatton
RR-1251	Sarah Jackson
RR-1252	Sarah Jayne Thornton
RR-1253	Sarah Louise Clayton
RR-1254	Sarah Mason
RR-1255	Sarah McMillan
RR-1256	Sarah Nottingham
RR-1257	Sarah Roxby
RR-1258	Sarah Sherwood
RR-1259	Sarah Shrimpton
RR-1260	Sarah Smith
RR-1261	Sarah Stoney
RR-1262	Sarah Thompson
RR-1263	Sean Gregory Wade
RR-1264	Sean Patrick O'Leary
RR-1265	Sebastian Huddlestone
RR-1266	Selina Armstrong
RR-1267	Shan Oakes
RR-1268	Shannon Waugh
RR-1269	Sharman Stead
RR-1270	Sharon Beaumont
RR-1271	Sharon Elizabeth Burgess
RR-1272	Sharon gaskin
RR-1273	Shaun Hughes
RR-1274	Shaun Walton
RR-1275	Sheena Swift
RR-1276	Sheila Crossland
RR-1277	Shelley Hoskins
RR-1278	Shelli Murphy
RR-1279	Sherburn Aero Club
RR-1280	Sherburn in Elmet Town Council
RR-1281	Shirley Haywood
RR-1282	Sibi Catley-Chandar
RR-1283	Simon Couldwell
RR-1284	Simon Edwards
RR-1285	Simon Roxby
RR-1286	Simon Standley
RR-1287	Simon Wise

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-1288	Simone Baxter
RR-1289	Skipwith Parish Council
RR-1290	Sonia Hampshire
RR-1291	Sophia Roberts
RR-1292	Sophie Bell
RR-1293	Sophie Crossland
RR-1294	Sophie Fountain
RR-1295	South Milford Community Allotments
RR-1296	South Milford Parish Council
RR-1297	South Milford Royal British Legion
RR-1298	SSE Hydrogen Developments Ltd
RR-1299	St.Helen's Church Skipwith Parochial Church Council
RR-1300	Stacey Brown
RR-1301	Stacey Levy
RR-1302	Stacey Slokan
RR-1303	Stefan Ball
RR-1304	Stephanie Patterson
RR-1305	Stephanie Pearse
RR-1306	Stephanie Victoria Crabtree
RR-1307	Stephen Anthony Potter
RR-1308	Stephen Curran
RR-1309	Stephen Hillam
RR-1310	Stephen John Parkin
RR-1311	Stephen Kellett
RR-1312	Stephen Lilley
RR-1313	Stephen Lodge
RR-1314	Stephen Michael Kennedy
RR-1315	Stephen Paul Woolcock
RR-1316	Stephen Richard Paul Caswell
RR-1317	Stephen Sadler
RR-1318	Stephen Targett
RR-1319	Stephen Wright
RR-1320	Steve Benn
RR-1321	Steve Mac Donald
RR-1322	Steve Powell
RR-1323	Steve Sharman
RR-1324	Steven Charles Dobson
RR-1325	Steven Fisher
RR-1326	Steven Irving
RR-1327	Steven Jack Noble
RR-1328	Steven Norfolk
RR-1329	Steven Raw
RR-1330	Steven Whittaker
RR-1331	Stewart John Allen
RR-1332	Stuart Bostock

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-1333	Stuart Brown
RR-1334	Stuart Charles Ward
RR-1335	Stuart John Twidale
RR-1336	Stuart Pennock
RR-1337	Stuart Preston
RR-1338	Stuart Stockdale
RR-1339	Stuart Towers
RR-1340	Sue Cowdery
RR-1341	Sue Hill
RR-1342	Sue Howarth
RR-1343	Sue Morgan
RR-1344	Sue Norman
RR-1345	Sue Steer
RR-1346	Summer Brownlee-Ross
RR-1347	Susan Bingham
RR-1348	Susan Brench
RR-1349	Susan Dover
RR-1350	Susan Faulds
RR-1351	Susan Harrison
RR-1352	Susan Louise Benaissa
RR-1353	Susan Mackenzie
RR-1354	Susan Marsay
RR-1355	Susan Parkin
RR-1356	Susan Parkinson
RR-1357	Susan Rowbotham
RR-1358	Susan Rowbotham
RR-1359	Susan Speight
RR-1360	Susan Stanbridge
RR-1361	Susan Tarling
RR-1362	Susan Taylor
RR-1363	Susan Taylor
RR-1364	Susan Walker
RR-1365	Susan Welburn
RR-1366	Susan Wood
RR-1367	Susannah Richmond
RR-1368	Suzanne Rimell
RR-1369	Suzanne Ross
RR-1370	Suzanne Young
RR-1371	Sylvia Greenaway
RR-1372	Tara Holleyhead
RR-1373	Terence Finn
RR-1374	Terence Hewson
RR-1375	Teresa Dallman
RR-1376	Teresa Fitch
RR-1377	Terry Grant
RR-1378	Terry Tobin

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-1379	Tetyana Vilkhova
RR-1380	The Coal Authority (trading name The Mining Remediation Authority)
RR-1381	The Friends of Skipwith Common FOSC
RR-1382	The Newtons
RR-1383	The Walkers
RR-1384	Thiago Smirnovas
RR-1385	Thomas Daniels
RR-1386	Thomas George
RR-1387	Thomas Holder
RR-1388	Thomas Holwey
RR-1389	Thorganby Parish Council
RR-1390	Thorpe Willoughby Parish Council
RR-1391	Tim Hey
RR-1392	Tim Shapcott
RR-1393	Time Team of Burton Salmon, Hillam and Monk Fryston
RR-1394	Timothy Andrews
RR-1395	Tina Pinder
RR-1396	Tom Fenn
RR-1397	Tom Kilraine
RR-1398	Tom Perkins
RR-1399	Tom Rowbotham
RR-1400	Tony Ellington
RR-1401	Tony Spencer
RR-1402	Tony Thackray
RR-1403	Tracey Williams
RR-1404	Tracey Winstanley
RR-1405	Tracy Burr
RR-1406	Tracy Florence Sheedy
RR-1407	Tracy Fryer
RR-1408	Tracy Twidale
RR-1409	Trevor Britain
RR-1410	Trevor John Benson
RR-1411	Trevor Stead
RR-1412	Trina Eastwood
RR-1413	UK Health Security Agency
RR-1414	Val Brunyard
RR-1415	Valerie Atkin
RR-1416	Valerie Clough
RR-1417	Valerie Male
RR-1418	Vaughan Biggins
RR-1419	Verity Sedgwick
RR-1420	Veronika Askin
RR-1421	Vicki Webb
RR-1422	Vicky Hodge

Reference ID	Relevant Representation Received From
RR-1423	Vicky Umpleby
RR-1424	Victoria Badere
RR-1425	Victoria Britton
RR-1426	Victoria Downes
RR-1427	Victoria Hardman
RR-1428	Victoria Hewson
RR-1429	Victoria Jackson
RR-1430	Victoria Neale
RR-1431	Victoria Stapleton
RR-1432	Victoria Wright
RR-1433	Vincent Larde
RR-1434	Virginia Williams
RR-1435	Vivien Mitchell
RR-1436	Vivienne Mary Shilton
RR-1437	Vivienne Smales
RR-1438	Walter Bedford
RR-1439	Wayne Jackson
RR-1440	Weightmans LLP on behalf of Northern Powergrid (Yorkshire) PLC and (North East) PLC
RR-1441	Wendy Crow
RR-1442	Wendy O'Mahony
RR-1443	Wendy Rose Evans
RR-1444	Wendy Tomlinson
RR-1445	Wendy Wilson
RR-1446	West Haddlesey Parish Meeting
RR-1447	William Atherton
RR-1448	William Everitt
RR-1449	William Harrison
RR-1450	William Hobman
RR-1451	William Kenealy
RR-1452	William Vaks
RR-1453	Wistow Parish Council
RR-1454	Woodhaven Boarding Kennels
RR-1455	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
RR-1456	Yvonne Csordas
RR-1457	Yvonne Neal
RR-1458	Yvonne Watson
RR-1459	Zk Performance ltd
RR-1460	Zoe Aspinall
RR-1461	Zoe Craven
RR-1462	Zoe Howden
RR-1463	Zoe Matsell
RR-1464	Zoe Wright

2 The Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations by topic

2.1 General Feedback

General Feedback

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
General Feedback				
GEN-01	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-0857, RR-0702, RR-0129, RR-0806, RR-0691, RR-0413, RR-0834, RR-0678, RR-1201, RR-1403, RR-1402, RR-0289, RR-0597, RR-0165, RR-0904, RR-0050, RR-0922, RR-0872, RR-1080, RR-0471, RR-0127, RR-0915, RR-0819, RR-0842, RR-0101, RR-0825, RR-0107, RR-1343, RR-0588, RR-1091, RR-1388, RR-0599, RR-0041, RR-1218, RR-1220, RR-1054, RR-1078, RR-0754, RR-0788, RR-1382, RR-1060, RR-0615, RR-0661, RR-1346, RR-0519, RR-1277, RR-0120, RR-0315, RR-0307, RR-0956, RR-1261, RR-1173, RR-0186, RR-0346, RR-1400, RR-1094, RR-0693, RR-1288, RR-1262, RR-0748, RR-0804, RR-0287, RR-0498, RR-0797, RR-1249, RR-0965, RR-0611, RR-1198, RR-1462, RR-0949, RR-0134, RR-0604, RR-0343, RR-0670, RR-0503, RR-1016, RR-1111, RR-0144, RR-0214, RR-0268, RR-0477, RR-0334, RR-1162, RR-0873, RR-1079, RR-0790, RR-0681, RR-0883, RR-0337, RR-0228, RR-0888, RR-0322, RR-0864, RR-0322, RR-0121, RR-0123, RR-1008, RR-0213, RR-0992, RR-0256, RR-0267, RR-0237, RR-0568, RR-0058, RR-1347, RR-0745, RR-0938, RR-0023, RR-1415, RR-0818, RR-1071, RR-1456, RR-1333, RR-1097, RR-0370, RR-0820, RR-0778, RR-0556, RR-1209, RR-0063, RR-0917, RR-0062, RR-0865, RR-0962, RR-1254, RR-0998, RR-0549, RR-0738, RR-0642, RR-0665, RR-0628, RR-0417, RR-1101, RR-0225, RR-0075, RR-1405, RR-0750, RR-0376, RR-0957, RR-0309, RR-0325, RR-0182, RR-0733, RR-0771, RR-0525, RR-0201, RR-1286, RR-0051, RR-1003, RR-1187, RR-0167, RR-0631, RR-0344, RR-0822,	General Feedback	Respondents expressed an **objection** to the Proposed Development.	The Applicant's **Statement of Need [APP-214]** provides evidence that an unprecedented capacity of new low-carbon generation Proposed Developments is urgently needed for the UK to meet its legally binding climate change targets. The government has confirmed that solar energy is at the heart of the Clean Power 2030 Mission [NPS EN-3 (2025) Paras 2.10.1 & 2.10.2]. The Statement of Need confirms that the need for the Proposed Development is urgent and that substantial weight should be given to the need for the Proposed Development [NPS EN-1 (2023) Para 3.2.9-3.2.10]. The Applicant is confident that the proposed management and mitigation measures set out in the **Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-038 to APP-190]** are comprehensive and robust and that the Proposed Development aligns with national and local planning policy; this is outlined in the **Planning Statement [APP-207]**. Of particular relevance are Section 6: Legislative and Policy Context and Section 7: Planning Assessment, of the Planning Statement which set out an appraisal of the Proposed Development against national and local planning policies. The Planning Statement concludes that the benefits of the Proposed Development, including meeting the identified urgent need, outweigh its limited adverse impacts.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	RR-0069, RR-1005, RR-0791, RR-0369, RR-0725, RR-0151, RR-1324, RR-0304, RR-0673, RR-0713, RR-1154, RR-0425, RR-0086, RR-1231, RR-0803, RR-1452, RR-0130, RR-0867, RR-1263, RR-0759, RR-0152, RR-0494, RR-1257, RR-0097, RR-0356, RR-1326, RR-0339, RR-0986, RR-0984, RR-0591, RR-1207, RR-0987, RR-0379, RR-1245, RR-0046, RR-0959, RR-0652, RR-0277, RR-0504, RR-1457, RR-1221, RR-0478, RR-0142, RR-1081, RR-0252, RR-1128, RR-0087, RR-1026, RR-0006, RR-0579, RR-0897, RR-1374, RR-0667, RR-1301, RR-0749, RR-0874, RR-0405, RR-1433, RR-0609, RR-0081, RR-0155, RR-0153, RR-0623, RR-0080, RR-0483, RR-0830, RR-0970, RR-0924, RR-0230, RR-0587, RR-0940, RR-0715, RR-0063, RR-0327, RR-0659, RR-0594, RR-1134, RR-0127, RR-0997, RR-0542, RR-0185, RR-1330, RR-0592, RR-0779, RR-0993, RR-1259, RR-0149, RR-0461, RR-0146, RR-0145, RR-0652, RR-0028, RR-1419, RR-1345, RR-0996, RR-0541, RR-0019, RR-0486, RR-1025, RR-1356, RR-0363, RR-0934, RR-0923, RR-0074, RR-0955, RR-1099, RR-1241, RR-1007, RR-0006, RR-0679, RR-0799, RR-0297, RR-0907, RR-0203, RR-1370, RR-0297, RR-0976, RR-0907, RR-0203, RR-0620, RR-1180, RR-0295, RR-1130, RR-0067, RR-0831, RR-0265, RR-0966, RR-0988, RR-1108, RR-1189, RR-0720, RR-0245, RR-0902, RR-0563, RR-0828, RR-0560, RR-0219, RR-0211, RR-0812, RR-0300, RR-0310, RR-0643, RR-0574, RR-1065, RR-0359, RR-0889, RR-0891, RR-0214, RR-0334, RR-0760, RR-0863, RR-0407, RR-0559, RR-1460, RR-1140, RR-0787, RR-0060, RR-1385, RR-0204, RR-1361, RR-0840, RR-1385, RR-1415, RR-0066, RR-0549, RR-1252, RR-0205, RR-1395, RR-1379, RR-0561, RR-0622, RR-0616, RR-1337, RR-1204, RR-0937, RR-1000, RR-0233, RR-1043, RR-0821, RR-0666, RR-0293, RR-0426, RR-0833, RR-0776, RR-0250, RR-1303, RR-1185, RR-0629,			

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	RR-0133, RR-0321, RR-1367, RR-1057, RR-0463, RR-0990, RR-0950, RR-0196, RR-1330, RR-0176, RR-1250, RR-0126, RR-0688, RR-0484, RR-1432, RR-0717, RR-1429, RR-0021, RR-0330, RR-0531, RR-0277, RR-0869, RR-1072, RR-0017, RR-0786, RR-0736, RR-0878, RR-0440, RR-0383, RR-1112, RR-0208, RR-0125, RR-1196, RR-1155, RR-1394, RR-1255, RR-0890, RR-1110, RR-0786, RR-0272, RR-0817, RR-0068, RR-0448, RR-0647, RR-0392, RR-0641, RR-0555, RR-0731, RR-0870, RR-0414, RR-1192, RR-0280, RR-0007, RR-0274, RR-0156, RR-1282, RR-0198, RR-0303,			
GEN-02	RR-0593, RR-0385, RR-1096, RR-1436, RR-0246, RR-0373, RR-0546, RR-0296, RR-0810, RR-0978, RR-0305, RR-0305, RR-0024, RR-0294, RR-0332, RR-0016, RR-1447, RR-0850, RR-0558, RR-0677, RR-0194, RR-0264, RR-1182, RR-1157, RR-0137, RR-0932, RR-0953, RR-1386,	General Feedback	Some respondents expressed **general support** for the Proposed Development, including on the basis that it would support relevant national policy.	The Applicant notes these comments. The **Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-038 to APP-190]**, **Statement of Need [APP-214]**, and **Planning Statement [APP-207]** together provide an assessment of the adverse and beneficial effects associated with the Proposed Development, an explanation of why the Proposed Development is needed and the benefits of solar energy generation, and the other benefits proposed by the Proposed Development.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
GEN-03	RR-1059, RR-0241, RR-0789, RR-1201, RR-1403, RR-1080, RR-0471, RR-0200, RR-0101, RR-1068, RR-1388, RR-1033, RR-0041, RR-0358, RR-0434, RR-1060, RR-0615, RR-0120, RR-0254, RR-0096, RR-0956, RR-0637, RR-0406, RR-1030, RR-0714, RR-0038, RR-0232, RR-0928, RR-0467, RR-1226, RR-0030, RR-0899, RR-0748, RR-0457, RR-0804, RR-0498, RR-0844, RR-1205, RR-1249, RR-0744, RR-0611, RR-0900, RR-0949, RR-0530, RR-0141, RR-0343, RR-0396, RR-0670, RR-0503, RR-0049, RR-0334, RR-0873, RR-0003, RR-0740, RR-0883, RR-0888, RR-1008, RR-1107, RR-1401, RR-0992, RR-0522, RR-1347, RR-0568, RR-1097, RR-0778, RR-0417, RR-0224, RR-0075, RR-0750, RR-0376, RR-0182, RR-1286, RR-1369, RR-1003, RR-1187, RR-0394, RR-1329, RR-0431, RR-1047, RR-1073, RR-0235, RR-0673, RR-0679, RR-1324, RR-0742, RR-0425, RR-0803, RR-1452, RR-0586, RR-0130, RR-0867, RR-0191, RR-0884, RR-0841, RR-0053, RR-0055, RR-1207, RR-0969, RR-0277, RR-0478, RR-0520, RR-0328, RR-1366, RR-1026, RR-0089, RR-0579, RR-0897, RR-0405, RR-1412, RR-0609, RR-0623, RR-0080, RR-0115, RR-0851, RR-0683, RR-0941, RR-0660, RR-0737, RR-1372, RR-0542, RR-0907, RR-0149, RR-1246, RR-0146, RR-0145, RR-0203, RR-0648, RR-0105, RR-1356, RR-1157, RR-0696, RR-1320, RR-0988, RR-0603, RR-0720, RR-1061, RR-1229, RR-0095, RR-0765, RR-0666, RR-0293, RR-1013, RR-1125, RR-0554, RR-0814, RR-0071, RR-0222, RR-1432, RR-0021, RR-1429, RR-1425, RR-0350, RR-0064, RR-0383, RR-0929, RR-0817, RR-1192, RR-0280, RR-0967, RR-0999, RR-0303, RR-0242, RR-1338	General Feedback	Respondents expressed general concern about impacts to the community.	The Applicant notes this comment and is confident that the impacts of the Proposed Development on communities have been assessed through the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), and are set out across the relevant technical chapters of the Environmental Statement (ES). The Applicant is confident that the proposed management and mitigation measures set out in the **Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-038 to APP-190]** are comprehensive and robust and that the Proposed Development aligns with national and local planning policy; this is outlined in the **Planning Statement [APP-207]**. Of particular relevance are Section 6: Legislative and Policy Context and Section 7: Planning Assessment, of the Planning Statement which set out an appraisal of the Proposed Development against national and local planning policies. The Planning Statement concludes that the benefits of the Proposed Development, including meeting the identified urgent need, outweigh its limited adverse impacts. Of particular relevance to the assessment of effects on local communities are **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**, **Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**, **Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]**, **Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement [APP-052]**, **and Chapter 16: Other Environmental Matters [APP-054],** all of which consider potential impacts on residential properties and local communities and include mitigation measures that are based on good practice used on projects across the UK, as well as measures developed in response to the sensitivities of the specific local environment.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
GEN-04	RR-0936	General Feedback	Respondent expressed concern that the cable corridor will be much wider than 'just a cable' and leave a wide, tarmac road blighting the landscape.	The Applicant notes this comment. For the open cut sections of the Cable Route Corridor, the working width for installation of the cable is anticipated to be 25 m. This may be widened in places and narrowed in others, for example to minimise removal of hedgerows or at open cut watercourse crossings. The working width will include a temporary haul road along which vehicles and plant will be located, as well as an area for temporary storage of excavated soil. A **temporary haul road** will be established throughout the Cable Route Corridor to enable vehicles to access the launch/reception pits and open cut trenches. The majority of the haul road will be constructed using granular material/hard core, although alternative protection measures may be used in some locations to minimise ground disturbance. For the Interconnecting Cables, the open cut cable trench would be up to approximately 7 m wide and approximately 2 m deep, subject to design and ground conditions. For the Grid Connection Cables, the trench will be up to approximately 2 m wide and 2 m deep, subject to design and ground conditions. The temporary haul road forms part of the construction working area and will be removed following installation of the Grid Connection Cables and Interconnecting Cables. The land used for the haul road will then be fully reinstated to its original use. As such, no permanent roads would remain within the Cable Route Corridor and the interconnecting cables would be buried underground. As identified in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**, visual effects associated with the Cable Route Corridor arise primarily during the construction phase and are temporary and reversible. Once construction is complete and the land has been reinstated, there would be no long-term visual impacts associated with this element of the Proposed Development. The assessment concludes that there would be no adverse residual effects during operation and the landscape would return to its baseline condition. Further detail regarding the Cable Route Corridor construction is included within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [APP-040]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 2.1: Cable Route Method Statement [APP-147]**.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
GEN-05	RR-1450	General Feedback	Respondent stated that the proposed bypass route to the A1(M) using a route across some of the land to be used by the Proposed Development (e.g. from east of Monk Fryston to north of Sherburn) would be lost, threatening the bypass proposals.	The Applicant notes this comment. The Proposed Development would not infringe on the bypass scheme, with cables being run underground. The Applicant acknowledges that the bypass scheme is a recognised local need and planning provision exists, however its actual construction is contingent on future reviews and secured funding.

2.2 Agricultural Land and Soils

Agricultural Land and Soils – General Comments

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Agricultural Land and Soils - General Comments				
AGR-01	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-0112, RR-1116, RR-0088, RR-0129, RR-1409, RR-1458, RR-1059, RR-0511, RR-1029, RR-0806, RR-0826, RR-0573, RR-0241, RR-1163, RR-0834, RR-0903, RR-0774, RR-0678, RR-1402, RR-0289, RR-1271, RR-1012, RR-0165, RR-0904, RR-0418, RR-1201, RR-1403, RR-0564, RR-0664, RR-0193, RR-1135, RR-0646, RR-1362, RR-0037, RR-0050, RR-0216, RR-1344, RR-0872, RR-0169, RR-0471, RR-0922, RR-0387, RR-0375, RR-1264, RR-0127, RR-0939, RR-0257, RR-0200, RR-0915, RR-0842, RR-0700, RR-0101, RR-0910, RR-0132, RR-0698, RR-0393, RR-0032, RR-1353, RR-0111, RR-1228, RR-0131, RR-1068, RR-0825, RR-0385, RR-1096, RR-0008, RR-0849, RR-1388, RR-1421, RR-0599, RR-0358, RR-1218, RR-0537, RR-1220, RR-0434, RR-1054, RR-0226, RR-0754, RR-0788, RR-1382, RR-1060, RR-0615, RR-0948, RR-0043, RR-1338, RR-0390, RR-1346, RR-1175, RR-0661, RR-1397, RR-0120, RR-0254, RR-0096, RR-0307, RR-1232, RR-0061, RR-1261, RR-0699, RR-0637, RR-1173, RR-0391, RR-0695, RR-0481, RR-0128, RR-0492, RR-0186, RR-0524, RR-1267, RR-0961, RR-0406, RR-0346, RR-0714, RR-1090, RR-0704, RR-1400, RR-1208, RR-1094, RR-0255, RR-0004, RR-0255, RR-0868, RR-0693, RR-0178, RR-0764, RR-0232, RR-0493, RR-1092, RR-0034,RR-1092, RR-1238, RR-0901, RR-1262, RR-0175, RR-0011, RR-0189, RR-1439, RR-1176, RR-1293, RR-0893, RR-0457, RR-0804, RR-0308, RR-0498, RR-1211, RR-0138, RR-0844, RR-0797, RR-0877, RR-1205, RR-0965, RR-1294, RR-0824, RR-0611, RR-1152, RR-1384, RR-0675, RR-0532, RR-1002, RR-0949, RR-0141, RR-0618, RR-0977, RR-0675, RR-0343, RR-0935, RR-0604, RR-0248, RR-0396, RR-1224, RR-0319,	Agricultural Land and Soils	Respondents expressed concern regarding the use and potential loss of agricultural land as a result of the Proposed Development. Some respondents considered that agricultural land should not be used for solar development, with particular reference to the use of high-grade or Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land. Some respondents indicated a preference for solar development to be located on previously developed (brownfield) land. Some respondents expressed a preference for rooftop solar over ground-mounted solar, suggesting that panels should instead be installed on existing buildings, including schools, industrial warehouses and residential properties. Some respondents also suggested that solar panels should be sited alongside existing infrastructure corridors, such as railway lines, motorways or other major roads. Specific alternative locations include Sherburn Industrial Estate, Xscape, Eggborough Power Station, TK Max Warehouse at Ferrybridge, Kellingley Colliery, Selby area has old factory sites such as Rigid paper, BOCM on Barlby road, Former Skelton Grange Power Station, Former Ferrybridge Power Station, pensioners' homes, Stillingfleet mine, Gascoigne Wood, Riccall Mines with spoil heaps, indusrial units at the Sherburn Industrial Estate, and Apperly Bridge train station car park.	An assessment of the potential effects of the Proposed Development on soils and agricultural land is provided in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils [APP-043]**. This chapter considers baseline agricultural land quality, including Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land, and assesses likely significant effects arising from construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development, together with embedded mitigation measures. The areas of each Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) grade affected by the Proposed Development are set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.1: Agricultural Land Classification [APP-150]**. Of the agricultural land within the Solar Development Sites, approximately 402 ha (45%) is confirmed as Subgrade 3b which is a resource of medium sensitivity and not considered BMV land. Approximately 307 ha (34%) is confirmed as Subgrade 3a, while approximately 179.4 ha (20%) is confirmed as Grades 1 and 2. The distribution of ALC grades is shown in **ES Volume 2, Figure 5.2: Agricultural Land Classification [APP-071]**. The 486 ha of BMV land within the Proposed Development (of which approximately 19.1 ha would be required for the 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. The Applicant has had regard to agricultural land quality and relevant policy protections (as detailed in Sections 4.2 and 4.3 of **ES Volume 3, Appendix 3.1: Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) [AS-019]**) in the design and site selection process and has sought, where practicable, to locate infrastructure on lower quality land. Remediation of compaction and any other effects resulting from soil sealing would be included in the soil management measures for the decommissioning phase, as secured in the **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) [APP-194].** The Proposed Development will result in a temporary and reversible loss of agricultural land for the operational life of the Proposed Development. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils [APP-043]** sets out that, as the Proposed Development is temporary, albeit long-term

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	RR-0312, RR-0945, RR-0157, RR-1105, RR-1359, RR-0670, RR-1079, RR-1016, RR-1410, RR-1111, RR-0651, RR-0049, RR-0506, RR-1348, RR-1274, RR-0100, RR-1169, RR-0905, RR-1074, RR-1066, RR-0214, RR-0009, RR-0268, RR-0368, RR-0477, RR-0056, RR-0663, RR-1162, RR-0334, RR-0790, RR-1079, RR-0782, RR-0490, RR-0150, RR-1126, RR-0681, RR-0883, RR-0103, RR-0952, RR-0337, RR-0260, RR-1383, RR-0682, RR-0976, RR-1020, RR-0888, RR-1449, RR-0773, RR-1313, RR-0864, RR-0042, RR-0139, RR-0322, RR-0121, RR-0442, RR-0427, RR-1008, RR-0285, RR-1107, RR-0213, RR-0160, RR-1401, RR-1119, RR-0992, RR-0004, RR-0522, RR-0104, RR-1115, RR-0776, RR-1117, RR-0237, RR-0762, RR-0052, RR-0568, RR-0058, RR-1347, RR-0306, RR-0745,RR-1106, RR-0658, RR-1415, RR-0023, RR-0818, RR-0827, RR-1071, RR-1333, RR-0576, RR-1160, RR-0538, RR-1097, RR-0370, RR-0820, RR-0778, RR-0556, RR-1209, RR-0917, RR-0062, RR-0865, RR-0726, RR-0163, RR-0847, RR-1309, RR-0460, RR-0854, RR-0847, RR-1041, RR-0090, RR-0505, RR-0908, RR-0443, RR-0282, RR-0998, RR-0768, RR-0291, RR-0454, RR-0384, RR-1275, RR-0777, RR-0738, RR-0549, RR-0601, RR-1014, RR-0642, RR-0109, RR-0318, RR-1376, RR-0628, RR-0680, RR-0856, RR-0417, RR-0962, RR-0879, RR-1284, RR-0286, RR-1428, RR-0224, RR-0286, RR-0625, RR-0075, RR-1405, RR-0750, RR-1184, RR-0376, RR-0102, RR-0627, RR-0079, RR-0288, RR-0487, RR-0798, RR-1292, RR-0092, RR-0650, RR-1222, RR-1148, RR-0182, RR-0733, RR-0771, RR-0201, RR-1156, RR-1416, RR-1242, RR-0279,RR-1276, RR-0930, RR-1369, RR-0474, RR-1340, RR-1003, RR-0167, RR-0887, RR-1335, RR-1028, RR-0816, RR-0822, RR-0069, RR-0352, RR-0402, RR-1005, RR-0431, RR-0179, RR-1290, RR-1073, RR-0369, RR-0235, RR-0331, RR-0843, RR-0240, RR-0757, RR-0360, RR-0725, RR-0304, RR-0673,			(lifetime of the Proposed Development), and reversible, the ISEP guidance indicates that the magnitude for the change of use of agricultural land for the panel areas, including all temporary construction elements and access tracks required, is low. The Proposed Development would have a direct, long-term, temporary and reversible moderate adverse effect on Grades 1 and 2 agricultural land, which is assessed as significant, and minor adverse effects on Subgrade 3a and 3b agricultural land, which is not significant. These effects are fully reported in the ES and are a matter for the Secretary of State to weigh in the planning balance against the need for the Proposed Development and its wider benefits. During the operational phase of the Proposed Development, the soil resource under the solar PV panels will remain largely undisturbed, and following decommissioning, the soil quality is expected to have improved from its current status, which is assessed as a significant moderate beneficial effect. Measures to avoid and minimise effects on soils and agricultural land are embedded within the Proposed Development design and secured through Schedule 2, Requirement 17 of the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]** which includes the preparation and implementation of a Soil Resources Management Plan (SRMP) in substantial accordance with the **Outline SRMP [APP-203].** The SRMP will control soil handling, storage and reinstatement during construction, operation and decommissioning, and a requirement to prepare and implement a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan in substantial accordance with the **oDEMP [APP-194]**, which is secured by Schedule 2, Requirement 19 of the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**. The **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]** details how grassland and other habitat will be established beneath and between the solar panels. Provision of a detailed LEMP in substantial accordance with the outline, is secured through Schedule 2, Requirement 6 of the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**. Through the establishment and maintenance of long-term grassland beneath and between the solar arrays, as well as the fact that, in some cases, the soil is being taken out of intensive agricultural use, soil health, quality and structure are anticipated to improve over the lifetime of the Proposed Development. In relation to suggestions that brownfield land or alternative locations should be used, including rooftop, these matters

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	RR-0713, RR-0679, RR-1324, RR-1154, RR-0848, RR-0742, RR-0488, RR-0655, RR-1109, RR-1351, RR-0425, RR-0086, RR-1231, RR-0803, RR-1378, RR-0130, RR-0333, RR-0410, RR-0867, RR-1263, RR-0759, RR-0152, RR-0612, RR-0480, RR-0070, RR-0494, RR-1058, RR-0329, RR-1199, RR-0813, RR-1285, RR-0097, RR-0341, RR-0356, RR-1326, RR-0339, RR-0983, RR-0841, RR-0983, RR-1248, RR-0053, RR-0415, RR-0692, RR-0076, RR-0723, RR-0417, RR-0055, RR-0534, RR-0795, RR-0913, RR-1422, RR-0926, RR-0099, RR-0707, RR-0896, RR-0712, RR-0100, RR-1334, RR-0718, RR-0689, RR-0379, RR-1171, RR-0447, RR-0399, RR-1085, RR-0206, RR-1193, RR-1245, RR-0148, RR-0610, RR-0122, RR-1225, RR-1207, RR-0046, RR-1357, RR-1302, RR-0959, RR-0669, RR-0652, RR-1001, RR-0540, RR-0513, RR-0690, RR-0533, RR-1354, RR-0277, RR-0504, RR-1457, RR-0478, RR-0620, RR-0964, RR-0142, RR-1311, RR-0365, RR-0882, RR-0249, RR-1230, RR-1081, RR-0520, RR-0252, RR-1445, RR-1128, RR-1366, RR-0459, RR-0087, RR-1438, RR-0808, RR-1266, RR-0039, RR-0919, RR-1049, RR-0974, RR-0421, RR-0261, RR-0089, RR-0404, RR-0135, RR-0395, RR-0897, RR-0694, RR-0015, RR-1374, RR-1050, RR-0761, RR-1051, RR-0749, RR-0874, RR-0855, RR-0377,RR-1433, RR-0388, RR-0577, RR-0155, RR-0153, RR-1398, RR-0081, RR-0735, RR-0735, RR-0200, RR-1451, RR-0428, RR-0458, RR-0547, RR-0711, RR-0299, RR-0686, RR-0077, RR-0371, RR-0510, RR-0080, RR-0271, RR-0972, RR-0357, RR-1336, RR-0483, RR-1006, RR-0635, RR-0110, RR-1223, RR-0807, RR-1067, RR-0898, RR-0954, RR-1273, RR-1375, RR-0290, RR-0187, RR-0033, RR-0830, RR-0200, RR-0970, RR-0276, RR-0253, RR-0335, RR-0924, RR-1122, RR-1441, RR-0541, RR-0230, RR-0578, RR-1142, RR-0940, RR-1315, RR-1165, RR-0715, RR-0336, RR-1360, RR-0229, RR-0838, RR-0063, RR-0482, RR-0683,			are addressed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-041]** and in the **Statement of Need [APP-214]**. The Applicant has considered alternatives, including previously developed land and other forms of solar deployment, as part of the site selection and design evolution process. As explained in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 3.1: Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) [AS-019]** an appraisal of alternative sites within a 25km radius of the existing National Grid Monk Fryston Substation has been undertaken, which concludes that there are no more suitable locations, including brownfield sites, within the 25km search area than the proposed location for the Proposed Development. With regard to siting the Proposed Development alongside existing infrastructure corridors such as motorways, major roads and railways, **ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-041]** and the accompanying **ES Volume 3, Appendix 3.1: Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) [AS-019]** set out the alternatives considered by the Applicant. The assessment did not identify any unconstrained, suitable and available land that could utilise existing infrastructure corridors. National policy and government guidance, as set out in the **Statement of Need [APP-214]**, recognise that while rooftop and smaller-scale solar installations are an important part of the energy mix, they cannot alone meet the scale of capacity required to achieve clean power and net zero objectives. Large-scale ground-mounted solar therefore remains necessary in addition to, not instead of, rooftop solar.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	RR-0239, RR-0672, RR-0183, RR-0617, RR-0746, RR-0701, RR-0701, RR-1159, RR-1331, RR-0644, RR-0489, RR-0005, RR-0660, RR-0004, RR-1113, RR-0106, RR-0809, RR-0737, RR-1372, RR-0687, RR-0127, RR-0880, RR-1134, RR-1200, RR-0971, RR-1291, RR-0997, RR-1368, RR-0316, RR-0608, RR-0094, RR-1305, RR-0438, RR-0741, RR-0836, RR-0542, RR-0907, RR-0779, RR-0993, RR-1259, RR-0461, RR-0215, RR-0815, RR-0146, RR-0145, RR-1095, RR-0652, RR-0445, RR-0386, RR-0203, RR-0996, RR-1265, RR-1406, RR-1419, RR-0221, RR-0589, RR-0619, RR-0837, RR-0118, RR-1408, RR-1423, RR-0550, RR-0497, RR-1269, RR-1025, RR-1300, RR-1120, RR-0363, RR-0934, RR-0374, RR-0923, RR-0074, RR-0955, RR-0829, RR-0743, RR-0582, RR-0105, RR-0734, RR-1241, RR-0400, RR-1256, RR-0696, RR-1007, RR-0621, RR-1287, RR-1314, RR-0951, RR-0835, RR-0630, RR-1055, RR-1167, RR-1099, RR-1240, RR-0963, RR-1370, RR-1099, RR-1320, RR-0620, RR-0295, RR-1130, RR-0909, RR-1340, RR-0265, RR-0270, RR-0966, RR-0217, RR-0988, RR-1318, RR-1127, RR-1430, RR-1195, RR-1234, RR-0603, RR-0921, RR-0720, RR-0758, RR-1316, RR-0073, RR-0044, RR-0348, RR-1181, RR-0562, RR-0947, RR-1319, RR-0065, RR-0902, RR-0932, RR-0380, RR-0505, RR-0767, RR-0563, RR-0091, RR-0881, RR-0184, RR-0828, RR-0709, RR-0866, RR-0266, RR-1215, RR-0724, RR-0596, RR-0219, RR-1100, RR-1132, RR-0211, RR-0366, RR-0338, RR-1229, RR-0300, RR-0449, RR-0310, RR-1233, RR-1461, RR-0643, RR-1147, RR-0727, RR-0574, RR-1065, RR-1018, RR-0359, RR-0544, RR-0423, RR-0889, RR-0891, RR-0453, RR-0766, RR-0472, RR-0708, RR-1009, RR-1130, RR-0345. RR-1410, RR-1066, RR-0214, RR-0334, RR-0354, RR-1347, RR-0760, RR-0747, RR-1407, RR-0452, RR-0190, RR-0218, RR-0013, RR-0745, RR-0027, RR-0649, RR-0657, RR-0805, RR-0920, RR-0936, RR-0158,			

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	RR-0281, RR-0236,RR-0719, RR-0154, RR-0247, RR-0787, RR-1114, RR-0204, RR-1361, RR-0710, RR-0840, RR-1385, RR-0143, RR-0658, RR-1415, RR-0998, RR-0549, RR-0662, RR-1014, RR-0642, RR-0429, RR-0914, RR-1252, RR-0846, RR-0628, RR-1365, RR-0456, RR-0561, RR-0205, RR-0345, RR-0722, RR-0014, RR-1031, RR-0263, RR-1239, RR-0501, RR-0616, RR-1337, RR-0937, RR-1084, RR-0035, RR-0040, RR-1098, RR-0433,RR-1000, RR-0372, RR-0572, RR-0284, RR-0656, RR-1325, RR-1052, RR-0535, RR-0233, RR-1332, RR-0223, RR-0223, RR-0860, RR-1118, RR-0875, RR-0523, RR-1043, RR-0045, RR-0821, RR-0685, RR-0072, RR-0293, RR-1435, RR-1363, RR-0364, RR-0048, RR-1013, RR-0171, RR-0202, RR-0468, RR-0566, RR-1168, RR-1124, RR-0275, RR-0361, RR-0595, RR-1046, RR-1089, RR-0426, RR-1431, RR-1258, RR-0250, RR-1463, RR-1373, RR-1342, RR-0931, RR-0554, RR-0047, RR-1185, RR-0814, RR-1093, RR-0545, RR-0439, RR-0629, RR-0633, RR-0705, RR-1217, RR-1042, RR-0409, RR-0424, RR-1227, RR-0463, RR-0353, RR-0001, RR-0697, RR-1253, RR-1004, RR-0990, RR-0093, RR-1150, RR-1062, RR-0800, RR-0950, RR-0500, RR-1330, RR-1123, RR-0059, RR-0769, RR-0176, RR-1250, RR-0960, RR-0706, RR-0688, RR-0763, RR-0473, RR-0484, RR-0639, RR-0886, RR-0469, RR-0676, RR-0871, RR-0801, RR-0717, RR-0330, RR-0785, RR-0021, RR-1425, RR-0531, RR-0933, RR-0446, RR-0869, RR-1072, RR-0389, RR-0283, RR-0018, RR-0430, RR-0653, RR-0464, RR-0736, RR-0878, RR-0168, RR-1019, RR-1213, RR-1327, RR-0262, RR-1243, RR-0739, RR-0192, RR-1203, RR-0432, RR-1352, RR-1448, RR-0491, RR-0721, RR-0602, RR-1281, RR-0571, RR-1112, RR-0383, RR-0567, RR-0636, RR-1021, RR-0852, RR-0435, RR-0125, RR-0929, RR-1196, RR-1155, RR-1394, RR-0585, RR-0412, RR-0890, RR-0408, RR-0136, RR-1110, RR-0786, RR-0272, RR-			

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	0817, RR-0314, RR-1251, RR-0347, RR-0647, RR-0392, RR-0641, RR-0555, RR-0269, RR-0870, RR-1206, RR-1216, RR-0647, RR-0731, RR-0278, RR-0980, RR-0414, RR-0509, RR-0280, RR-0007, RR-0274, RR-0509, RR-0156, RR-1023, RR-0054, RR-0638, RR-0967, RR-1131, RR-1391, RR-0580, RR-0853, RR-0942, RR-0220, RR-1011, RR-0999, RR-0885, RR-0640, RR-1191, RR-0973, RR-0444, RR-0303, RR-1138, RR-1387, RR-0676, RR-0098, RR-1063, RR-1170, RR-0842, RR-1002, RR-0343, RR-0427, RR-0123, RR-0750			
AGR-02	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-1163, RR-0834, RR-1402, RR-0165, RR-0418, RR-0037, RR-0915, RR-0842, RR-1228, RR-0599, RR-1220, RR-0226, RR-0615, RR-1346, RR-1175, RR-0661, RR-1397, RR-0524, RR-1267, RR-0406, RR-0714, RR-1090, RR-1208, RR-0255, RR-0178, RR-0764, RR-1092, RR-0901, RR-1293, RR-0893, RR-0457, RR-0797, RR-0877, RR-0965, RR-0824, RR-1384, RR-0675, RR-0904, RR-0532, RR-0949, RR-0977, RR-0675, RR-0565, RR-0248, RR-1224, RR-0319, RR-0157, RR-1016, RR-1074, RR-0214, RR-0009, RR-0790, RR-1079, RR-0103, RR-0682, RR-0976, RR-1020, RR-0773, RR-0864, RR-0322, RR-1008, RR-0213, RR-1401, RR-0992, RR-0568, RR-0745, RR-0658, RR-0938, RR-0023, RR-1071, RR-1333, RR-0538, RR-0820, RR-1209, RR-0062, RR-0865, RR-0726, RR-1309, RR-0854, RR-1041, RR-0998, RR-0738, RR-1014, RR-0642, RR-0109, RR-0628, RR-0417, RR-0962, RR-0225, RR-1284, RR-0224, RR-1405, RR-0750, RR-1338, RR-1184, RR-0627, RR-0487,RR-0798, RR-1222, RR-0182, RR-0733, RR-0201, RR-1416, RR-1242, RR-0279, RR-0930, RR-1003, RR-0167, RR-1335, RR-0816, RR-0822, RR-0402, RR-1005, RR-0431, RR-0369, RR-0843, RR-0679, RR-1154, RR-0848, RR-0655, RR-1109, RR-1351, RR-0086, RR-1231, RR-0803, RR-1378, RR-0199, RR-0130, RR-0867, RR-1263,	Agricultural Land and Soils	Respondents expressed concern that the Proposed Development could adversely affect UK food security and domestic food production. Some respondents linked this concern to the UK's reliance on imported food and the need to strengthen domestic food resilience.	The effects of the Proposed Development on agricultural land, including land quality and productivity, are assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils [APP-043]**, which states that food security has been considered. The Applicant does not consider that food security will be compromised by the Proposed Development (or solar energy more widely), particularly in the context that the 486 ha of BMV land within the Proposed Development (of which/ approximately 19.1 ha would be required for the 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. It should also be noted that food security is not identified as an issue within the suite of Energy National Policy Statements or the 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. Government-led agricultural initiatives, such as the Sustainable Farming Incentive which is relaunching on the 30th June 2026, have prioritised soil health, environmental enhancement and climate resilience, recognising that long-term food security is influenced by a range of factors beyond land take alone, including soil condition, climate change and environmental pressures. The Proposed Development allows soils to remain in situ and undisturbed during operation, supporting soil recovery and long-term land health, with land reinstated and returned to agricultural

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	RR-0480, RR-0070, RR-0494, RR-1285, RR-0097, RR-0341, RR-0339, RR-0983, RR-1248, RR-0718, RR-1139, RR-1085, RR-0148, RR-1225, RR-1207, RR-0513, RR-0533, RR-0277, RR-0504, RR-1457, RR-0142, RR-0520, RR-1366, RR-0087, RR-1438, RR-0261, RR-0135, RR-0897, RR-0015, RR-1051, RR-0749, RR-0155, RR-0153, RR-0200, RR-0972, RR-0483, RR-1223, RR-0898, RR-1375, RR-0187, RR-0033, RR-0200, RR-0276, RR-0253, RR-0940, RR-1360, RR-0539, RR-0838, RR-0063, RR-0239, RR-0004, RR-1372, RR-1134, RR-1200, RR-1291, RR-1368, RR-0608, RR-1305, RR-0741, RR-0779, RR-0993, RR-0461, RR-0215, RR-0146, RR-0145, RR-0996, RR-1265, RR-0589, RR-0363, RR-0934, RR-0923, RR-0074, RR-1099, RR-0105, RR-1007, RR-0630, RR-1167, RR-0963, RR-0121, RR-1370, RR-1130, RR-0265, RR-0966, RR-0921, RR-1319, RR-0065, RR-0932, RR-0380, RR-0767, RR-0563, RR-0184, RR-0709, RR-0724, RR-1100, RR-0338, RR-1229, RR-0310, RR-1233, RR-1461, RR-0727, RR-0574, RR-1066, RR-0214, RR-0760, RR-0747, RR-1407, RR-0452, RR-0190, RR-0218, RR-0013, RR-0195, RR-0745, RR-0649, RR-0944, RR-0920, RR-0281, RR-0236, RR-0247, RR-0787, RR-0840, RR-1385, RR-0658, RR-0998, RR-1014, RR-0914, RR-1252, RR-1365, RR-0561, RR-0205, RR-0722, RR-0014, RR-0622, RR-1337, RR-0372, RR-1332, RR-0259, RR-0875, RR-1043, RR-0821, RR-0293, RR-0426, RR-1258, RR-1463, RR-0554, RR-1185, RR-0814, RR-0439, RR-0424, RR-0463, RR-0353, RR-0697, RR-1253, RR-0093, RR-1062, RR-0800, RR-0500, RR-0059, RR-0769, RR-0176, RR-0176, RR-0706, RR-0763, RR-0473, RR-0676, RR-0330, RR-0531, RR-1072, RR-0389, RR-0283, RR-0464, RR-0878, RR-1327, RR-1203, RR-0432, RR-0383, RR-0571, RR-0636, RR-0852, RR-1394, RR-0412, RR-0890, RR-0786, RR-0272, RR-0817, RR-0647, RR-0269, RR-1216, RR-0647,			use as far as practicable following decommissioning. No permanent loss of agricultural land is anticipated. It should also be noted that the latest figures to September 2024 indicate that solar occupied around 21,200 ha of agricultural land in the UK. In 2025, 545,000 ha of arable land in England were left uncropped (source: Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs, Agricultural land use in England at 1 June 2025). As set out in the **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) [APP-194],** post-decommissioning of the Proposed Development, the landowners would choose how the land is to be used and managed. The landowner may return all of the land to arable use, although it is likely that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained given their potential benefits to agricultural land and the wider farming estate.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	RR-0731, RR-0414, RR-0967, RR-0580, RR-0220, RR-0303			
	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-0129, RR-1059, RR-1271, RR-1012, RR-0008, RR-0849, RR-0255, RR-0255, RR-0178, RR-0034, RR-1176, RR-1178, RR-0103, RR-0976, RR-0864, RR-1034, RR-0568, RR-0998, RR-1405, RR-1145, RR-1292, RR-0182, RR-0201, RR-1351, RR-0086, RR-0841, RR-1085, RR-1051, RR-0943, RR-1372, RR-0127, RR-1368, RR-1305, RR-0996, RR-0105, RR-0951, RR-1370, RR-0265, RR-0988, RR-0767, RR-1229, RR-0060, RR-0998, RR-1379, RR-0502, RR-0833, RR-1253, RR-0531, RR-0571, RR-0636, RR-0571, RR-1119, RR-0571	Agricultural Land and Soils	Respondents expressed general concern regarding the potential effects of the Proposed Development on soil health and land quality.	The Applicant has included measures to avoid and minimise effects on soils and agricultural land embedded within the Proposed Development design and secured through Schedule 2, Requirement 17 of the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]** the preparation and implementation of a **Soil Resources Management Plan (SRMP)** in substantial accordance with the **Outline SRMP [APP-203].** The SRMP will control soil handling, storage and reinstatement during construction, operation and decommissioning, and a requirement to prepare and implement a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan in substantial accordance with the **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) [APP-194]**, which is secured by Schedule 2, Requirement 19 of the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**. The **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]** details how grassland and other habitat will be established beneath and between the solar panels. The provision of a detailed LEMP is secured through Schedule 2, Requirement 6 of the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**. Through the establishment and maintenance of long-term grassland beneath and between the solar arrays, as well as the fact that, in some cases, the soil is being taken out of intensive agricultural use, soil health, quality and structure are anticipated to improve over the lifetime of the Proposed Development.
AGR-03	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-0949, RR-0630, RR-0143, RR-1365, RR-1293, RR-0665, RR-0442, RR-0285, RR-1119, RR-0052	Agricultural Land and Soils	Respondents expressed dissatisfaction that sheep would not graze at the Site, or scepticism as to whether sheep grazing would in practice take place. Some respondents also considered that references to sheep grazing, including imagery used in consultation materials, were misleading.	The assessment of effects of the Proposed Development on agriculture in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils [APP-043]** recognises that agricultural production beneath the solar panels would not be the primary land use during the operational phase. For the purposes of the Environmental Impact Assessment, the Proposed Development has been assessed on a conservative basis assuming that grassland within the Solar PV Sites will be managed through mechanical cutting rather than relying on grazing. This ensures that the assessment does not depend on livestock grazing to mitigate agricultural effects for assessment purposes. Whilst mechanical cutting has been considered as a worst case scenario, it does not preclude the consideration of grazing management practices. These will be considered. In addition, **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils [APP-043]** highlights the potential to reduce the

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				loss of the use of land for agricultural production by also using the land for some form of agricultural production, which is common in England, with Defra statistics for 2025 showing that over half of the agricultural land used for solar production was also used for some form of agricultural production. This will be able to be explored for the Proposed Development.
AGR-04	RR-0983, RR-1447, RR-0850, RR-0558, RR-0677, RR-0194, RR-0264, RR-1182, RR-0932	Agricultural Land and Soils	Respondents expressed general support for agri-voltaics in principle and/or diversification of agricultural land for other practices.	The Applicant welcomes this comment.
AGR-05	RR-0834, RR-1347	Agricultural Land and Soils	Respondents expressed doubt that there would be continued agricultural use in / around the solar panels, based on a lack of agricultural activity at Cleve Hill.	The assessment of likely effects on agricultural land set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils [APP-043]** does not rely upon continued agricultural use for mitigation. As confirmed in paragraph 5.10.2, it is assumed that vegetation will be managed mechanically, however the introduction of livestock for grazing is not precluded. The Applicant is unable to comment on the management decisions applicable to Cleve Hill.
	RR-1002, RR-0582, RR-1370, RR-0599	Agricultural Land and Soils	Respondents expressed concern about the impact on agricultural land caused by installation of the cable.	Land and soils disturbed for the installation of cables will be managed according to the best practice principles for soil handling, as set out in the **Outline Soils Resource Management Plan (SRMP) [APP-203]**. Paragraph 6.3.2 of the Outline SRMP confirms that soils will be reinstated over the cables as soon as reasonably practicable after installation, such that the handling conditions are likely to be the same. Disturbance to the land will therefore be temporary and short-term. Agricultural use will be able to resume almost immediately after reinstatement of the soil profile.
AGR-06	RR-0296	Agricultural Land and Soils	Respondent has expressed support for allowing the soil to rest to recover nutrients.	The Applicant notes this comment. The Proposed Development allows soils to remain in situ and undisturbed during operation, supporting soil recovery and long-term land health, with land reinstated and returned to agricultural use as far as practicable following decommissioning.
AGR-07	RR-1245	Agricultural Land and Soils	Respondent queried whether the ALC data is based on up-to-date survey information?	The ALC data was obtained during surveys undertaken for the purpose of the DCO application, conducted between October 2024 and September 2025. As noted in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.1: Agricultural Land Classification [APP-150]**, the survey was undertaken in accordance with the established guidelines for grading agricultural land in England and Wales (Welsh Government and Defra, 2025. Joint Publication 069 - Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales; Guidelines for grading

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				the quality of agricultural land), and the methodology was agreed in consultation with Natural England.
AGR-08	RR-1142	Agricultural Land and Soils	Respondent stated that the Proposed Development is a missed opportunity to deploy regenerative farming on the fields.	The adoption of regenerative farming practices within a holding is a decision for individual landowners to make. Therefore, opportunities to deploy regenerative farming across the Solar Development Sites in the absence of the Proposed Development are limited to landowner preferences. Reversion of arable land to long-term grassland under solar panels is compatible with many of the aims of regenerative farming, such as soil conservation, as well as with goals of government initiatives such as the Sustainable Farming Incentive. The Proposed Development allows soils to remain in situ and undisturbed during operation, supporting soil recovery and long-term land health, with land reinstated and returned to agricultural use as far as practicable following decommissioning.

Agricultural Land and Soils – Detailed

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Agricultural Land and Soils - Detailed				
AGR-09	RR-0442, RR-0285, RR-1119, RR-0052	Agricultural Land and Soils	The respondents expressed concern regarding the impacts to their organic farm, including impacts to livestock health, farm viability, decades of ecological improvement, and farming sustainability. **Their BoR plots are:** **1. RR-1119:** 13-033, 13-037, 13-039, 13-043 **2. RR-0052:** 13-033, 13-034, 13-037, 13-039, 13-043	Throughout the operation of the Proposed Development, there is not anticipated to be a requirement for fertiliser and pesticide applications commensurate with the use of chemicals on conventionally managed arable land. As well as a reduction in potentially airborne agricultural chemicals that could cross farm boundaries, the establishment of low-input grassland and other habitat/ecological mitigation areas, and the inclusion of insect boxes within those areas, as specified in the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**, are expected to attract more pollinators to the locality, which will be of benefit to adjacent agricultural land. Reversion of arable land to long-term grassland is compatible with the goals of government initiatives such as the Sustainable Farming Incentive, which are broadly centred around ecological and environmental improvements across farmland. No Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) are to be used in solar panel coatings and on BESS batteries, as outlined within the **Outline Operational Management Plan (oOEMP) [APP-193]**. A commitment will be added to **Appendix 1.3 Commitments Register [APP-145]** to reflect this. Construction effects are managed through the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192].** This includes measures to prevent contamination during construction, including management of fuels, oils, chemicals and silt-laden runoff. It also sets out pollution prevention measures, temporary drainage controls and incident response procedures. Requirement 12 in Schedule 2 to the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]** secures that a CEMP must be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority, and that the CEMP must be substantially in accordance with the oCEMP. All construction works must be carried out in accordance with the approved CEMP. The Applicant has also prepared an O**utline Pollution and Spillage Response Plan (oPSRP) [APP-198]** for the construction, operation, and eventual decommissioning of the Proposed Development, setting out the intended strategies for managing pollution and spillage incidents on site. **Appendix 16.1 Construction Dust Assessment [APP-183]** outlines that "*with the appropriate best practice mitigation*

				measures suitable for high-risk sites in place, there is likely to be no significant effects on existing receptors from the dust-generating activities onsite" . The framework for managing environmental effects during the operational phase is set out in the **Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) [APP-193]** which identifies how commitments made in the **ES [APP-038 to APP-190]** will be implemented during operation and maintenance, including control of lighting, operational traffic, noise, air quality, landscape and ecological management, soil protection, water management and community liaison. It also sets out monitoring and reporting arrangements to ensure mitigation measures remain effective throughout the operational life of the Proposed Development. The organic farm is identified as a local farm business in the socioeconomic assessment **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051],** Table 13-20. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.1: Socioeconomic Receptors Impact Assessment [APP-177]**, Table 1-4 which assesses the potential impacts to local business receptors during construction, operation and decommissioning notes that 'This farming company, which produces organic and sustainable beef and lamb products using high health status organic and conservation grazing methods, has been assessed as having a medium level of sensitivity because of its economic value, limited opportunity for substitution and the business not considered likely to incur a loss or gain as a result of potential changes in the environment. The potential magnitude of impact has been assessed as low given that, despite the receptors proximity (80 m) to the Order Limits, construction and operation related effects from the Proposed Development would be likely to result in little change to the business' baseline situation. Therefore, potential significance of impact on this receptor has been assessed as minor adverse and not significant' The Applicant seeks to minimise disruption to affected farming businesses where practicable and is committed to working with all land interests to achieve this. Where there are any residual impacts on farm businesses, the Applicant will engage with landowners to compensate them through voluntary agreements or the compensation mechanisms available for the use of compulsory acquisition powers. The Applicant is continuing to engage with landowners to understand potential impacts on their businesses and welcomes engagement from the respondent.

AGR-10	RR-0303	Agricultural Land and Soils	Respondent stated that during the consultation and evaluation process, they observed fields being planted with grass (GS4), which could reasonably give the impression of lower-grade or less productive land. The respondent stated that those same fields have since been reverted back to a productive corn crop. The respondent concluded that this raises serious questions about how the land has been presented and assessed and this is clearly viable agricultural land that is actively used for food production. The respondent added that these facts can be checked against legal farming records submitted to DEFRA under farming regulations yearly.	The baseline conditions for agricultural land set out in **ES Volume 3, Chapter 5: Agricultural Land Classification [APP-150]** were established through site surveys conducted in accordance with long-established guidelines for grading land (Welsh Government and Defra, 2025. Joint Publication 069 - Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales; Guidelines for grading the quality of agricultural land). The guidelines confirm that "*The grading does not necessarily reflect the current economic value of land, land use, range of crops, suitability for specific crops or level of yield*." How the land is presented does not influence the ALC grading. The inclusion of grass leys in arable rotations is a very common practice and certainly does not implicate a landowner as attempting to present the land as a lower quality than it is.

2.3 Air Quality

Air Quality

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Air Quality				
AIR-01	RR-1059, RR-0661, RR-0519, RR-0406, RR-0949, RR-0670, RR-1078, RR-0178, RR-0764, RR-0945, RR-0237, RR-1405, RR-1276, RR-0352, RR-1051, RR-0230, RR-1307, RR-1370, RR-1417, RR-0921, RR-1062, RR-0464, RR-0272, RR-0647, RR-1306, RR-1426, RR-0311, RR-0020, RR-1185, RR-0622, RR-1115, RR-1369, RR-1003, RR-1457, RR-0142, RR-0579, RR-0634, RR-0897, RR-1320, RR-1042, RR-0350, RR-0196, RR-0001, RR-0071, RR-0728, RR-0636, RR-0017, RR-1425, RR-1282, RR-1025, RR-0730, RR-1254, RR-1309, RR-0607, RR-0485, RR-1148, RR-0712, RR-1437, RR-0760, RR-0195, RR-0837, RR-0587, RR-0606, RR-1297, RR-1377, RR-0847, RR-0103, RR-1403, RR-0481, RR-0216, RR-1201, RR-1338	Air Quality	Respondents expressed general concern regarding the potential effects of the Proposed Development on **air quality**, including the risk of **increased pollution and dust.**	A Construction Dust Assessment (CDA) is included in **Environmental Statement (ES) Volume 3, Appendix 16.1: Construction Dust Assessment [APP-183]** 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 human and ecological receptors and from construction activity, would not be significant. As discussed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Matters [APP-054]** it has been concluded that with the appropriate best practice mitigation measures suitable for high-risk sites in place, as set out within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.1: Construction Dust Assessment [APP-183]** and secured via the **oCEMP [APP-192],** including monitoring during the construction phase, provision to erect barriers around dusty activities, and requirement to produce a Dust Management Plan (DMP), there is likely to be no significant effects on existing receptors from the dust-generating activities onsite.
AIR-02	RR-0949, RR-0352, RR-1372	Air Quality	Respondents raised concerns around the potential for toxic fumes in the event of a BESS fire and how that might impact nearby residents.	The Applicant's **Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP) [APP-196]** incorporates new key mandatory fire and explosion testing and safety requirements included in the revised NFPA 855 (2026) standard. The oBSMP has been prepared to prevent and fully mitigate the risks from a BESS failure event. The Safety Objectives are listed in Section 1.4 of the oBSMP. The oBSMP stipulates that the Applicant at detailed design will only select a BESS system that as mandated under NFPA 855 (2026 Revision) must have undertaken Large Scale Fire Testing (LSFT). This testing involves burning the full BESS system to validate the safe minimum spacing distances for equipment. The objective of the test is to evaluate the thermal exposure impacts from a developed BESS fire, to determine the risk to adjacent BESS or equipment. The Applicant has commissioned a Plume Analysis study within the **BESS Fire Emissions Modelling Technical**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Note [APP-187] to assess the potential environmental impact of a BESS thermal runaway incident to sensitive receptors within a 1 km radius of the potential BESS area, to assess the potential to cause air quality impacts during a BESS fire. Concentrations of carbon monoxide (CO), formaldehyde, hydrogen chloride (HCl), hydrogen cyanide (HCN), hydrogen fluoride (HF), ammonia (NH_3), nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and particulates, were modelled using Atmospheric Dispersion Modelling Software (ADMS) to determine the effects of BESS fire emissions on human health. In line with NFCC recommendations, a high-level visibility assessment has also been undertaken using the modelled particulates results to determine the effect of BESS fire emissions on visibility to the local road network. The Plume Study considers all toxic emissions at the peak of a BESS fire, all emissions at receptor locations were below all relevant public health exposure limit guidelines throughout the timeframe when the battery system of the indicative BESS design was fully consumed (burnt out). The Plume Study concludes that there are no significant toxic emissions or visibility impacts on sensitive receptors. Nonetheless, at the detailed design stage the Applicant will commission a BESS system and site-specific Plume Analysis study to assess the environmental impact of a site incident to sensitive receptors within a 1 km radius based on the detailed design of the BESS. That assessment must demonstrate that toxic gas emissions to sensitive receptors would be below relevant public health exposure limit guidelines when the battery system of a BESS is fully consumed (burnt out), production of Particulate Matter (PM) and a visibility impact assessment on any transport links within a 1 km radius of the BESS area will also be included. The Emergency Response Plan (ERP) produced at the detailed design stage (template outlined in Section 4.4.4 of the oBSMP) will incorporate all necessary emergency response procedures and actions based upon thermal runaway test data supplied by the BESS system provider. Section 5 of the oBSMP outlines a comprehensive list of pre-construction requirements to ensure that BESS failure safety risks are minimised and hazards fully mitigated.
AIR-03	RR-0103	Air Quality	Respondent has expressed concern about air quality impacts to residents in Escrick.	**ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.1: Construction Dust Assessment [APP-183]** outlines that "*with the appropriate best practice mitigation measures suitable for high-risk sites*

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				in place, there is likely to be no significant effects on existing receptors from the dust-generating activities onsite". Within the Construction Dust Assessment a review of sensitive receptors within and in proximity of the Order Limits of the Proposed Development was conducted to inform the construction dust assessment in line with the maximum distance criteria in the IAQM guidance for the various impacts considered including up to 250 m for sensitive human receptors. Escrick is therefore beyond this distance. Figure 2 in Annex B of the Construction Dust Assessment shows the 250m construction dust buffer around the Order Limits. It is acknowledged that isolated residential receptors are located within the 250m buffer however with the dust management techniques included in the **oCEMP [APP-192]** no significant effects will occur. Access routes are detailed in **ES Volume 2, Figure 14.4: Construction Routing [APP-113]**. This shows that access to Solar Development Site 1 is proposed via Wheldake Lane to the north, avoiding Escrick village.
AIR-04	RR-1243	Air Quality	Respondent expressed concern about dust impacts from construction on vehicles at Field House Farm.	The Applicant recognises concerns regarding dust impacts from construction vehicles at Field House Farm. An **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** has been prepared, which includes measures to minimise the impacts of construction traffic. Final details in relation to vehicle movements will be agreed with the Local Highway Authority and included within the detailed CTMP. Construction activities would be temporary in nature, and only during installation of this section of the Cable Route Corridor. Access for existing users would be maintained during construction, with any temporary restrictions managed through appropriate traffic management measures agreed with the relevant highway authority. A Construction Dust Assessment (CDA) is included in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.1: Construction Dust Assessment [APP-183]**. Within the Construction Dust Assessment a review of sensitive receptors within and in proximity of the Order Limits of the Proposed Development was conducted to inform the construction dust assessment in line with the maximum distance criteria in the IAQM

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				guidance for the various impacts considered including up to 250 m for sensitive human receptors. It is acknowledged that Field House Farm is located within this distance. The assessment acknowledges a high risk of dust during construction, but determines the resulting effect, including from traffic movements on sensitive human and ecological receptors and from construction activity, would be not significant. As discussed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Matters [APP-054]** it has been concluded that with the appropriate best practice mitigation measures suitable for high-risk sites in place, as set out within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.1: Construction Dust Assessment [APP-183]** and secured via the **oCEMP [APP-192]**, including monitoring and inspections of nearby receptors during the construction phase, provision to erect barriers around dusty activities, and requirement to produce a Dust Management Plan (DMP), there is likely to be no significant effects on Field House Farm or any other sensitive receptors from the dust-generating activities onsite.

2.4 Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection

Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection – General Comments

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection - General Comments				
ALT-01	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-0112, RR-0088, RR-1458, RR-1012, RR-0165, RR-1344, RR-0008, RR-0849, RR-1421, RR-0832, RR-0754, RR-0292, RR-0615, RR-0661, RR-1272, RR-0406, RR-1090, RR-0693, RR-0493, RR-1238, RR-0011, RR-0287, RR-1211, RR-1002, RR-0334, RR-0490, RR-0570, RR-1115, RR-1347, RR-0938, RR-0556, RR-0917, RR-0998, RR-0768, RR-0549, RR-0962, RR-0225, RR-0750, RR-0487, RR-0733, RR-0051, RR-1003, RR-0631, RR-1073, RR-0235, RR-0725, RR-0586, RR-1341, RR-0759, RR-0191, RR-0813, RR-1326, RR-0339, RR-0415, RR-0692, RR-0984, RR-1017, RR-1334, RR-0987, RR-0399, RR-0148, RR-0652, RR-0087, RR-0732, RR-0694, RR-0761, RR-0161, RR-0577, RR-0200, RR-0080, RR-0510, RR-1067, RR-0187, RR-0830, RR-0200, RR-0968, RR-0660, RR-0997, RR-1219, RR-1246, RR-0461, RR-1095, RR-0996, RR-1265, RR-1300, RR-0074, RR-0799, RR-1240, RR-0217, RR-0044, RR-0348, RR-0245, RR-0505, RR-0828, RR-0605, RR-0266, RR-0812, RR-1229, RR-0300, RR-0449, RR-1233, RR-1461, RR-0643, RR-1065, RR-0334, RR-0998, RR-0549, RR-1183, RR-0821, RR-0072, RR-1431, RR-0250, RR-1046, RR-0439, RR-1253, RR-0059, RR-0484, RR-0021, RR-1019, RR-0929, RR-1153, RR-0414	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	Respondents expressed concern about the loss of **green belt**. Respondents stated that the Proposed Development conflicts with EN-1 policy relating to development in the Green Belt.	The Applicant makes note of this comment. Table 7-4 of the **Planning Statement [APP-207]** identifies which components of the Proposed Development are located within Green Belt land. Solar Development Sites (SDSs) 2, 3 and 4, and Cable Route Corridor segments (CRCs) 2-6, 3-4, 3-4a and 4-POC, are wholly or partly located within the West Yorkshire Green Belt. In regard to green belt, the government made a significant change to Green Belt policy with the introduction of the concept of 'grey belt'. Policy compliance is considered within Section 7.5 of the **Planning Statement [APP-207], Planning Statement Appendix 2, Grey Belt Assessment [APP-209]** and the **Policy Compliance Document [APP-224]**. The Planning Statement identifies that the Proposed Development is located on grey belt land as the Sites do not strongly contribute to Green Belt purposes and there are no overriding policy constraints that would justify refusal. The Proposed Development therefore does not constitute inappropriate development, meaning the test of very special circumstances does not need to be engaged. However, should the Secretary of State not accept the conclusion that the Proposed Development is not inappropriate development, the Proposed Development is defined as Critical National Priority (CNP) Infrastructure in NPS-1, which sets out a presumption in favour of CNP Infrastructure projects in the planning balance, including assuming that the very special circumstances test is made out.
ALT-02	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-0129, RR-0411, RR-0193, RR-1135, RR-0588, RR-0599, RR-1078, RR-0390, RR-1346, RR-1261, RR-0961, RR-0844, RR-1205, RR-1462, RR-0134, RR-1002, RR-0949, RR-0670, RR-1111, RR-0214, RR-0864, RR-0442, RR-0285, RR-1119, RR-0052, RR-0370,	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	Some respondents expressed general opposition to the Proposed Development on the basis that they consider it to be in the **wrong location**.	National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-3 Paras 2.10.11 and 2.10.18 explain that the availability of grid connection, suitable irradiance levels, and local topography are key inputs to the selection of sites suitable for large-scale solar generation developments. The number of locations within the UK at which large-scale solar generation is suitable is therefore likely to be limited, and this is a material issue

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	RR-1209, RR-0865, RR-1254, RR-0163, RR-1101, RR-0075, RR-1405, RR-0750, RR-0798, RR-0182, RR-1236, RR-0235, RR-0742, RR-1378, RR-1285, RR-0859, RR-0447, RR-0046, RR-0969, RR-1457, RR-1026, RR-0919, RR-0579, RR-0694, RR-0161, RR-1433, RR-0155, RR-0153, RR-0299, RR-0371, RR-0483, RR-1223, RR-0898, RR-0290, RR-0997, RR-0608, RR-1246, RR-0146, RR-1419, RR-0203, RR-0934, RR-0734, RR-1320, RR-0909, RR-0265, RR-1127, RR-1234, RR-0720, RR-0091, RR-0184, RR-0709, RR-0560, RR-1132, RR-0211, RR-0643, RR-0236, RR-0792, RR-0247, RR-0060, RR-0561, RR-0937, RR-1089, RR-1258, RR-0729, RR-0353, RR-0321, RR-0500, RR-0464, RR-1112, RR-0208, RR-0852, RR-0793, RR-0272, RR-0555, RR-0870, RR-0638, RR-0967, RR-0853			when considering how the UK is to meet the urgent need for low carbon generation as is set out in the NPSs. This point is expanded upon in the **Statement of Need [APP-214]**, with Section 8 providing evidence to support the suitability of the proposed location of the Proposed Development for large-scale solar plus storage in relation to the timeliness and availability of the grid connection, transmission system operability and the decarbonisation and energy security benefits the Proposed Development will bring forward from this location. As set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-041]** and the Site Selection Assessment Report at **ES Volume 3, Appendix 3.1: Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) [AS-019]** an appraisal of alternative sites within a 25km radius of the Existing National Grid Monk Fryston Substation has been undertaken, which concludes that there are no more suitable locations within the 25km search area than the proposed location for the Proposed Development, following the undertaking of a robust site selection process.
ALT-03	RR-0834, RR-0599, RR-0041, RR-0754, RR-1382, RR-0390, RR-0844, RR-0949, RR-0214, RR-0883, RR-0888, RR-0322, RR-0121, RR-1008, RR-1115, RR-0658, RR-1071, RR-1333, RR-0063, RR-0917, RR-0917, RR-0865, RR-0908, RR-0750, RR-1369, RR-1003, RR-1073, RR-0331, RR-0757, RR-0673, RR-0086, RR-0803, RR-1457, RR-1081, RR-0395, RR-0153, RR-0290, RR-0997, RR-0608, RR-0542, RR-0779, RR-0993, RR-0215, RR-0146, RR-0934, RR-0923, RR-0105, RR-1320, RR-1195, RR-0091, RR-1132, RR-0846, RR-0628, RR-0433, RR-0353, RR-1250, RR-0383, RR-0929, RR-0412, RR-0890, RR-0392, RR-0414, RR-0274, RR-0156, RR-0638	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	Some respondents expressed scepticism that **other suitable sites had not been properly considered**. Some respondents also expressed dissatisfaction that alternative sites were not subject to consultation.	The Applicant followed a staged approach to site selection, taking into consideration a range of planning, environmental and operational factors and the project objectives. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-041]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 3.1: Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) [AS-019]** explains the methodology that has been applied when identifying and evaluating potential sites for the Proposed Development. It identifies a number of potential development areas for the Proposed Development that were considered as part of the site selection process and presents how each of those areas perform against a range of planning, environmental and operational constraints and opportunities and the project objectives. This report concludes that there are no more suitable and available locations within the search area than the proposed location for the Proposed Development, based on the criteria identified. The Applicant notes that there is no general obligation to consult on alternative sites. Further, as described in the **Statement of Need [APP-214]**, in particular in Sections 2.1, 4.1 and 4.2, the government is seeking a large capacity of new low carbon Proposed Developments to come forwards to prioritise projects needed for 2030, while maintaining a robust pipeline of projects beyond 2030 towards meeting net zero by 2050.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The urgent and unprecedented requirement for new large scale solar Proposed Developments supports the view that any other suitable and available sites, if such sites had been found, they would likely also be needed.
ALT-04	RR-1201, RR-1403, RR-1344, RR-0169, RR-1424, RR-1090, RR-1211, RR-0824, RR-0565, RR-0214, RR-1392, RR-1456, RR-1309, RR-1041, RR-1003, RR-0848, RR-1263, RR-0152, RR-0053, RR-0983, RR-0099, RR-0959, RR-1001, RR-0510, RR-0924, RR-0183, RR-0971, RR-0619, RR-0934, RR-0374, RR-0923, RR-0582, RR-0966, RR-0988, RR-1061, RR-0184, RR-0866, RR-1147, RR-0985, RR-0472, RR-0214, RR-1347, RR-1407, RR-0013, RR-0233, RR-0531, RR-0890, RR-0571, RR-0347, RR-0647, RR-1391	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	Some respondents expressed a preference for **alternative forms of energy generation**, including other renewable technologies or non-renewable sources, with some identifying specific options they would favour. This includes drilling for oil, offshore wind, tidal, geothermal, shale gas, nuclear and SMRs, better energy storage, coal, and hydroelectric.	Section 6 of the **Statement of Need [APP-214]** provides an analysis of many different low carbon generation technologies which are being developed as part of the UK's fight against climate change. The Statement of Need concludes, in Section 6.12, that a large capacity of many low carbon technologies is required to meet the Government's energy objectives. Section 3.9 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-041]** states that the Solar Development Sites are considered suitable for solar energy generation due to their topography and the irradiance levels in this part of the country, proximity to a point of connection, and availability. Given this, and the fact that The Applicant is a solar and battery development company which stands ready to help deliver the Government's ambition in its Clean Power Action Plan to achieve 45-47 GW of installed solar capacity by 2030, other technologies have not been considered by the Applicant in the development of the Proposed Development. Section 3.9.4 to 3.9.5 of the chapter further discusses suitability, or lack thereof, for alternative forms of generation. While the need for unprecedented capacity growth is urgent, some technologies (e.g. nuclear, SMRs, tidal) are either unproven at scale, unconsented, unfunded or have long development timescales (and therefore do not meet the urgent need identified in EN-1 Para 3.1.1 and following). As such these technologies would not support the need to use existing and available infrastructure to minimise the cost and timescales associated with connecting to the grid, the large capacities of low carbon generation needed to meet net zero. Section 7.7 of the Statement of Need compares the annual energy generated per square kilometre from solar, from onshore wind and from crop-to-energy (biofuels) technology. The analysis shows that large-scale ground-mount solar Proposed Developments which maximise their annual output, are likely to produce a greater quantity of low carbon electricity per acre than the output from a crop-to-biogas application; and that the energy production from land under solar is of a similar order of magnitude to the energy production from land under onshore wind, while the

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				environmental effects of solar Proposed Developments may be significantly lower. The Applicant therefore agrees that other low carbon technologies are urgently needed in the UK to meet the UK's climate legal targets; however, none of those technologies are more suitable at the proposed location than the Proposed Development, and none listed in this Representation are viable alternatives to the Proposed Development, because they will all be needed too, albeit in different locations.
ALT-05	RR-0834, RR-0599, RR-0041, RR-0390, RR-0949, RR-1002, RR-0568, RR-0820, RR-0750, RR-1154, RR-1457, RR-0395, RR-0577, RR-0153, RR-0290, RR-0587, RR-0608, RR-1246, RR-0146, RR-0105, RR-1004, RR-0571, RR-0929, RR-0392	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	Some respondents raised general concerns about the **site selection process** and the suitability of the sites chosen for the Proposed Development.	Site selection is addressed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-041]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 3.1: Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) [AS-019]**. The SSAR explains how brownfield land, industrial land, previously developed land, and low-grade agricultural land were considered through the site selection process. As set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 3.1: Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) [AS-019]** the Applicant reviewed available brownfield land within 25km of the POC at Monk Fryston Substation. The assessment concluded that there were no sites within the search area of sufficient size to accommodate a large-scale solar development, either individually or cumulatively. The sites assessed were too small to support the Proposed Development and were largely allocated for housing or mixed-use development, in line with local planning policies, thereby creating a conflict with the intended use for renewable energy infrastructure. Therefore, it was concluded that there was no available or suitable brownfield land for the purposes of the Proposed Development. The Applicant's site selection assessment then went on to identify a total of 9 potential development areas (PDAs), including the proposed site for the Proposed Development, which have then been assessed against a range of standardised assessment criteria (such as flood risk, cultural heritage, ecology, landscape and visual). The conclusion of that assessment is that there are no more suitable and available locations within the search area than the proposed location for the Proposed Development, based on the criteria identified and the project objectives for the Proposed Development.
ALT-06	RR-1029, RR-0599, RR-1115, RR-0201, RR-0086, RR-0919, RR-0974, RR-1051,	Alternatives and Design	Some respondents expressed concern that the **Solar Development Site 1 is located too far from the grid**	The Applicant confirms that the existing National Grid Monk Fryston substation has been identified as the point of

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	RR-1433, RR-0155, RR-1331, RR-0644, RR-0334, RR-1043, RR-0136, RR-0647, RR-1023, RR-0999, RR-0962	Iteration, and Site Selection	connection point at Monk Fryston Substation, and / or that the proposed cable route is too long. Some respondents suggested that a site closer to Monk Fryston Substation should be selected instead. A number of respondents also referred to the potential for **energy losses over the length of the cable route** and questioned whether this would affect overall efficiency or cost effectiveness.	connection (POC). This decision was based on available capacity, network resilience, and strategic grid planning. As explained in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 3.1: Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) [AS-019]**, a search area was identified at a 25 km radius which is considered by the Applicant to be a viable cable connection distance for a solar project of this scale. The POC and 25 km search area are shown on Figure 1, Annex A of the SSAR. Analysis of GIS mapping, guided by NPS policy, identified land free from major constraints such as flood risk, environmental and heritage designations, high-quality agricultural land, Green Belt, and sensitive receptors. These areas were then assessed for suitability based on factors including site size (minimum 40 ha), brownfield availability, and topography. As insufficient land was sites were found, the search was expanded to include some previously excluded land (Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land, Green Belt and Flood Zones 2 and 3). With input from land agents, sites were further evaluated considering access to Monk Fryston Substation, key planning and environmental constraints, and accordance with the project objectives. The SSAR concludes there are no more suitable alternative sites within 25 km, and the selected Solar Development Sites are the most appropriate to meet the project objectives. As can be seen from the alternative PDAs considered, this included broad areas between the POC and SDS1, to consider whether any areas closer to the POC could be utilised (such as PDAs 6 and 9). However, none of the alternative PDAs assessed were considered suitable for development. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-041]** establishes that the primary aim of the Cable Corridor was to find the most direct alignments between the Monk Fryston Substation and each of the Solar Development Sites. This represents the most operationally efficient route and would be expected to result in fewer impacts and a shorter construction period. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 3.1: Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) [AS-019]** sets out further how the Cable Corridor Options Area was identified throughout the pre-Application process and how this has been further refined to the Cable Route Corridor presented in the DCO Application. Several factors were considered when determining the Cable Route Corridor design to take a direct route whilst following existing features, such as roads, and avoiding

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				sensitive receptors as far as practicable, such as habitat designations, residential and commercial properties as well as heritage assets. Further, from an operational perspective, high voltage electricity transmission cabling at up to 275kV in this case, is specifically designed to minimise energy losses over long distances. As such, a distance of 25km results in negligible losses. The assessments set out in the various chapters of the **ES [APP-038 to APP-190]** detail what impacts are expected as a result of the Proposed Development based on the minimum and maximum parameters of the Proposed Development, and the mitigation and enhancement measures that are proposed to reduce these impacts.
ALT-07	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-1362, RR-0599, RR-1002, RR-0116, RR-1115, RR-0201, RR-1433, RR-0155, RR-0334, RR-1004, RR-0999	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	Some respondents expressed concern that the solar areas are too **fragmented** or spread across a wide area. Some respondents also questioned the need for multiple land parcels within the Proposed Development.	The Applicant has outlined its approach to site selection and the considerations made in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-041]**. As further explained in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 3.1: Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) [AS-019]**, to identify suitable sites a search area was identified at a 25 km radius. In doing so, the Applicant was mindful of NPS EN-3 paragraph 2.10.9, which provides that: *"Along with associated infrastructure, a solar farm currently requires between 1.6 and 2.25 hectares for each MW of output., However, this will vary significantly depending on the site, with some being larger and some being smaller."* Therefore, for a grid connection of 500 MW, a site size of between 800 and 1,125 ha (excluding cable route) is needed; the Applicant focussed its initial search on sites around 1,100 ha. It was recognised that it may not be possible to identify a single site of this size. Therefore, the Applicant considered both contiguous land parcels and land parcels near one another in its initial search. The Applicant has considered land parcels closer together in its assessment of potential development areas (PDAs) in the SSAR (for instance PDAs 6 and 9, which are both large enough to accommodate a project equivalent to the Proposed Development). However, none of the alternative PDAs identified were considered suitable for development, based on the criteria identified and the project objectives.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The **Statement of Need [APP-214]** explains at Section 7.4 that NSIP proposals may comprise adjoining or separate parcels of land and that proposals may consider separate land parcels which do not border each other but instead combine to an integrated Proposed Development which is more dispersed within a countryside setting. Further, the connection of separate parcels of suitable land together into a single Proposed Development may, subject to analysis, enable those parcels of land to connect economically to the electricity system, whereas if developed as stand-alone projects they may not be able to carry the associated costs of connection and therefore may never be developed. Taking all these factors into account and having undertaken the process set out in the **Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) [AS-019]**, the Solar Development Sites which have been selected are the most appropriate to meet the project objectives.
ALT-08	RR-0826, RR-0834, RR-0599, RR-0949, RR-1457, RR-0334, RR-1363, RR-1004	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	Some respondents expressed concern that the site was selected primarily on a **commercial basis**, particularly through identifying landowners willing to make land available, rather than on wider planning, environmental or technical considerations.	As detailed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-041]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 3.1: Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) [AS-019]**, the Applicant has followed a staged approach to assessment, taking into consideration a range of planning, environmental and operational factors and the project objectives. Potential availability of large scale landholdings within the search area was a consideration (is it supports project objective 5 as set out in the SSAR), however it is not the only consideration in the site selection process, given the policy tests that need to be passed by a project seeking consent.
ALT-09	RR-0834, RR-0949, RR-0549, RR-0616	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	Some respondents expressed general concern or opposition regarding the proposed location of **the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS)**.	The location of the BESS was determined through an options appraisal and iterative design process, having regard to technical and planning requirements, environmental constraints and potential effects on nearby receptors. The BESS Compound is located at Solar Development Site 2, close to the Solar PV Sites and the on-site substation, which provides operational and efficiency benefits, including minimising transmission losses, maximising storage efficiency, supporting grid balancing, and enabling a rapid and reliable response to network fluctuations. Among the options considered for co-locating the BESS with the Solar PV Sites, Solar Development Site 2 was identified as the least at risk of flooding, most accessible, and least environmentally constrained location for the BESS Compound. The BESS layout was developed which

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				minimises impacts to noise sensitive receptors and noise barriers are included within the BESS Compound (refer to **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]** for further details). Access points have also been identified to enable safe access to the BESS Compound in the event of a fire. The various chapters of the **Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-038 to APP-190]** assess the likely significant effects arising from the BESS at this location and identify mitigation measures where necessary. Further detail on the consideration of alternatives, the design evolution of the Proposed Development and the assessment of potential effects is provided in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-041]**, which sets out the iterative process undertaken to identify the preferred location and layout for the Proposed Development, including the BESS Compound, in Section 3.4.
ALT-10	RR-0507, RR-0781, RR-0910, RR-0434, RR-0004, RR-1293, RR-0744, RR-0343, RR-1169, RR-0427, RR-0004, RR-1209, RR-0376, RR-1222, RR-1242, RR-1335, RR-0179, RR-0369, RR-0425, RR-0896, RR-0379, RR-0669, RR-0478, RR-0085, RR-1366, RR-0974, RR-0499, RR-1223, RR-1273, RR-0940, RR-0146, RR-1408, RR-0829, RR-0963, RR-0966, RR-0988, RR-1181, RR-1065, RR-1018, RR-0334, RR-0628, RR-0233, RR-1168, RR-1112, RR-0641, RR-0824, RR-1092, RR-1410	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	Some respondents expressed the view that solar PV cells and solar panels are **inefficient or outdated**. Some respondents suggested that the UK is not a suitable location for solar generation due to limited sunlight and frequent cloud cover. A number of respondents also described solar energy as unreliable because generation depends on levels of **sunlight**. Some respondents expressed that Drax activity would block the sun and make solar inefficient.	The Applicant notes these comments. The Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (December 2025) states that that the UK has huge potential for solar power and that solar energy is at the heart of the Clean Power 2030 Mission [Paras 3.3.23 & 3.3.24]. The UK has adequate irradiance levels for solar generation. As detailed in Section 6.4 and 6.8 of the **Statement of Need [APP-214]** the radiance levels of a proposed site for a solar Proposed Development are just one factor, solar panel efficiency is also influenced by the installed capacity of the panels and their orientation and layout. The efficiency of a Proposed Development is influenced by panel selection, the physical properties of those panels, the properties of other electrical components which make up a Proposed Development, and the electrical design of that Proposed Development. In summary, the efficiency of the solar panels used by the Proposed Development is intrinsic to their design while also dependent on irradiance levels and location, incident sunlight, and panel orientation. In bringing forward the Proposed Development, the Applicant will be able to benefit from the most up to date technology in respect of solar panels. Drax Power Station is at a sufficient distance so as not to cause shading issues for the Proposed Development from its physical assets. Any cover created by plumes is also not considered to cause shading concerns for the Proposed Development.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
ALT-11	RR-1035, RR-0057	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	Respondents asked specifically why the location for the substation at Little Skipwith was selected.	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that there is no proposed onsite substation within Little Skipwith directly. There is an onsite substation located on Solar Development Site 1 as shown on the **Works Plans [AS-004].** This location is over 3.3km from Little Skipwith. The details regarding the choice of the onsite substation in Solar Development Site 1 is set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-041]** (see table 3-5). The specific reasons for the choice of location the substation in SDS1 include: - maximising distances to visual, ecological and noise receptors in order to minimise associated impacts; - allowance for buffers between the substation and sensitive habitats; and - locating the substation away from publicly accessible locations including Skipworth Road, public rights of way and permissive paths. These measures mean that the substation within Solar Development Site 1 would be located over 400 m metres away from the nearest local residents at Tileshead Farm and Mount Pleasant Farm. This distance, alongside existing vegetation and proposed planting means that with respect to views from the wider landscape, it is possible that the top of the proposed substation within Solar Development Site 1 would be visible above solar panels in oblique views from Skipworth Road. Intervening vegetation in the flat landscape would be likely to largely screen this element in views from public rights of way, for example along Potter's Lane to the south (VP9) and within Escrick Farm to the west (VP53).
ALT-12	RR-0236, RR-0171	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	Respondents expressed concern the required national grid infrastructure does not exist to support the Proposed Development. One respondent expressed concern that the existing infrastructure and substation cannot also support the Yorkshire GREEN project, suggesting this might delay the Proposed Development.	The Applicant can confirm that the existing National Grid Monk Fryston Substation has been identified as the Point of Connection (POC), as detailed in the **Grid Connection Statement [APP-222]**. The Proposed Development will utilise the existing National Grid transmission infrastructure in terms of the point of connection and onward transmission. The specific, minimal, infrastructure required for the Proposed Development to connect to the existing Monk Fryston 275 kV Substation is set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [APP-040]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 2.1: Cable Route Method Statement [APP-147]**, and the **Grid Connection Statement [APP-222]**.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The Applicant has a grid connection agreement with NESO, and as the system operator, NESO is under certain obligations to deliver on the grid connection under the agreement in place. The development of upgrades to Monk Fryston Substation, as consented through the Yorkshire GREEN project, will not delay the development of the Proposed Development.
ALT-13	RR-0868	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	Respondent has expressed concern about the engagement through the evolution of the design of the Proposed Development.	As set out in Section 3.3 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-041]** the Applicant has undertaken robust and meaningful engagement throughout the application. Following on from these activities, the Applicant has considered a number of suggestions for alternative sites that were presented throughout the first phase of non-statutory consultation between October and December 2024. This is set out in Table 3-1 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-041]**. Further alternative sites were then put forward during Statutory Consultation, with the responses detailed in Table 3-2. Section 3.4 and 3.5 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-041]** also set out how the design iteration for the Solar Development Sites and Cable Route Corridor was considered, including taking account of feedback received during the non-statutory and statutory consultation periods. Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report **[APP-024]** also describes the pre statutory consultation design workshops undertaken by the Applicant, which helped to influence the design evolution of the Solar Development Sites.
ALT-14	RR-0076	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	Respondent has expressed concern about the lack of security around the site.	The Applicant is committed to providing security features on the site including cameras, perimeter fencing and lighting. These are set out in more detail in Sections 2.5.62 to 64 and Sections 2.8.10 to 13 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [APP-040].** These measures are secured via the Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan.
ALT-15	RR-0123	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	Respondent stated that the Proposed Development conflicts with EN-1 and EN-3 relating to Agricultural Land and Site Selection.	Section 7.6 of the **Planning Statement [APP-207]** sets out the appraisal of the Proposed Development against policy relating to Agricultural Land. This concludes that through the site selection process, siting of built infrastructure, the Design Commitments and the application of embedded and

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				additional mitigation and management methods, impacts on best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land have been minimised and mitigated. The overall approach to design and mitigation have been informed through pre-application engagement with Natural England. An appraisal of the Proposed Development against specific policies in NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-3 can be found in the **Policy Compliance Document [APP-224]** which sets out how the Proposed Development is in compliance with policies on agricultural land. Further details of how the Applicant has considered agricultural land in its site selection assessment are provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 3.1: Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) [AS-019].** In line with planning policy, the Applicant has first considered lower grade agricultural land (i.e. not BMV) together with previously developed land, contaminated land and industrial sites, to assess their suitability to accommodate the Proposed Development. That initial search did not reveal any sites suitable for the Proposed Development on non-agricultural land. Four potential development areas (PDAs) were identified on lower grade agricultural land, but were discounted on the basis that they were not big enough to accommodate the Proposed Development and were already subject to existing land uses. Therefore, the Applicant expanded its search criteria to include Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land at Stage 5 of the assessment. This resulted in the identification of 5 further potential development areas for assessment (PDAs 5-9). Each were assessed against standardised assessment criteria to consider their suitability for the Proposed Development, which included an assessment of the likely impacts on BMV agricultural land (with some PDAs containing more BMV agricultural land than the proposed site for the Proposed Development). The overall conclusion of the site selection assessment, in consideration of all constraints (not just agricultural land) and the project objectives, is that there are no more suitable and available locations within the 25km search area than the proposed location for the Proposed Development, based on the criteria identified. In conclusion, the Applicant considers that they have complied with planning policy in respect of site selection and design and agricultural land and the wider benefits for the agricultural businesses, for biodiversity and for delivery of

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				affordable, zero carbon energy, are considered in this context to weigh in favour of the Proposed Development.
ALT-16	RR-1347	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	Respondent stated that low scale more local renewable sites would benefit local communities and be preferable to large-scale solar Proposed Developments.	The Applicant supports the development of smaller renewable energy schemes but in addition to, rather than as an alternative to, large-scale solar schemes. Paragraph 3.3.12 of NPS EN-1 explains that the connection of large-scale generation facilities via high voltage transmission systems enables the pooling of generation and demand and enables the efficient bulk transfer of power between areas with surplus and areas in deficit. This is a key benefit of large-scale schemes and explains government's support for them to come forwards alongside smaller schemes. The Proposed Development will, if consented, make a significant contribution to achieving the UK's legal requirement to decarbonise to Net Zero by 2050 and to enhancing the security of energy supplies. The **Statement of Need [APP-214]** provides further information on the need for and benefits arising from the Proposed Development.
ALT-17	RR-0440	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	Respondent expressed concern there is little detail around the final design of the Proposed Development.	The Applicant would like to provide reassurance that the level of design currently presented is typical and appropriate for a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIPs). NSIPs are commonly assessed and consented on an 'outline' level of design, with detailed design developed post-consent through the discharge of DCO requirements. This approach allows the Environmental Statement to assess a robust reasonable worst-case scenario, whilst also providing flexibility to incorporate the most appropriate and up-to-date technology available at the time of construction. It is not uncommon for years to pass between the initial design and the Proposed Development being consented, therefore, this methodology allows the design to adapt to emerging technologies rather than being fixed from the offset.

Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection – Detailed

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection – Detailed				
ALT-18	RR-0134, RR-0146, RR-1132	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	Respondents expressed concern regarding the proximity of the proposals to residential areas.	The use of buffer zones is set out in the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]** and the **Design Approach Document (DAD) [APP-216]**, which sets out the Applicant's approach to addressing the criteria for good design for energy infrastructure set out in section 4.7 of NPS EN-1 more broadly. The DAD explains how at each stage the Applicant has been mindful of impacts to residential areas, including removing areas of panels. As detailed in the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]**, the minimum offset from residential properties will be 30m from the curtilage of properties. This buffer zone was established following pre-application consultation, EIA scoping, and environmental surveys and assessments. The Applicant is confident that the proposed management and mitigation measures set out in the **Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-038 to APP-190]** are comprehensive and robust, and will assist in reducing the impacts of the Proposed Development on the local population. Of particular relevance to the assessment of effects on local communities are **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**, **Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049], Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]**, **Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement [APP-052]**, and **Chapter 16: Other Environmental Matters [APP-054]**, all of which consider potential impacts on residential properties and local communities and include mitigation measures, particularly landscape design, that are based on good practice used on projects across the UK, as well as measures developed in response to the sensitivities of the local environment.
ALT-19	RR-0654, RR-1174	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	Respondents expressed objection to the location of Site 1 due to its proximity to Skipwith Road.	The Applicant considers that the fact that SDS1 is adjacent to Skipwith Road does not make it an unsuitable site. 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

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Section 10.3 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**. The LVIA concludes that views into SDS1 from Skipwith Road to the west of SDS 1 are largely curtailed by roadside hedgerows, apart from occasional gaps which afford views into the fields within the Order Limits. Further, screening planting will be used to soften views along Skipwith Road. The LVIA recognises that there may be temporary visual impacts for residents living along, and those travelling along, Skipwith Road during the construction phase of the Proposed Development. However, the LVIA does not anticipate these effects to be significant during the operation of the Proposed Development due to existing vegetation and establishment of planting to integrate the Proposed Development into the landscape. Mitigation measures are shown on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** and are secured via the **Works Plans [AS-004]**, **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195],** and the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]**. Additionally, **ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement [APP-052]** outlines that there will be no significant traffic and movement effects as a result of the Proposed Development including on Skipwith Road. Furthermore, an **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** has been prepared which identifies the routes that should be used by construction traffic. An access route, located off Skipwith Road and north of Main Street, has been identified to minimise movements through the village.
ALT-20	RR-1090	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	Respondent expressed opposition to the construction compound on King Rudding Lane, stated the lane is not suitable.	Section 3.7 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-041]** sets out the process by which the Applicant identified the locations for Cable Corridor Construction Compounds. The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** has been prepared to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction. Construction traffic routes and access points have been developed to utilise the most appropriate sections of the highway network and, where practicable, to minimise the use of more constrained rural routes. Table 2-1 of the Transport Assessment sets out baseline traffic flows on the

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				assessed links and demonstrates that King Rudding Lane currently accommodates HGV movements, with approximately 7% of total traffic comprising HGVs. Under the assessed worst-case scenario, the construction phase would result in a temporary increase in HGV numbers on this route (from 28 to 56 movements), representing a short-term increase in HGV composition. These changes have been assessed within the TA and are considered to be temporary and limited in scale. They would be managed through the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), which will include measures such as defined routing, controls on the timing of vehicle movements, and the use of traffic management where required to minimise impacts on the local network. The conclusions of the TA are set out in Section 7 and confirm that any temporary impacts associated with the Proposed Development, including from the compound at King Rudding Lane can be appropriately managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), with no long-term significant effects expected on the transport network.
ALT-21	RR-1176	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	Respondent stated it would be more efficient to upgrade Drax instead of build the Proposed Development.	Section 3.3 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-041]** sets out consideration of alternatives that have been raised in consultation responses. This includes Drax, which has been reviewed by the Applicant as set out within Table 3-1 of Chapter 3. Drax is currently still operating in a biomass capacity, with further consent to add carbon capture facilities. However, any upgrade of Drax is not an 'alternative' to the Proposed Development. As set out in the **Statement of Need [APP-214]** the UK requires low carbon development at scale to meet its policy targets, alongside other technologies such CCS abated power stations.
ALT-22	RR-1107	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	Respondent queried that if government subsidies were removed, what would be the cost comparison to alternative forms of energy?	The Applicant, Light Valley Solar Limited, is a 100% subsidiary of IGP UK Projects Limited. Both are registered in England and Wales and subject to UK tax law and regulations. Investment may come from a range of sources, including international ones. This is common practice with UK infrastructure projects and helps fund the transition to clean energy at the scale required.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				As such, Light Valley Solar is a privately financed development and is not receiving any public money, subsidy or funding in the development of the Proposed Development. All financial risks associated with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Proposed Development, including those related to the cable route, are borne entirely by the developer. The commercial viability of the Proposed Development has been assessed as part of the developer's investment decision, including the length of the cable and associated infrastructure. The **Funding Statement [APP-021]** submitted with the DCO application demonstrates that the Proposed Development is financially viable and adequately funded to deliver the Proposed Development in full Chapter 10 (and in particular Figure 34) of the **Statement of Need [APP-214]** provides information on the cost of large-scale solar energy in comparison to other forms of energy generation. The chapter also explains how solar generation will reduce the wholesale cost of power (Figure 33) and help to shield consumers from the inflationary effects of volatile global fossil fuel markets. Section 2.10 of **NPS EN-3** explains the government's view that *"solar energy is at the heart"* of the Clean Power 2030 Mission and that *"the UK has huge potential for solar power: it is a cost-effective, versatile, and effective technology."* **NPS EN-3** goes on to explain that *"Solar farms are one of the most established renewable electricity technologies in the UK and the cheapest form of electricity generation."* and that *"Solar farms can be built quickly and, coupled with consistent reductions in the cost of materials and improvements in the efficiency of panels, large-scale solar is now viable in some cases to deploy subsidy-free"*.
ALT-23	RR-0475	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	**[BoR numbers 05-049, 06-003, 06-005, 06-006]**: Respondent expressed concern that there has been a lack of detail around the cable route going through their property and the area proposed for the easement option. They have noted concerns around lack of drainage on the land and potential damage to the soil.	With regard to the siting of the Cable Route Corridor (CRC) generally, details of the design evolution of the CRC and the reasons for its location are set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-041].** The final alignment of the CRC has been chosen in order to minimise potential impacts on various constraints including

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				agricultural land and soils, landscape and visual effects on public rights of way and residential receptors, and disturbance to local roads. The Applicant acknowledges the concern expressed regarding soils and drainage. The Applicant encourages the respondent to review the **Outline Soil Resource Management Plan (oSRMP) [APP-203]** which sets out the Applicant's commitments in respect of the management of soils**.** In particular it is noted that land and soils disturbed for the installation of cables will be managed according to the best practice principles for soil handling**.** Paragraph 6.3.2 of the Outline SRMP confirms that soils will be reinstated over the cables as soon as reasonably practicable after installation, such that the handling conditions are likely to be the same. Disturbance to the land will therefore be temporary and short-term. Agricultural use will be able to resume almost immediately after reinstatement of the soil profile. The **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** commits to consultation with affected landowners to investigate the current extent of land drainage. Where necessary, pre-construction land drainage will be explored with the aim of maintaining the efficiency of the existing drainage system and the integrity of the working areas during construction. Any land drains temporarily disturbed or damaged during construction would be reinstated, diverted, or otherwise made good to their original condition upon completion of the works to ensure that existing surface water and land drainage arrangements are maintained post-construction. The Applicant remains committed to meaningful engagement with all land interests.
ALT-24	RR-1051	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	Respondent stated that site selection appears driven primarily by land availability and grid connection capacity rather than a least-harm or landscape-led design approach, and that reasonable alternatives have not been adequately tested, including concerns previously raised by North Yorkshire Council and acknowledged by the Applicant at examination stage.	**ES Volume 3, Appendix 3.1: Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) [AS-019]** sets out how the Applicant undertook its site selection assessment and the methodology adopted. As is common with solar schemes, the first stage was to identify a Point of Connection for the Proposed Development and the general irradiance and topography of

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				the area. There is a consensus between Government and industry that the single biggest obstacle to the deployment of renewable energy is the capacity of the electricity grid and long delays for grid connections. Following this, Monk Fryston 275 kV Substation was identified as a suitable Point of Connection for the Proposed Development. As detailed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-041]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 3.1: Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) [AS-019]**, the Applicant has then followed a staged approach to assessment, taking into consideration a range of planning, environmental and operational factors and the project objectives. Potential availability of large scale landholdings within the search area was a consideration (is it supports project objective 5 as set out in the SSAR), however it is not the only consideration in the site selection process, given the policy tests that need to be passed by a project seeking consent. Following the Site Selection process, mitigation measures were implemented to introduce landscaping measures and mitigate against harm. This includes measures set out in the **oCEMP [APP-192]**, **oOEMP [APP-193]**, **oDEMP [APP-194]** and **oLEMP [APP-195]**. Reasonable alternatives, including alternative sites and design iterations for the solar development sites and Cable Route Corridor are detailed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-041]**. This sets out how the Applicant considered alternative locations such as brownfield land, former power stations, residential rooftops, airfields and motorway locations.
ALT-25	RR-1051	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	Respondent stated that alternative design approaches, such as a more compact layout or mixed-technology solution, may have reduced environmental and landscape harm, and that the current multi-site spread results in avoidable cumulative impacts across a wide area.	The Applicant notes the suggestion that a more compact layout or alternative technology mix may have reduced landscape and environmental effects. As set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-041]**, the Proposed Development has been informed by an iterative design process which balances landscape, environmental and technical constraints across the study area. The **Design Approach Document (DAD) [APP-216]** goes on to explain how these factors have been taken into account in the design evolution of the Solar Development Sites themselves. As further explained in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 3.1: Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) [AS-019]**, the

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Applicant looked for sites of around 1,100 ha in its initial search. NPS EN-3 paragraph 2.10.9 states that *"along with associated infrastructure, a solar farm currently requires between 1.6 and 2.25 hectares for each MW of output. However, this will vary significantly depending on the site, with some being larger and some being smaller."* On this basis, a 500 MW scheme would typically require approximately 800 to 1,125 ha (excluding cable route), and the Applicant therefore focussed its initial search on areas capable of accommodating a scheme of this scale. The Applicant considered contiguous land parcels and land parcels close together, but none of the land parcels closer together that were assessed as part of the SSAR were considered suitable to accommodate the Proposed Development. The **Statement of Need [APP-214]** further explains at Section 7.4 that NSIP proposals may comprise adjoining or separate parcels of land, and that combining separate parcels into a single integrated Proposed Development can enable viable connection to the electricity system where standalone schemes may not be deliverable. The adopted multi-site arrangement reflects site-specific considerations, including landform, field patterns, environmental sensitivities and grid connection requirements, rather than representing an avoidable spread of development. This approach enables the retention of landscape features, the incorporation of offsets and embedded mitigation, including reinforcement of vegetation and substantial new planting, and avoids concentrating effects in a single location. A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and is reported in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**. This includes consideration of the different parts of the Proposed Development in combination by assessing the likely impacts and effects on Landscape Character Areas defined in the Selby Landscape Character Assessment.
ALT-26	RR-1051	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	Respondent stated that the Examining Authority's site visit selection process may be influenced by the Applicant, and that selected locations may not fairly represent the true extent of impacts, a concern also raised by North Yorkshire Council.	The Applicant understands this comment to relate to the Accompanied Site Inspection(s) (ASI) that the Examining Authority (ExA) will undertake as part of the examination. To clarify, the Applicant will suggest locations for the ASI which are intended to give the ExA a better understanding of the environmental effects of the Proposed Development, but other parties also have an opportunity to suggest specific

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				sites that they think the ExA should visit. The ExA is also able to carry out its own unaccompanied site visits, or suggest specific locations to be added to the ASI route.
ALT-27	RR-1051	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	Respondent stated that design assumptions appear inconsistent or unclear, particularly in relation to panel height, tracking systems, and worst-case scenario modelling.	The Applicant disputes the claim that design assumptions are unclear. The Applicant has provided transparent and comprehensive information in the Environmental Statement which sets out worst-case scenarios including the design parameters and locations for the solar panels and associated infrastructure. The impact assessments are informed using the "Rochdale Envelope" approach, which is an industry standard for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, and defines the maximum envelope of the Proposed Development's parameters and design optionality. This approach allows the Applicant to secure necessary design flexibility to incorporate technological innovation and improvements, such as more efficient solar panel models, that may be available at the time of construction. A full description of the Proposed Development and its associated physical parameters are provided in Table 2-1 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [APP-040]**. The **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]** sets out the technical specifications and maximum dimensions used to inform these worst-case scenarios for the environmental assessment. The DCO secures that the detailed design of the Proposed Development must be built out in line with this document.
ALT-28	RR-0382	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	**[BoR numbers 12-075, 12-076, 18-004, 18-005, 18-006, 19-001, 19-002, 19-005, 19-006, 19-007, 19-008, 19-009, 19-010, 19-011, 19-012, 19-013, 19-014, 19-015]**: I am registering to comment/disagree with one element of these plans, the proposal to dig through two fields south of Hillam (west of Solar development site 4) to connect to the grid. The objection is based on the fact that these two fields (known as Bowers and Woodlands) already have planning consent for a smaller solar Proposed Development, managed by Hillam Solar, which has already obtained planning consent from the Secretary of State. This concern has been raised with the lawyers acting for Light Valley Solar, but with no success.	The Applicant is in discussions with Hillam Solar to allow for its cabling to be laid in these fields, in and amongst the proposals that that project will bring forward.
ALT-29	RR-1153	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	Respondent expressed that Site 3 is unnecessary given its proximity to Hillam.	The inclusion of SDS3 is considered necessary and in line with the Project Objectives including Objective 1, which seeks to ensure that the Proposed Development supports the decarbonisation and security of the UK's energy supply by maximising its clean energy generation potential.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Section 3.7 of the **Statement of Need [APP-214]** explains that there is a limited number of available and timely connections for grid-scale developments. The Applicant has secured a 500MW grid connection to the existing Monk Fryston Substation. To underutilise an existing and available grid connection, which has been prioritised through NESO's Connections Reform process with the highest priority (Gate 2 Phase 1), is not consistent with the government's objectives to ensure that the supply of energy always remains secure, reliable, affordable, and consistent with legally binding carbon reduction targets, or the Project Objectives. The inclusion of SDS3 is to maximise use of the available grid connection, and therefore the renewable energy potential, of the Proposed Development. For further details on the Project Objectives, see **ES Volume 3, Appendix 3.1: Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) [AS-019]**. The SSAR also explains the alternative sites that have been considered (including ones further away from Hillam) and why these have been discounted for various reasons including historic, ecological, flood and land use constraints. Environmental effects of the Proposed Development on Hillam have been assessed within the chapters of the **Environmental Statement [APP-038 to APP-190]**. Of note, the Landscape and Visual assessment in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]** demonstrates that, while there may be points along routes between South Milford, Monk Fryston, Hillam and Birkin where the Proposed Development is visible, these views are typically intermittent, filtered or glimpsed, often influenced by roadside hedgerows, woodland blocks and existing vegetation. With time, the mitigation planting, including hedgerows, woodland belts and field boundary reinforcement, will have established, resulting in further filtering and screening of views. Across the majority of these routes, residual visual effects are assessed as minor adverse or negligible adverse, and therefore not significant, with visibility reduced to glimpsed or filtered views and the baseline character of the landscape partially restored. Views of residents on the eastern edge of Hillam are represented by VP14. The LVIA concludes that effects would be moderate adverse (significant) during construction and year

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				1 of operation, reducing the minor adverse and not significant by year 15 of operation.
ALT-30	RR-1153	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	Respondent expressed particular concern about the scale of Site 4.	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding the scale of the Proposed Development and its potential effects on landscape character. Solar Development Site 4 has been included following an iterative site selection process which balanced technical constraints, environmental considerations and deliverability. The Proposed Development has been designed to maximise the energy generation benefit from the available land and the available grid connection, whilst avoiding, minimising and/or mitigating harmful environmental effects. With respect to the size of Site 4, this includes green corridors across the landscape to strengthen the green infrastructure and nature network and incorporating public rights of way and permissive paths. In addition, a large area, in the south eastern corner of Site 4 close to Haddlesey Road, will not be used for solar infrastructure and instead have alternative land use; currently indicated as a potential recreational space. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and is reported in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**, with further detail provided in in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2: Landscape Baseline and Effects [APP-168]** and **Appendix 10.3: Visual Baseline and Effects [APP-169]**. The LVIA provides an assessment of effects across the Selby Landscape Character Areas within the Study Area as shown on **ES Volume 2, Figure 10.3.2: Selby District Published Landscape Character Areas [APP-092]** and from representative viewpoints identified on the **ES Volume 2, Figure 10.5: Viewpoints Plan [APP-095]**. The effects on the landscape including and surrounding Solar Development Sites 3 and 4 are assessed via LCA 13: Haddlesey Farmland. The LVIA concludes that the effects on landscape character reduce over time, with the highest magnitude predicted during the construction period, reflecting temporary activity, increased movement and a reduction in openness across parts of the LCA. As construction concludes, by Year 1 of operation, residual effects are assessed as minor adverse and not significant,

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				reflecting the cessation of construction activity. By Year 15, following the establishment of mitigation planting, effects remain minor adverse and not significant, with the Proposed Development increasingly integrated into the landscape through a strengthened hedgerow framework and new planting. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: Visual Baseline and Effects [APP-169]** confirms a comparable trend for visual effects, with the greatest effects occurring in early years prior to establishment of mitigation, and progressively reducing as planting matures and filters views of the development. This reflects established LVIA practice, with assessment at Year 1 and Year 15 capturing the establishment of mitigation over time. Mitigation measures are shown on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** and are secured via the **Works Plans [AS-004]**, **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**, and the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]**. The mitigation includes new woodland planting, hedgerow reinforcement, landscape buffers and careful siting of infrastructure. Together, these measures are designed to soften views, restore enclosure and reinforce landscape structure, ensuring that the Proposed Development becomes progressively assimilated into its rural context. Accordingly, the LVIA concludes that while the Proposed Development introduces change, effects are largely limited to the construction phase or early operation, and reduce over time, with long-term residual effects not significant in EIA terms, from Site 4.
ALT-31	RR-0155	Alternatives and Design Iteration, and Site Selection	Respondent stated that removal of Site 5 on flood risk grounds demonstrates reactive siting rather than proper upfront environmental constraint-led planning.	As set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-041]** Solar Development Site 5 was removed only following further flood modelling which confirmed the site was not suitable for development due to potential flood depths. Site 5 was included within the Proposed Development at an early stage where flood risk had been considered based on high level constraints mapping and balanced against other factors to consider that it could be an appropriate site. As with other sites, and in line with common practice, this was subject to the results of detailed assessments. It was that later modelling which indicated that, notwithstanding the site selection balancing

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				exercise having been undertaken, flood depths would make the site unsuitable. The Applicant disagrees that this indicates reactive siting rather than upfront constraint led planning.

2.5 Arboriculture

Arboriculture – General Comments

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Arboriculture - General Comments				
ARB-01	RR-0088, RR-1458, RR-0834, RR-0825, RR-0008, RR-0849, RR-0375, RR-0661, RR-0956, RR-0406, RR-0255, RR-0034, RR-0949, RR-0873, RR-0003, RR-1401, RR-0213, RR-1347, RR-1158, RR-0713, RR-0742, RR-1263, RR-0494, RR-1285, RR-0053, RR-1457, RR-0483, RR-0587, RR-0203, RR-0374, RR-1320, RR-0620, RR-0966, RR-1437, RR-0936, RR-1114, RR-0204, RR-1395, RR-0502, RR-0622, RR-0381, RR-0656, RR-0685, RR-1185, RR-1093, RR-0321, RR-0093, RR-1062, RR-0408, RR-0793, RR-0347, RR-1251, RR-0555, RR-0647, RR-0580, RR-0853	Arboriculture	Respondents expressed concern regarding the potential **loss of trees** and **hedgerows** as a result of the Proposed Development.	The Applicant acknowledges respondents' preference for the retention of existing woodland, trees and hedgerows. As set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044],** the design of the Proposed Development has sought to avoid the loss of woodland, trees and hedgerows wherever practicable through an environmentally led layout and the application of the mitigation hierarchy. No loss of ancient woodland is proposed, and appropriate buffers are applied to woodland habitats, including a minimum 10 m buffer to broad-leaved woodland a 15 m buffer to ancient woodland and 8m buffer to hedgerows, to protect these habitats from direct and indirect effects. The Applicant has undertaken an **Arboricultural Impact Assessment** (**ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.2 [APP-184]**), with further detail provided in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Matters [APP-054]**. This sets out the tree and hedgerow impact of the Proposed Development. Underground cables will be located in existing gaps in hedgerows wherever feasible, and the final design will seek to retain trees and hedgerows, as far as practicable, to retain existing Historic Landscape Character. Any trees or hedges lost to cable installation will be replanted where appropriate in the Cable Route Corridor. This is set out in the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217].** Existing trees and hedgerows are retained where possible, with any limited removals confined to locations where necessary for access or infrastructure connections. These measures, alongside habitat protection and management secured through the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**, ensure the protection of retained woodland and trees and support biodiversity conservation and enhancement across the site. As set out in the **Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Report [APP-220],** with the Proposed Development's landscaping proposals in place, there will be a gain of approximately 72% in hedgerow units as a result of the Proposed Development.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
ARB-02	RR-1347, RR-1320, RR-1347, RR-0408, RR-0155, RR-1189	Arboriculture	Respondents expressed concern regarding impacts to **ancient woodland**. Respondents highlighted Gilbertson's Wood and Gateforth Wood.	The Applicant acknowledges the sensitivity of the landscape in the vicinity of Gilbertson's Wood (a plantation on ancient woodland (PAWS) and Gateforth Wood (a plantation woodland that is not ancient according to published ancient woodland maps), and the importance of the latter for recreation and amenity. As set out in the **Design Approach Document (DAD) [APP-216]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.2: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [APP-184],** the layout of Solar Development Sites 1 and 4 has been informed by a clear design strategy to retain and strengthen existing landscape features and to avoid unacceptable effects on key receptors. This includes maintaining a 15m separation zone to ancient woodland (Gilbertson's Wood) and a 10m separation zone to non-ancient woodland (Gateforth Wood), which ensures that development is not located directly adjacent to the sensitive arboricultural receptors without mitigation, alongside the retention of intervening field boundaries such as hedges where practicable. This approach is in accordance with relevant national guidance relating to the protection of ancient woodland and veteran trees, including the Natural England Standing Advice on Ancient Woodland, Ancient Trees and Veteran Trees. The guidance seeks to avoid direct loss of ancient woodland and maintain appropriate separation distances. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Matters [APP-054]** provides further detail of the assessment of likely significant effects on ancient woodland and veteran trees in Section 16.4, informed by **ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.2: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [APP-184]**. The assessment concludes that with appropriate best practice mitigation measures, effects on sensitive arboricultural receptors, such as ancient woodland, will not be significant. The stand off distances to ancient woodland and non-ancient woodland are secured via the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217].** The DAD also sets out proposals to enhance recreational connectivity through the introduction of new permissive paths within and around Site 4, which will complement the existing Public Rights of Way network and provide improved access to, and around, Gateforth Wood, increasing opportunities for public enjoyment of the landscape. These routes are designed to integrate with the landscape

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				structure and benefit from proposed planting, improving the quality of the recreational experience over time.
ARB-03	RR-0216	Arboriculture	Respondent has stated that woodland and hedgerow has already been removed for the Proposed Development	No woodland or hedges have been removed to facilitate the Proposed Development, nor will any woodland, hedges or trees be removed prior to any granting of the Development Consent Order and the discharge of relevant Requirements as necessary.

Arboriculture – Detailed

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Arboriculture - Detailed				
ARB-04	RR-0216	Arboriculture	Respondent has stated that they are buying and planting trees to mitigate against the solar farm as the developer refuses to confirm if trees will be cut down near their property.	The Applicant has undertaken an **Arboricultural Impact Assessment** (ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.2 **[APP-184]**), with further detail provided in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Matters [APP-054]** that sets out which trees will be removed and which retained. Furthermore, the Applicant's **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** confirms that no trees in close proximity to the property in question will be removed. The OEM also shows the locations of where new planting has been proposed, including a total of 500 trees and 35km of new hedgerow. Existing trees and hedgerows are retained where possible, with any limited removals confined to locations where necessary for access or infrastructure connections. These measures, alongside habitat protection and management secured through the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**, ensure the protection of retained woodland and trees and support biodiversity conservation and enhancement across the site. The Applicant notes that the query regarding tree removals was raised on May 4 2025, prior to statutory consultation, at which point it was too early in the pre-application and design process to confirm tree and hedgerow removal locations, as this would not have been known. The Applicant nevertheless provided a response on May 21 2025, and a follow-up on June 2 2025, confirming the Applicant's intention to retain trees in this area. The Applicant continued to engage with the respondent, including attending a meeting at the respondent's property in September 2025 to discuss the Proposed Development and address questions and concerns. Following this correspondence, the Applicant can confirm that trees in the area in which the respondent is concerned with will be retained. **The Outline Environmental Masterplan - Site 6 & 7 [PDA-009]** illustrates that no trees or vegetation in this area will be removed. Additionally, as detailed in the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217],** the Applicant will commit to minimum offsets from trees and hedgerows, ensuring their protection during construction and operation in accordance with established arboricultural best practice. The design commitments that have been made are secured within **Schedule 2, Requirement 4 of the Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
ARB-05	RR-1301	Arboriculture	Respondent expressed particular concern about the removal of vegetation along Bishopdyke Road and Long Lane for the purposes of road widening.	There are no plans to remove trees or hedges along Bishopdyke Road or Long Lane. There are two Highway Improvement Areas (HIAs) along Long Road, including one at the junction with Bishopdyke Road and one at the junction with Broad Lane. HIAs are sections of the highway network where localised improvements are proposed, such as improvements to the road edge where it is deteriorated and provision of temporary passing places within the existing highways boundary, traffic management, and provision of visibility splays, or temporary highway and traffic works required to safely accommodate the Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) deliveries. The Applicant does not anticipate that vegetation will be removed as a result of these HIAs. Regarding vegetation management (rather than removal) 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. Overall, the project will ensure that local wildlife habitats are left in a measurably better state than before. We aim to exceed the baseline requirement for developers to create a net gain of biodiversity by a minimum of 10% with measures including new hedgerow and tree planting. The Applicant's design principles seek to minimise impact on existing vegetation.
ARB-06	RR-0155	Arboriculture	Respondent stated that buffer distances of 10–15 metres are insufficient to prevent edge effects, root damage, hydrological change, and ecological degradation.	The design incorporates a minimum 15 m buffer from ancient woodland and a 10 m buffer from non-ancient woodland, with the security fencing designed a minimum of 20 m from the woodland edge and the nearest panels positioned beyond this. This ensures that development is not located directly adjacent to the sensitive arboricultural receptors without mitigation, alongside the retention of intervening field boundaries such as hedges where practicable. This approach is in accordance with relevant national guidance relating to the protection of ancient woodland and veteran trees, including the Natural England Standing Advice on Ancient Woodland, Ancient Trees and Veteran Trees. The guidance seeks to avoid direct loss of ancient woodland and maintain appropriate separation distances. The standoff distances to ancient woodland and non-ancient woodland will be secured via the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217].**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				As detailed in the **ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.2: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [APP-184]**, in the instance where standoff distances cannot be applied, alternative mitigation has been proposed to reduce the impacts on retained trees. The Arboricultural Impact Assessment provides general recommendations for the special technique measures that would be implemented to mitigate impacts. However, the specific and bespoke details would be carefully planned once detailed construction information is available to avoid tree damage. An Arboricultual Method Statement will be produced before construction starts and prior to decommissioning to guide sensitive works around trees, with provision for supervision by a qualified arboriculturist where necessary. The requirement for an Arboricultural Method Statement is committed to in the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192].**
ARB-07	RR-0483	Arboriculture	Respondent expressed concern for the impact on wild orchids.	Habitat surveys as detailed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.1: Habitats Report [APP-151]** have been completed for the entirety of the Order Limits and did not identify any wild orchids. This is not surprising as the vast majority of the Proposed Development will extend over cropland, where wild orchids would not normally be present. In general terms, it is noted that The Proposed Development will be undertaken in line with legislation, such as the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.
ARB-08	RR-0456	Arboriculture	Respondent expressed concern that the 10-15m buffer to the north eastern corner extending to Gilbertsons Wood Ancient Woodland would not be sufficient.	The design incorporates a minimum 15-m buffer from ancient woodland and a 10 m buffer from non-ancient woodland, with the security fencing designed a minimum of 20 m from the woodland edge and the nearest panels positioned beyond this. This ensures that development is not located directly adjacent to the sensitive arboricultural receptors without mitigation, alongside the retention of intervening field boundaries such as hedges where practicable. This approach is in accordance with relevant national guidance relating to the protection of ancient woodland and veteran trees, including the Natural England Standing Advice on Ancient Woodland, Ancient Trees and Veteran Trees. The guidance seeks to avoid direct loss of ancient woodland and maintain appropriate separation distances. As such, the Applicant considers that the 15 m buffer to Gilbertson's Wood is appropriate to minimise the impacts of the Proposed Development in this location.

2.6 Aviation

Aviation

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Aviation				
AVI-02	RR-1029, RR-0834, RR-0949, RR-0343, RR-0563, RR-0653, RR-1370, RR-1051, RR-0853	Aviation	Respondents expressed concerns regarding the proposed grass emergency landing strip within Site 6, including its function as an emergency landing space for aircraft. Concerns were raised about aircraft safety and the potential risk posed by nearby solar infrastructure, particularly given the proximity of the emergency landing strip to residential properties. Respondents also referred to a documented history of aircraft incidents and emergency landings in surrounding fields, including cases investigated by the Air Accidents Investigation Branch, and considered the location of the proposed emergency landing strip to represent an unacceptable safety risk.	The emergency landing strip has been positioned to be directly in line with and underneath the climb-out path from runway 19 at Sherburn-in-Elmet airfield. Its location would not result in any change to the current flight paths of aircraft using the airfield. There are no buildings under the final approach to the strip. A search of AAIB records since 2005 found no instances of aircraft carrying out forced landings in the area of the final approach to runway 01/climb-out from runway 19. However the emergency landing strip would provide for such an eventuality without requiring aircraft to overfly any buildings.
AVI-04	RR-0853	Aviation	Respondent has requested for solar to be removed from the field surrounding Milford Lodge Cottage within Site 6 to allow for more space for emergency landings for aircraft. Respondent stated that all solar development should be removed from this field to provide a genuinely safe and unobstructed emergency landing area, and that anything less conflicts with the Planning Act 2008 Section 104 duties and with Selby Core Strategy 2013 Policy SP1, which requires development to improve residents' quality of life and local economic, social, and environmental conditions.	The Applicant acknowledges this request but does not consider this is required, for the reasons given below. The Planning Act 2008 Section 104 requires the Secretary of State to have regard to relevant national policy statements, any local impact report, any matters prescribed in relation to development to which the application relates, and any other matters important and relevant. In the context of relevant National Policy Statements and aviation specifically, Section 5.5 of NPS EN-1 advises that new energy developments can affect aerodromes and that "*Collaboration and co-existence between aviation, defence and energy industry stakeholders should be strived for to ensure scenarios such that neither is unduly compromised.*" The Applicant continues to consult with all aerodromes in the vicinity of the Proposed Development. As the aviation point raised is specific to safety, design is also considered relevant. With reference to National Policy for design and sustainable development, NPS EN-1, paragraph 4.7.10 confirms the importance the Planning Act 2008 places on good design and sustainability. The Selby Core Strategy 2013 Policy SP1 also referenced in the Issue raised, sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This is relevant in the context of co-existence between aviation and the energy industry (economic sustainability) and with regard to safety where unsafe design would have potential societal impacts should an accident occur.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				In response, the Applicant can clarify the allowance made for the emergency landing strip is in accordance with the guidance in Combined Aerodrome Safeguarding Team Advice Note 5, Section 2.2.2. This reflects best practice for design and safety. There is no need, from an aircraft safety point of view, to remove panels from an area wider than that proposed for the emergency landing strip. This should be seen in the context that it is only in the event of an engine failure on approach/climb out that an aircraft would need to use this area.
AVI-05	RR-1333	Aviation	Respondent expressed concern about the potential impact of the Proposed Development on local airfields, specifically Sherburn, Leeds East and Breighton. Respondents raised concern that the scale of the Proposed Development could create significant thermals and air turbulence, posing a safety risk to light aircraft. Respondent questioned whether the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) had been consulted.	The Applicant acknowledges these comments. As part of the Application, the Applicant submitted a **Glint and Glare Assessment [APP-186]**, where the Applicant considered the impact of the Proposed Development from a glint and glare perspective on the Sherburn-In-Elmet Airfield Burn Airfield, Leeds East Airport and Breighton Airfield as well as for road, rail and residential properties plus other aviation receptors, and this is discussed further in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Matters [APP-054]**. The Glint and Glare Assessment predicted significant impacts from south-facing and tracking panels on aviation activity at Sherburn-in-Elmet and Burn Airfields. However, the Empirical Study (**ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.4: Glint and Glare Assessment [APP-186])** indicates the impacts predicted by the Glint and Glare modelling do not occur in practice. On this basis, the Applicant considers that no mitigation is required, and no significant effects are anticipated for airfield users. The Applicant is continuing to engage with these airfields. A low impact is predicted at Leeds East Airport and no mitigation is required. No significant impacts are predicted upon aviation activity at Breighton Airfield The Applicant agrees that ground-mounted solar arrays have the potential to produce low-level wind turbulence through thermal updraughts when solar panels are heated by the Sun; there is however no evidence of this negatively impacting

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				general aviation pilots. Solar panels are designed to absorb energy from the Sun and typically operate most efficiently at around 25°C; they are designed to remain cool in direct sunlight, and it is not anticipated that panels would reach temperatures significantly greater than the surrounding ground. Thermal updraughts from solar PV are expected to be comparable to that already experienced by pilots from natural and manmade heat sinks (such as areas of asphalt/tarmac), which pilots are routinely trained to manage. The Applicant can confirm that the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) was consulted on the Proposed Development.
AVI-06	RR-0343	Aviation	Respondent expressed concern that EMFs will interfere with low-flying aircraft.	Potential effects of electromagnetic fields have been assessed within the **EMF Report [APP-188]** and **ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Matters chapter [APP-054]**. No significant effects are predicted due to the levels of EMF produced by electrical equipment and the distance to any sensitive receptors. Any produced EMFs would be at the power frequency of 50Hz rather than the VHF and UHF radio frequencies used by equipment in aircraft which may overfly the site.

2.7 Battery Safety

Battery Safety – General Comments

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Battery Safety - General Comments				
BAT-01	RR-0903, RR-0774, RR-0834, RR-1201, RR-1403, RR-0861, RR-0255, RR-1092, RR-0804, RR-0949, RR-1002, RR-0343, RR-1008, RR-0427, RR-1347, RR-0568, RR-0084, RR-0102, RR-1222, RR-0733, RR-0352, RR-1199, RR-0723, RR-0669, RR-0520, RR-1051, RR-0483, RR-0230, RR-1372, RR-0996, RR-1025, RR-0105, RR-0951, RR-0600, RR-1370, RR-0958, RR-0720, RR-0921, RR-1212, RR-0245, RR-0708, RR-0236, RR-0060, RR-1365, RR-0561, RR-0205, RR-0361, RR-1004, RR-0571, RR-0303, RR-1118, RR-0853, RR-1199, RR-0084	Battery Safety	Respondents expressed concern regarding the **use of batteries** within the Proposed Development, and the associated **fire and safety risk**. Some respondents raised environmental and safety concerns in relation to batteries, including the risk of fire and the potential danger or harm in the event of a Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) fire.	Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) are a safe and proven technology, and the Applicant can confirm that in the unlikely event of a fire incident local residents would be safe, with measures to control fire emissions and ensure safety outlined in the **Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP) [APP-196]**. The Applicant notes that the BESS can only be constructed and operated in compliance with the final version of the oBSMP, which has been developed in consultation with North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service (NYFRS), who have been consulted during pre-application discussions and as part of statutory consultation, and engagement will continue across the project lifecycle to ensure that all key site safety and emergency response requirements are fulfilled by the Applicant. The Applicant regularly evaluates BESS system defect and root cause analysis reports to inform all critical aspects of BESS safety required for procurement, construction, installation, commissioning, and decommissioning phases of projects. Factory Acceptance Testing (FAT) and Site Acceptance Testing (SAT) are key components in ensuring credible BESS failure scenarios are prevented and fully mitigated should they occur. The BESS has been included as associated development to support the operation of the main solar site by storing energy when it is in abundance and releasing it to the grid when needs are greater. Section 4.2 and Section 6.11 of the **Statement of Need [APP-214]** provide information on the need for flexible assets (including BESS). **ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.5: BESS Fire Emissions Modelling Technical Note [APP-187]** assesses the battery fire emission impact and concludes there would be no significant air quality effects as a result of a BESS fire incident. At the detailed design stage a BESS system and site-specific Plume Analysis study will be conducted to assess the environmental impact of a site incident to sensitive receptors within a 1 km radius. As stipulated in NFPA 855 (2026) water can be used directly on lithium-ion battery fires to provide cooling, but this tactic may prolong the burn out times and increase pollution risks, therefore the Fire Service is only likely to use water for boundary cooling of adjacent equipment. A range of recent Large Scale Fire Tests (LSFT) has demonstrated that the typical BESS failure fire event with battery

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				systems at a high State of Charge (SOC), the peak fire conditions have lasted for a period spanning 60-150 minutes. The rest of the testing fire events within the BESS enclosures typically lasted another 6-8 hours at a lower intensity, because BESS enclosure designs have very high levels of thermal insulation approximately up to 24 hours of smouldering involving non battery combustibles may occur within BESS structure. No intervention is necessary from firefighters in these low intensity burn scenarios. The detailed design phase of the Proposed Development will consider the lifecycle of the battery system from installation (during the construction phase of the Proposed Development) to decommissioning. At the detailed design stage, the selected BESS will have undertaken Large Scale Fire Testing (LSFT) to fully inform inputs for risk assessment tools which will be utilised together with detailed consequence modelling to provide a comprehensive site operations and emergency response safety audit. LSFT of the selected BESS design is conducted to establish minimum equipment spacing distances (no fire propagation to adjacent BESS or infrastructure) and site -specific consequence modelling will provide a clear, evidence -based case for the final BESS area installation plans at the detailed design phase and will be agreed with North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service (NYFRS). Section 4.3.2 of the **Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP) [APP-196]** stipulates that the BESS area will contain 4 hours water supply. Section 4.3.2 of the oBSMP also stipulates: *"A BESS design which may require direct NYFRS firefighting engagement tactics will not be selected for this facility"*. If firefighters are applying water fog or spray patterns to adjacent BESS enclosures or deploying defensive spray plates that form a water curtain between the affected enclosure and adjacent BESS these "boundary cooling" tactics would likely be applied intermittently in 15-minute application periods with temperature changes measured between application periods. Section 4.3.1 of the oBSMP **[APP-196]** confirms that: *"The firefighting water requirement will be fully assessed at the detailed design stage based upon analysis of LSFT of the BESS design plus any additional fire and explosion test data provided by an independent Fire Protection Engineer, water storage volumes will be fully agreed with NYFRS."*
BAT-02	RR-1370, RR-0205	Battery Safety	Respondents expressed concern that the Proposed Development would result in a thermal runaway.	The Applicant's **Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP) [APP-196]** has been submitted to fully accommodate

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				the latest BESS safety requirements contained in NFPA 855 (2026) ensuring that any credible risks associated with battery storage are either prevented or fully mitigated if a BESS failure occurs. The oBSMP has been prepared for the Proposed Development using guidance from North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service (NYFRS) and incorporating recommendations of the National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC). The oBSMP very clearly documents the fire and explosion protection requirements for the illustrative BESS design and the BESS system that is selected at the detailed design stage. Reports such as the Intertek CEA: Global Energy Storage Manufacturing Quality Report 2026 highlight critical BESS system safety issues and demonstrates how corrective actions should be taken before a failure incident can occur. The Applicant regularly evaluates BESS system defect and root cause analysis reports to inform all critical aspects of BESS safety required for procurement, construction, installation, commissioning, and decommissioning phases of projects. Factory Acceptance Testing (FAT) and Site Acceptance Testing (SAT) are key components in ensuring credible BESS failure scenarios are prevented and fully mitigated should they occur. The **oBSMP [APP-196]** sets out the proposed approach for management of fire safety risk, stipulating that the Applicant at detailed design will only select a BESS system that as mandated under NFPA 855 (2026) must have undertaken Large Scale Fire Testing (LSFT). Final BESS design and site layout will be validated through LSFT and rigorous consequence modelling to minimise the requirement for any NYFRS intervention in a thermal runaway incident. LSFT will establish minimum equipment spacing distances that demonstrate there is no fire propagation to adjacent BESS enclosures or Energy Storage System (ESS) equipment. The Emergency Response Plan (ERP) produced at the detailed design stage (template outlined in Section 4.4.4 of the **oBSMP [APP-196]**) will incorporate all necessary emergency response procedures and actions based upon thermal runaway test data supplied by the BESS system provider. Section 5 of the **oBSMP [APP-196]** outlines a comprehensive list of pre-construction requirements to ensure that BESS failure safety risks are minimised and hazards fully mitigated.
BAT-03	RR-1029, RR-1199, RR-0921, RR-1212, RR-0236, RR-0060	Battery Safety	Respondents have stated that North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue are not prepared to deal with fires associated with the Proposed Development	Regarding the capacity of the fire service, as detailed in Section 2.1 of the **oBSMP [APP-196]**, North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service (NYFRS) have been consulted during pre-application discussions and as part of statutory consultation, and

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				engagement will continue across the project lifecycle to ensure that all key site safety and emergency response requirements are fulfilled by the Applicant. As set out in the **oBSMP [APP-196]**, the final BESS design and site layout should minimise the requirement for direct NYFRS intervention. Section 4.3.2 of the oBSMP also stipulates: *"A BESS design which may require direct NYFRS firefighting engagement tactics will not be selected for this facility"*. NYFRS intervention in worst-case scenarios would typically be limited to boundary cooling of adjacent BESS and Energy Storage System (ESS) units to prevent the fire from spreading. A Detailed BSMP will be submitted to and approved in consultation with NYFRS, the Environment Agency (EA), and North Yorkshire Council prior to the commencement of the works for the BESS. All requisite firefighting requirements are set out in Section 4 of the oBSMP. The detailed design phase of the Proposed Development will consider the lifecycle of the battery system from installation to decommissioning. At the detailed design stage, the selected BESS design will have completed Large Scale Fire Testing (LSFT) to fully inform inputs for risk assessment tools which will be utilised together with detailed consequence modelling to provide a comprehensive site operations and emergency response safety audit which will be agreed with NYFRS. The BESS Compound will have a robust and validated Emergency Response Plan (ERP), developed in consultation with NYFRS. The ERP (template outlined in Section 4.4.4 of the **oBSMP [APP-196]**) will be developed post planning consent to facilitate effective and safe emergency response. It will follow UK National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) and NFPA 855 guidelines. Access will be designed such that emergency services are able to access the site easily with site roads being clearly laid out and signed in accordance. Three separate NYFRS access points to the BESS Compound have been integrated. A swept path analysis for emergency vehicles has been undertaken, and the roads have been confirmed as suitable for emergency vehicle access.
BAT-04	RR-1199	Battery Safety	Respondent expressed particular concern that fire and rescue, police and health and safety bodies are not statutory parties and therefore their comments on areas such as BESS fires will not be taken onboard when the infrastructure has already been installed.	The Applicant notes that the Health and Safety Executive (HSE), North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service (NYFRS), and North Yorkshire Council are statutory consultees and have been consulted as part of the pre-application consultation on the Proposed Development. NYFRS have been consulted during pre-application discussions and as part of statutory consultation, and engagement will continue across the project lifecycle to ensure that all key site safety and emergency response requirements are delivered.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Furthermore, a detailed Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) will be submitted to and approved in consultation with NYFRS, the Environment Agency (EA), and North Yorkshire Council prior to the commencement of the construction works for the BESS. The detailed design phase of the Proposed Development will consider the lifecycle of the battery system from installation to decommissioning. At the detailed design stage, the selected BESS design will have completed Large Scale Fire Testing (LSFT) to fully inform inputs for risk assessment tools which will be utilised together with detailed consequence modelling to provide a comprehensive site operations and emergency response safety audit which will be agreed with NYFRS. The BESS Compound will have a robust and validated Emergency Response Plan (ERP), developed in consultation with NYFRS and the Environment Agency. The ERP will be developed post planning consent to facilitate effective and safe emergency response. It will follow UK National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) and NFPA 855 guidelines. An outline **BSMP [APP-196]** has been submitted as part of the application.
BAT-05	RR-0155	Battery Safety	Respondent stated that the proximity of BESS infrastructure to homes, heritage assets, and major road corridors has not been adequately assessed	The Applicant notes this comment and respectfully disagrees. Table 3-6 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-041]** outlines the BESS location design parameters. Among the considerations, for landscape, the table confirms the location and orientation of the BESS to be considered against key visual receptors and key views, while for cultural heritage considerations included avoidance of national cultural heritage designations and areas of significant archaeology, while considering context and setting of cultural heritage assets. In selecting Solar Development Site 2 for the BESS Compound, particular weight was given to finding fields of approximately 10.5 hectares (being the size of land parcel required for the BESS) without the need to remove hedgerows (to reduce environmental impacts), more than 100 m from residential properties (safety), with good potential access, and being located in Flood Zone 1 making the site sequentially preferable for the BESS. Regarding proximity of the BESS to nearby roads (in terms of safety and impacts as opposed to access considerations), **ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.5: BESS Fire Emissions Modelling Technical Note [APP-187]** assesses the battery fire emission impact and concludes there would be no significant air quality effects as a result of a BESS fire incident. At the detailed design stage, a BESS system and site-specific Plume Analysis study will be conducted to assess the environmental impact of a site

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				incident to sensitive receptors within a 1 km radius, including roads. The Applicant's **Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP, [APP-196])** incorporates new key mandatory fire and explosion testing and safety requirements included in the revised NFPA 855 (2026) standard. The oBSMP has been prepared to prevent and fully mitigate the risks from a BESS failure event. The Emergency Response Plan (ERP) produced at the detailed design stage (template outlined in Section 4.4.4 of the **oBSMP [APP-196]**) will incorporate all necessary emergency response procedures and actions based upon thermal runaway test data supplied by the BESS system provider. Section 5 of the **oBSMP [APP-196]** outlines a comprehensive list of pre-construction requirements to ensure that BESS failure safety risks are minimised and hazards fully mitigated.

Battery Safety – Detailed

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Battery Safety - Detailed				
BAT-06	RR-1008	Battery Safety	Respondents referenced recent fire (within 12 months previous) incidents at operational solar sites in the Selby area, and expressed concern that the Proposed Development poses a similar risk.	The Applicant notes this concern; however, it also notes that there have been no publicly reported fire incidents at solar farms in the Selby area in the last 6-12 months. While recent fire incidents have been reported in Cawood in October 2024, Barlby in May 2025, and a contained fire at Drax Power Station, none of these cases involved solar or BESS sites. The Applicant's **Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP) [APP-196]** sets out the proposed approach for management of fire safety risk. The **oBSMP [APP-196]** 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). Final BESS design and site layout will be validated through LSFT and rigorous consequence modelling to minimise the requirement for any NYFRS intervention in a thermal runaway incident. LSFT will establish minimum equipment spacing distances that demonstrate there is no fire propagation to adjacent BESS enclosures or Energy Storage System (ESS) equipment. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.5: BESS Fire Emissions Modelling Technical Note [APP-187]** assesses the battery fire emission impact and concludes there would be no significant air quality effects as a result of a BESS fire incident. **At the detailed design stage a BESS system and site-specific Plume Analysis study will be conducted to assess the environmental impact of a site incident to sensitive receptors within a 1 km radius.** The Emergency Response Plan (ERP) produced at the detailed design stage (template outlined in Section 4.4.4 of the **oBSMP [APP-196]**) will incorporate all necessary emergency response procedures and actions based upon thermal runaway test data supplied by the BESS system provider. Section 5 of the **oBSMP [APP-196]** outlines a comprehensive list of pre-construction requirements to ensure that BESS failure safety risks are minimised and hazards fully mitigated. Site and BESS access will be designed such that emergency services are able to access Proposed Development easily with site roads being clearly laid out and signed in accordance. Three separate NYFRS access points to the BESS Compound have

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				been integrated. A swept path analysis for emergency vehicles has been undertaken, and the roads have been confirmed as suitable for emergency vehicle access.
BAT-07	RR-0834	Battery Safety	Respondent expressed concern for the potential impact of a BESS fire to the A63	The Applicant confirms that robust fire safety measures are inherent in the BESS design plans to fully mitigate any potential impacts on the road network. The Applicant has submitted an Outline Battery Safety Management Plan **(oBSMP) [APP-196]** which has been prepared for the Proposed Development using guidance from North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service and incorporating recommendations of the National Fire Chiefs Council. The safety objectives for the design of the BESS site are listed in Section 1.3.10 - 1.3.13 of the oBSMP. The potential for a BESS fire to impact the A63 has been considered within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.5: BESS Fire Emissions Modelling Technical Note [APP-187]**. The assessment of emissions from a BESS fire included a Study Area of 1km from the BESS compound, as shown in Section 2.2 Plate 1, which included the A63. As indicated in Table 3-6, the lowest fire visibility predicted on local roads occurs at ROAD2, which represents the A63, 24 m south east of the BESS Compound. The worst-case visibility distance predicted at this location because of smoke from a BESS fire is 146.1 m, which is twice the vehicle stopping distance at the national speed limit for this road (the typical braking distance is 73 m for a car travelling at 60 mph (Ref 14)). It should be reiterated that these visibility calculations assume that a fire occurs at the closest BESS enclosure to the road and that this happens to coincide with the worst possible meteorological conditions for pollution dispersion at that road location (worst hour for dispersion across five years of meteorological data). Overall, **ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.5: BESS Fire Emissions Modelling Technical Note [APP-187]** assesses the battery fire emission impact and concludes there would be no significant air quality effects as a result of a BESS fire incident. At the detailed design stage a BESS system and site-specific Plume Analysis study will be conducted to assess the environmental impact of a site incident to sensitive receptors within a 1 km radius, which includes the A63. The Applicant's **Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP) [APP-196]** sets out the proposed approach for management of fire safety risk. The **oBSMP [APP-196]** stipulates that the Applicant at detailed design will only select a BESS system that is mandated under NFPA 855 (2026 Revision) must have undertaken Large Scale Fire Testing (LSFT). The objective of the test is to evaluate the thermal exposure impacts from a developed BESS enclosure, to determine propagation risk

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				to adjacent BESS or equipment. Testing also defines the length of burn, duration of Peak Heat Release Rate, maximum burn temperatures, etc. Final BESS design and site layout will be validated through LSFT and rigorous consequence modelling to minimise the requirement for any NYFRS intervention in a thermal runaway incident. LSFT will establish minimum equipment spacing distances that demonstrate there is no fire propagation to adjacent BESS enclosures or Energy Storage System (ESS) equipment. This will ensure that there will be no significant off-site impacts from a BESS failure event.
BAT-08	RR-0084	Battery Safety	Respondent stated that the Applicant has not properly proven that the battery storage system (BESS) will actually deliver the benefits claimed, or that it can operate safely. Respondent elaborates: - The battery may simply shuffle energy around rather than provide extra usable electricity to the grid. - The application does not explain how long the battery runs, how often it cycles, how it charges/discharges, and how it interacts with the grid. - The application does not clearly outline the benefits of the BESS, including to the community - The application's noise and fire assessments cannot be accurate based on the lack of technical information	The BESS has been included as associated development to support the operation of the main solar site by storing energy when it is in abundance and releasing it to the grid when needs are greater. Section 4.2 and Section 6.11 of the **Statement of Need [APP-214]** provide information on the need for flexible assets (including BESS). Section 7.9 of the **Statement of Need [APP-214]** explains that BESS reduce grid carbon emissions by reducing otherwise wasted renewable generation and reducing the need for fossil fuel generation at times of peak demand. Figure 22 to Figure 26 show how the battery would work with the main solar site to charge and discharge and its interactions with the grid. However, in practice, how the BESS would operate at any point in time would depend on a large number of other factors including national demand, the weather, and the evolving composition of the future GB generation fleet. Section 2.5 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [APP-040]** explains that the number of BESS Enclosures allows for degradation of the batteries and ensures a four-hour system duration can be maintained. **NPS EN-1** sets out the policy position in favour of electricity storage and states at paragraph 3.3.25 that: *"Storage has a key role to play in achieving net zero and providing flexibility to the energy system, so that high volumes of low carbon power, heat and transport can be integrated."* Paragraph 4.2.29 of the **Statement of Need [APP-214]** explains the local and national benefits which storage assets can provide. The Proposed Development is well suited to generate, store, and release clean electricity to power homes, vehicles, offices,

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				shops, and factories, both locally and nationally, and support the government's aim to deliver a clean, secure, reliable and affordable electricity system which helps shield consumers from the inflationary effects of volatile global fossil fuel markets. The Applicant has submitted an **Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP) [APP-196]** which has been prepared for the Proposed Development using guidance from North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service (NYFRS) and incorporating recommendations of the National Fire Chiefs Council. The safety objectives for the design of the BESS site are listed in Section 1.3.10 - 1.3.13 of the oBSMP. The Applicant has ensured site design is fully compliant with National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) guidance and has worked closely with NYFRS to address some site specific operational and access requirements for NYFRS. The implementation of the oBSMP is secured through a Requirement in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [APP-017]**. This will stipulate that a Detailed BSMP will be submitted to and approved in consultation with NYFRS, the Environment Agency (EA), by North Yorkshire Council prior to the commencement of the works for the BESS. The Detailed BSMP will be substantially in accordance with this **oBSMP [APP-196]**. Section 4 of the oBSMP covers all requisite firefighting considerations including, fire breaks, firefighting water containment, firefighting water supply requirements, all aspects of Emergency Planning including ERP and RM plan content templates, and summaries of Plume Study consequence modelling to validate BESS site locations. As now mandated under NFPA 855 (2026) the Applicant will only be able to select a BESS system that has undertaken LSFT. At the detailed design stage, the selected BESS LSFT data will be leveraged to fully inform inputs for risk assessment tools which will be utilised together with detailed consequence modelling to provide a comprehensive site operations and emergency response safety audit, this is stipulated in the oBSMP pre-construction requirements (Section 5). The Applicant notes that, regarding certain project components, including the BESS and operational details including how long the battery runs, how often it cycles, and how it

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				charges/discharges, these details would not be finalised until the final BESS to be used has been selected, allowing flexibility in choosing the newest forms of the technology. This approach is valid; the EIA presented within the ES has been undertaken adopting the principles set out in the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note Nine: Rochdale Envelope which provides guidance regarding the degree of flexibility that may be considered appropriate within an application for development consent under the Planning Act 2008. LSFT involves deliberately burning a complete BESS enclosure to evaluate thermal exposure, heat release rates, burn duration, maximum temperatures and, critically, the potential for fire propagation to adjacent BESS or associated equipment. The purpose of this testing is expressly to validate minimum equipment spacing and to demonstrate that cascading or multi-BESS enclosure ignition does not occur where tested layouts and mitigation measures are implemented. These tests therefore explicitly address the type of multi-BESS fire propagation risks, including scenarios observed in real world incidents, by requiring evidence that propagation risk is controlled through design rather than reliance on emergency intervention. Because the illustrative current BESS design utilised for oBSMP drafting and fire emission modelling demonstrated that a fire did not propagate during Large Scale Fire Testing (LSFT) the Applicant has demonstrated that the loss of a single BESS enclosure is a credible worst-case event for the safety and risk assessment documentation submitted for the DCO. Real world, worst-case scenario BESS fires have involved fires that have generally consumed two BESS enclosures i.e. fire has propagated from one BESS to another BESS unit. The worst-case propagation of four BESS enclosures occurred in Lyme, New York which involved battery systems integrating NMC pouch cells in air cooled modules, these battery systems will not be for the Proposed Development. These worst-case real-world incidents have involved legacy BESS systems which had not undertaken LSFT, many systems were not NFPA 855 or UL 9540 compliant. The Applicant regularly evaluates BESS system defect and root cause analysis reports to inform all critical aspects of BESS safety required for procurement, construction, installation, commissioning, and decommissioning phases of projects. Factory Acceptance

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Testing (FAT) and Site Acceptance Testing (SAT) are key components in ensuring credible BESS failure scenarios are prevented and fully mitigated should they occur. The assessment presented in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]** is based on an indicative design available at the time of writing to inform a reasonable worst-case assessment. The design is expected to continue evolving, and changes may occur, such as modifications to the layout of the BESS Compound. Any changes will ensure that resulting operational noise impacts do not lead to significant effects. Given this, the Applicant has committed that the submission of the detailed Operational Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) will include details of the operational noise mitigation measures incorporated into the final design, together with a noise impact assessment of the finalised design for the relevant part of the Proposed Development. This assessment will be required to demonstrate that operational noise sources will not give rise to materially new or materially different effects that are worse than those reported in the Environmental Statement. The Applicant has also committed to undertaking a verification exercise, the methodology for which will be agreed as part of the detailed OEMP and submitted to North Yorkshire Council, approximately three months after operations commence for the relevant part of the Proposed Development. The purpose of this exercise will be to confirm that the conclusions of the noise impact assessment have been achieved in practice. Should the verification exercise demonstrate that those conclusions have not been borne out, the Applicant has further committed to implementing remedial measures to ensure that the predicted noise outcomes are delivered. Details of the noise impact assessment including any noise monitoring, will be determined within the detailed OEMP(s), an outline version of which (**oOEMP, [APP-193]**) has been submitted as part of the DCO application.
BAT-09	RR-1199	Battery Safety	Respondent expressed concern that 'ex motor lithium batteries' will be used which are second hand and prone to failure.	The Applicant confirms that second life batteries will not be considered for the Proposed Development. The Outline Battery Safety Management Plan is based on Lithium-Ion batteries, as set out in that document.
BAT-10	RR-1199	Battery Safety	Respondent expressed concern that fire safety will be monitored remotely, which will create a time lag and increase risk.	The Applicant notes this comment. The safety objectives for the design of the BESS are to minimise the likelihood of a failure event, which is the overriding priority. In the event that a failure does occur, the design aims to minimise its consequences, restrict the impact to the BESS site, and reduce any effects on the surrounding area.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				As stipulated in Section 1.3.13 of the **Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP) [APP-196]**, final BESS design and site layout must be validated through mandatory Large Scale Fire Testing (LSFT) and rigorous consequence modelling to minimise the requirement for any NYFRS intervention in a thermal runaway incident. LSFT will establish minimum equipment spacing distances that demonstrate there is no fire propagation to adjacent BESS enclosures or Energy Storage System (ESS) equipment. Consequence modelling will quantify operational buffer zones for NYFRS to ensure Overhead Power lines will not impede incident response protocols; spacing will be agreed with NFRS prior to construction of the BESS. NYFRS intervention in worst-case scenarios would typically be limited to boundary cooling of adjacent BESS and ESS units to prevent the fire from spreading. This strategy will be finalised in consultation with NYFRS prior to operation and be clearly communicated in the ERP, including measures: 1) To ensure that fire, smoke, and any release of toxic gases do not significantly impact site operatives, first responders, and the local community; and 2) To ensure that firewater run-off is contained and tested before release or, if necessary, removed by tanker and treated offsite. The BESS will be monitored by an on-site control facility within the BESS Compound, as well as 24/7 monitoring by a remote-control facility provided by the BESS manufacturer or operator. 24/7 remote monitoring for BESS sites is required by NFCC guidance and NFPA 855 (2026) safety requirements. Remote monitoring allows for BESS experts to help interpret, prevent, and mitigate any operational scenarios which may lead to a BESS failure event. Section 3.3 of the oBSMP covers all requisite safe BESS operation requirements including all monitoring and control capabilities. Site access will be designed such that emergency services are able to access the site easily with site roads being clearly laid out and signed in accordance. Three separate NYFRS access points to the BESS Compound have been integrated. A swept path analysis for emergency vehicles has been undertaken, and the roads have been confirmed as suitable for emergency vehicle access. The **oBSMP [APP-196]** sets out the proposed approach for management of fire safety risk, stipulating that the Applicant at detailed design will only select a BESS system that as mandated

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				under NFPA 855 (2026 Revision) must have undertaken Large Scale Fire Testing (LSFT). Final BESS design and site layout will be validated through LSFT and rigorous consequence modelling to minimise the requirement for any NYFRS intervention in a thermal runaway incident.

2.8 Biodiversity and Ecology

Biodiversity and Ecology – General Comments

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
BIO-01	RR-0857, RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-1116, RR-0088, RR-0129, RR-1458, RR-1059, RR-0806, RR-0561, RR-0411, RR-0781, RR-1194, RR-0241, RR-0751, RR-0834, RR-0903, RR-0774, RR-0181, RR-0678, RR-0752, RR-0597, RR-1271, RR-1012, RR-1201, RR-1403, RR-0564, RR-0664, RR-1135, RR-0050, RR-0207, RR-1344, RR-0922, RR-1080, RR-0471, RR-1179, RR-0375, RR-0127, RR-0939, RR-0915, RR-0842, RR-0101, RR-0910, RR-1424, RR-0698, RR-0583, RR-0111, RR-0131, RR-0083, RR-0825, RR-0107, RR-1343, RR-0367, RR-0588, RR-0008, RR-0849, RR-1076, RR-1388, RR-1421, RR-1033, RR-0832, RR-0599, RR-1033, RR-0022, RR-0537, RR-0041, RR-1220, RR-1054, RR-1078, RR-0754, RR-0788, RR-0292, RR-0861, RR-1382, RR-0861, RR-0450, RR-0615, RR-0661, RR-0390, RR-1346, RR-1175, RR-1035, RR-0057, RR-1397, RR-0796, RR-0315, RR-0096, RR-0114, RR-1272, RR-0307, RR-0956, RR-1261, RR-0637, RR-1173, RR-0273, RR-0481, RR-0128, RR-0524, RR-0519, RR-0313, RR-0355, RR-1030, RR-0406, RR-0346, RR-0927, RR-0714, RR-1090, RR-0704, RR-0868, RR-0255, RR-0515, RR-0693, RR-0178, RR-0764, RR-0038, RR-0232, RR-0493, RR-0034, RR-1238, RR-0011, RR-0912, RR-0899, RR-1293, RR-0748, RR-0716, RR-0893, RR-0457, RR-0804, RR-0287, RR-0308, RR-0498, RR-1178, RR-0844, RR-0797, RR-0243, RR-1294,RR-0824, RR-0611, RR-1384, RR-1198, RR-0530, RR-0141, RR-0949, RR-0343, RR-1436, RR-0396, RR-1224, RR-0157, RR-1310, RR-0670, RR-0503, RR-1016, RR-1111, RR-0049, RR-1348, RR-0124, RR-1321, RR-0144, RR-1066, RR-0214, RR-0477, RR-0268, RR-0056, RR-0006, RR-1162, RR-0334, RR-0873, RR-0790, RR-0782, RR-0490, RR-1079, RR-0150, RR-0883, RR-0570, RR-1383, RR-	Biodiversity and Ecology	Some respondents expressed concern about the **Proposed Development's potential impact** on the local environment, wildlife, biodiversity and ecology. Some respondents suggested that the Proposed Development would **displace wildlife** or result in the loss or reduction of habitats. Some respondents raised particular concerns about potential effects on wildlife during the **construction phase**. Some respondents asked if any ecological impact assessment had been conducted.	Potential impacts on ecology and biodiversity are fully assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]** and **ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050]**. The Applicant has followed a robust environmentally led design process taking account of the mitigation hierarchy. This assessment considers baseline ecological conditions and evaluates likely significant effects arising during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. It identifies avoidance, mitigation and enhancement measures to address potential impacts on habitats and protected and notable species. It also identifies opportunities for ecological enhancement, including the creation and long-term management of habitats, and delivery of biodiversity net gain. Potential impacts of the Proposed Development on ecology and biodiversity are assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]** and **Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050]**, which considers baseline conditions and evaluates likely effects during construction, operation and decommissioning. The assessment identifies embedded and additional mitigation measures and concludes that, with these measures in place, no unacceptable significant adverse effects on ecology and biodiversity are anticipated. The Proposed Development will result in a net gain in biodiversity as well as incorporating enhancements. The ecological mitigation and enhancement proposals, including BNG measures, are illustrated indicatively on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** and detailed in the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]** and the **Outline Bird Mitigation Area Management Plan (oBMAMP) [APP-205**]. The **oLEMP [APP-195]** includes provisions for habitat establishment, maintenance and ecological monitoring to confirm that mitigation and enhancement measures are functioning as intended and to identify and implement remedial measures where required. It is expected that the Proposed Development will have a gain of approximately 78.58% for habitats, 73% for hedgerows, and 10.42% for watercourses based on the current development proposals. Full details of the gain are set out in the **Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Report [APP-220]**.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	0976, RR-1020, RR-1449, RR-0123, RR-1313, RR-0773, RR-0042, RR-0322, RR-0442, RR-0427, RR-1008, RR-0285, RR-1401, RR-1119, RR-0213, RR-1119, RR-0992, RR-0104, RR-1115, RR-0256, RR-0237, RR-1034, RR-0227, RR-0762, RR-0052, RR-0058, RR-0306, RR-0568, RR-0745, RR-1106, RR-1106, RR-0938, RR-0658, RR-1415, RR-0023, RR-0827, RR-1048, RR-1456, RR-1235, RR-1333, RR-0576, RR-0538, RR-1097, RR-0370, RR-0820, RR-0778, RR-1158, RR-0917, RR-0062, RR-0865, RR-0726, RR-1254, RR-0163, RR-0847, RR-1309, RR-0854, RR-1133, RR-0962, RR-1041, RR-0505, RR-0908, RR-0443, RR-0768, RR-0291, RR-0384, RR-1268, RR-1275, RR-0549, RR-0668, RR-0662, RR-0665, RR-0628, RR-0680, RR-0962, RR-1101, RR-0879, RR-0159, RR-0286, RR-1428, RR-0224, RR-0286, RR-1405, RR-0750, RR-0102, RR-0627, RR-0079, RR-1145, RR-0798, RR-0487, RR-1292, RR-0906, RR-0092, RR-0650, RR-1164, RR-1222, RR-0309, RR-1148, RR-1188, RR-0771, RR-1416, RR-0051, RR-1242, RR-0279, RR-1276, RR-1003, RR-0302, RR-1028, RR-1329, RR-0822, RR-0069, RR-0352, RR-0402, RR-0431, RR-0179, RR-1073, RR-0369, RR-0235, RR-0240, RR-0757, RR-0360, RR-0725, RR-0673, RR-0713, RR-0679, RR-1324, RR-1154, RR-0848, RR-1109, RR-0086, RR-1231, RR-0803, RR-1452, RR-0130, RR-0586, RR-0333, RR-0590, RR-0867, RR-1263, RR-0759, RR-0191, RR-0180, RR-0494, RR-0329, RR-0813, RR-0470, RR-1260, RR-1285, RR-1257, RR-0097, RR-0341, RR-0356, RR-0841, RR-0986, RR-0983, RR-0053, RR-0415, RR-0692, RR-0723, RR-0984, RR-1017, RR-0926, RR-0591, RR-0712, RR-0858, RR-0100, RR-0987, RR-1139, RR-1171, RR-0447, RR-1193, RR-1245, RR-0514, RR-0046, RR-1207, RR-0959, RR-0969, RR-0669, RR-0823, RR-1354, RR-1457, RR-0925, RR-0620, RR-1270, RR-0964, RR-1311, RR-0365, RR-0142, RR-0882, RR-0249, RR-1081, RR-1230, RR-0520,			

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	RR-1445, RR-1128, RR-1128, RR-1366, RR-1438, RR-1026, RR-1266, RR-0039, RR-1049, RR-0919, RR-0089, RR-0404, RR-0634, RR-1244, RR-0015, RR-1027, RR-1374, RR-0761, RR-1051, RR-1301, RR-0749, RR-0874, RR-0161, RR-0405, RR-1412, RR-0081, RR-0577, RR-0081, RR-0735, RR-0735, RR-1077, RR-1464, RR-0623, RR-0458, RR-0428, RR-0499, RR-0299, RR-0080, RR-0271, RR-1304, RR-0784, RR-1006, RR-0113, RR-0483, RR-0110, RR-1067, RR-0954, RR-1273, RR-0290, RR-0033, RR-0115, RR-0830, RR-1137, RR-0140, RR-0253, RR-1122, RR-0541, RR-0578, RR-1142, RR-0587, RR-0940, RR-0851, RR-0715, RR-1360, RR-0063, RR-0482, RR-0327, RR-0239, RR-0672, RR-0455, RR-0183, RR-0188, RR-0701, RR-0659, RR-0594, RR-0794, RR-0941, RR-0489, RR-0119, RR-0005, RR-1113, RR-0004, RR-0809, RR-0106, RR-0737, RR-0687, RR-0127, RR-1350, RR-0323, RR-0880, RR-1134, RR-0780, RR-0025, RR-0971, RR-1291, RR-0997, RR-1368, RR-0316, RR-1219, RR-0094, RR-1305, RR-0836, RR-0542, RR-1259, RR-0149, RR-0461, RR-1246, RR-0215, RR-0536, RR-0086, RR-0803, RR-0591, RR-1051, RR-1301, RR-0161, RR-0577, RR-0299, RR-0290, RR-0215, RR-0697, RR-0146, RR-0445, RR-0401, RR-0028, RR-0386, RR-1419, RR-0203, RR-0401, RR-1419, RR-0221, RR-0648, RR-0619, RR-0837, RR-0118, RR-1408, RR-1423, RR-0550, RR-0019, RR-0486, RR-1269, RR-1025, RR-0378, RR-1356, RR-1120, RR-0836, RR-0117, RR-0955, RR-0829, RR-0743, RR-0105, RR-0734, RR-0696, RR-1136, RR-1007, RR-1427, RR-1314, RR-0951, RR-0632, RR-0835, RR-0630, RR-0876, RR-1167, RR-0799, RR-1240, RR-0963, RR-1370, RR-1320, RR-0620, RR-0600, RR-0909, RR-0831, RR-0862, RR-0217, RR-0026, RR-0966, RR-0892, RR-1108, RR-1189, RR-0988, RR-1127, RR-1195, RR-0349, RR-0958, RR-1417, RR-1234, RR-0603, RR-0783, RR-0758, RR-1061, RR-0479, RR-0348, RR-0562,			

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	RR-0947, RR-1319, RR-0245, RR-0380, RR-0505, RR-0767, RR-0091, RR-0184, RR-0709, RR-0266, RR-0724, RR-1132, RR-1229, RR-0300, RR-1461, RR-1147, RR-0727, RR-0574, RR-1065, RR-1018, RR-1247, RR-0544, RR-0258, RR-0423, RR-0889, RR-0891, RR-0147, RR-0766, RR-1437, RR-0708, RR-1009, RR-1443, RR-0049, RR-1066, RR-0214, RR-0334, RR-0354, RR-1034, RR-0227, RR-0760, RR-0551, RR-0195, RR-0745, RR-0649, RR-0657, RR-0805, RR-0936, RR-0863, RR-0703, RR-0407, RR-0236, RR-0559, RR-1087, RR-0719, RR-0398, RR-0154, RR-0792, RR-1140, RR-0787, RR-1140, RR-1114, RR-0204, RR-1361, RR-0710, RR-0658, RR-1415, RR-1385, RR-0998, RR-0549, RR-0662, RR-0642, RR-0429, RR-1252, RR-0628, RR-1365, RR-1183, RR-1395, RR-1379, RR-0561,RR-0205, RR-0722, RR-0502, RR-1031, RR-0622, RR-0946, RR-0263, RR-1239, RR-0616, RR-0937, RR-0765, RR-0035, RR-1000, RR-0572, RR-0372, RR-0284, RR-1102, RR-0535, RR-0223, RR-1404, RR-1118, RR-1043, RR-0045, RR-0557, RR-0685, RR-0666, RR-1435, RR-0364, RR-0048, RR-1013, RR-0202, RR-0595, RR-1431, RR-0833, RR-1258, RR-1463, RR-0755, RR-0671, RR-1342, RR-0931, RR-1373, RR-0209, RR-1185, RR-0814, RR-0545, RR-0629, RR-1042, RR-0409, RR-0231, RR-0133, RR-1227, RR-0729, RR-1367, RR-1057, RR-0321, RR-0001, RR-0990, RR-0093, RR-1150, RR-0800, RR-0500, RR-0059, RR-0126, RR-0688, RR-0469, RR-1432, RR-0801, RR-1429, RR-0021, RR-0330, RR-0785, RR-1425, RR-0350, RR-0170, RR-0389, RR-0283, RR-0653, RR-1019, RR-0878, RR-1213, RR-1327, RR-1243, RR-0440, RR-0192, RR-0432, RR-1448, RR-0210, RR-0082, RR-0602, RR-1281, RR-0383, RR-0636, RR-0567, RR-0916, RR-0036, RR-0852, RR-0435, RR-0571, RR-0125, RR-1155, RR-0340, RR-0412, RR-0585, RR-0890, RR-0408, RR-0136, RR-1110, RR-0817, RR-1251, RR-0347, RR-0392, RR-1328, RR-0555,			

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	RR-0647, RR-0731, RR-0811, RR-0278, RR-0280, RR-0007, RR-0274, RR-0156, RR-0054, RR-0638, CC-0427, RR-1131, RR-0031, RR-0580, RR-0853, RR-1011, RR-0885, RR-1282, RR-0198, RR-0640, RR-0973, RR-0197, RR-0444, RR-0012, RR-0098			
BIO-02	RR-0678, RR-0752, RR-1201, RR-1403, RR-0375, RR-0849, RR-0599, RR-1220, RR-0861, RR-0615, RR-0956, RR-0912, RR-1293, RR-0287, RR-0498, RR-0797, RR-0611, RR-0949, RR-0343, RR-1436, RR-0935, RR-1321, RR-0214, RR-0663, RR-0334, RR-0003, RR-1020, RR-1008, RR-0237, RR-1158, RR-0726, RR-1041, RR-0908, RR-1268, RR-0628, RR-0627, RR-1222, RR-1242, RR-1032, RR-0867, RR-1263, RR-1260, RR-0983, RR-0913, RR-0591, RR-1171, RR-0447, RR-0046, RR-1207, RR-1457, RR-0620, RR-0919, RR-1244, RR-1027, RR-1301, RR-0577, RR-1398, RR-0428, RR-1006, RR-0483, RR-0954, RR-1137, RR-0276, RR-0230, RR-0119, RR-0106, RR-1219, RR-0215, RR-1345, RR-1423, RR-1427, RR-0835, RR-0963, RR-0620, RR-0831, RR-1108, RR-0245, RR-1132, RR-0574, RR-0766, RR-1437, RR-0708, RR-0027, RR-0863, RR-0787, RR-1385, RR-1365, RR-0205, RR-0937, RR-1102, RR-0685, RR-1042, RR-0001, RR-1426, RR-0800, RR-0653, RR-1327, RR-0082, RR-1281, RR-0571, RR-0136, RR-0731, RR-0509, RR-0580, RR-0853	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondents expressed concern for the potential impact on **deer**. Some respondents expressed specific concern for roe deer	Impact of the Proposed Development on protected and notable species and habitats is fully considered in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]**. The majority of important habitats will be retained and protected, with arable land largely replaced by neutral grassland which is of higher ecological importance. The chapter concludes that, with embedded mitigation in place, no significant adverse effects on ecological features are anticipated. Similar to all UK wildlife, deer (including Roe deer) are protected from intentional ill harm and mistreatment. However, legislation surrounding deer is mostly centred around controls over poaching and culling, i.e. times of year, methods used etc. This is due to the impacts of deer overpopulation on the ecosystem and people, i.e. crops, forests and road traffic accidents. As such, excluding intentional ill harm, there is no real legislative consideration for the development with regards to deer. However, commuting routes through the site of use to 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 to ensure the habitat is not fragmented. A detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan will also be in place which will ensure wildlife will be considered during the construction phase of the Proposed Development and methods utilised to avoid harm. An outline **CEMP [APP-192]** forms part of the application documents, and the detailed CEMP must be in substantial accordance with that outline. This is secured via Requirement 12 in Schedule 2 of the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017].** Additionally, details on ecological mitigation and enhancement are detailed in the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195].** The **oLEMP [APP-195]** includes provisions for habitat establishment, maintenance and ecological monitoring to confirm that mitigation and enhancement measures are functioning as intended and to identify and implement remedial measures

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				where required. In securing the long-term management of habitats and delivering Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), the Proposed Development will bring benefits to species, such as deer, through enhancing and maintaining habitats and reducing the disturbance of the Proposed Development.
BIO-03	RR-0857, RR-0678, RR-0834, RR-0375, RR-0842, RR-0842, RR-1343, RR-1388, RR-1033, RR-1220, RR-0599, RR-0861, RR-0615, RR-0661, RR-0714, RR-0255, RR-0515, RR-0178, RR-1178, RR-0949, RR-0503, RR-0214, RR-0103, RR-0285, RR-0370, RR-0847, RR-0908, RR-1405, RR-0750, RR-0627, RR-0352, RR-0235, RR-0425, RR-1231, RR-1285, RR-0591, RR-0712, RR-0858, RR-1334, RR-0478, RR-0520, RR-0808, RR-0919, RR-1027,	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondents expressed concern that the proposed **security fencing** could restrict wildlife movement and result in habitat fragmentation or loss. Some respondents expressed concern for the fencing potentially harming animals.	Potential effects of boundary treatments and fencing on ecology and wildlife movement are assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]**, which considers impacts on habitats and species during construction, operation and decommissioning and identifies measures to avoid or mitigate barriers to wildlife movement. The Proposed Development design incorporates fencing around the Solar PV Arrays that is permeable to wildlife, with the exception of deer. This means animals, including small mammals such as badger and otter, as well as amphibians

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	RR-0161, RR-0943, RR-0081, RR-0428, RR-0483, RR-0276, RR-0239, RR-0005, RR-0106, RR-0105, RR-0963, RR-1370, RR-0966, RR-0958, RR-1132, RR-1065, RR-0766, RR-1361, RR-0205, RR-0937, RR-1435, RR-1258, RR-1042, RR-0001, RR-0500, RR-0571, RR-0408, RR-0272, RR-0280, RR-0580, RR-0853, RR-1282, RR-1119, RR-0962			and reptiles, will be able to freely access habitats within the Solar PV Sites without the need for wildlife gates. Existing commuting routes through the site, including hedgerows, ditches and treelines, will be retained, buffered and appropriately protected throughout all phases of the Proposed Development to ensure fauna are able to move through the site and habitats do not become fragmented. The Applicant can confirm that commuting routes through the site for deer, such as ditches, hedgerows and their surrounding buffers, have been incorporated throughout the Proposed Development, with fencing designed to work around these routes; this is detailed further in Table 6-6 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]**. In addition, wide buffers are retained around the peripheries of the Solar PV Sites to allow wildlife, including deer, to move between favoured habitats. The Proposed Development also includes wide internal commuting corridors comprising neutral grassland and other valuable ecological habitats which will remain unfenced, helping to maintain the permeability of the Order Limits for a range of fauna. Collectively, these existing and newly created corridors will help limit habitat fragmentation within the Order Limits and cumulatively when considered alongside other consented developments. These measures are described in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]**, detailed in the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]** and shown indicatively on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]**. In addition, arable land within the Solar PV Sites will be replaced with grassland beneath the solar panels, which will provide suitable commuting and foraging habitat for a range of fauna. The cessation of intensive agricultural practices, including the reduced use of pesticides and other agrochemicals, is also expected to contribute to an overall improvement in biodiversity value across the Order Limits over the lifetime of the Proposed Development. Fencing will be subject to regular inspection and maintenance to ensure continued permeability to wildlife and effective functioning over the lifetime of the Proposed Development. Measures for ongoing ecological management and maintenance are set out in the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The preparation, approval and implementation of the detailed Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, substantially in accordance with the **oLEMP [APP-195]**, is secured via the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**, ensuring that fencing design, habitat management and maintenance measures are delivered and maintained throughout the lifetime of the Proposed Development.
BIO-04	RR-0857, RR-0834, RR-0037, RR-0050, RR-0101, RR-0307, RR-1261, RR-1208, RR-0255, RR-0949, RR-0123, RR-1008, RR-1401, RR-0992, RR-0568, RR-0370, RR-0062, RR-0847, RR-0549, RR-1405, RR-0750, RR-0279, RR-1073, RR-0369, RR-0713, RR-0086, RR-0803, RR-0591, RR-1051, RR-1301, RR-0161, RR-0577, RR-0299, RR-0290, RR-0626, RR-0374, RR-0074, RR-0105, RR-0214, RR-0998, RR-0171, RR-1004, RR-0500, RR-0408, RR-0817, RR-0731, RR-0853, RR-0155	Biodiversity and Ecology	Some respondents expressed concern that the proposed ecological **mitigation measures are insufficient** or would be ineffective. Some respondents also expressed scepticism that Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) would be achieved.	Potential impacts of the Proposed Development on ecology and biodiversity are assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044] and Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050]**, which considers baseline conditions and evaluates likely effects during construction, operation and decommissioning. The assessment identifies embedded and additional mitigation measures and concludes that, with these measures in place, no unacceptable significant adverse effects on ecology and biodiversity are anticipated. A comprehensive package of habitat retention, creation, enhancement and long-term management measures is proposed to avoid, reduce and mitigate impacts and to deliver Biodiversity Net Gain. These include the protection of existing habitats, creation of new habitats, and long-term ecological management to improve habitat quality over the lifetime of the Proposed Development. The ecological mitigation and enhancement proposals, including BNG measures, are illustrated indicatively on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** and detailed in the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195] and the Outline Bird Mitigation Area Management Plan (oBMAMP) [APP-205]**. The **oLEMP [APP-195]** includes provisions for habitat establishment, maintenance and ecological monitoring to confirm that mitigation and enhancement measures are functioning as intended and to identify and implement remedial measures where required. It is expected that the Proposed Development will have a gain of approximately 78.58% for habitats, 73% for hedgerows, and 10.42% for watercourses based on the current development proposals. Full details of the gain are set out in the **Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Report [APP-220].** The preparation, approval and implementation of a detailed Landscape and Ecological Management Plan and BNG Strategy, substantially in accordance with the **oLEMP [APP-195]**, is secured through the **Draft Development Consent**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Order (DCO) [APP-017], ensuring that ecological mitigation and enhancement measures are delivered, monitored and maintained throughout the lifetime of the Proposed Development.
BIO-05	RR-0849,RR-0861, RR-1293, RR-0287, RR-0611, RR-0949, RR-0343, RR-1436, RR-0214, RR-1008, RR-0237, RR-0726, RR-0628, RR-1222, RR-0867, RR-1260, RR-0983, RR-0046, RR-1207, RR-1027, RR-1301, RR-0428, RR-1006, RR-0276, RR-1134, RR-0215, RR-1345, RR-0835, RR-0245, RR-0574, RR-1437, RR-0214, RR-0628, RR-0937, RR-0765, RR-0656, RR-1042, RR-0001, RR-1426, RR-0800, RR-0082, RR-1281	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondents expressed concern for impact on **hares and rabbits**.	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. **Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]** sets out the impact of the Proposed Development on brown hare and other protected species, and the methods being undertaken to mitigate for them. These include retaining and appropriately buffering arable field margins, neutral grassland and woodland edges, which will maintain key habitats offering value for brown hare within the Solar Development Sites. Brown hares utilise cropland habitat and as such, there will be a temporary reduction in the extent of suitable habitat due to the loss of arable habitats, until the newly created grassland establishes. Hares are highly mobile and the temporary loss of habitats during construction is anticipated to be similar in effect (i.e. causing disturbance or temporary displacement to hares) to the regular agricultural activities or harvesting, sowing, harrowing and rolling that take place across much of the Proposed Development at present. It is considered that the Proposed Development would become more suitable for brown hares immediately once works in a particular area are completed. As a result, no significant effects arising from the loss of habitat or displacement/disturbance during the construction phase are anticipated. Fencing within the Proposed Development has been designed to let wildlife, including brown hare pass through. This means that animals (excluding deer only) will be able to freely access habitats within the Solar PV. Additionally, construction lighting will be controlled to limit impacts on surrounding habitats. These measures are outlined in the Biodiversity Chapter and secured via the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]** and **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]**. Rabbits are not afforded any legislative protection beyond preventing intentional ill harm and are therefore not considered in the chapter. However, some of the measures included to protect brown hare will also benefit rabbit.
BIO-06	RR-0752, RR-1201, RR-1403, RR-0949, RR-0343, RR-1436, RR-0334, RR-0427, RR-1008, RR-0750, RR-0627, RR-1222, RR-1242, RR-0240, RR-1027, RR-1051,	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondents expressed concern for impact to **badgers**.	**ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]** sets out the methods being undertaken to mitigate the impact of the Proposed Development on badgers, including locating construction works and solar infrastructure away from known

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	RR-1301, RR-0483, RR-0230, RR-0837, RR-1025, RR-0831, RR-1385, RR-0205, RR-1102, RR-0685, RR-1426, RR-0082, RR-0571, RR-0853			badger setts, and the micrositing of cables within the Cable Route Corridor to pass through existing gaps in hedgerows, avoiding habitats of value to badger, where possible. Mitigation measures are secured via the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]**, which further includes Precautionary Working Methods (PWMs) to protect badger, such as through infilling of excavations / providing mammal ladders to reduce the likelihood of entrapment, maintaining a tidy site and preserving important commuting routes. Construction lighting will also be controlled to limit impacts on surrounding habitats, including habitats of importance to badger. Perimeter security fencing is not considered to be a barrier to badger movement given their propensity for digging (the security fencing is not proposed to be buried). Badger gates are not considered necessary within security or protective fencing as there is no known evidence of their efficacy.
BIO-07	RR-1201, RR-1403, RR-0599, RR-0011, RR-0912, RR-0797, RR-0343, RR-1020, RR-0427, RR-0750, RR-1222, RR-0046, RR-1051, RR-0290, RR-0119, RR-1134, RR-1219, RR-1345, RR-1234, RR-0245, RR-0765, RR-1367, RR-0653, RR-0571, RR-0509, RR-0156	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondents expressed concern for impact to **bats**.	**ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]** sets out the species of bats returned in the data search and site surveys, which sites they were located in, and methods proposed to mitigate any impacts on the species group. The level of bat activity recorded across the Order Limits was similar, with Solar Development Site 1 having the highest level of bat activity recorded while Solar Development Site 8 had the lowest. The vast majority of the habitat within the Order Limits is sub-optimal habitat for commuting and foraging bats, namely the cropland. Habitat features of importance for commuting and foraging bats, such as watercourses, ponds, grassland, woodland and hedgerows will be retained and appropriately buffered where practicable. This will maintain key habitats which offer value for commuting and foraging bats. Other proposed habitat enhancement within the Solar Development Sites, as shown indicatively on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** includes hedgerow planting/enhancement, wet grassland, ditch enhancement/creation and tree planting. This habitat enhancement will aim to connect and extend commuting networks within the Proposed Development, which will improve habitat quality, extent and connectivity for commuting and foraging bats. In addition, a series of bat boxes will be installed on mature trees within the Sites. Mitigation and enhancement measures are secured via the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**. To ensure commuting and foraging bats are protected during the construction phase, the **Outline Construction Environmental**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192] secures and further details measures and approaches to be adopted which will limit the likelihood of impacts upon retained habitats of importance for commuting and foraging bats, through damage, pollution and disturbance during the construction phase. Further detail regarding the assessment of bats is available within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.4: Bat Report [APP-154]**. Both management plans are secured via the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017].**
BIO-08	RR-0834, RR-0849, RR-0661, RR-0034, RR-1178, RR-0144, RR-0306, RR-1244, RR-1006, RR-1368, RR-1247, RR-0685, RR-1367, RR-0321, RR-0636, RR-1011	Biodiversity and Ecology	Some respondents expressed concern about potential impacts on **insects** and other invertebrates.	The Applicant notes this comment. The effects of the Proposed Development on insects are assessed in **Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]**, which sets out the methods being undertaken to mitigate the impact of the Proposed Development on invertebrates. With regard to insects, the hedgerows, mature trees, woodland edges, neutral grassland and arable field margins are, comparatively, of higher importance than the cultivated cropland, which is largely of negligible importance for insects such as pollinating bees. However, as these habitats are either limited in extent, or subject to degradation from agricultural activities, such as dust deposition and spray drift from herbicide and pesticide applications, the presence of a notable assemblage of insects within the Solar Development Sites is considered unlikely. Habitat features of importance for terrestrial insects will be retained and appropriately buffered where practicable, helping to maintain key habitats which offer value for insects within the Solar Development Sites. As the solar panels will largely extend across habitat of negligible importance to invertebrates (namely cropland), and as it is unlikely there will be a notable assemblage of them, it is anticipated that there will not be any significant adverse effects on invertebrates as a result of the construction phase of the Proposed Development. Once operational, the Proposed Development will not be of disturbance to insect life, with the provision of neutral grassland and other planting providing long-term habitat for insects. Mitigation and enhancement measures are secured via the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** and **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**.
BIO-09	RR-0752, RR-0599, RR-0661, RR-0949, RR-0343, RR-1158, RR-1222, RR-0867, RR-0983, RR-1207, RR-0831, RR-0574, RR-1102, RR-1426	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondents expressed concern for impact on **foxes**.	Similar to all UK wildlife, foxes are protected from intentional ill harm and mistreatment. However, there is no further legislative protection surrounding foxes. Commuting routes through the site of use to foxes will be provided, e.g. ditches, hedgerows and their surrounding

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				buffers, have been included throughout the Proposed Development and fencing has been designed to work around these commuting routes to ensure the habitat is not fragmented. Measures are included in the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** which will ensure wildlife will be considered during the construction phase of the Proposed Development.
BIO-10	RR-0599, RR-0334, RR-0003, RR-1158, RR-0750, RR-1242, RR-0106, RR-1219, RR-1345, RR-0835, RR-1247	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondents expressed concern for the loss of **hedgehogs**.	The potential impacts of the Proposed Development on hedgehogs are assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]**, which considers baseline conditions and evaluates likely effects on wildlife movement and habitat connectivity during construction, operation and decommissioning. The assessment concludes that, with embedded mitigation in place, no significant adverse effects on hedgehogs are anticipated. Additionally, given the creation of grassland, woodland, scrub and hedgerow habitats of importance to hedgehog (for the lifetime of the Proposed Development), the Proposed Development is considered likely to result in significant beneficial effects for hedgehog. Measures to minimise the impacts of the Proposed Development on hedgehogs during the construction phase are outlined in the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]**. The **oCEMP** identifies that construction fencing within the Proposed Development has been designed to let small mammals such as hedgehog pass through where practicable, and construction lighting will be controlled to limit impacts on surrounding habitats, including habitats of importance to hedgehog.
BIO-11	RR-0983, RR-0332, RR-1447, RR-0850, RR-0558, RR-0677, RR-0194, RR-1182, RR-0853, RR-1011	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondent expressed **general support** for the Proposed Development's proposed environmental enhancements, including the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). Some respondents specified they support measures such as wildlife corridors.	The Applicant welcomes the support for the Proposed Development's environmental improvements and Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). It is expected that the Proposed Development will have a gain of approximately 78.58% for habitats, 73% for hedgerows, and 10.42% for watercourses, based on the current proposals. Full details are set out in the **Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Report [APP-220]**. Wide commuting corridors are proposed within the Solar Development Sites comprising neutral grassland and other valuable ecological habitats which will remain unfenced, allowing the maintained permeability of the Order Limits for a range of fauna including larger mammals. The presence of these numerous existing and newly created commuting corridors within the Proposed Development will limit habitat

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				fragmentation within the Order Limits alone and cumulatively when considering impacts of other consented proposals.
BIO-12	RR-1020, RR-1008, RR-0847, RR-1242, RR-0587, RR-1087, RR-1426	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondents expressed concern for the potential impact on **Newts/Great Crested Newts**.	Potential impacts of the Proposed Development on amphibians, including great crested newts, are assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]**, which considers baseline conditions and evaluates likely effects during construction, operation and decommissioning. It concludes that, with embedded mitigation in place, no significant adverse effects on amphibians, including great crested newts are anticipated. The vast majority of the habitat within the Order Limits is sub-optimal habitat for amphibians, including great crested newts. However, there are some habitat features of importance for amphibians that form boundary features of the cropland within the Order Limits, namely watercourses, ponds, grassland, woodland and hedgerows. Forty-five ponds were identified as requiring eDNA survey in 2025. Of these a number were unable to be surveyed and a precautionary approach has been undertaken with the assumption that GCN may be present. These ponds will be subject to survey in 2026. If any ponds are found to have GCN present, specific mitigation will be prescribed. In order to minimise the risk of accidental killing / injury of amphibians during the construction phase, the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** sets out the supervision and protective measures required during works affecting potentially suitable habitat for amphibians at field boundaries. With regards to great crested newts, measures to ameliorate the risk of accidental killing / injury of great crested newts within 250 m of certain ponds will be completed through Precautionary Working Methods, traditional great crested newt licencing and habitat creation within the Proposed Development, or via registration under District Level Licensing. The preparation, approval and implementation of the detailed Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, substantially in accordance with the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**, is secured through Schedule 2 of the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**.
BIO-13	RR-0797, RR-0103, RR-1115, RR-0576, RR-0607, RR-0848, RR-0142	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondents expressed concern for the impact of **construction traffic** on local wildlife	As set out in the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** a 15mph speed limit will be applied for surface tracks and a 10mph speed limit for

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				unsurfaced tracks, will be applied across the construction sites to reduce the impact of construction traffic on wildlife. Potential impacts on ecology and biodiversity are fully assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]** and **ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050].** The Applicant has followed a robust environmentally led design process taking account of the mitigation hierarchy. Chapter 6 and Chapter 12 conclude that there will be no significant effects from the Proposed Development on biodiversity and ecology. 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 [APP-049]**. The assessment references British Standard BS 5228:2009+A1:2014 Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites - Noise (Part 1) and Vibration (Part 2). Details of the assessment including plant equipment assumptions and predicted construction noise levels are presented in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.2: Construction Noise and Vibration Assumptions and Results [APP-172]**. The assessment, which includes noise emissions from horizontal directional drilling and piling, concludes that there will be no significant adverse effects from construction noise and vibration on ecological receptors, following the application of best practicable measures mitigation approaches. Chapters 6 and 12 detail mitigation measures to reduce the impacts of construction traffic on wildlife, including timing noise and vibrations sensitive activities to avoid sensitive ornithological periods where practicable. These measures will be secured through the implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), as detailed in the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192].**
BIO-14	RR-0214, RR-1268, RR-1242, RR-0214, RR-0937	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondent expressed concern regarding the impact of the proposals on **squirrels**	Similar to all UK wildlife, grey squirrels are protected from intentional ill harm and mistreatment. However, there is no further legislative protection surrounding grey squirrels, which are an invasive species. Due to the habitats present within the Order Limits, and the known distribution of the species, the presence of red squirrels within the Order Limits is reasonably discounted.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Commuting routes through the site of use to squirrels will be provided, 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 to ensure the habitat is not fragmented. Measures are included in the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** which will ensure wildlife will be considered during the construction phase of the Proposed Development.
BIO-15	RR-0599, RR-0750, RR-0290	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondents expressed concern for the potential impacts on **otters**.	Potential impacts of the Proposed Development on otters are assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]**, which considers baseline conditions and evaluates likely effects on protected species during construction, operation and decommissioning. An assessment of impacts on otters is set out in the ES. It concludes that, with embedded mitigation in place, no significant adverse effects on otters are anticipated for construction and operation. Additionally, the Proposed Development's proposed creation/enhancement of habitats of importance to otter will provide a significant beneficial effect to the species. Measures to avoid disturbance to otters and protect riparian habitats during construction are set out in the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]**. These include pre-construction surveys, protective buffers to watercourses, and controls on working practices near sensitive habitats. The preparation, approval and implementation of the detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan, substantially in accordance with the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]**, are secured through Requirement 6 in Schedule 2 of the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**, ensuring otter protection measures are delivered and maintained throughout construction and operation of the Proposed Development.
BIO-16	RR-0849, RR-0214, RR-1426	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondents expressed concern for impact on **reptiles / amphibians**.	Potential impacts of the Proposed Development are assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044],** which considers baseline conditions and evaluates likely effects during construction, operation and decommissioning. The assessment states that it is unlikely that there will be impacts to reptiles and common amphibians, as a large area of the Proposed Development is sub-optimal for the species groups, and suitable habitat for the species groups, i.e. ditches, will be retained and buffered.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				As a precautionary approach, measures to avoid impacts on common amphibians and reptiles and to protect suitable habitats during construction are set out in the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]**. These include sympathetic, staged habitat clearance and timing, under the supervision of an Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) where necessary.
BIO-17	RR-1458, RR-0599, RR-1324	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondents expressed concern for the loss of **riparian habitat and watercourses**.	Potential impacts of the Proposed Development on riparian and watercourse habitats are assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.1 Habitats Report [APP-151],** which consider baseline conditions and evaluate likely effects during construction, operation and decommissioning. The vast majority of these habitats will be retained and buffered through the development, limiting impacts on this habitat as a result of the Proposed Development. Measures to avoid disturbance to and protect riparian and watercourse habitats during construction are set out in the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192].** These include pre-construction surveys, protective buffers to watercourses, controls on working practices near sensitive habitats, and pollution prevention measures.
BIO-18	RR-1293, RR-0591, RR-0835	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondents expressed concern regarding the impact of the proposals on **stoat** and weasels.	Suitable habitats for stoats and weasels within the Order Limits will largely be retained and appropriately buffered including neutral grassland, hedgerows, treelines, and woodland edges, which will maintain key habitats offering value for the species within the Solar Development Sites. Commuting routes through the site of use to stoats and weasels will be provided, 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 to ensure the habitat is not fragmented. Measures are included in the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** which will ensure wildlife will be considered during the construction phase of the Proposed Development. Measures to minimise the impacts of the Proposed Development on small mammals during the construction phase are outlined in the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]**. The **oCEMP** identifies that construction fencing within the

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Proposed Development has been designed to let small mammals such as stoats and weasels pass through where practicable, and construction lighting will be controlled to limit impacts on surrounding habitats, including habitats of importance to stoats and weasels. The preparation, approval and implementation of a detailed Landscape and Ecological Management Plan and BNG Strategy, substantially in accordance with the **oLEMP [APP-195]**, is secured through the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**, ensuring that ecological mitigation and enhancement measures are delivered, monitored and maintained throughout the lifetime of the Proposed Development. These proposed habitats include habitats of suitability to stoats and weasels such as neutral grassland, woodland and hedgerows, which will improve the Order Limits for the species post development.
BIO-19	RR-0123, RR-1027, RR-0708	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondents stated that the Proposed Development conflicts with NPS EN-1 relating to Biodiversity and Ecology.	Potential impacts of the Proposed Development on ecology and biodiversity have been assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044].** The assessment has been prepared in accordance with the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1), together with national policy, best practice guidance and ongoing consultation with North Yorkshire Council (NYC), the Environment Agency, and Natural England (NE). This is demonstrated in Section 6.3, relevant legislation, policy, standards and guidance, of Chapter 6, with regard to both the assessment approach and mitigation measures implemented. The Applicant is confident that the ecological assessments undertaken and the proposed management and mitigation measures set out in Chapter 6 are comprehensive and robust and that the Proposed Development aligns with national and local planning policy; this is outlined in the **Planning Statement [APP-207]** and **Policy Compliance Document [APP-224]**. The **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [APP-192]** has been developed in accordance with NPS EN-1 to control construction-phase risks and manages potential impacts to biodiversity, such as through the use of an Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) on construction sites.
BIO-20	RR-0290, RR-1134, RR-0574	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondents expressed concern regarding the impact of the proposals on **voles and water voles.**	The impact of the Proposed Development on water voles is assessed within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]**, which considers baseline conditions and evaluates

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				likely effects on protected and notable species during construction, operation and decommissioning. The assessment identifies that a number of ditches within the Order Limits were found to be unsuitable for water vole due to being dry or heavily managed, although suitable habitat exists along the River Ouse and Selby Dam. The Applicant can confirm that evidence of water voles was identified in five locations, although confirmed presence of water vole burrows was only recorded at one location. Measures to avoid disturbance to and protect water voles during construction are set out in the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192].** Following discussions with Natural England, they have confirmed that a Letter of No Impediment is required for water voles, which would confirm that Natural England is not aware of a reason why a protected species licence would not be issued in relation to water vole, if needed. An Outline Water Vole Mitigation Strategy will be provided no later than Deadline 1 to Natural England and will be used to inform a LoNI. Pre-commencement water vole surveys, and Precautionary Working Methods (PWM) are also committed to within the **oCEMP [APP-192]**. Further detail on the results of the water vole assessment can be found in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.7: Water Vole Report [APP-157]**. Similar to all UK wildlife, bank voles and field voles are protected from intentional ill harm and mistreatment. However, there is no further legislative protection surrounding these vole species. Commuting routes through the site of use to voles will be provided, 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 to ensure the habitat is not fragmented. Measures are included in the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** which will ensure wildlife will be considered during the construction phase of the Proposed Development.
BIO-21	RR-0808, RR-0636, RR-1079	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondents expressed concern about vegetation growth underneath panels.	The Applicant notes this comment. Neutral grassland is proposed under the panels. To ensure the grassland is successful beneath the panels, shade tolerant species mixes could be chosen which would be appropriate for the

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				conditions. The interaction of the sun with the panels as it moves through the day will also provide sunlight to different areas around the panels.
BIO-22	RR-1027, RR-0847, RR-0853	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondents stated that the Proposed Development conflicts with the Environment Act 2021, the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, the NPPF, and Core Strategy policy requirements relating to the protection and enhancement of green infrastructure.	Potential impacts of the Proposed Development on ecology and biodiversity have been assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044].** The assessment has been prepared in accordance with the Environment Act 2021, the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, together with national policy, best practice guidance and ongoing consultation with North Yorkshire Council (NYC), the Environment Agency, and Natural England (NE). This is demonstrated in Section 6.3, relevant legislation, policy, standards and guidance, of Chapter 6, with regard to both the assessment approach and mitigation measures implemented. As a result of the embedded and additional mitigation measures proposed, and the habitats to be created as part of the Proposed Development, which will provide a gain of approximately 78.58% for habitats, 73% for hedgerows, and 10.42% for watercourses based on the current development proposals (full details of the gain are set out in the **Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Report [APP-220]**), the Proposed Development will be in accordance with Environment Act 2021, and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. The **Planning Statement [APP-207]** and **Policy Compliance Document [APP-224]** demonstrates how the Proposed Development supports the protection and enhancement of green infrastructure, in line with national and local policies. The December 2025 draft for consultation similarly reflects on the value of Green Infrastructure as part of the Key principles for well-designed places (draft policy DP3). Policy SP18 of the Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan (2011-2027), adopted in 2013, relating to protecting and enhancing the environment notes under part 4 that *"wherever possible a strategic approach will be taken to increasing connectivity to the District's Green Infrastructure including improving the network of linked open spaces and green corridors and promoting opportunities to increase its multi-functionality"* (see page 86 of the **Policy Compliance Document [APP-224]**). The Applicant has made a commitment to deliver extensive green infrastructure as part of the Proposed Development.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				This is secured through the submitted **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]** and the **oLEMP [APP-195]**.
BIO-23	RR-1424, RR-0369	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondents stated that the developer has not been transparent about the environmental impacts.	Potential impacts of the Proposed Development on ecology and biodiversity are assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]** and **Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050]**, which considers baseline conditions and evaluates likely effects during construction, operation and decommissioning. The ecological mitigation and enhancement proposals, including BNG measures, are illustrated indicatively on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** and detailed in the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]** and the **Outline Bird Mitigation Area Management Plan (oBMAMP) [APP-205]**. The **oLEMP [APP-195]** includes provisions for habitat establishment, maintenance and ecological monitoring to confirm that mitigation and enhancement measures are functioning as intended and to identify and implement remedial measures where required. It is expected that the Proposed Development will have a gain of approximately 78.58% for habitats, 73% for hedgerows, and 10.42% for watercourses based on the current development proposals. Full details of the gain are set out in the **Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Report [APP-220]**.
BIO-24	RR-0343	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondent expressed concern regarding the impact of the proposals on **feral cats**	The Applicant notes that feral cats are not specifically protected in current legislation and are considered detrimental to UK wildlife. However, similar to all animals, they are protected from intentional ill harm and mistreatment under the Protection of Animals Act 1911. Measures are included in the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** which will ensure wildlife will be considered during the construction phase of the Proposed Development. These measures will also provide protection to feral cats.
BIO-25	RR-0599	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondent requested that fencing is designed to allow hedgehogs to pass through.	Existing commuting corridors within the Solar Development Sites, such as hedgerows, ditches, and treelines will be retained, buffered, and appropriately protected through all phases of the development to ensure fauna are still able to pass through the development, ensuing habitats do not become fragmented. Furthermore, fencing within the development will be constructed to allow small

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				mammals (including hedgehog, otter and badger), amphibians and reptiles to pass through. In addition, wide commuting corridors are proposed within the Solar Development Sites comprising neutral grassland and other valuable ecological habitats which will remain unfenced, allowing the maintained permeability of the Order Limits for a range of fauna including larger mammals such as deer. The presence of these numerous existing and newly created commuting corridors within the Proposed Development will limit habitat fragmentation within the Order Limits alone and cumulatively when considering impacts of other consented proposals. Furthermore, the arable land that will be lost will be replaced with grassland beneath the solar panels, which will also form suitable commuting habitat for a range of fauna, and due to the halt of detrimental farming practices (e.g. extensive pesticide use), will improve the biodiversity of the Order Limits post development.
BIO-26	RR-0571	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondent expressed concern that insects may die by concentrated heat caused by solar arrays.	The Applicant notes this concern. Solar panels are designed to absorb radiation rather than emit heat, and are therefore not considered to significantly increase or vary local temperatures. On this basis, significant effects arising from heat generation are not considered to impact wildlife, including insects, and this matter was not scoped into the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). Due to the halt of detrimental farming practices (e.g. extensive pesticide use), the Proposed Development is anticipated to improve the conditions for invertebrates within the Order Limits post development, as discussed within the **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044].** Additionally, as per the design commitments detailed in the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]**, habitat features of importance for terrestrial invertebrates will be retained and appropriately buffered where practicable. This will help to maintain key habitats which offer value for invertebrates within the Solar Development Sites.
BIO-27	RR-0342	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondent stated that more tree planting is necessary for wildlife and to prevent flooding.	The Proposed Development has been carefully designed to minimise impacts on water resources and flood risk. The Proposed Development is designed to be flood-resilient, and sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) will be used to manage surface water runoff, maintaining greenfield runoff rates, and reducing flood risk. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.2: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [APP-184]** confirms that a vast majority of the trees within the Order Limits will be retained. Any losses will be mitigated through additional planting, as illustrated indicatively

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				within the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]**. This planting has been accounted for within the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment, which demonstrates a net gain of over 70% in habitat units post-development. Flood risk from all relevant sources has been comprehensively assessed within the **Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) [APP-179]** and **ES Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water Resources and Flood Risk [APP-053]**. The FRA considers both the risk of flooding to the Proposed Development and its potential to affect flood risk elsewhere, including from surface water runoff. The assessment has been undertaken in accordance with national planning policy and guidance, including the application of appropriate climate change allowances, and has been informed by consultation with the Environment Agency, the Lead Local Flood Authority, and relevant Internal Drainage Boards. Chapter 15 identifies that vegetation clearance during construction could temporarily increase the risk of surface water flooding. However, the implementation of surface water management measures, as set out in the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]**, will ensure that any effects on nearby receptors remain negligible. Further mitigation measures are detailed within the FRA, Chapter 15, and the **Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-182]** to ensure that surface water run-off or flood risk is not increased as a result of the development. The Drainage Strategy confirms that as long as vegetation beneath the solar arrays is retained, no significant increase in surface water runoff is anticipated from the installation of the solar PV areas when compared to the existing scenario.
BIO-28	RR-0912, RR-0797, RR-0949, RR-0103, RR-1268, RR-1301, RR-1368, RR-1320, RR-0479, RR-1042, RR-1282	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondents expressed concern regarding the impact of **noise on wildlife.** One respondent expressed concern noise will interfere with mating calls of birds.	Potential noise effects as a result of the Proposed Development on ecological receptors, including ornithology, are assessed within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]**, and **ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050]** of the Environmental Statement (ES). Information about predicted construction noise levels at ecology receptors are presented in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049],** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.2: Construction Noise and Vibration Assumptions and Results [APP-172]**.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The ES identifies that construction would result in temporary and localised increases in noise, however, impacts during the operational phase have been mitigated through careful design, and are therefore low. This ensures that there is limited disturbance to surrounding receptors. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050]** demonstrates that effects on breeding and mating behaviour are not expected to be significant and key habitats used by breeding birds would be retained or buffered where necessary so that noise disturbance would be temporary and reversible. Mitigation measures, secured through **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** and the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]** include the oversight of an Ecological Clerk of Works during the breeding bird season to reduce disturbance to breeding birds, adaptation of Best Practicable Means, and implementation of ecological mitigation and habitat management measures identified within the ES. On this basis, and as set out in the ES, the Proposed Development is not predicted to result in significant adverse effects on birds as a result of noise, including impacts on mating calls. It is important to note that significant noise effects on bird species are typically associated with sustained, high-intensity, long-term sources such as airports. Even in these conditions, many bird species demonstrate a high degree of behavioural plasticity, adapting by altering song timing or exhibiting the Lombard effect (increasing vocals higher than background noise). By contrast, construction-related noise in this instance would be temporary and intermittent, confined to the construction and decommissioning phases, with a substantial operational period of up to 60 years in between during which no comparable disturbance would occur. Regarding dog kennels it is well known that dogs have a greater sensitivity to noise than do humans and can particularly be disturbed by sudden loud sounds. Conversely, levels of sound in kennels are often elevated by sound from the animals and most dogs demonstrate some habituation to noise. During operation, sound from the Proposed Development will be continuous and at a low level, with no sudden loud bangs etc, presenting a very low risk of disturbance. The effects on horses in liveries are expected to have similar characteristics to those for dog kennels.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Measures to minimise impacts on horses and dog kennels will be confirmed in the detailed CEMP and with appropriate mitigation measures in place the Applicant does not anticipate significant effects on kennels and liveries.
BIO-29	RR-0571	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondent expressed concern that bats may die by mistaking glass panels for water.	Natural England's evidence review (NEER012) confirms that there is currently limited peer-reviewed evidence relating to the ecological effects of solar PV developments. Following a review of the available literature, the Applicant notes that the experimental conditions within studies completed regarding the attraction of bats to panels are not representative of the Proposed Development. In particular, that the studies did not specifically test solar panels and instead used plastic sheeting in lab conditions. In addition, solar has been in use for a number of years, with no strong evidence of it causing incidents with bats. The inclination, spacing and layout of panels, together with the presence of vegetation beneath and between panel rows, will substantially reduce the potential for panels to mimic water bodies or present a continuous reflective surface. Furthermore, the majority of panels are to be located well away from any watercourse, significantly reducing the likelihood of being mistaken for such a habitat. In addition, modern PV panels incorporate surface treatments designed to maximise light absorption and minimise reflectivity, further reducing the potential for glint, glare and polarised light effects compared to earlier panel designs. Following on from these measures, which are aligned with good practice with solar projects across the country, there is not yet strong direct field evidence showing that bats frequently collide with or are harmed by solar panels because they mistake them for water. Mitigation is embedded through Proposed Development design, including appropriate panel height, layout and spacing to minimise any potential risk to bats. In addition, the provision of habitat buffers, more and better hedgerows, and the replacement of cropland for neutral grassland will increase the biodiversity importance of the site for bats, as demonstrated by the BNG calculations. Along with the halt of detrimental farming practices, such as the use of pesticides, this will act to improve the Solar Development Site for foraging bats post development.
BIO-30	RR-0571	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondent expressed concern that soil compaction, land clearance, and drainage alterations can be detrimental to wildlife.	The potential effects of soil compaction during construction have been considered within **the Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-182]** and the **Outline Construction**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192] which considers appropriate construction-phase measures to be implemented to manage this risk. Furthermore, the **Outline Soil Resource Management Plan (oSRMP) [APP-203]** sets out good practice measures to avoid damage to soil structure, including measures to both minimise ground compaction and ensure remedial action is undertaken where ground is compacted. Utilising grass or wildflower cover will help to enhance interception and root growth, promoting effective rainwater infiltration and interception. The **Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-182]** sets out the Applicant's assessment of surface water runoff from the development including Solar PV areas. The Proposed Development is in accordance with all relevant national standards and guidelines on the management of surface water, including NPS EN-3 on the management of runoff from solar panels. Furthermore, appropriate mitigation measures are proposed within the **Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) [APP-179]** and the **Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-182]** to ensure that surface water run-off or flood risk is not increased as a result of the development. The **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** commits to consultation with affected landowners to investigate the current extent of land drainage. Where necessary, pre-construction land drainage will be explored with the aim of maintaining the efficiency of the existing drainage system and the integrity of the working areas during construction. Any land drains temporarily disturbed or damaged during construction would be reinstated, diverted, or otherwise made good to their original condition upon completion of the works to ensure that existing surface water and land drainage arrangements are maintained post-construction. Furthermore, the **Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-182]** sets out a design approach that maintains existing land drainage function by limiting changes to runoff characteristics and ensuring that surface water is managed in line with existing runoff rates. Due to the halt of detrimental farming practices (e.g. extensive pesticide use) and the creation of neutral grassland in place of cropland the Proposed Development is anticipated to improve the soil conditions for biodiversity within the Order Limits post

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				development, as discussed within the **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044].** In summary, in light of the above, detrimental impacts regarding soil compaction, land clearance, and drainage alterations to wildlife will be not significant.
BIO-31	RR-0426	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondent expressed concern that solar panels, due to their highly effective polarization of reflected sunlight, could create surfaces that attract polarized-light-sensitive insects, i.e. polarotactic insects, such as horseflies, which could negatively impact both human activity and livestock in the surrounding area.	Natural England's evidence review (NEER012) confirms that there is currently limited peer-reviewed evidence relating to the ecological effects of solar PV developments. Following a review of the available literature, the Applicant notes that the experimental conditions within studies completed regarding the attraction of invertebrates to panels are not representative of the Proposed Development. In particular, the test surfaces were positioned flat or near-horizontal at ground level, on dark substrates such as asphalt and in close proximity to water bodies. In contrast, the Proposed Development will comprise tilted PV panels mounted at an angle and raised above ground level (minimum clearance of 0.4 m). The inclination, spacing and layout of panels, together with the presence of vegetation beneath and between panel rows, will substantially reduce the potential for panels to mimic water bodies or present a continuous reflective surface, which cause the attraction of polarized-light-sensitive insects. In addition, modern PV panels incorporate surface treatments designed to maximise light absorption and minimise reflectivity, further reducing the potential for glint, glare and polarised light effects compared to earlier panel designs. On this basis, the Applicant is confident that the solar panels would not create surfaces that excessively attract polarized-light-sensitive insects, i.e. polarotactic insects, such as horseflies. Instead, mitigation is embedded through Proposed Development design, including appropriate panel height, layout and spacing, and the provision of habitat buffers and enhancements, that will increase the biodiversity importance of the site, as demonstrated by the BNG calculations.
BIO-32	RR-0793	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondent expressed concern that surveys were carried out during the winter months, they raised concerns that this may not accurately represent accurate findings.	The Applicant acknowledges the concern regarding the timing of surveys. Ecological surveys have been undertaken in accordance with relevant best practice guidance in the correct season, as detailed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]** and **ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050]**. The guidance confirms that certain types of survey work can be reliably undertaken in the winter, while others require seasonal windows.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The methodologies and scope of the surveys, as agreed with Natural England and North Yorkshire Council, as well as the results of the surveys can be found in the ES Chapters and the appendices, including **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.1: Habitats Report [APP-151], Appendix 6.2: Otter Report [APP-152], Appendix 6.3: Badger Report (confidential) [APP-153], Appendix 6.4: Bat Report [APP-154], Appendix 6.5: Fish Habitat Assessment and eDNA Survey (Aquatics Report) [APP-155], Appendix 6.6: GCN Report [APP-156], Appendix 6.7: Water Vole Report [APP-157], Appendix 12.1: Breeding Bird Survey Report - Solar Development Sites 1-5 [APP-174]**, **Appendix 12.2: Non-breeding Bird Survey Report [APP-175]**, and **Appendix 12.3: Breeding Bird Survey Report - Solar Development Sites 6-8 [APP-176]**.

Biodiversity and Ecology – Detailed

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Biodiversity and Ecology - Detailed				
BIO-33	RR-1002, RR-0642, RR-0086, RR-0130, RR-0919, RR-0386, RR-1070, RR-0147, RR-0642, RR-0136, RR-1110, RR-1282, RR-0245	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondents expressed concern for impacts to Skipwith Common.	Potential impacts of the Proposed Development on ecology and biodiversity are assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]**. An assessment of the potential impacts on the qualifying features of the Skipwith Common SAC and SSSI as a result of the Proposed Development is included in the ES chapter and the **Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment (sHRA) Report [APP-223]**. The sHRA finds no pathway for adverse effects to be caused to Skipwith Common SAC, and **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]** confirms that negligible effects on Skipwith Common SAC and SSSI are anticipated during all phases of the development, which are not significant.
BIO-34	RR-1002, RR-0086, RR-1213, RR-0262, RR-0136, RR-1282	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondents expressed concern for impacts to the Lower Derwent Valley Nature Reserve.	The Lower Derwent Valley SAC is designated for Annex I habitats: Lowland hay meadows (Alopecurus pratensis, Sanguisorba officinalis) and Alluvial forests with Alnus glutinosa and Fraxinus excelsior (Alno-Padion, Alnion incanae, Salicion albae) as well as Annex II species otter. As further discussed in the **Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment (sHRA) Report [APP-223]**, the Proposed Development is not functionally linked to the Lower Derwent Vally **SAC** (however is functionally linked to SPA). The Applicant notes the presence of Functionally Linked Land to the SPA in both **ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050]** and **Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment (sHRA) [APP-223].** The Functionally Linked Land associated with bird species has been fully and appropriately assessed within the **sHRA,** as indirect impacts to the SPA and Ramsar site were identified to FLL and the species associated with the site **[APP-223]**. Natural England is satisfied with the approach, assessment and conclusion that there will be no adverse effects of the integrity of the Lower Derwent Valley SPA and Ramsar site, as detailed in their Relevant Representation within **The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]**. The Bird Mitigation Area has been designed to offset all impacts on waterbird species, both during breeding and non-breeding periods. It is also expected that species not currently recorded within the Order Limits will benefit from the habitat enhancements, as well as from improved habitat connectivity to the Lower Derwent Valley and wider network.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
BIO-35	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-0642, RR-0642, RR-1110	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondents expressed concern for impacts to Wheldrake Ings, located 2.5 miles from the Proposed Development and a nationally important wetland habitat.	Wheldrake Ings Nature Reserve forms part of the Lower Derwent Valley SAC and Ramsar. Potential impacts of the Proposed Development on ecology and biodiversity are assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]**. An assessment of the potential impacts on the qualifying features of the Lower Derwent Valley SAC and Ramsar as a result of the Proposed Development is included in the ES chapter and the **Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment (sHRA) Report [APP-223]**. The sHRA finds no pathway for adverse effects to be caused to the Lower Derwent Valley SAC and Ramsar, and **ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]** confirms that negligible effects on the Lower Derwent Valley SAC and Ramsar are anticipated during all phases of the development, which are not significant.
BIO-36	RR-0664, RR-0802, RR-0404	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondents expressed concern about the impact to wildlife in Wistow as a result of the cable route.	Potential impacts on ecology and biodiversity are fully assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]** and **ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050]**. The Applicant has followed a robust environmentally led design process taking account of the mitigation hierarchy. This assessment considers baseline ecological conditions and evaluates likely significant effects arising during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. It identifies avoidance, mitigation and enhancement measures to address potential impacts on habitats and protected and notable species. It also identifies opportunities for ecological enhancement, including the creation and long-term management of habitats within the Solar Development Sites, and delivery of biodiversity net gain. ES Chapters 6 and 12 consider baseline conditions and evaluate likely effects during construction, operation and decommissioning. This includes an assessment of ecological receptors near Wistow, including Burr Closes Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Mulberry Farm Ponds Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC), the River Ouse, and notable species and habitats. The assessment identifies embedded and additional mitigation measures and concludes that, with these measures in place, no unacceptable significant adverse effects on ecology and biodiversity are anticipated. These measures include but are not limited to the use of trenchless techniques to cross the River Ouse, and the implementation of an **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP)**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				[APP-192] to protect fauna and flora during the construction phase.
BIO-37	RR-1121, RR-1222, RR-1051	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondents stated that Hambleton Hough has been excluded from application documents, including Environmental Statement Volume 2, Figure 6.4 Non-Statutory Designated Sites 2 km - Technical Assessment and Environmental Statement Volume 2, Figure 11.1 Noise and Vibration Study Area.	The noise study area of 300m as presented in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]** and **ES Volume 2, Figure 11.1: Noise and Vibration Study Area [APP-098]** includes Hambleton Hough. However, Hambleton Hough is not designated as a statutory or non-statutory site and therefore does not need to be added to **ES Volume 2, Figure 6.4: Non-Statutory Designated Sites 2 km - Technical Assessment [APP-075]**. Hambleton Hough is also not located within the Order Limits and therefore does not require specific assessment. However, Hambleton Hough does include Priority Habitat deciduous woodland located approximately 50 m south of the Cable Route Corridor and therefore will be protected during the construction phase via standard pollution prevention methods detailed in a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) which will be in place at the point of any works. This is secured via Requirement 12 in Schedule 2 of the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017].**
BIO-38	RR-1268, RR-0012	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondents expressed concern for impacts to wildlife in Escrick.	Potential impacts on ecology and biodiversity are fully assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]** and **ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050]**. The Applicant has followed a robust environmentally led design process taking account of the mitigation hierarchy. This assessment considers baseline ecological conditions and evaluates likely significant effects arising during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. It identifies avoidance, mitigation and enhancement measures to address potential impacts on habitats and protected and notable species. It also identifies opportunities for ecological enhancement, including the creation and long-term management of habitats, and delivery of biodiversity net gain. ES Chapters 6 and 12 consider baseline conditions and evaluate likely effects during construction, operation and decommissioning. The assessment identifies embedded and additional mitigation measures and concludes that, with these measures in place, no unacceptable significant adverse effects on ecology and biodiversity are anticipated. The assessment of potential ecological impacts in the vicinity of Escrick has been undertaken in accordance with the methods outlined in the ES chapters. The assessment identifies that there would be limited impacts to species

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				including at Solar Development Site 1 and the creation of new hedgerows and the enhancement of existing boundary features throughout the Order Limits and secured in the prepared **Outline Landscape and Ecological Masterplan (oLEMP) [APP-195]** are expected to improve habitat availability and connectivity for species locally and is likely to contribute positively to the local populations over the long term. A comprehensive package of habitat retention, creation, enhancement and long-term management measures is proposed to avoid, reduce and mitigate impacts and to deliver Biodiversity Net Gain. These include the protection of existing habitats, creation of new habitats, and long-term ecological management to improve habitat quality over the lifetime of the Proposed Development. The ecological mitigation and enhancement proposals, including BNG measures, are illustrated indicatively on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]**, detailed in the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]** and the **Outline Bird Mitigation Area Management Plan (oBMAMP) [APP-205]**. The **oLEMP [APP-195]** includes provisions for habitat establishment, maintenance and ecological monitoring to confirm that mitigation and enhancement measures are functioning as intended and to identify and implement remedial measures where required. It is expected that the Proposed Development will have a gain of approximately 78.58% for habitats, 73% for hedgerows, and 10.42% for watercourses based on the current development proposals. Full details of the gain are set out in the **Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Report [APP-220]**. The preparation, approval and implementation of a detailed Landscape and Ecological Management Plan and BNG Strategy, substantially in accordance with the **oLEMP [APP-195]**, is secured through the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**, ensuring that ecological mitigation and enhancement measures (including BNG) are delivered, monitored and maintained throughout the lifetime of the Proposed Development.
BIO-39	RR-1110	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondent expressed concern for impacts to Brayton Barff woodland nature reserve, located near Selby.	The Applicant acknowledges these concerns. Potential impacts of the Proposed Development on ecology and biodiversity are assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6:**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Biodiversity [APP-044] and **Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050]**, which considers baseline conditions and evaluates likely effects during construction, operation and decommissioning. The assessment identifies embedded and additional mitigation measures and concludes that, with these measures in place, no unacceptable significant adverse effects on ecology and biodiversity are anticipated. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]** has assessed impacts on Brayton Barff and concludes that no significant adverse effects on the ecological features of Brayton Barff Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC).
BIO-40	RR-0861	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondent expressed concern for the newts by the edge of the ditch that runs along site 7.	Potential impacts of the Proposed Development on amphibians, including newts, are assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]**, which considers baseline conditions and evaluates likely effects during construction, operation and decommissioning. It concludes that, with embedded mitigation in place, no significant adverse effects on amphibians, including great crested newts are anticipated. As stated in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.6: GCN Report [APP-156],** the vast majority of the habitat within the Order Limits is sub-optimal habitat for amphibians, including newts. However, there are some habitat features of importance for amphibians that form boundary features of the cropland within the Order Limits, namely watercourses, ponds, grassland, woodland and hedgerows. Forty-five ponds on-site or within 250 m of the Solar Development Sites, were identified as requiring eDNA survey in 2025, as shown in **ES Volume 2, Figure 6.10: GCN eDNA Results [APP-081]**. Of these 32 were unable to be surveyed in 2025 and a precautionary approach has been undertaken with the assumption that GCN may be present. These ponds will be subject to survey in 2026. If any ponds are found to have GCN present, specific mitigation will be prescribed. Regarding waterbodies in 250 m of Solar Development Site 7, either the waterbodies within 250 m of the site have returned negative results for GCN, or presence of the species has been assumed where access to ponds in 250 m is not possible. Where presence is assumed, suitable mitigation will be provided to protect the species during all phases of development. Precautionary Working Methods (PWMs) have also been included to protect any common amphibians including other species of newts during construction, with the

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				10 m buffer surrounding ditches within the Solar Development Sites largely retained and enhanced through development. In order to minimise the risk of accidental killing / injury of amphibians during the construction phase, the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** sets out the supervision and protective measures required during works affecting potentially suitable habitat for amphibians at field boundaries. With regards to great crested newts, measures to ameliorate the risk of accidental killing / injury of great crested newts within 250 m of certain ponds will be completed through Precautionary Working Methods, traditional great crested newt licencing and habitat creation within the Proposed Development, or via registration under District Level Licensing. The preparation, approval and implementation of the detailed Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, substantially in accordance with the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**, is secured through Schedule 2 of the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**.
BIO-41	RR-0861	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondent stated that the proposed site entrance opposite the stables at Woodhaven Kennels would create a serious safety and welfare risk for the horses, as construction traffic and machinery could frighten them. They stated that horses, being prey animals, may react to perceived threats by bolting, potentially causing dangerous incidents such as running through or jumping fences. They further stated that this could make hacking out unsafe or impossible and could render the stables unusable if the horses are in a constant state of distress, potentially requiring relocation on welfare grounds.	During construction measures will be undertaken to control vehicle speeds and ensure safe interaction with other road users, including those accessing adjacent land and properties. Given the presence of horses, kennels and other sensitive land uses in this location, the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (**outline CTMP [APP-201]**) and Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (**outline CEMP [APP-192]**) will take account of these constraints to ensure that movements are undertaken in a controlled and proportionate manner, minimising disruption to both the highway and surrounding land uses. Regarding dog kennels, it is well known that dogs have a greater sensitivity to noise than do humans and can particularly be disturbed by sudden loud sounds. Conversely, levels of sound in kennels are often elevated by sound from the animals and most dogs demonstrate some habituation to noise. The effects on horses and stables are expected to have similar characteristic to those for dog kennels. Measures to minimise noise impacts on horse and dog kennels will be confirmed in the detailed CEMP and with appropriate mitigation measures in place the Applicant does not anticipate significant effects on kennels and liveries.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
BIO-42	RR-0591	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondent expressed particular concern for wildlife in and near Common Lane.	Potential impacts on ecology and biodiversity are fully assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]** and **ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050]**. The Applicant has followed a robust environmentally led design process taking account of the mitigation hierarchy. This assessment considers baseline ecological conditions and evaluates likely significant effects arising during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. It identifies avoidance, mitigation and enhancement measures to address potential impacts on habitats and protected and notable species. It also identifies opportunities for ecological enhancement, including the creation and long-term management of habitats, and delivery of biodiversity net gain. ES Chapters 6 and 12 consider baseline conditions and evaluate likely effects during construction, operation and decommissioning. The assessment identifies embedded and additional mitigation measures and concludes that, with these measures in place, no unacceptable significant adverse effects on ecology and biodiversity are anticipated. A comprehensive package of habitat retention, creation, enhancement and long-term management measures is proposed to avoid, reduce and mitigate impacts and to deliver Biodiversity Net Gain. These include the protection of existing habitats, creation of new habitats, and long-term ecological management to improve habitat quality over the lifetime of the Proposed Development. The ecological mitigation and enhancement proposals, including BNG measures, are illustrated indicatively on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]**, detailed in the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]** and the **Outline Bird Mitigation Area Management Plan (oBMAMP) [APP-205]**. The **oLEMP [APP-195]** includes provisions for habitat establishment, maintenance and ecological monitoring to confirm that mitigation and enhancement measures are functioning as intended and to identify and implement remedial measures where required. It is expected that the Proposed Development will have a gain of approximately 78.58% for habitats, 73% for hedgerows, and 10.42% for watercourses based on the current development proposals. Full details of the gain are set out in the **Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Report [APP-220]**.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The preparation, approval and implementation of a detailed Landscape and Ecological Management Plan and BNG Strategy, substantially in accordance with the **oLEMP [APP-195]**, is secured through the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**, ensuring that ecological mitigation and enhancement measures (including BNG) are delivered, monitored and maintained throughout the lifetime of the Proposed Development. With regards to Common Lane specifically, **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]** and **ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050]** consider baseline conditions and evaluate likely effects during construction, operation and decommissioning. This includes an assessment of ecological receptors near Common Lane, including Bishop Wood Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC), and notable habitats such as hedgerows, ditches and trees. The assessment identifies embedded and additional mitigation measures and concludes that, with these measures in place, no unacceptable significant adverse effects on ecology and biodiversity are anticipated. These measures include but are not limited to the implementation of an **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** and **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]** to protect fauna and flora surrounding Common Lane during the construction and operation phase.
BIO-43	RR-1051	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondent stated that ecological survey work is incomplete or inadequate for the later-added Sites 6–8, meaning key environmental impacts may not have been properly assessed.	The Proposed Development within Sites 1-4 and 6-8 requires the same type of surveys and level of survey effort. A such, the same scope of survey work has been completed for site 6-8 and 1-4. All of the survey work completed abides by best practice guidance with regards to survey effort, with the scope of the surveys approved by Natural England and North Yorkshire Council. All survey work was completed and informed the **Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-038 to APP-190]**. The surveys and assessments that have been completed are considered sufficient to support a robust assessment of likely significant effects.
BIO-44	RR-1051	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondent expressed concern for the impact on bluebells.	English bluebells were sporadically located within the Order Limits at field boundary features such as hedgerows. The vast majority of these boundary features will be retained and buffered through the development. However, should any works be required in an area where English bluebells have been recorded, the bluebells will be translocated to an area outside of construction workings prior to the start of the works. This will be added to the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]**.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
BIO-45	RR-1051	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondent stated that they have personal evidence of badger activity in a garden directly adjoining the site, which they believe may not be fully reflected in the ecological baseline.	A badger survey of the Order Limits and 30 m around the Order Limits (where access was possible) was completed and the results discussed within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.3: Badger Report (confidential) [APP-153],** with all badger setts currently recorded within the survey area to be retained through development. Due to the mobile nature of the species, a pre commencement badger survey of the Order Limits and 30 m around the Order Limits (where access is possible) will be conducted before works start, as detailed in the ES and **Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]**. If you wish to provide access to your garden during this updated survey this will assist the Applicant with gaining as much updated badger data as possible to accurately map the up to date spread of the species. Should any additional setts be located during the updated survey, these will be adequately protected/mitigated following relevant legislation. Furthermore, as the area where panels will be installed is generally set back from the site boundary and neighbouring residential properties, it is likely any setts within neighbouring gardens will be sufficiently buffered from development works such that no impacts will occur.
BIO-46	RR-1301	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondent expressed particular concern about the loss of biodiversity along Long Lane and Bishopdyke Road. They stated displacing wildlife from these areas will cause animal casualties on Bishopdyke Junction.	There are no plans to remove trees or hedges along Bishopdyke Road or Long Lane. There are two Highway Improvement Areas (HIAs) along Long Road, including one at the junction with Bishopdyke Road and one at the junction with Broad Lane. HIAs are sections of the highway network where localised improvements are proposed, such as improvements to the road edge where it is deteriorated and provision of temporary passing places within the existing highways boundary, traffic management, and provision of visibility splays, or temporary highway and traffic works required to safely accommodate the Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) deliveries. The Applicant does not anticipate that vegetation will be removed as a result of these HIAs. As discussed above, the works in the HIAs will comprise a small-scale temporary impact on fauna and flora and will not result in major displacement of large number of animals on a continuous basis. Any potential vegetation removal will be controlled via working methods outlined in an **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]**. Through implementing these measures, the risk of killing or injuring fauna is avoided or reduced to a level that is not significant and compliant with relevant wildlife legislation.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				More generally, potential impacts on ecology and biodiversity are fully assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]** and **ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050]**. The Applicant has followed a robust environmentally led design process taking account of the mitigation hierarchy. This assessment considers baseline ecological conditions and evaluates likely significant effects arising during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. It identifies avoidance, mitigation and enhancement measures to address potential impacts on habitats and protected and notable species. It also identifies opportunities for ecological enhancement, including the creation and long-term management of habitats, and delivery of biodiversity net gain.
BIO-47	RR-0271	Biodiversity and Ecology	**[BoR numbers 13-051, 14-017, 14-022, 14-029]**: Respondent raised concern that no wildlife surveys have been taken on their pond or their owl box / presence of barn owls, despite their property's proximity to the Proposed Development.	Pond surveys are required for great crested newts for all ponds within the Order Limits, and all ponds in 250 m of the Solar Development Sites. The majority of ponds within 250 m of the Solar Development Sites have been surveyed, with only a small number with restricted access. These ponds have been identified from OS and aerial mapping. If the respondent believes it has a pond on your lan within 250 m of the Solar Development Sites that is not shown on mapping, the Applicant will be happy to survey this pond for great crested newts in the correct surveying season. Regarding barn owls; the Proposed Development will not directly impact on any nesting site (tree or building) and there is no potential for disturbance given the species tolerance levels (e.g., nesting in barns around operational farms). As such there is no requirement to survey specific known nesting locations. It should be noted that the habitat enhancements will provide substantive benefits for foraging barn owls (through increased prey availability).
BIO-48	RR-0793	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondent expressed concern about impacts on wildlife in Site 2.	Solar Development Site 2 comprised primarily of arable fields, with a small number of grassland margins, some of which were managed specifically for the benefit of wildlife. Solar Development Site 2 is crossed by a central bare ground track from north to south, and a flowing wet ditch running east to west, Ditch 2.1, which was bordered by a wide strip of neutral grassland. Some of the fields were bound by hedgerows, Hedgerow 2.1-Hedgerow 2.5 of varying structure and composition, as well as scattered trees, and small amounts of scrub. The majority of the habitat within Site 2 is of negligible ecological importance (cropland), with the habitats of local or

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				higher ecological importance largely located at the site boundaries. These boundary habitats will largely be retained and buffered through development. Potential impacts on ecology and biodiversity are fully assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]** and **ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050]**. The Applicant has followed a robust environmentally led design process taking account of the mitigation hierarchy. This assessment considers baseline ecological conditions and evaluates likely significant effects arising during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. It identifies avoidance, mitigation and enhancement measures to address potential impacts on habitats and protected and notable species. It also identifies opportunities for ecological enhancement, including the creation and long-term management of habitats, and delivery of biodiversity net gain. ES Chapters 6 and 12 consider baseline conditions and evaluate likely effects during construction, operation and decommissioning. The assessment identifies embedded and additional mitigation measures and concludes that, with these measures in place, no unacceptable significant adverse effects on ecology and biodiversity are anticipated. A comprehensive package of habitat retention, creation, enhancement and long-term management measures is proposed to avoid, reduce and mitigate impacts and to deliver Biodiversity Net Gain. These include the protection of existing habitats, creation of new habitats, and long-term ecological management to improve habitat quality over the lifetime of the Proposed Development. The ecological mitigation and enhancement proposals, including BNG measures, are illustrated indicatively on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]**, detailed in the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]** and the **Outline Bird Mitigation Area Management Plan (oBMAMP) [APP-205]**. The **oLEMP [APP-195]** includes provisions for habitat establishment, maintenance and ecological monitoring to confirm that mitigation and enhancement measures are functioning as intended and to identify and implement remedial measures where required. It is expected that the Proposed Development will have a gain of approximately 78.58% for habitats, 73% for hedgerows, and 10.42% for watercourses

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				based on the current development proposals. Full details of the gain are set out in the **Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Report [APP-220]**. The preparation, approval and implementation of a detailed Landscape and Ecological Management Plan and BNG Strategy, substantially in accordance with the **oLEMP [APP-195]**, is secured through the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**, ensuring that ecological mitigation and enhancement measures (including BNG) are delivered, monitored and maintained throughout the lifetime of the Proposed Development.
BIO-49	RR-0731	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondent expressed concern that areas of special interest have not been adequately taken into account.	Potential impacts of the Proposed Development on all designated sites for nature conservation and any areas of priority habitat outside the Order Limits are fully assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.1: Habitats Report [APP-151]**. A habitat survey was also completed for the entirety of the Order Limits to identify any important habitats within the Order Limits, as detailed in the ES Chapter. These assessments consider baseline ecological conditions and evaluate likely significant effects arising during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. They identify avoidance, mitigation and enhancement measures to address potential impacts on habitats and protected and notable species. They also identify opportunities for ecological enhancement, including the creation and long-term management of habitats, and delivery of biodiversity net gain. Table 6-1 in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]** details the scope of the biodiversity assessment, with regard to the EIA Scoping Opinion from the Planning Inspectorate and guidance from Natural England. This includes the designated sites and important on-site/surrounding habitats that were scoped in for assessment for all phases of the Proposed Development. Measures to minimise the impacts of the Proposed Development on designated sites and important on-site/surrounding habitats during the construction phase are outlined in the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192].** The assessment concluded that, with embedded mitigation and further mitigation where required, there would be no significant adverse effects on the designated sites and

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				important on-site/surrounding habitats that were scoped into the assessment.
BIO-50	CC-0427	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondent expressed concern regarding the impact on Romney Marsh, an area of scientific interest.	Romney Marsh is located on the south-eastern coast of England and is therefore outside of the Zone of Influence of the Proposed Development.
BIO-51	RR-0853	Biodiversity and Ecology	Respondent stated that the development would have an unacceptable impact on wildlife and biodiversity, as Site 6 and surrounding land currently support a diverse range of species dependent on an open, connected agricultural landscape.	Solar Development Site 6 largely comprised arable fields bound by wet drainage ditches and associated modified grassland margins, as well as sporadic hedgerows and treelines. There were also occasional scattered trees at boundaries, with a small woodland copse in the west of Solar Development Site 6. Some discrete areas of neutral and modified grassland were also present. The majority of the habitat within Site 6 is of negligible ecological importance (cropland), with the habitats of local or higher ecological importance largely located at the site boundaries. These boundary habitats will largely be retained and buffered through development. Potential impacts on ecology and biodiversity are fully assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]** and **ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050]**. The Applicant has followed a robust environmentally led design process taking account of the mitigation hierarchy. This assessment considers baseline ecological conditions and evaluates likely significant effects arising during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. It identifies avoidance, mitigation and enhancement measures to address potential impacts on habitats and protected and notable species. It also identifies opportunities for ecological enhancement, including the creation and long-term management of habitats, and delivery of biodiversity net gain. ES Chapters 6 and 12 consider baseline conditions and evaluate likely effects during construction, operation and decommissioning. The assessment identifies embedded and additional mitigation measures and concludes that, with these measures in place, no unacceptable significant adverse effects on ecology and biodiversity are anticipated. A comprehensive package of habitat retention, creation, enhancement and long-term management measures is proposed to avoid, reduce and mitigate impacts and to deliver Biodiversity Net Gain. These include the protection of existing habitats, creation of new habitats, and long-term ecological management to improve habitat quality over the lifetime of the Proposed Development.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The ecological mitigation and enhancement proposals, including BNG measures, are illustrated indicatively on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]**, detailed in the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]** and the **Outline Bird Mitigation Area Management Plan (oBMAMP) [APP-205]**. The **oLEMP [APP-195]** includes provisions for habitat establishment, maintenance and ecological monitoring to confirm that mitigation and enhancement measures are functioning as intended and to identify and implement remedial measures where required. It is expected that the Proposed Development will have a gain of approximately 78.58% for habitats, 73% for hedgerows, and 10.42% for watercourses based on the current development proposals. Full details of the gain are set out in the **Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Report [APP-220]**. The preparation, approval and implementation of a detailed Landscape and Ecological Management Plan and BNG Strategy, substantially in accordance with the **oLEMP [APP-195]**, is secured through the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**, ensuring that ecological mitigation and enhancement measures (including BNG) are delivered, monitored and maintained throughout the lifetime of the Proposed Development.

2.9 Climate Change Resilience and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Climate Change Resilience and Greenhouse Gas Emissions – General Comments

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	Climate Change Resilience and Greenhouse Gas Emissions - General Comments			
CLI-01	RR-1059, RR-0507, RR-0995, RR-0181, RR-0367, RR-1091, RR-0661, RR-0307, RR-1232, RR-0061, RR-0764, RR-1262, RR-0334, RR-1449, RR-0121, RR-1008, RR-1401, RR-0427, RR-0745, RR-0827, RR-1333, RR-1097, RR-1309, RR-0282, RR-0738, RR-0750, RR-0376, RR-1369, RR-1283, RR-1109, RR-0669, RR-1081, RR-0735, RR-0735, RR-1067, RR-0033, RR-0830, RR-0701, RR-0005, RR-0907, RR-0146, RR-1411, RR-0105, RR-1240, RR-0966, RR-0988, RR-1127, RR-0709, RR-1147, RR-1065, RR-0889, RR-0657, RR-0236, RR-0827, RR-0765, RR-1043, RR-0001, RR-0176, RR-0653, RR-1112, RR-0636, RR-0156, RR-0509	Climate Change Resilience and Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Some respondents expressed concern that the Proposed Development would **cause greater environmental harm than environmental benefit**, including suggestions that it could result in **higher carbon emissions than it would save**. Some respondents also expressed scepticism about whether the Proposed Development should be described as 'green'.	The Applicant notes concerns raised around environmental harm as a result of the Proposed Development. The Environmental Statement has sought to assess and mitigate impacts upon environmental receptors. The resulting mitigation measures are secured through the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192], Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [APP-193]** and **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) [APP-194]**. These plans will be secured through Requirements in Schedule 2 of the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017].** **ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Greenhouse Gas Emissions [APP-047]** assesses the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions for the life cycle of the Proposed Development across construction, operation and decommissioning, with the detailed assessment included in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment [APP-166]**. When considering the beneficial renewable energy generation that will aid the UK in achieving its net zero targets, the ES concludes that the Proposed Development provide significant beneficial effects in respect of GHG emissions. Chapter 9 references the policy statements for energy, including the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1), the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3). EN-1 highlights the need for large-scale renewable energy deployment to ensure the UK can provide reliable and affordable energy as well as meeting UK decarbonisation targets. EN-3 recognises solar farms as one of the most established renewable electricity technologies in the UK and the cheapest form of electricity generation worldwide. It provides clear support for large scale solar development for many reasons, including cost effectiveness and versatility as well as high effectiveness at generating renewable energy for a resilient UK electricity grid. The Proposed Development will therefore contribute to the achievement of the Government's decarbonisation targets, which is a net environmental benefit that has consistently been

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				given significant weight in the planning balance, and which, alongside the enhancements arising from the Proposed Development, significantly outweighs the limited environmental effects caused by the Proposed Development. In addition, it is also noted that the GHG emissions assessment identifies embedded mitigation to reduce the impact of the Proposed Development on the global climate. Those relevant to the construction phase and secured via the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** include segregating construction waste for reuse and recycling, minimising waste through careful construction management and the use of lower embodied carbon materials where feasible, and reusing existing infrastructure and resources within the Order Limits to reduce the need for new materials. Additional measures include reducing emissions by switching off vehicles and plant when not in use, ensuring compliance with current emissions standards, and maintaining construction plant and machinery to optimise efficiency. Further measures relevant to the operational phase of the Proposed Development, secured via the **Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [APP-193]**, include regular planned maintenance and for replacement activities to ensure construction mitigation measures are applied (as above) to optimise efficiency. An **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** will also be implemented to help reduce GHG emissions associated with construction traffic. Measures include promoting lower carbon travel by communicating local public transport, pedestrian and cycle routes to construction staff, and providing secure cycle storage facilities. While the rural location and early shift patterns mean most workers are expected to travel by vehicle, the Proposed Development aims to reduce single-occupancy car journeys through the provision of shared minibus transport, encouraging car sharing, and providing secure cycle parking within the construction compounds.
CLI-02	RR-0745, RR-0827, RR-0417, RR-1190, RR-0339, RR-0421, RR-0541, RR-0019, RR-0923, RR-0966, RR-0988, RR-1100, RR-0745, RR-0250, RR-0653, RR-0870, RR-0509	Climate Change Resilience and Greenhouse	Some respondents expressed **scepticism about climate change** and questioned the scientific basis for climate policy and associated targets.	As a result of its commitments to the Paris Agreement, in June 2019 the UK became the first major economy to legislate for a 2050 net zero GHG emissions target through the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019. Decarbonisation is therefore a UK legal requirement. The government's objectives are to ensure the supply of energy to

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
		Gas Emissions		the national energy system always remains secure, reliable, affordable, and consistent with meeting legally binding greenhouse emissions reductions. NPS EN-1 states that government has identified that meeting the UK's legal targets will require a step change in the decarbonisation of the UK's energy system [Para 2.3.3], and large-scale ground mounted solar has an important role to play in the UK. More information can be found in the **Statement of Need [APP-214]**, which establishes the urgent and unprecedented need for the Proposed Development. Climate change is recognised globally as a serious environmental threat by recognised scientific experts. The methods used in the assessment of climate change in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Greenhouse Gas Emissions [APP-047]** are standard methods for quantification of the effects of Climate Change grounded in scientific evidence and based on information from UK government's Department for Security, Energy and Net Zero and applicable guidance such as the Institute of Sustainability and Environmental Professionals (formerly the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment). For example, the **ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Greenhouse Gas Emissions [APP-047]** follows the GHG Protocol guideline which is a globally recognised standard for measuring and managing GHG emissions.
CLI-03	RR-1059, RR-1029, RR-0615, RR-0307, RR-0417, RR-1369, RR-0179, RR-0033, RR-0708, RR-0653, RR-0636, RR-1283	Climate Change Resilience and Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Some respondents expressed concern about the environmental effects associated with the **manufacture of components** used in the Proposed Development. Some respondents doubted whether this had been assessed.	**ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Greenhouse Gas Emissions [APP-047]** assesses the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions for the life cycle of the Proposed Development, with the detailed assessment included in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment [APP-166]**. The life cycle assessment includes GHG emissions associated with products to be used on site (i.e. the manufacture of components such as solar panels, cables, the BESS and other key infrastructure components), as well as construction, operation and decommissioning activities. The results of the GHG emissions assessments, provided in carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e), are included within Chapter 9 and further details provided within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment [APP-166]**. The GHG emissions assessment also considers the context that the Proposed Development will play in the

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				decarbonisation of the UK electricity grid. The assessment demonstrates that when compared with forecast wider grid intensity in the opening year, the Proposed Development will provide electricity at a lower GHG intensity than the comparable grid intensity. Further details are provided in Section 9.9 Assessment of likely impacts and effects of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Greenhouse Gas Emissions [APP-047]** While the assessment concludes there is a minor adverse impact from construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development, given the purpose of the Proposed Development is renewable energy generation for the UK grid, it is reasonable to conclude there is a significant benefit in GHG emissions terms for the Proposed Development as a whole.
CLI-04	RR-0745, RR-1112	Climate Change Resilience and Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Respondents expressed concern that the loss of agricultural land and resulting food insecurity could lead to the loss of a carbon sink and increased CO2 emissions associated with importing and transporting food to the UK, noting that insufficient detail has been provided on the environmental impacts of food importation.	The effects of the Proposed Development on agricultural land, including land quality and productivity, are assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils [APP-043]**, which states that food security has been considered. The Applicant does not consider that food security will be compromised by the Proposed Development (or solar energy more widely), particularly in the context that the 486 ha of BMV land within the Proposed Development (of which approximately 19.1 ha would be required for the 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. It should also be noted that food security is not identified as an issue within the suite of Energy National Policy Statements or the 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. As noted in paragraphs 5.9.26 to 5.9.28 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils [APP-043],** conversion of arable land to permanent pasture results in the accumulation of organic matter in soils, along with other

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				benefits to soil health, and therefore grassland within the Solar Development Sites is anticipated to represent a substantial carbon sink over the lifetime of the Proposed Development. The Applicant therefore disagrees that the Proposed Development would result in significant alterations to the importation and transportation of food to the UK. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Greenhouse Gas Emissions [APP-047]** assesses the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions for the life cycle of the Proposed Development, with the detailed assessment included in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment [APP-166]**. Of relevance to this comment is that this GHG emissions assessment includes an assessment of land use change. As set out in the Applicant's **Statement of Need [APP-214]** an unprecedented capacity of new low-carbon generation Proposed Developments is urgently needed for the UK to meet its legally binding climate change targets. The Proposed Development, as a low carbon source of electricity, will contribute to meeting this need and therefore support the transition to net zero with a beneficial impact in terms of the wider contribution it will make.
CLI-05	RR-1410	Climate Change Resilience and Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Respondent stated that the 500MWH battery installation will only store the maximum output for 1 hour.	The Applicant disagrees with this comment. As stated in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [APP-040]** Section 2.5, the number of BESS enclosures allows for degradation of the batteries and has been design with a Rochdale envelope approach. Technology in terms of battery capacity is developing and whilst a 4 hour system is the current technology there are 8 hour systems being developed now. The assessment within the ES reflects the parameters in scale and size set out in t**he Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]** and the detailed design of the BESS, reflecting the most efficient installation at the time of construction, would be subject to being compliant with this. It is necessary that there will be some flexibility built into the design of the Proposed Development when submitting the DCO Application so that the detailed design of the Proposed Development can be informed by technical considerations, post-consent work, and take advantage of innovation in technology. This is of particular importance in order to maintain flexibility due to the rapid pace of change in battery storage

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				technology. The final number of BESS enclosures will therefore be dependent on technology evolution before the final design is confirmed.
CLI-06	RR-0745	Climate Change Resilience and Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Respondent stated that increasing demand for electricity has not been fully factored in. Respondent provided the example of 32.86 million registered cars in the UK powered by petrol/diesel. To convert these cars to electric, powered by solar in the month of December, would require an area of solar panels amounting to 507,000 hectares. This is equivalent to 63% of the land mass of North Yorkshire. The calculation is as follows: (1) Average annual mileage per car = 7,400 miles (i.e. 617 miles per month). Source RAC. (2) Average mileage per kwh = 4.0. Source vehicle manufacturers. (3) Total kwh required to fuel all additional electric cars in any one month = (32.86m x 617)/4. This is 5,068.655m kwh. (4) One hectare of solar panels typically produces 10,000 kwh in the month of December. Source various solar forums. (5) Total area needed is 5,068.655m / 0.01m kwhs = 507,000 hectares. (6) Total land mass of North Yorkshire = 810,000 hectares. 507/810 = 63%	The Applicant agrees that electricity demand will increase as a result of taking fossil fuels out of cars (among other reasons), and that therefore an unprecedented capacity of new low carbon generation schemes is required. Large-scale solar is one part of the solution. Indeed, **NPS EN-1** states that *"even with major improvements in overall energy efficiency, and increased flexibility in the energy system, demand for electricity is likely to increase significantly over the coming years and could more than double by 2050 as large parts of transport, heating and industry decarbonise by switching from fossil fuels to low carbon electricity"* (**Paragraph 3.3.3**). Government's objectives for the UK energy system are to ensure that supplies always remain secure, reliable, affordable and consistent with meeting the UK's legally binding target to cut GHG emissions to net zero by 2050. **Section 3.8** of the **Statement of Need [APP-214]** describes the Government's Clean Power 2030 Action Plan which sets challenging ranges for the future capacity of operational clean power sources. These include 45-47GW of solar by 2030 and 45-69GW by 2035. Capacity ranges are also included for other clean power sources. Therefore, Government has established that there is a Critical National Priority for developments like the Proposed Development because of the national security, economic, commercial and net zero benefits they deliver, and Paragraph 2.10.2 of NPS EN-3 (2023) confirms that solar is at the heart of the Government's strategy for low-cost decarbonisation of the energy sector.
CLI-07	RR-0745	Climate Change Resilience and Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Respondent stated that a future UK government could ban solar on productive agricultural land, just like the Italian government did in May 2024.	The Applicant's **Statement of Need [APP-214]** provides evidence that an unprecedented capacity of new low-carbon generation Proposed Developments is urgently needed for the UK to meet its legally binding climate change targets. The government has confirmed that solar energy is at the heart of the Clean Power 2030 Mission [NPS EN-3 (2025) Paras 2.10.1 & 2.10.2]. NPS EN-1 establishes an urgent need The Statement of Need confirms that the need for nationally significant low-carbon generation schemes like the Proposed Development is urgent and determines that substantial weight

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				should be given to the meeting that need for the Proposed Development [NPS EN-1 (2023) Para 3.2.69-3.2.107]. NPS EN-3 states that the development of ground mounted solar arrays is not prohibited on BMV agricultural land (paragraph 2.10.22). The Proposed Development qualifies as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) under Sections 14(1)(a), 15(1) and 15(2) of the PA 2008 (Ref 1) as it is an onshore generating station in England with a generating capacity exceeding 100 MW (AC). The designated National Policy Statements (NPSs) for Energy EN1, EN3 and EN5 apply to this examination and to decision making relating to this Application. The Examining Authority (ExA) must consider the Proposed Development in accordance with the previously mentioned NPSs and any other applicable policy or considerations the ExA deem to be important and relevant. The PA2008 makes it clear that, in making a decision, the relevant Secretary of State (SoS) *"must decide the application in accordance with any relevant NPS"* (s104(3)), subject to certain provisos including those related to legal or treaty obligations. The SoS is entitled to disregard any representations that relate to the merits of the designated NPS. The designated NPSs do not impose a restriction on the development of solar PV panels on agricultural land. However, they set out a framework of policy principles to guide site selection, including the need to consider the availability of alternative sites, the use of previously developed land where possible, and avoiding, minimising and mitigating adverse effects on land use. This includes avoiding impacts on best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land. EN-1 and EN-3 recognise that it may not always be possible to avoid locating solar developments on agricultural land, and that decisions should be made in consideration of balancing land uses against the urgent need for new energy infrastructure. This includes having regard to grid connection points, environmental constraints, and the feasibility of alternative locations. In line with the policy approach detailed in the NPSs, the Applicant has therefore sought, where practicable, to avoid areas of highest agricultural land value to minimise effects on agricultural land. The Applicant also needed to balance the need to locate the Proposed Development on a Site of

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				sufficient size and within proximity to an appropriate grid connection, without giving rise to unacceptable environmental effects. In this instance, the Applicant reviewed available land within 25 km of the Point of Connection (POC) at Monk Fryston Substation, as detailed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-041]**. Therefore, whilst the potential for future changes to policy with future UK governments is uncertain and carries limited weight in the determination of this application, the Applicant has located the Proposed Development on agricultural land in line with the currently policy framework, notably the designated NPSs.
CLI-08	RR-0853	Climate Change Resilience and Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Respondent stated that the proposals fail to meet Emerging Local Plan Climate Policy (SP3, p.34), stating that Net zero carbon required and no whole-life carbon assessment has been provided.	The emerging Selby Local Plan 2024 is no longer considered relevant policy, given the Plan is no longer progressing and will be replaced by the future North Yorkshire Local Plan. However, the Proposed Development is in alignment with adopted local and national policies concerned with climate change, as addressed in the **Planning Statement [APP-207]** and **Policy Compliance Document [APP-224]**. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Greenhouse Gas Emissions [APP-047]** assesses the greenhouse gas emissions for the life cycle of the Proposed Development, with the detailed assessment included in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment [APP-166]**.

Climate Change Resilience and Greenhouse Gas Emissions – Detailed

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Climate Change Resilience and Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Detailed				
CLI-09	RR-0145, RR-0074	Climate Change Resilience and Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Respondents expressed concern that the government is simultaneously funding Solar Radiation Modification (sun-dimming) research which could reduce solar panel efficiency by up to 12%, and questioned whether it is appropriate to sacrifice agricultural land and rural roads for a technology the state is actively working to make less effective.	The Applicant first notes that it is not the role of individual planning decisions to question national policy. This has been consistently emphasised in Court decisions. The national policy which exists is the National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 which recognises new solar development as a critical national priority. That is the policy against which the Proposed Development is judged, and it is that which the Secretary of State will take into account. The **Statement of Need [APP-214]** sets out in full the need and justification for the Proposed Development. The Statement of Need describes the Government's policy that large capacities of low carbon generation will be required to meet increased demand and replace output from retiring (fossil fuel) plants, and that *"a secure, reliable, affordable, Net Zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar"*. The Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (December 2025) states that that the UK has huge potential for solar power and that solar energy is at the heart of the Clean Power 2030 Mission [Paras 3.3.23 & 3.3.24]. NPS EN-1 further confirms that there is an urgent need for renewable energy generation that is a critical national priority [para 3.3.62 & 3.3.63]. The Proposed Development therefore directly contributes towards meeting the national net zero and energy security requirements for the near future.
CLI-10	RR-1092	Climate Change Resilience and Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Respondent expressed concern that the BESS would not address the seasonal mismatch between peak solar generation and periods of higher winter energy demand.	**Section 9.5** of the **Statement of Need [APP-214]** illustrates the collective capability of a future national generation portfolio of solar, wind and zero-carbon baseload generation in meeting national demand for electricity in Great Britain throughout a year on a month average basis. **Section 7.12** of the **Statement of Need [APP-214]** explains that the BESS included as associated development to the Proposed Development would support the operation of the main solar scheme through its operational life by helping to balance supply and demand on a shorter-term basis by storing abundant generation and exporting it to the grid when it is needed.
CLI-11	RR-1092	Climate Change Resilience	Respondent stated that the energy system already experiences imbalance issues, including periods where consumers are incentivised to use excess electricity and	The Applicant agrees that consumer flexibility, as described in this representation, is an important growing way of matching demand for energy to times when renewable supplies are high.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
		and Greenhouse Gas Emissions	wind generation is curtailed, and they stated the proposal would contribute further to this inefficiency by overproducing when not needed and underproducing when demand is highest.	However, **NPS EN-1** clarifies that *"New generating plants can deliver a low carbon and reliable system, but we need the increased flexibility provided by new storage and interconnectors (as well as consumer led flexibility …) to reduce costs in support of an affordable supply"* (**Paragraph 3.3.5**). **Section 7.12** of the **Statement of Need [APP-214]** explains that the BESS included as associated development to the Proposed Development would support the operation of the main solar scheme through its operational life by helping to balance supply and demand on a shorter-term basis by storing abundant generation and exporting it to the grid when it is needed.
CLI-12	RR-1092	Climate Change Resilience and Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Respondent stated that they do not consider the proposal to meet the definition of "base load," which they stated should provide continuous, dispatchable power at full output when required, citing nuclear, biomass, and gas-fired stations as examples. They stated that a system with significantly variable output, including seasonal lows of around 20%, does not meet this standard.	**NPS EN-1** provides that the Government's view is that *"a secure, reliable, affordable, net zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar"* (**Paragraph 3.3.23**). The Government is supportive of large-scale solar schemes, stating in **NPS EN-3** that solar power is *"a cost-effective, versatile, and effective technology"* (**Paragraph 2.10.1**), that it is *"at the heart of our Clean Power 2030 Mission"* (**Paragraph 2.10.2**), that they can be built quickly and are the cheapest form of electricity generation (**Paragraphs 2.10.5 and 2.10.6**). **Section 3.8** of the **Statement of Need [APP-214]** describes the Clean Power 2030 Action Plan and the capacity ranges for solar and other low-carbon technologies, including baseload and flexible technologies, which will support the Government's Clean Power 2030 Mission. This indicates that government is encouraging a wide mix of renewable, low-carbon baseload, low-carbon dispatchable and flexible technologies to come forward with urgency. Further information on each of the major technology types is included in **Chapter 6** of the **Statement of Need [APP-214]**. The Statement of Need concludes, in Section 6.12, that a large capacity of many low carbon technologies is required to meet the Government's energy objectives and a diverse mix of low carbon generation will be required to meet national decarbonisation targets.
CLI-13	RR-0969	Climate Change Resilience and Greenhouse	Respondent stated that the Proposed Development would not significantly contribute to tackling climate change, adding that a collective international effort would be required.	**Chapter 3** of the **Statement of Need [APP-214]** describes the UK Government's plans for achieving Net Zero by 2050 as part of its leading role in supporting global decarbonisation through the Paris Agreement commitments and other instruments.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
		Gas Emissions		As a result of its commitments to the Paris Agreement, in June 2019 the UK became the first major economy to legislate for a 2050 net zero GHG emissions target through the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019. Decarbonisation is therefore a UK legal requirement. The government's objectives are to ensure the supply of energy to the national energy system always remains secure, reliable, affordable, and consistent with meeting legally binding greenhouse emissions reductions. Light Valley Solar will contribute to this. NPS EN-1 states that the UK government has identified that meeting the UK's legal targets will require a step change in the decarbonisation of the UK's energy system [Para 2.3.3], and large-scale ground mounted solar, such as the Proposed Development has an important role to play in the UK.

2.10 Community Benefits

Community Benefits

Reference Comment	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Community Benefits				
COM-01	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-0834, RR-0101, RR-0910, RR-0588, RR-0496, RR-0358, RR-0615, RR-1035, RR-0057, RR-0255, RR-1092, RR-0949, RR-0343, RR-0945, RR-1410, RR-0049, RR-1321, RR-0214, RR-0297, RR-1392, RR-0268, RR-0864, RR-0237, RR-0762, RR-0237, RR-0827, RR-1048, RR-0062, RR-0628, RR-0417, RR-0962, RR-1284, RR-1405, RR-0750, RR-1222, RR-0182, RR-1369, RR-1324, RR-0612, RR-0983, RR-0707, RR-1225, RR-1001, RR-0277, RR-1457, RR-0142, RR-0897, RR-1374, RR-0577, RR-0153, RR-0155, RR-1336, RR-1006, RR-0290, RR-0229, RR-0005, RR-0737, RR-0215, RR-0146, RR-0619, RR-0486, RR-0363, RR-1370, RR-0966, RR-1127, RR-1319, RR-0211, RR-0049, RR-0214, RR-0334, RR-0195, RR-0236, RR-1151, RR-0060, RR-0827, RR-0628, RR-0937, RR-0765, RR-0381, RR-1325, RR-1118, RR-0293, RR-1303, RR-0629, RR-0059, RR-0170, RR-0736, RR-0878, RR-1192, RR-0054, RR-0885, RR-1410	Community Benefits	Respondents expressed the view that the Proposed Development would provide **no meaningful benefit** to the local community, or that the proposed benefits would be insufficient. Some respondents also expressed **scepticism** as to whether any community benefits would in practice be delivered and that proposals for community benefit funding are bribes, or ways to 'buy off' the community.	The Applicant is committed to providing a Community Benefit Fund to allow for community-driven benefits that are not necessarily associated with the Proposed Development itself as we believe that the communities closest to the project should benefit from it. As a low-cost form of generation, if the project is connected to the electricity transmission network, it will contribute to lowering the cost of energy for all, including locally. During the development of the project proposals, the Applicant consulted on community benefits and will continue to engage locally to shape a Community Benefit Fund that works for the community. Furthermore, the **Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan (oSSCEP) [APP-202]** anticipates that the estimated labour requirement for the Proposed Development over the projected construction period is equivalent to a gross 385 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) employees per annum. In addition to the direct construction employment generated by the Proposed Development itself, there would be an increase in local employment arising from both indirect and induced effects of the construction activity. Employment growth is anticipated to arise locally through suppliers to the construction process as a result of additional spending within local supply chains. Other benefits of the Proposed Development include: • Connectivity and public access improvements, including enhancements to the local PRoW network and the creation of additional permissive paths. • Local recruitment and procurement and supporting local education and skills uplifting, including promotion of apprenticeship Proposed Developments, workforce training, and STEM education initiatives. • Ecological and landscape enhancement, including creating additional areas of hedgerow (including infilling existing hedgerow), grassland, woodland planting. • Significant BNG contributions and habitat creation/ enhancement, including commuting corridors through

Reference Comment	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				the development and wetland areas for ground nesting birds. • Retention and enhancement for watercourses, ponds and ditches, including providing connectivity for species such as otter, water vole, and amphibians. • Installation of habitat features, including bat and bird boxes. These benefits are set out in more detail in the **Planning Statement [APP-207]**.
COM-02	RR-0305	Community Benefits	Respondent expressed they believe the Proposed Development will provide meaningful benefit to the community.	The Applicant welcomes this comment.
	RR-0983	Community Benefits	Respondent requested community benefits should be guaranteed in law to avoid deprioritisation if Proposed Development is sold.	The Community Benefit Fund sits separately from the DCO process as community benefits do not form part of the planning balance. 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. The proposed fund will provide funding for local organisations and/or initiatives based on feedback received from the community, both as part of the pre-application consultation and on an ongoing basis if the Proposed Development is approved and begins operations. If the Proposed Development is consented, the Applicant will develop a formal mechanism for managing community benefit funding as part of its pre-construction activities. This will be informed by comments from community stakeholders. The Applicant's approach is aligned with the approach on made DCOs, including West Burton, Cottam and Gate Burton. This allows for the most appropriate mechanism for the management of the community fund to be set up and secured once the Proposed Development is being progressed.
COM-03	RR-0546, RR-1160, RR-0334	Community Benefits	Respondents requested incentives for residents to get solar panels on their rooftops.	The Applicant notes this suggestion and will consider this alongside feedback already received on potential uses of the Community Benefit Fund.
COM-04	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-0983, RR-1314, RR-1387, RR-0139	Community Benefits	Respondents requested cheaper electricity for locals. This includes requests for compensation for villages nearby and for all residents within a 2 miles radius.	Electricity generated from the Proposed Development will be exported to the National Electricity Transmission System (NETS), and provided to consumers via third party electricity companies, which means that the Applicant cannot commit to the provision of cheaper electricity prices for the specific community surrounding the site. However, building large quantities of renewable generation in the UK is anticipated to

Reference Comment	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				keep consumer costs down by capturing and storing energy when it is abundant (therefore cheap) and releasing it when it is needed. Solar remains one of the cheapest forms of electricity generation available with current technologies. Regarding compensation, in the event that losses can be demonstrated then compensation may be payable in circumstances where properties meet the criteria set out in legislation relating to compulsory acquisition and the compensation code. The Applicant has submitted the **Book of Reference [APP-022]** which includes persons who may be entitled to compensation if the Development Consent Order is granted and the Proposed Development developed. Under Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973, property owners (Category 3) are eligible to claim compensation for any physical impacts from the operation of the Proposed Development, such as noise and vibration. However, compensation is not available for loss of value due to visual impacts or diminished views—this is consistent with established planning law. Separate from the above circumstances, the Applicant does not intend to provide 'general' financial compensation to residents, however, the Applicant is committed to providing a community benefit fund.
	RR-0294	Community Benefits	Respondent requested cycling infrastructure, permissive paths be created for outlying villages around York and Selby.	The Applicant can confirm that approximately 8 km (5 miles) of new permissive paths will be created (some of which are accessible to cyclists), as shown on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** and secured in the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**, improving access for cyclists and creating new loops and new links between existing routes. The **Outline PRoW Management Plan (oPROWMP) [APP-199]** provides a framework for the management of cycling as well as walking and horse riding and other public access routes throughout the Site. The key objective is to ensure safety at all times throughout the Proposed Development's construction, operational and decommissioning phases, with the same applying to permissive paths during the operational phase. Once in place, the Community Benefit Fund will provide funding for local organisations and/or initiatives based on feedback received from the community. This could include funding groups to develop rights of way or additional permissive paths in the area.

2.11 Construction and Decommissioning

Construction and Decommissioning – General Comments

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	Construction and Decommissioning - General Comments			
CON-01	RR-0088, RR-0129, RR-1059, RR-0834, RR-1271, RR-1121, RR-1201, RR-1403, RR-0910, RR-1424, RR-0599, RR-1220, RR-1054, RR-1060, RR-0661, RR-1277, RR-0956, RR-0406, RR-0346, RR-1090, RR-1094, RR-0178, RR-0521, RR-0457, RR-0308, RR-0498, RR-0301, RR-0949, RR-0343, RR-0670, RR-1066, RR-0334, RR-1126, RR-0773, RR-0992, RR-1115, RR-0745, RR-0576, RR-0865, RR-1237, RR-0627, RR-0650, RR-0279, RR-0930, RR-1073, RR-0369, RR-0235, RR-1172, RR-0590, RR-0470, RR-0841, RR-0591, RR-0969, RR-1457, RR-0520, RR-1230, RR-0919, RR-0579, RR-1244, RR-1027, RR-1051, RR-0784, RR-0239, RR-1372, RR-0215, RR-0146, RR-1406, RR-1120, RR-0743, RR-0244, RR-1320, RR-0909, RR-0026, RR-0756, RR-0921, RR-1229, RR-1443, RR-0745, RR-0010, RR-0066, RR-0502, RR-1337, RR-0381, RR-1013, RR-1124, RR-0426, RR-1431, RR-1459, RR-0950, RR-0469, RR-1425, RR-1327, RR-1339, RR-0136, RR-0272, RR-0967, RR-0999, RR-0198, RR-1282, RR-0303	Construction and Decommissioning	Some respondents expressed general concern about potential **disruption during the construction phase** of the Proposed Development.	The likely significant effects of the Proposed Development during the construction phase are assessed throughout the **ES [APP-038 to APP-190]**, including effects on traffic and transport, noise and vibration, air quality, landscape and visual amenity, ecology, and local communities. Furthermore, **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [APP-040]** sets out the construction program for the Proposed Development. As part of the assessment, appropriate mitigation measures have been developed and are incorporated into the Proposed Development. Measures to limit disruption during construction are secured in the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** and the **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]**. Requirement 12 in Schedule 2 to the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]** secures that a CEMP must be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority, and that the CEMP must be substantially in accordance with the **Outline CEMP [APP-192].** All construction works must be carried out in accordance with the approved CEMP.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
CON-02	RR-0857, RR-1201, RR-1403, RR-0037, RR-0842, RR-1091, RR-0008, RR-0849, RR-0226, RR-0754, RR-1397, RR-0406, RR-1176, RR-0748, RR-0498, RR-1105, RR-0049, RR-1169, RR-1321, RR-1162, RR-1107, RR-1347, RR-0568, RR-0818, RR-0847, RR-0549, RR-0906, RR-0816, RR-1283, RR-0369, RR-0713, RR-1324, RR-1109, RR-0425, RR-0086, RR-1231, RR-0867, RR-0759, RR-0841, RR-0718, RR-1085, RR-1245, RR-1207, RR-1457, RR-0478, RR-0328, RR-0974, RR-0395, RR-1051, RR-0161, RR-0153, RR-0106, RR-0542, RR-0907, RR-0461, RR-1246, RR-0461, RR-0146, RR-0145, RR-0401, RR-0934, RR-0074, RR-0105, RR-1099, RR-1370, RR-0988, RR-0966, RR-0947, RR-1132, RR-1229, RR-0449, RR-0766, RR-0049, RR-0334, RR-1347, RR-0236, RR-0060, RR-1365, RR-0381, RR-1053, RR-0426, RR-1253, RR-0950, RR-1123, RR-0469, RR-0531, RR-0464, RR-0168, RR-0274, RR-0942, RR-0853, RR-0303	Construction and Decommissioning	Some respondents expressed scepticism that the **land would be returned to its original use**, including agricultural use, following decommissioning of the Proposed Development. Some respondents suggested that this concern is heightened by the potential for the Proposed Development to change ownership before the decommissioning phase. Some respondents also stated that the land should not be classified as brownfield following decommissioning.	The effects of decommissioning on soils and agricultural land are assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils [APP-043]**. As stated in this chapter, as well as in Section 2 of the **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) [APP-194]** which is secured under Schedule 2, Requirement 19 of the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**, all land will be returned to its original use and condition as far as practicable and returned to the landowner. Should the Proposed Development change ownership before the decommissioning phase, any new owner remains bound by the commitments and obligations set out within the DCO and associated management plans, including in relation to decommissioning. The effect on agricultural land quality at decommissioning would be influenced by the extent of disturbance caused by the removal of the Solar PV Panels, for example the presence and dimensions of leftover voids or the depth of the remaining underground cables. The effects on soils are likely to be less than those reported for the construction phase, subject to relevant good practice measures in place at the time of decommissioning managed through soil management measures in the detailed DEMP(s), which would reflect relevant principles of the **oSRMP [APP-203].** Currently, the most environmentally acceptable option is to leave the cables in-situ, although the cables could be removed by excavating at regular intervals and pulling the cable through to the extraction point, thus avoiding the need to excavate the entire cable trench. In either case, the disturbance to the land and soil would be less than that likely to occur during the construction phase. Built aspects of the Proposed Development such as the BESS Area and substations are also subject to the proposal to return the land to its original use and condition. Measures to manage decommissioning and reinstatement are set out in the **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) [APP-194]** which has been submitted as part of the DCO Application. Decommissioning will include robust methodologies and control points to avoid

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				contamination of the underlying land with physical or chemical contaminants and will be applied in conjunction with soil resource management measures to be set out within the final DEMP. A detailed Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan will be prepared substantially in accordance with the **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) [APP-194]** and must be submitted to and approved by the relevant local planning authority prior to the commencement of decommissioning. This is secured through Requirement 19 in Schedule 2 of the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**. In addition, the Applicant is seeking a time-limited consent for the Proposed Development to have an operational period of up to 60 years, with decommissioning to take place following cessation of operation. This is secured by Requirement 19 in Schedule 2 of the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**. The Applicant confirms that none of the land will be considered brownfield automatically after decommissioning. The expectation is that the land will return to farming, but the Applicant cannot dictate what will happen to the land post-decommissioning when the Applicant no longer has an interest in the land. However, any proposal taken forward by a landowner after decommissioning would be seen in the context that the lawful use, post-solar, would be the land use that is currently taking place on that land.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
CON-03	RR-0129, RR-0599, RR-1090, RR-0144, RR-0976, RR-0104, RR-1115, RR-0568, RR-0778, RR-0505, RR-0201, RR-0279, RR-1003, RR-1290, RR-0086, RR-0803, RR-1378, RR-0841, RR-0520, RR-0919, RR-1049, RR-0974, RR-1027, RR-0943, RR-0276, RR-0968, RR-0997, RR-0542, RR-0145, RR-0074, RR-1185, RR-0770, RR-0283, RR-0017, RR-0136, RR-0314, RR-0647, RR-0967, RR-0999	Construction and Decommissioning	Respondents expressed concerns about the **construction of the cable route**. In particular, some respondents raised questions about the proposed width and depth of the cable trench.	The construction of the cable route has been assessed throughout the **Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-038 to APP-190]**, which considers the effects associated with these works. The ES assesses the cable route within defined maximum parameters, including limits on working width and assumed trench dimensions (as identified within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [APP-040]** and, **where relevant, the Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]**) to ensure that a reasonable worst-case scenario is assessed. **ES Volume 2, Appendix 2.1: Cable Route Method Statement [APP-147]** outlines further information on how the Cable Route Corridor is to be constructed including illustrative cross sections of typical cable trenches and HDD techniques. The design commitments that have been made are secured within Schedule 2, Requirement 4 of the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**. The detailed design and construction of the cable route will be undertaken within the parameters authorised by the DCO. Measures to manage and minimise construction effects, including reinstatement of land following installation, are set out in the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]**. The land use for the Cable Route Corridor would be temporary in nature; once the cable has been laid underground and completed, the land will be reinstated to its previous state and use, allowing for activities such as farming to continue. Requirement 12 in Schedule 2 to the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]** secures that prior to construction, a CEMP must be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority, and that the CEMP must be substantially in accordance with the **Outline CEMP [APP-192].** All construction works will be carried out in accordance with the approved CEMP.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
CON-04	RR-0037, RR-0842, RR-0599, RR-1208, RR-0255, RR-0949, RR-1105, RR-1321, RR-1107, RR-0352, RR-0713, RR-1324, RR-1245, RR-1457, RR-0620, RR-1051, RR-0461, RR-1246, RR-0145, RR-0074, RR-0966, RR-1461, RR-1365, RR-0381, RR-0426, RR-0770, RR-0950, RR-0878, RR-1206, RR-0303	Construction and Decommissioning	Some respondents requested further information about how decommissioning of the Proposed Development would be **funded** and who would be **responsible for delivering it**. Some respondents asked whether funds would be set aside to cover decommissioning costs in the event that the Applicant were to become insolvent. A number of respondents also expressed concern that the cost of decommissioning could fall to taxpayers.	A requirement to decommission the Proposed Development is part of the Development Consent Order (DCO). The requirement to decommission the Proposed Development would sit with the owner at the time of decommissioning. Failing to comply with Requirement 19 would be a criminal offence. Decommissioning is also covered in agreements with landowners, which includes decommissioning securities to cover the cost of decommissioning in the event of any breach by the Applicant or in the event of the insolvency of the Applicant. The amount of such decommissioning security is regularly re-valued throughout the lifecycle of the Proposed Development and topped up if necessary. Decommissioning is secured through Requirement 19 in Schedule 2 of the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**.
CON-05	RR-0442, RR-0285, RR-1119, RR-0052, RR-0201, RR-1286, RR-1242, RR-0279, RR-0816, RR-0352, RR-0369, RR-0053, RR-1457, RR-0080, RR-0290, RR-0145, RR-0996, RR-0074, RR-0105, RR-1099, RR-1370, RR-0875, RR-0950, RR-0469, RR-0531, RR-0274, RR-0853, RR-1282	Construction and Decommissioning	Respondents raised concerns about the proposed 60-year operational lifetime of the Proposed Development and / or broader concerns regarding the length of time the Proposed Development would remain in place. Some respondents suggested that **60 years is too long or not really temporary.**	The operation and maintenance of the Proposed Development have been assessed throughout the **Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-038 to APP-190]** which considers operational effects, including general maintenance and replacements, across relevant topic areas. As part of the assessment, appropriate mitigation measures are incorporated into the Proposed Development and secured through the DCO and associated management plans. The Applicant is seeking a time-limited consent for the Proposed Development to have an operational period of up to 60 years with decommissioning to take place following cessation of operation. As such, relevant topics in the ES have assessed impacts as temporary, but long-term. The ES considers operational effects to be permanent in aspects of the assessment, where it is appropriate to do so in line with topic guidance. Specifically, **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils [APP-043]** accounts for potential permanent loss of soils as an agricultural resource in the locations of the BESS, substations, accesses and for Conversion Units.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
CON-06	RR-0857, RR-0573, RR-0751, RR-0834, RR-0346, RR-0949, RR-1016, RR-1107, RR-0376, RR-0201, RR-1369, RR-0076, RR-0142, RR-1244, RR-0033, RR-0323, RR-0215, RR-0105, RR-0026, RR-0958, RR-1229, RR-0950, RR-1425, RR-0885, RR-1249	Construction and Decommissioning	Some respondents expressed general concern about the **operation and maintenance** phase of the Proposed Development, including how it would be managed over its lifetime.	The operation and maintenance of the Proposed Development have been assessed throughout the **Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-038 to APP-190]** which considers operational effects, including general maintenance and replacements, across relevant topic areas. As part of the assessment, appropriate mitigation measures are incorporated into the Proposed Development and secured through the DCO and associated management plans. The framework for managing environmental effects during the operational phase is set out in the **Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [APP-193]** which identifies how commitments made in the **ES [APP-038 to APP-190]** will be implemented during operation and maintenance, including control of lighting, operational traffic, noise, air quality, landscape and ecological management, soil protection, water management and community liaison. It also sets out monitoring and reporting arrangements to ensure mitigation measures remain effective throughout the operational life of the Proposed Development. The detailed Operational Environmental Management Plan will be prepared substantially in accordance with the **Outline OEMP** and must be submitted to and approved by the relevant local planning authority prior to the commencement of operation. This requirement is secured through Requirement 13 of the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**.
CON-07	RR-1059, RR-0573, RR-0751, RR-0834, RR-1201, RR-1403, RR-0979, RR-0037, RR-0764, RR-0003, RR-1449, RR-1107, RR-0762, RR-0282, RR-0201, RR-1369, RR-0925, RR-0735, RR-0735, RR-0563, RR-1461, RR-1365, RR-0636, RR-0509, RR-1059, RR-0949, RR-1016, RR-0003, RR-1107, RR-0820, RR-1369, RR-0033, RR-0923, RR-1461, RR-0502, RR-0250, RR-0950, RR-0636, RR-0571, RR-0857, RR-1065	Construction and Decommissioning	Some respondents expressed scepticism that solar panels and other components of the Proposed Development would be appropriately **recycled** at the end of their operational life.	The **Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [APP-193]**, secured by Schedule 2, Requirement 13 of the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**, sets out the commitment of the Applicant to maximise recycling and reuse of Proposed Development components at the end of their life. Section 2.9 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [APP-040]** sets out that waste generated at decommissioning would primarily be from the Solar PV Sites, including electrical components, the Solar PV Mounting Structures, and fencing. The components will be recycled or disposed of in accordance with good practice and processes at that time. Any piles will be removed. Waste would be managed in accordance with the relevant legislation and guidance at the time and in accordance with the detailed plans developed pursuant to the **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) [APP-194]**.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Up to 99% of materials in a solar PV module are recyclable, with the number of solar panel recycling plants in the UK increasing. Companies which are aligned with the Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment Recycling (WEEE) Regulations 2013 such as Recycle solar in Scunthorpe, Solar Recycling Solutions in Dartford and Waste Experts based in Huddersfield are all Approved Authorised Treatment Facilities for solar waste. In addition, a detailed Materials and Waste Management Plan (MWMP) will be prepared alongside the detailed DEMP(s) setting out how measures to manage the disposal of waste from the Order Limits may be required in accordance with relevant legislative and policy requirements. The detailed MWMP will ensure waste streams generated during operation are sent to waste recycling and handling facilities that have sufficient capacity to handle waste arisings from the Proposed Development. **An outline MWMP [APP-197]** is included as part of the Application.
CON-08	RR-0834, RR-0903, RR-0774, RR-0842, RR-0297, RR-1324, RR-0502, RR-0950	Construction and Decommissioning	Some respondents expressed general concern about potential **disruption during the decommissioning phase** of the Proposed Development. A number of respondents also requested further information about decommissioning, stating that insufficient detail had been provided.	The decommissioning of the Proposed Development has been assessed within the **Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-038 to APP-190]** which considers the effects associated with decommissioning activities. As part of the assessment, appropriate mitigation measures are incorporated into the Proposed Development. Information on decommissioning activities is provided within the **ES [APP-038 to APP-190]** and within the **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) [APP-194]**. At the end of the Proposed Development's operational life, it would be decommissioned and the land restored to its original use and condition as far as practicable. Decommissioning may take between 24-36 months, however it is possible that decommissioning may take less time, and this will be confirmed in the final DEMP. Decommissioning will involve the removal of all solar infrastructure, including the solar PV modules, and BESS and all associated infrastructure (including On-Site Cabling) to 1.2 m bgl; to be recycled or disposed of in accordance with good practice and processes at that time. Any piles would be removed. The mode of dealing with Interconnecting Cables and Grid Connection Cables during decommissioning will be dependent upon government

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				policy and good practice at that time. Currently, the most environmentally acceptable option is considered to be leaving the cables in situ, as this avoids disturbance to overlying land and habitats and to neighbouring communities. All above ground infrastructure will be removed and the land restored to its current use and to the landowner. Post decommissioning it is up to the landowners will choose how the land is to be used and managed. It is likely that established habitats such as hedgerows and woodland would be retained. Measures to manage and minimise disruption during decommissioning are set out in the **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) [APP-194]**. This explains how mitigation measures identified in the **ES [APP-038 to APP-190]** will be implemented during decommissioning and includes controls for working hours, noise, lighting, traffic management, pollution prevention, waste management and community liaison. The **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) [APP-194]** also confirms that decommissioning activities will be undertaken in phases over an anticipated 24–36-month period, with measures to coordinate traffic movements, control noise and vibration in accordance with best practicable means and manage temporary lighting to minimise effects on nearby receptors. A detailed Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan will be prepared substantially in accordance with the **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) [APP-194]** and must be submitted to and approved by the relevant local planning authority prior to the commencement of decommissioning. This is secured through Requirement 19 in Schedule 2 of the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**.
CON-09	RR-0857, RR-0037, RR-1457, RR-0314	Construction and Decommissioning	Some respondents expressed general **support for the restoration of the land** to its original use following decommissioning. Some respondents also emphasised that the land should be returned to its original condition, including agricultural use where applicable.	The Applicant recognises the importance of restoring the land following decommissioning and is committed to ensuring that appropriate measures are secured to achieve this. The Applicant welcomes the support received in this regard. At the end of the Proposed Development's operational life, all Solar PV Sites would be decommissioned and the land restored to its original use and condition as far as practicable.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				There will be opportunities for the retention of a range of biodiversity improvements, including established habitats, hedgerows and woodland, beyond the decommissioning of the Proposed Development, ultimately enhancing the ecological value of the area. Measures to manage decommissioning and reinstatement are set out in the **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) [APP-194]** which has been submitted as part of the DCO Application. Decommissioning will include robust methodologies and control points to avoid contamination of the underlying land with physical or chemical contaminants and will be applied in conjunction with soil resource management measures to be set out within the final DEMP. A detailed Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan will be prepared substantially in accordance with the **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) [APP-194]** and must be submitted to and approved by the relevant local planning authority prior to the commencement of decommissioning. This is secured through Requirement 19 in Schedule 2 of the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**. In addition, the Applicant is seeking a time-limited consent for the Proposed Development to have an operational period of 60 years, with decommissioning to take place following cessation of operation. This is secured by Requirement 19 in Schedule 2 of the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**. The expectation is that the land will return to farming, but the Applicant cannot dictate what will happen to the land post-decommissioning when the Applicant no longer has an interest in the land. However, any proposal taken forward by a landowner after decommissioning would be seen in the context that the lawful use, post-solar, would be the land use that is currently taking place on that land.
CON-10	RR-0037	Construction and Decommissioning	Respondent has expressed concern about the use of concrete, including removing it at the end of operational life.	As set out within **Environmental Statement (ES) Volume 1, Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [APP-040]**, when the operation and maintenance phase ends, the Solar Development Sites would be decommissioned and the land returned to its original use and condition as far as practicable and returned to the landowner.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				It is assumed that the process of decommissioning would involve the removal of all solar infrastructure, including the solar PV modules, and BESS and all associated infrastructure (including On-Site Cabling) to 1.2 m bgl; to be recycled or disposed of in accordance with good practice and processes at that time. This includes removal of concreted areas. The safe use of concrete will be controlled by the measures included in the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** during construction and the **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) [APP-194]** and its use will be limited primarily to building and solar equipment foundations and concrete feet where required. At the end of its service life, concrete can be recycled by crushing it to recover the aggregate, which can then be reused in new concrete or as sub-base, fill, and hardcore materials, with the majority of concrete demolition waste in the UK being successfully recycled through established processing and reuse networks.
CON-11	RR-1424	Construction and Decommissioning	Respondent stated that the developer has not provided enough information regarding the impacts of construction in the short and long term.	Construction phase information is included within Section 2.7 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [APP-040]** including an indicative construction programme. Each technical chapter (**ES Volume 1, Chapter 5 [APP-043]** to **Chapter 16 [APP-054]**) assesses the likely significant effects during the construction of the Proposed Development.
CON-12	RR-0352	Construction and Decommissioning	Respondent asked if the underground cables would be removed as part of decommissioning.	Decommissioning will involve the removal of all solar infrastructure, including the solar PV modules, and BESS and all associated infrastructure (including On-Site Cabling) to 1.2 m bgl; to be recycled or disposed of in accordance with good practice and processes at that time. The mode of dealing with Interconnecting Cables and Grid Connection Cables during decommissioning will be dependent upon government policy and good practice at that time. Currently, the most environmentally acceptable option is considered to be leaving the cables in situ, as this avoids disturbance to overlying land and habitats and to neighbouring communities.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
CON-13	RR-1112	Construction and Decommissioning	Respondent expressed concern that no details exist on cost, both economical and environmental of maintenance and final dismantling of the Proposed Development.	The Applicant acknowledges comments regarding the cost effectiveness and profitability of the Proposed Development. However, it is important to clarify that Light Valley Solar is a privately financed development. All financial risks associated with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Proposed Development, including those related to the cable route, are borne entirely by the developer. The commercial viability of the Proposed Development has been assessed as part of the developer's investment decision, including the length of the cable and associated infrastructure. The **Funding Statement [APP-021]** submitted with the DCO application demonstrates that the Proposed Development is financially viable and adequately funded to deliver the Proposed Development in full. The operation and maintenance of the Proposed Development have been assessed throughout the **ES [APP-038 to APP-190] which** considers operational effects, including general maintenance and replacements, across relevant topic areas. As part of the assessment, appropriate mitigation measures are incorporated into the Proposed Development and secured through the DCO and associated management plans.

Construction and Decommissioning – Detailed

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Construction and Decommissioning - Detailed				
CON-14	RR-0251, RR-0802, RR-0515, RR-0847, RR-0725, RR-0404	Construction and Decommissioning	Respondents expressed concern about cable route construction disruption to Wistow.	The **Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-038 to APP-190]** identifies the parameters used for the environmental impact assessment within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [APP-040]**, including those associated with constructing the cable route. The Cable Route Corridor has been assessed by each technical **ES chapter [APP-043 to APP-054]**. Following the implementation of mitigation, significant effects associated with impact to visual receptors, public rights of way, equestrian facilities, tree and hedgerows losses and soil resources are limited to the construction of the Cable Route Corridor and considered temporary. Where necessary and appropriate, the technical chapter also sets out mitigation measures relevant to the Cable Route Corridor that would be implemented as part of the Proposed Development to address the effects identified. These include optimally locating the cable trenches during detailed design to minimise impacts to trees and hedgerows; good practice management measures to prevent pollution incidents, minimise effects from noise and vibration, and prevent and minimise dust creation and air pollution to limit effects on local residence and ecology; manage traffic associated with the Proposed Development; and management of interfaces with Public Rights of Way to minimise impacts. Long Lane and Pinfold Hill are identified as routes for Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs) only. These movements would be limited in number and undertaken on an infrequent basis. AIL movements are subject to a separate approval and permitting process, requiring coordination with and approval from the relevant authorities, including North Yorkshire Council and the police, to ensure that they are undertaken safely and with appropriate traffic management measures in place. The Applicant recognises the sensitivity of local receptors in Wistow, including locations such as Pinfold Hill where on-street parking and school-related activity takes place. Construction traffic will be managed to minimise interaction with peak local activity where practicable, and appropriate traffic management

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				measures will be implemented where required to ensure the safe movement of vehicles and protection of road users. The identified construction routes have been selected to utilise the most appropriate roads available, and to avoid where practicable, designated protected areas, height and weight restrictions, and residential areas. The conclusions of the **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network.
CON-15	RR-0066, RR-1337, RR-0911, RR-1306	Construction and Decommissioning	Respondents expressed concern regarding the impact/damage to utilities under roads including electricity, water, telecoms, fibre, and drainage.	Utility assets have been identified in the **Crossing Schedule [PDA-013]**. This document also sets out the likely construction method of how the assets and obstacles will be crossed (i.e. by way of open cut trench, trenchless techniques such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) or a combination of both). Impacts on utility infrastructure will be mitigated through the measures set out in Table 3-14 in the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]**. Requirement 12 in Schedule 2 to the Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017] secures that a CEMP must be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority, and that the CEMP must be substantially in accordance with the **oCEMP [APP-192]**. All construction works must be carried out in accordance with the approved CEMP. The **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]** includes protective provisions for the benefit of the utilities owners / operators to ensure that construction does not cause impact / damage. Construction would also follow relevant standards and best practice for working around utilities.
CON-16	RR-1214	Construction and Decommissioning	**[BoR numbers: 20-035, 20-036, 20-038]**: Respondent expressed specific concerns regarding the construction compound on Fairfield Lane. The compound borders their paddock which includes 17 horses and other livestock. Access is a single track road with water drainage dikes on either side of the road. It is a serious concern that the compound will cause total disruption to the road which is used several times on a daily basis by ourselves and many local people.	Temporary Construction Compounds are necessary for the construction of the Proposed Development to store materials, house facilities for construction workers, and implement mitigation measures to manage construction work such as wheel washing facilities and storage bins for recyclables and other waste. Locating the temporary Construction Compounds within the Proposed Development Site also minimises movement of personnel, equipment and materials between the Site and from offsite facilities if these were used as an alternative.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The construction phase has been assessed by each technical **ES chapter [APP-043 to APP-054]**. The noise assessment makes the worst case assumption that construction activities could take place in the compound areas. Even then, with best practice mitigation measures in place, as described in Section 11.11 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**, no significant adverse effects from construction noise or vibration are expected. Fairfield Lane is identified primarily as a route associated with Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) movements, which are limited in number and undertaken on an infrequent basis. The Applicant recognises the constrained nature of Fairfield Lane, including its single-track configuration and the presence of drainage ditches and adjacent land uses such as paddocks and livestock. Arrangements for transport of the Abnormal Loads will need to be made under licence with the Local Highway Authority to ensure it can be done safely, and to minimise impacts. As such, Fairfield Lane has been identified as requiring localised improvements, shown by the provision of a Highways Improvement Area (HIA) in **ES Volume 2, Figure 1.2: Elements of the Proposed Development [APP-058]**. These movements will therefore be planned and undertaken in a controlled manner. Measures to manage and minimise construction effects are set out in the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** and the **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]**. Measures will be included to control vehicle speeds and ensure safe interaction with other road users, including those accessing adjacent land and properties. Given the presence of livestock and other sensitive land uses in this location, the final CTMP and CEMP will take account of these constraints to ensure that movements are undertaken in a controlled and proportionate manner, minimising disruption to both the highway and surrounding land uses. Requirement 12 in Schedule 2 to the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]** secures that a CEMP must be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority, and that the CEMP must be substantially in

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				accordance with the **oCEMP [APP-192]**. All construction works must be carried out in accordance with the approved CEMP. The Applicant has made a number of commitments within the outline **CEMP [APP-192]**, **PRoWMP [APP-199]** and **CTMP [APP-201]** to engage with the community and local parties, including in respect of effects to land drainage and use of tracks, that would be able to be applied to Fairfield Lane. The Applicant has engaged with representatives of the respondent regarding their concerns relating to the location of a construction compound and met with a representative on 12th January 2026. A discussion was had regarding possible mitigation measures which could be implemented and the representative was satisfied further discussions were to be had following detailed design. Should the respondent have further queries or concerns relating to the siting of the compound, construction or mitigation measures, the Applicant welcomes the opportunity to continue to engage with them.
CON-17	RR-0104	Construction and Decommissioning	Respondent queried how the cable route will cross the River Ouse and the A19.	Trenchless solutions, for example horizontal directional drilling (HDD) are proposed for the crossing of the River Ouse and the A19. The **Crossings Schedule [APP-191]** and **ES Volume 2, Figure 2.5: Avoidance Areas [APP-062]** illustrate the areas where trenchless crossings have been committed to. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [APP-040]** incudes further information on maximum cabling parameters including for HDD. **ES Volume 2, Appendix 2.1: Cable Route Method Statement [APP-147]** outlines further information on how the Cable Route Corridor is to be constructed including an illustrative cross section for HDD installation.
CON-18	RR-0097	Construction and Decommissioning	Respondent queried where construction workers would park?	Parking will be provided within the temporary construction compounds and laydown areas. Temporary construction compound and laydown area details are described within Section 2.7 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [APP-040]** and the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]**. Requirement 12 in Schedule 2 to the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]** secures that a CEMP must be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority, and that the CEMP must be substantially in accordance with the **oCEMP [APP-192]**. All construction works

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				must be carried out in accordance with the approved CEMP. As included within the **oCEMP [AP-192]** contractors and visitors will be advised that parking facilities will be provided on-site in advance of visiting the Proposed Development and that they should not park on-street.
CON-19	RR-1457	Construction and Decommissioning	Respondent stated that the application documents lack detailed information regarding the construction phase despite its 3-year length.	Construction phase information is included within Section 2.7 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [APP-040]** including an indicative construction programme. Each technical chapter (**ES Volume 1, Chapter 5 [APP-043]** to **Chapter 16 [APP-054]**) assesses the likely significant effects during the construction of the Proposed Development.
CON-20	RR-0017	Construction and Decommissioning	**[BoR numbers 08-010, 08-011, 08-013]**: Respondent expressed specific concern for the impacts the construction of the cable will have to their property.	The **Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-038 to APP-190]** assesses the cable route within defined parameters, as set out within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [APP-040]** and represent a reasonable worst-case scenario to ensure the assessment reported in the ES captures the likely significant effects associated with the cable route. The construction of the cable route has been assessed throughout the **ES [APP-038 to APP-190]**, which considers the effects associated with these works, including nearby residential properties. The Cable Route Corridor is approximately 1.3km away from the property and the property will therefore not be directly affected by noise and vibration and dust emissions from construction works within the Cable Route Corridor. Lordship Lane forms one of the access routes to the Cable Route Corridor. Access for existing users would be maintained during construction, with any temporary restrictions managed through appropriate traffic management measures agreed with the relevant highway authority. Lordship Lane has also been identified as a route for Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs). These movements would be limited in number and undertaken on an infrequent basis. AIL movements are subject to a separate approval and permitting process, requiring coordination with and approval from the relevant authorities, including North Yorkshire Council and the police, to ensure that they are undertaken safely and with appropriate traffic management measures in place. Construction traffic will be managed to minimise interaction with peak local activity where practicable. Appropriate traffic

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				management measures will be implemented where required to ensure the safe movement of vehicles and protection of road users. Measures to manage and minimise construction effects, including reinstatement of land following installation, are set out in the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]**. Requirement 12 in Schedule 2 to the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]** secures that a CEMP must be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority, and that the CEMP must be substantially in accordance with the **oCEMP [APP-192]**. All construction works must be carried out in accordance with the approved CEMP.
CON-21	RR-0878	Construction and Decommissioning	Respondent reported that the Funding Statement lacks details on a ring-fenced, index-linked decommissioning bond.	The **Funding Statement [APP-021]** submitted with the DCO application demonstrates that the Proposed Development is financially viable and adequately funded to deliver the Proposed Development in full, including decommissioning requirements. There is no policy or precedent for decommissioning bonds to be a requirement on the face of a DCO.
CON-22	RR-0306	Construction and Decommissioning	Respondent stated a bespoke decommissioning bond should be placed in Escrick before construction to cover the eventual cost.	The **Funding Statement [APP-021]** submitted with the DCO application demonstrates that the Proposed Development is financially viable and adequately funded to deliver the Proposed Development in full, including decommissioning requirements.

2.12 Consultation and Engagement

Consultation and Engagement

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Consultation and Engagement				
ENG-01	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-1163, RR-0834, RR-1121, RR-0599, RR-0615, RR-0956, RR-0868, RR-1226, RR-0949, RR-1115, RR-0762, RR-0237, RR-0075, RR-1222, RR-0352, RR-0983, RR-0421, RR-0577, RR-1077, RR-1372, RR-1411, RR-0105, RR-0605, RR-0211, RR-0614, RR-0708, RR-0936, RR-0561, RR-0263, RR-0168, RR-0440, RR-1023, RR-0539, RR-0577, RR-0708	Consultation and Engagement	Some respondents expressed dissatisfaction with the consultation process undertaken for the Proposed Development. Respondents stated that their views have not been taken into account, and that as there is widespread opposition, the Proposed Development should be stopped.	The Applicant considers that the statutory consultation has been robust, thorough and undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008, the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) regulations, and the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009. The Applicant's consultation has been considered sufficient by the Planning Inspectorate through its acceptance of the DCO Examination. Furthermore, the Applicant's consultation has been considered sufficient and compliant by North Yorkshire Council through its **Adequacy of Consultation Response [AoC-005]**. The **Consultation Report [APP-024]** sets out the Applicant's approach to pre-application consultation and sets out how the Applicant has had regard to comments received at consultation. The Applicant also notes that the examination process provides a further opportunity for interested parties to comment on the Proposed Development. This examination is managed by an independently appointed Examining Authority. Further to this, the Applicant provided an extended relevant representation period beyond the minimum statutory timeframe to allow sufficient time for members of the public to review the submitted application documents and register as an interested party. The Applicant acknowledges that any adverse effects from the Proposed Development are more likely to be felt locally than the largely wider-scale benefits of the Proposed Development. The Proposed Development is anticipated to help meet the UK's net zero requirements for energy production, which is considered a critical national priority and set out in National Policy Statements for Energy NPS EN-1 (section 4.2) and EN-3. This therefore will benefit the national population rather than just the local population. Where the Proposed Development is anticipated to benefit local people more specifically, this is done through providing onsite permissive paths to increase access to the countryside, providing improved landscape planting through reinforcing existing hedgerows and planting of new trees and providing biodiversity net gains through habitat improvements. These

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				are set out in detail with the **Planning Statement [APP-207].** It is also noted that the Proposed Development would be required to pay a substantial business rate contribution to North Yorkshire Council, retained and spent by them. That notwithstanding, the Applicant is committed to providing a Community Benefit Fund to allow for community-driven benefits that are not necessarily associated with the Proposed Development itself. The purpose is to establish a means to recognise local community needs that the Applicant wants to be able to contribute towards in recognition of the local impact of the Proposed Development. However, the Applicant recognises that this Fund should not be taken into account in the planning balance for the Proposed Development.
ENG-02	RR-0834, RR-0956, RR-1205, RR-0505, RR-0105, RR-0350, RR-0237, RR-0352, RR-1372, RR-0105, RR-0936, RR-0211, RR-1051, RR-1249, RR-0983, RR-0853, RR-1338	Consultation and Engagement	Some respondents criticised the accessibility of the consultation process. Respondents criticised the quality of materials, stating that the they were not clear and had errors. Respondents expressed concern that they did not receive a consultation postcard or were otherwise unaware of consultation(s) taking place. Respondents stated that many local residents are still not aware of the full scale of the plans. Respondent expressed concern that residents were unable to access physical plans.	The Applicant committed to publicising all phases of consultation, utilising methods set out within the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC). This included the provision of posters for identified Local Information Points (LIPs), placing advertisements in local newspapers, and proactively updating a list of project registrants who registered to be kept informed about the Proposed Development. As well as the methods to publicise consultation, the SoCC also detailed measures which enabled meaningful participation and ensured accessibility to the consultation process, including through encouraging anyone who may require consultation materials in alternative formats, such as large-print, audio or braille, to get in touch with the Proposed Development via the Proposed Development communication channels to request these materials. Consultation information events were held across different days of the week and covered a range of times to accommodate different working hours and care schedules to promote accessibility and attendance. This included holding an event on a Saturday and events running into the evening, as well as an online webinar event. In-person information events were only held at venues accessible by public transport and which accommodated the needs of individuals with limited mobility. The full SoCC is included within **Consultation Report Appendix 4: Statement of Community Consultation Materials [APP-028]**. The Applicant issued over 12,500 postcards setting out the details of the Phase One Consultation. The Applicant then mapped a Core Consultation Zone (CCZ) for the Phase Two Consultation, which local authorities were consulted on. This

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				CCZ included over 14,000 addresses, with two postcards in advance of the Phase Two consultation – the second postcard being circulated to inform the CCZ of the updated event located in Escrick. These addresses were mapped using the most up to date Royal Mail data available and subsequently posted using Royal Mail's postal service. The Applicant therefore acknowledges that there were addresses that were not sent postcards at Phase One consultation compared to Phase Two consultation due to changes in the CCZ. Further information on the creation of the CCZ, alongside information on the postcards sent to communicate the phases of consultation, can be found in the **Consultation Report [APP-024]**. The Applicant considers that the statutory consultation has been robust, thorough and undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008, the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) regulations, and the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009. The Applicant's consultation has been considered sufficient by the Planning Inspectorate through its acceptance of the DCO Examination. Furthermore, the Applicant's consultation has been considered sufficient and compliant by North Yorkshire Council through its **Adequacy of Consultation Response [AoC-005]**. The **Consultation Report [APP-024]** sets out the Applicant's approach to pre-application consultation. The Applicant also notes that the examination process provides a further opportunity for interested parties to comment on the Proposed Development. This examination is managed by an independently appointed Examining Authority. Further to this, the Applicant provided an extended relevant representation period beyond the minimum statutory timeframe to allow sufficient time for members of the public to review the submitted application documents and register as an interested party. Regarding access to physical plans, the Applicant made all consultation materials available at Community Access Point (CAP) sites, at public information events and by request to the communication channels. The Applicant notes all consultation materials have remained accessible on the project website and have also been evidenced within **Consultation Report**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Appendix 6 Part A [APP-030] and Part B [APP-031]. While consultation materials, including plans, were made available at CAP sites only during Phase Two (statutory) consultation, the Applicant notes that the project communication channels remain open, and physical copies of the most up-to-date plans can be requested if accessing them online is not possible.
ENG-03	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-0868, RR-0949, RR-0211, RR-1023, RR-1051, RR-0834, RR-0669	Consultation and Engagement	Respondents expressed concern that consultation events and the webinar did not provide clear or sufficiently informed responses to residents' questions, and that they had also received contradictory information from Proposed Development representatives.	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the comment and notes that a webinar was held as part of the Phase Two Consultation to provide an opportunity for those unable to attend the in-person events. The webinar enabled attendees to view consultation materials and submit questions to members of the project team, who responded to numerous queries within the time available. Given the breadth of information and topics associated with the Proposed Development, it could not be guaranteed that every question could be answered during the event or by every member of the Applicant team, despite being well prepared and including a mix of specialists at each event. Where questions could not be answered on the day, attendees were encouraged to submit them via the Proposed Development's communication channels for a full written response. These channels remain open throughout the Examination, with stakeholders encouraged to get in touch with any further questions or requests for clarification. Further details of the webinar and consultation process are set out within the **Consultation Report [APP-024]**.
ENG-04	RR-1196, RR-1255	Consultation and Engagement	Respondents expressed a desire to be kept informed about future proceedings and would like the opportunity to comment further in the future.	The Applicant notes this comment and can confirm that there will be further opportunity to partake in the Examination via Written Representations and at Examination hearings. By registering as an Interested Party and submitting a Relevant Representation, parties will continue to receive updates from PINS, including about future proceedings as the Examination progresses.
ENG-05	RR-0983	Consultation and Engagement	Respondent expressed concern that assurances and conversations at consultation meetings were not part of the final proposals.	The Applicant notes this comment. The feedback received as part of consultation was a written process, and conversations held during events were not considered as feedback. Stakeholders were also encouraged to provide their feedback via the feedback forms (online or hardcopy), email or Freepost. All feedback has been considered by the Applicant and responded to within **Consultation Report Appendix 11: Section 47 Applicant Response Table [APP-036]**. As well as the Applicant Response Table showing how feedback has been considered and how it may have influenced the design, the table also includes a column stating whether a piece of

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				feedback has resulted in a change to the Proposed Development design or the Applicant's evidence.
ENG-06	RR-1073	Consultation and Engagement	Respondent requested assurances that the Examination Authority has been sent the concerns raised by Keir Mather MP, Mayor David Skaith, and the community's statutory feedback, and that their feedback / concerns have not been re-worded or altered.	The Applicant can confirm that any Relevant Representations submitted by the local community or statutory and political stakeholders have been received by PINS as the Examination Authority for the Proposed Development. This process is managed by PINS, and as such no wording would be changed by the Applicant. The Applicant is responsible for further processing Relevant Representations and providing responses. This means that, due to the volume of Relevant Representations submitted by the public, concerns, queries and feedback raised through these submissions have been split by topic / theme, with repeated points grouped together, as can be seen in this document. While this does mean that, for text included in the 'Summary of Issue Raised' column, the wording may have changed, these are meant to be summaries of points raised rather than verbatim.
ENG-07	RR-0548, RR-0962, RR-0983	Consultation and Engagement	Respondents queried why a consultation event could not happen in Birkin, some respondents cited the Church as a suitable venue for this.	The Applicant notes this comment. The Phase Two consultation leaflet (See **Consultation Report Appendix 6: Phase Two Consultation Materials [APP-030 – APP-031]**) sets out that consultation events were hosted in Monk Fryston, Hambleton and Chapel Haddlesey, all three of which in close proximity to Birkin, allowing residents to attend either of the three nearest events, or the community webinar if unable to attend the in-person consultation events. The venues where consultation events were held were agreed with North Yorkshire Council in consultation on the SoCC. The SoCC can be viewed in **Consultation Report Appendix 4 [APP-028]**.
ENG-08	RR-0834, RR-0949	Consultation and Engagement	Respondents stated that consultation was inadequate because no events were held in South Milford.	The Applicant notes this comment. The Phase Two consultation leaflet (See **Consultation Report Appendix 6: Phase Two Consultation Materials [APP-030 – APP-031]**) sets out that consultation events were hosted in Monk Fryston and Sherburn-in-Elmet, both of which in close proximity to South Milford, allowing residents to attend either of the two nearest events, or the community webinar if unable to attend the in-person consultation events. The venues where consultation events were held were agreed with North Yorkshire Council in consultation on the SoCC. The SoCC can be viewed in **Consultation Report Appendix 4 [APP-028]**. The Applicant considers that the statutory consultation has been robust, thorough and undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008, the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) regulations, and the Infrastructure

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009. The Applicant's consultation has been considered sufficient by the Planning Inspectorate through its acceptance of the DCO Examination. Furthermore, the Applicant's consultation has been considered sufficient and compliant by North Yorkshire Council through its **Adequacy of Consultation Response [AoC-005]**, while the acceptance of the full DCO application by the Planning Inspectorate further supports that consultation has been considered adequate.
ENG-09	RR-1051, RR-1370	Consultation and Engagement	Respondents stated that the late addition of Sites 6, 7 and 8 meant consultees were not given a fair opportunity to comment on the full Proposed Development at the appropriate stage, and that the original scoping basis no longer reflects the development now being examined.	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the comment. Sites 6, 7 and 8 were part of the proposals for the Proposed Development consulted on at statutory consultation (Phase Two). The consultation zone of approximately 12,500 addresses that received consultation postcards for Phase One consultation did include South Milford, due to the proximity of the original Proposed Development boundary, and therefore addresses in proximity to Sites 6, 7 and 8 will have received a postcard. However, the Applicant does note the fact that these sites were not included at this stage, and therefore the interest of members of the community may not have been as high. All addresses within 2km of all Solar Development Sites, as set out within the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC), in **Consultation Report Appendix 4 [APP-028]**, were included in the CCZ as part of statutory consultation. As committed to by the Applicant, these addresses were directly notified during statutory consultation, ensuring compliance with the SoCC. Although Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping is recognised as a useful preliminary procedure, it is not a mandatory requirement under the EIA Regulations and is advisory only. The purpose of the EIA scoping process is to get agreement on the methodologies and the scope of assessments that would be taken based on the description of the Proposed Development and not a specific red line boundary. EIA Scoping is also not a public consultation process but a technical consultation on the EIA scope only. The addition of Sites 6-8 did not change the methodology or the scope of what needed to be assessed as it involves the same type of development as the other Solar Development Sites. The

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				addition of these sites only adjusted the study area to be considered.
ENG-10	RR-0440	Consultation and Engagement	Respondent expressed concern that consultation was not undertaken sufficiently with South Milford Parish Council.	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this comment. South Milford Parish Council were a statutory organisation under Section 42, and were treated as such during statutory consultation, and subsequently under Section 56 since the submission of the DCO application. The Applicant can confirm that consultation was undertaken with South Milford Parish Council at Phase One consultation (non-statutory), Phase Two (statutory), and at Targeted Consultation. Furthermore, the Applicant has engaged with South Milford Parish Council throughout the pre-application process. As described in Chapter 7 of the **Consultation Report [APP-024]**, an invite was sent for the Design Workshops on 12 May 2025 to local and technical stakeholders, including South Milford Parish Council, who were unable to attend the workshops. Nevertheless, all feedback provided by South Milford Parish Council has been considered (See **Consultation Report Appendix 12: Section 42 Applicant Response Table [APP-037]**), and the Applicant notes that the Parish Council also submitted a Relevant Representation, which has been responded to (see **The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 [PDA-014]**).
ENG-11	RR-0956	Consultation and Engagement	Respondent stated that the targeted consultation communication they received by post sought to illegitimately restrict their right to consultation to the proposed scope changes only rather than the whole application.	The Applicant notes that the purpose of the Targeted Consultation was to consult on the 40 minor amendments to the Order Limits for the Proposed Development that were added post-Phase Two (statutory) consultation. However, the Phase One and Phase Two Consultations allowed for anyone interested in the Proposed Development to comment on any part of the application. The Applicant shared a document, the 'Approach to Targeted Consultation document', for further review and comment with North Yorkshire Council on 15 September 2025. A finalised version of this document is included in **Consultation Report Appendix 9: Targeted Consultation Materials [APP-034]**. In response, North Yorkshire Council stated that they were content with the proposed Targeted Consultation approach and considered it proportionate to the amendments made to the Proposed Development. The response from North Yorkshire Council is available in **Appendix 1: Statement of Compliance [APP-025]**.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				In addition, as can be seen in **Consultation Report Appendix 11: Section 47 Applicant Response Table [APP-036]**, the Applicant did respond to more general and broader project-related feedback raised during Targeted Consultation.
ENG-12	RR-0663	Consultation and Engagement	**[BoR CAT 3]**: Respondent stated that they were not notified of phase 1 for the battery station and then only found out about site 2 via social media so the consultation of this process, and they live directly opposite Site 2.	The Applicant acknowledges the comments and confirms the party was not issued a S42 notice inviting them to the initial Statutory Consultation held in Summer 2025. In the initial assessment of environmental data carried out by the Applicant, the property was not classified as a potential Category 3 interest under section 10 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965, or under Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973, or under section 152(3) of the PA 2008. However, pursuant to the community consultation process carried out under section 47 of the PA2008, all addresses within 2km of all Solar Development Sites were included in the Core Consultation Zone (CCZ) and sent a consultation postcard via Royal Mail. As the respondent has stated that they live opposite Site 2, they will have been sent a postcard at both Phase One and Phase Two consultation. After the Statutory Consultation, the proposed Order Limits were further refined based on consultee feedback and continued design analysis. Following these amendments to the Order Limits, analysis of environmental data based on the new design was conducted and the Applicant identified the property could now have a potential claim as a category 3 under section 10 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965, or under Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973, or under section 152(3) of the PA 2008. The Applicant subsequently sent a Targeted Consultation S42 Notice on 16/10/2025, inviting the party to the later Targeted Consultation held in Winter 2025 to seek feedback from the consultee.
ENG-13	RR-0962	Consultation and Engagement	Respondent stated there has been a lack of consultation in Escrick, with residents feeling unable to participate openly and having to rely on independent meetings arranged outside formal consultation processes.	The Applicant notes this comment. The **Consultation Report [APP-024]** sets out that consultation events were held at both Phase One and Phase Two consultation. In addition, a community webinar was also held for those unable to attend the in-person consultation events. The venues where consultation events were held were agreed with North Yorkshire Council in consultation on the SoCC. The SoCC can be viewed in **Consultation Report Appendix 4 [APP-028]**. As well as the consultation leaflet, as detailed in Chapter 8 of the **Consultation Report [APP-024]**, the Applicant also

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				advertised consultation both in the Selby Times and at Local Information Points (LIPs), with LIPs being sent a poster to display; both advertised the consultation event details and how to get involved with the consultation and submit feedback. The Applicant also made consultation materials available at Community Access Points (CAPs), and sent two postcards to the CCZ, with the second notifying of the venue change in Escrick. The postcards were sent to over 14,000 properties which made up the CCZ. The CCZ for our Phase Two consultation was established by measuring 500 metres from the boundary of both the Solar Development Sites and the Cable Route Corridor, which had been refined following Phase Two. This approach to the CCZ, and our approach to consultation as a whole, is detailed in full in our Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC), which was approved by North Yorkshire Council as the Local Planning Authority. The SoCC is available to view in **Consultation Report Appendix 4: Statement of Community Consultation Materials [APP-028]**. Chapter 11 of the **Consultation Report [APP-024]** explains the approach to Targeted Consultation, while the materials used during the consultation are available within **Consultation Report Appendix 9: Targeted Consultation Materials [APP-034]**. The Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) (see **Appendix 4: Statement of Community Consultation Materials [APP-028]**), stated that prior to Phase Two Consultation, the project team would undertake design preview workshops with parish councils, relevant local interest and community groups, and technical stakeholders in order to encourage feedback on the design of the Proposed Development. In accordance with this commitment, the Applicant held two design workshops in June 2025 before the commencement of Phase Two Consultation, inviting representatives from parish councils including Escrick. These workshops presented the emerging design of the Proposed Development, including the proposed design principles, and sought to gather local insights and feedback from community representatives and statutory consultees. The attendees of these workshops are set out in Section 7.4 of the **Consultation Report [APP-024]**. The workshops were intended both to obtain valuable feedback on the Proposed Development from local stakeholders and to provide early notice of the forthcoming consultation.
ENG-14	RR-1222	Consultation and Engagement	Respondent raised concern regarding site notices at Hambleton Hough / the proposed compound, stating they	The Applicant notes the comment. During pre-application the Applicant undertook comprehensive site noticing of any unregistered land as part of the diligent inquiry methodology

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			contained no street names or identification to help people understand where the proposal was for.	set out in Chapter 8 of the **Statement of Reasons [APP-020].** Each plan that accompanied these unregistered sites notice included a plan using an OS basemap, which highlighted land features and roads names, whilst also including an inset within the plan frame to show the parcel of land in the wider context of the landscape to further aid identification. Notices also included where to find more information about the Proposed Development, through links to the project website, as well as contact details if further information was required, including the Planning Inspectorate website for the Proposed Development that included all documents submitted as part of the DCO Application.
ENG-15	RR-1051	Consultation and Engagement	Respondent stated that out-of-date NSIP webpages, conflicting plans, and document errors undermined transparency and the ability of the public to participate fairly in the process.	The Applicant notes the comment. The Applicant worked with an experienced professional team across planning, environmental, legal and land disciplines. Where errors have been, or are identified in documentation, these are corrected in the normal course of project management. To date no error identified affects the substance of the Application or the robustness of the assessment. The **Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-038 to APP-190]** and environmental and ecological surveys have been undertaken by competent experts with considerable experience assessing similar Proposed Developments. Details of qualifications, experience and professional institute membership are provided within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 1.4: Statement of Competence [APP-146]**. The Applicant notes that management of NSIP webpages and the specific pages for Light Valley Solar are a matter for PINS. Where PINS have requested updated, more accessible plans from the Applicant, such as the **OEMs [PDA-003 to PDA-010]**, the Applicant has responded and provided updated versions. The Applicant does not consider that the ability for the public to participate fairly in the process has been undermined, including for the reasons stated above. The Applicant considers that the statutory consultation has been robust, thorough and undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008, the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) regulations, and the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009. The Applicant's consultation has been considered sufficient by the Planning Inspectorate through its acceptance of the DCO Examination. Furthermore, the Applicant's consultation has been considered sufficient and compliant by

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				North Yorkshire Council through its **Adequacy of Consultation Response [AoC-005]**.
ENG-16	RR-0853	Consultation and Engagement	Respondent stated that the Applicant has failed to meet the Selby Core Strategy 2013 requirement that local communities be actively involved in plan-making, as adjacent residents were not consulted, including specific examples relating to Sites 4 and 6.	The **Planning Statement [APP-207]** and **Policy Compliance Document [APP-224]** demonstrate how the Applicant has considered and responded to national and local policy. This includes the saved policies in the Selby District Local Plan 2005 and the Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan 2011-2017. Whilst the Applicant is not 'plan-making' in the way a local planning authority would do, the Applicant is preparing to progress a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP). In applying for an NSIP under section 42 of the 2008 Planning Act, the Applicant had a duty to carry out and report on consultation. During the pre-application process a total of three consultations were held: Phase One (non-statutory) held Winter 2024; Phase Two (statutory) held Summer 2025; and a Targeted Consultation held Winter 2025. Feedback provided was considered by the Applicant alongside the results of at-the-time ongoing environmental assessments, with the Applicant's response to feedback from local residents for both Phase Two and Targeted consultations included in **Consultation Report Appendix 11: Section 47 Applicant Response Table [APP-036]**. The Applicant also notes that the examination process provides a further opportunity for interested parties to comment on the Proposed Development. This examination is managed by an independently appointed Examining Authority. Further to this, the Applicant provided an extended relevant representation period beyond the minimum statutory timeframe to allow sufficient time for members of the public to review the submitted application documents and register as an interested party. Chapter 8 of the **Consultation Report [APP-024]** provides further information regarding how statutory consultation was promoted, including through posters, advertisements in the Selby Times, email communications and project registrant notification. Postcards were also utilised, which were sent to over 14,000 properties which made up the Core Consultation Zone (CCZ). The CCZ was established by measuring 500 metres from the boundary of both the Solar Development Sites and the Cable Route Corridor. Initially, at Phase One, 12,500

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				addresses were identified and sent postcards, however the CCZ was updated between Phase One and Phase Two, leading to the identification of additional addresses, with postcards notifying of Phase Two (statutory) consultation sent to over 14,000 properties. This approach to the CCZ, and our approach to consultation as a whole, is detailed in full in our Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC), which was approved by North Yorkshire Council as the Local Planning Authority. The SoCC is available to view in **Consultation Report Appendix 4: Statement of Community Consultation Materials [APP-028]**. The addresses included within the CCZ were mapped using the most up to date Royal Mail data available and subsequently posted using Royal Mail's postal service. The Applicant therefore acknowledges that there were addresses that were not sent postcards at Phase One consultation compared to Phase Two consultation due to changes in the CCZ.

2.13 Cultural Heritage

Cultural Heritage – General Comments

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Cultural Heritage - General Comments				
CUL-01	RR-1396, RR-1135, RR-0032, RR-0599, RR-0693, RR-0498, RR-0343,RR-0864, RR-0285, RR-0213, RR-1222, RR-0930, RR-1187, RR-0352, RR-0713, RR-1109, RR-0882, RR-1051, RR-0161, RR-0779, RR-0074, RR-1212, RR-1426	Cultural Heritage	Respondents expressed concern regarding the potential effects of the Proposed Development on **listed buildings**.	A full assessment of potential impacts on listed buildings has been carried out within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage [APP-046]**, including a site walkover and a settings assessment. The assessment concludes that there will be no significant adverse effects on Listed Buildings within the Order Limits or wider study area. Some minor adverse effects on setting or glimpsed views of construction activities and/or panels are possible. Where possible, impacts have been mitigated by design. Mitigation includes full landscape reinstatement being undertaken following the installation of the Cable Route Corridor to minimise changes in the setting of heritage assets This is set out within the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** secured via Requirement 12 of the **Draft DCO [APP-017]** as well as **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**, and the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]**. Consultation with NYC's Conservation Officer has concluded that any harm to listed buildings will be less than substantial. Consultation with NYC's Conservation Officer has concluded that any harm to listed buildings will be less than substantial.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
CUL-02	RR-0186, RR-0693, RR-0343, RR-0864, RR-0182, RR-0279,RR-0930, RR-1187, RR-1073, RR-0369, RR-1109, RR-0130, RR-1357, RR-0421, RR-1051, RR-0428, RR-1372, RR-1370, RR-1212, RR-0828, RR-0354	Cultural Heritage	Respondents have expressed general concern about the impact on **heritage**.	A full assessment of potential impacts on the cultural heritage resource is provided within the **ES Volume 1, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage [APP-046]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.5: Statements of Significance and Impact Assessment [APP-165]**. These are supported and informed by **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline [APP-159]**, **Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Gazetteer [APP-160]**, **Appendix 8.3: Geophysical survey results [APP-161 to APP-163]**, and **Appendix 8.4: Trial Trenching Reports [APP-164]**. The assessment has concluded that there will be a significant effect on buried archaeological remains within the Order Limits where impacts cannot be mitigated by embedded design measures. The Applicant has undertaken geophysical survey of the Solar Sites and Cable Route Corridor (save for where access or crops prevented survey), as well as a scheme of archaeological trial trenching to identify potential archaeological features within the Order Limits. Where possible, these have been avoided by design or impacts mitigated by non-intrusive construction measures (**ES Volume 1, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage [APP-046]** Section 8.8). Where impacts are unavoidable, an **Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [APP-200]** has been prepared to ensure all archaeological remains are properly excavated and recorded in advance of construction works. No significant effects are anticipated on built heritage assets within 2km of the Order Limits. Embedded design measures have been adopted to reduce visibility and strengthen existing planting around Birkin House and more widely across the Proposed Development to minimise changes within the setting of heritage assets. These can be found within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage [APP-046]** Section 8.8.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
CUL-03	RR-0375, RR-0285, RR-1073, RR-1377, RR-1357, RR-0882, RR-0161, RR-0155, RR-0587, RR-0779	Cultural Heritage	Respondents raised concerns over the proximity of solar sites to the **Monk Fryston conservation area**, some feel the Proposed Development will destroy it.	The Applicant acknowledges this concern and can confirm that a full assessment of potential impacts on listed buildings and the Monk Fryston Conservation Area was carried out and is detailed within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage [APP-046]**. The assessments included a site walkover and an assessment of the overall setting of the conservation area. In respect to Monk Fryston Conservation Area, the ES concludes that while the village's rural surroundings make a key contribution to its significance, views of the solar panels would be screened by the modern development in the eastern end of the village, as well as the dense woodland in the Monk Fryston Hall estate. As this screening would be limited to glimpsed views, it is considered that overall, the impact will be minor. The **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** secures measures to mitigate impacts to the Monk Fryston Conservation Area and other cultural heritage and archaeological aspects during the construction phase. Mitigation includes avoidance of direct physical impacts to designated heritage assets, and landscape reinstatement, including replanting of and tree or hedge lengths lost, following the installation of the Cable Route Corridor to minimise changes in the setting of heritage assets. This is set out within the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** secured via Requirement 12 of the **Draft DCO [APP-017]** as well as **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**, and the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]**. Consultation with NYC's Conservation Officer has concluded that any harm to listed buildings will be less than substantial.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
CUL-04	RR-0343, RR-0306, RR-0713, RR-1051, RR-0145, RR-0074	Cultural Heritage	Respondents expressed general concern regarding the potential effects of the Proposed Development on **archaeology**, including the risk of damage to archaeological sites.	A full assessment of potential impacts to below ground archaeology has been carried out and is detailed within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage [APP-046]**. The assessment included a site walkover, settings assessment, geophysical survey of the Solar Development Sites and Cable Route Corridor **[APP-161 to APP-163]** and trial trenching of Solar Development Sites (reported in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Trial Trenching Reports [APP-164]**). Where archaeological features were identified during geophysical survey and archaeological trial trenching, impacts have been mitigated by design measures (exclusion from construction activities, removal from the Proposed Development, use of non-intrusive construction methodologies) or through archaeological excavation to ensure preservation by record in advance of construction activities. An **Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [APP-200]** has been prepared detailing all mitigation measures outlined above which will be enacted to ensure there are no significant effects on the buried archaeological resource as a result of the Proposed Development. The ES chapter concludes that with additional mitigation the potential for impacts on archaeological remains within the Order Limits is up to minor adverse and is not significant.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
CUL-05	RR-0112, RR-0214, RR-0937, RR-0729	Cultural Heritage	Respondents expressed concern for the proximity of the Proposed Development to **conservation areas.**	The Applicant acknowledges this concern and confirms that an assessment of the Proposed Development on Conservation Areas (Escrick, Hillam, Monk Fryston, and Riccall) was included in the full assessment of potential impacts as detailed within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage [APP-046]**. The assessment concludes that there will be no significant adverse effects on Conservation Areas or listed buildings within the Order Limits or wider study area. Some minor adverse effects on setting or glimpsed views of construction activities and/or panels are possible. Where possible, impacts have been mitigated by design. Mitigation includes avoidance of direct physical impacts to designated heritage assets, and landscape planting to reinforce existing hedgerows strengthening the landscape pattern as secured through the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**. This is secured within the **Requirement 6 of the Draft DCO [APP-017]**.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
CUL-06	RR-0193, RR-0599	Cultural Heritage	Respondent stated that the Proposed Development contradicts both national and local planning policies that promote sustainability, proportionality, and protection of rural heritage.	The **Planning Statement [APP-207]** and **Policy Compliance Document [APP-224]** demonstrate how the Applicant has considered and responded to national and local policy in relation to cultural heritage. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage [APP-046],** supported by geophysical surveys, archaeological evaluations and Statements of Significance and Impact Assessments, presents an assessment of impacts on archaeological remains, Important Hedgerows, and heritage assets (including views), has been prepared in full consideration of the requirements set out within National Planning Policy as per the NPPF, NPS EN-1, NPS EN-3 and NPS EN-5. The assessments also consider relevant local planning policy within the Selby District Local Plan (2005) and draft Local Plan (2024) pertaining to the conservation of the historic environment, designated sites and other archaeological remains (ENV22, ENV 27, and ENV28; SG9, SG10, SG12, and SG13). The Environmental Improvement Plan (DEFRA, 2025) has also been taken into account when developing the Proposed Development. As required by NPS EN-1, a full assessment of the significance of all assets with the potential to experience impacts from the Proposed Development has been undertaken (**ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.5: Statements of Significance and Impact Assessment [APP-165]**). In respect of the heritage assessment, this has been informed by a full cultural heritage baseline, supported by a site walkover and settings assessment, prepared in accordance with the standards and guidance of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists. The baseline has been enhanced by a comprehensive geophysical survey of the Order Limits, accompanied by targeted trial trenching evaluation to ensure accurate identification and characterisation of the archaeological resource. Embedded mitigation has been applied with a preference for avoidance of impacts where possible. No significant effects are predicted to arise from changes within the setting of heritage assets as a result. Where impacts on buried archaeological remains cannot be avoided by design (including the use of non-intrusive construction methods), an **Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [APP-200]** has been prepared in consultation with the Archaeological Advisor to the Local Planning Authority. The Archaeological Mitigation Strategy will be secured by Requirement 11 of the **Draft DCO [APP-017].**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
CUL-07	RR-0306	Cultural Heritage	Respondent requested a more rigorous, independent archaeological survey be carried out before a DCO is considered.	The Applicant can confirm that the assessment of heritage assets and the historic environment was undertaken by suitably qualified and experienced professionals, in accordance with established best practice and relevant guidance. Further details are provided within the **Statement of Competence [APP-146]**. A comprehensive cultural heritage baseline has been prepared to support and inform the EIA in accordance with national planning policy (NPPF and NPS EN-1) and the standards and guidance of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists. Baseline sources include the Archaeological Data Service, British Geological Survey, Office of National Statistics, Local authority data (including the North Yorkshire Historic Environment Record and York City Historic Environment Record), National Heritage List for England, historic mapping, Regional Research Agenda for South Yorkshire, and the North Yorkshire and West Yorkshire Archives. This has been supplemented with a full walkover of the site and settings assessment, geophysical survey of the Solar Development Sites and Cable Corridor, and archaeological evaluation of the Solar Development Sites. All fieldwork has been carried out in consultation with the Archaeological Advisor to the LPA and in line with the standards and guidance of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists. The results of archaeological field surveys are available for review in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.3: Geophysical survey results [APP-161 to APP-163]**, and **Appendix 8.4: Trial Trenching Reports [APP-164]**. A gazetteer of all heritage assets identified within the Study Area is presented in **ES Volume 3**, **Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Gazetteer [APP-160]**, with statements of significance and potential impacts from the Proposed Development listed in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.5: Statements of Significance and Impact Assessment [APP-165]**.

Cultural Heritage – Detailed

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Cultural Heritage - Detailed				
CUL-08	RR-0599, RR-1002, RR-0343, RR-0268, RR-0962, RR-0163	Cultural Heritage	Respondent expressed concern for Grade II-listed **Birkin House** and Church of **St Mary the Virgin.**	An assessment of the potential impacts on Birkin House (NHLE 1316672) and the Church of St. Marythe Virgin (NHLE 1316671) is provided within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.5: Statements of Significance and Impact Assessment [APP-165]**. Both assets are also addressed in greater detail within **ES Volume, 1 Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage [APP-046]**. Neither asset will experience physical impacts from the Proposed Development. Birkin House is located in close proximity to Site 4, its setting is well defined and enclosed within what may have been former gardens or grounds. This is bounded by trees and other natural screening. Part of the area adjacent to the property has been given over to industrial buildings which have introduced an industrial element into its previously rural surrounds. Embedded mitigation measures to strengthen existing natural screening surrounding the property will limit any views to seasonal and glimpsed in nature. These measures are secured through the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]** and within the **Requirement 6 of the Draft DCO [APP-017]**. This is judged to produce a minor adverse effect on the property which is not a significant effect. The Church of St. Mary is located within the southern end of the village of Birkin. Its churchyard is bound to the west by Intake Lane, which connects to Birkin Lane and Main Street, reflecting the church's importance as the religious centre of the community. The church is located immediately adjacent to a Highways Improvement Area (HIA). Construction activities would occur within the setting of the church, to the northwest, including moving plant, lighting and noise. These would be temporary in nature and fully resolved upon completion of construction works and will not physically impact the church or its immediate setting. The solar panels and all associated infrastructure at Solar Development Site 4 would introduce an industrial character to the periphery of the asset's setting. However, this impact will be, at most, limited to glimpsed views, as the church is heavily screened by intervening built form. Landscape mitigation measures to minimise views towards the site are set out within the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]** These effects are judged at most to be minor adverse which is not a significant effect.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
CUL-09	RR-0101, RR-0337, RR-0260, RR-0155,	Cultural Heritage	Respondent expressed concern regarding the impact to the Escrick Conservation Area.	The Applicant acknowledges this concern and confirms that an assessment of the Proposed Development on Escrick Conservation Area was included in the full assessment of potential impacts as detailed within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage [APP-046]**. The assessment includes the Escrick Conservation Area and listed buildings within the Estate as well as the historic associated designed parkland and gardens. The assessment concludes that during construction there may be temporary effects but given the distance separation these are considered to be not significant. Once operational, the views of the solar panels from the Conservation Area and the designated structures therein, would be limited to glimpses and limited to certain angles, therefore not making any physical changes to the heritage assets within Escrick, or its historic landscaped parklands, and not changing their setting in such a way that would impede understanding of their interrelationships or key designed views. The integrity of the designed landscape of Escrick Park will not be compromised and the interrelationship of all assets will be retained. The impacts are considered not significant. Where possible, impacts have been mitigated by design. Mitigation includes avoidance of direct physical impacts to designated heritage assets, and landscape planting to reinforce existing hedgerows strengthening the landscape pattern as secured through the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**. This is secured within the **Requirement 6 of the Draft DCO [APP-017]**.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
CUL-10	RR-0577,	Cultural Heritage	Respondent expressed concern for the heritage impact on **Hillam**.	Hillam Conservation Area encloses the historic core of the village and is located c. 530m from Site 3. A full assessment of potential impacts upon the Conservation Area and assets contained therein is presented in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.5: Statements of Significance and Impact Assessment [APP-165]**. The assessment concludes that, whilst the introduction of the solar panels would constitute a permanent, adverse change to its external rural setting, it is considered that this impact would be minor, as the form and composition of the intervening landscape, which includes modern built form along almost all edges of the conservation area, would limit any visual or audible impacts. Where possible, impacts have been mitigated by design. Mitigation includes grassland borders and planting of native trees to soften views towards Site 3 as secured through the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**. This is secured within the **Requirement 6 of the Draft DCO [APP-017]**.
CUL-11	RR-0343, RR-0461,	Cultural Heritage	Respondents stated that the Ministry of Defence should be consulted due to the presence of a Second World War crash site near Birkin, associated with Halifax bomber losses. Respondent expressed concern about the potential impact of the Proposed Development on this area, describing it as a war grave and an important part of local heritage history.	Whilst not a designated heritage asset, military crash sites are protected under the Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 with all potential crash sites included within the Site Gazetteer and Statements of Significance/Impact Assessments. Consultation has been undertaken with the Archaeological Officer for North Yorkshire Council throughout the design development. This site involved a mid-air collision between two aircraft (Serial nos. NA609 and MZ633) resulting in the total loss of 27 lives including 13 ground crew. Both sites are recorded on the NYHER (MNY26980, MNY26979). The approximate crash sites are located outside of the Order Limits (344m and 262m east, respectively) and the field to the immediate east of the crash sites will not contain any solar panels or experience any development. The assessment of impact was informed by comprehensive geophysical survey and archaeological trial trenching of Site 4, which did not reveal any evidence of aircraft debris. Taking into account the mid-air nature of the collision and results of prospection surveys, the assessment concluded that the Proposed Development would likely result in **no change** and returned a Neutral Effect, which is not significant as set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage [APP-046]**.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
CUL-13	RR-0155	Cultural Heritage	Respondent stated that Escrick Conservation Area and Monk Fryston Conservation Area lie in close proximity to Sites 1 and 2 and would materially impact their settings.	The Applicant acknowledges this concern and confirms that an assessment of the Proposed Development on both Escrick Conservation Area and Monk Fryston Conservation Area was included in the full assessment of potential impacts as detailed within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage [APP-046]**. The assessment includes the Escrick Conservation Area and listed buildings within the Estate as well as the historic associated designed parkland and gardens. The assessment concludes that during construction there may be temporary effects but given the distance separation these are considered to be not significant. Once operational, the views of the solar panels from the Conservation Area and the designated structures therein, would be limited to glimpses and limited to certain angles, therefore not making any physical changes to the heritage assets within Escrick, or its historic landscaped parklands, and not changing their setting in such a way that would impede understanding of their interrelationships or key designed views. The integrity of the designed landscape of Escrick Park will not be compromised and the interrelationship of all assets will be retained. The impacts are considered not significant. In respect to Monk Fryston Conservation Area, the ES concludes that while the village's rural surroundings make a key contribution to its significance, views of the solar panels would be screened by the modern development in the eastern end of the village, as well as the dense woodland in the Monk Fryston Hall estate. As this screening would be limited to glimpsed views, it is considered that overall, the impact will be minor. Where possible, impacts to both Conservation Areas have been mitigated by design. Mitigation includes avoidance of direct physical impacts to designated heritage assets, and landscape planting to reinforce existing hedgerows strengthening the landscape pattern as secured through the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**. This is secured within the **Requirement 6 of the Draft DCO [APP-017]**. The **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192**], as secured by **Requirement 12 of the Draft DCO [APP-017],** also secures measures to cultural heritage assets during the construction phase.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
CUL-14	RR-0155	Cultural Heritage	Respondent stated that Winchat Hall and Whinchat Cottages would experience significant visual harm, with no adequate mitigation demonstrated by the Applicant.	The Applicant confirms that an assessment of potential impacts on Whinchat Hall is provided within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.5: Statements of Significance and Impact Assessment [APP-165]**. The buildings are not designated heritage assets and are not recorded within the North Yorkshire Historic Environment Record as known heritage assets. Whinchat Hall and associated buildings were added to the Applicant's assessment as an additional potential heritage asset following map regression (UHA_015). The building is marked on First Edition Ordnance Survey map of 1851 as Shallows Farm. The footprint of the building complex has undergone some alteration from that shown on early Ordnance Survey mapping. The primary designed views from the property face away from the Proposed Development towards the main road, however the assessment concludes that the solar panels will introduce a permanent, adverse change to its rural setting, which makes a contribution to its significance. Embedded mitigation to strengthen existing borders in the form of native tree and hedgerow planting to reduce visibility between the Proposed Development and this heritage asset is set out within the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**. This is secured within the **Requirement 6 of the Draft DCO [APP-017]**. The overall significance of effect for this asset is minor adverse. Whinchat Cottages are not designated heritage assets and are not recorded within the North Yorkshire Historic Environment Record. They are also not recorded on early Ordnance Survey mapping (up to 1910, 2nd edition). They are of mid-20th century date and so were not considered within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage [APP-046]**. A native woodland block will be planted at the rear of the cottages to mitigate views towards the development, as set out within the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
CUL-15	RR-0074	Cultural Heritage	Respondent expressed concern about the impact of the Proposed Development on the setting of a Grade I listed building in Birkin, stating that Site 4 will encircle the village and permanently degrade the historic rural setting of the listed building and surrounding residential amenity.	The Village of Birkin is not covered by a Conservation Area, but does contain three Grade II Listed buildings and one Grade I Listed building, being The Church of St. Mary. Panels are proposed to the north and north-east of the village. The church of St. Mary is located within the southern end of the village. Its churchyard is bound to the west by Intake Lane, which connects to Birkin Lane and Main Street, reflecting the church's importance as a religious centre of the community. The church is located immediately adjacent to a Highways Improvement Area (HIA). Construction activities would occur within the setting of the church, to the northeast, including moving plant, lighting and noise associated with these minor works. These would be temporary in nature and fully resolved upon completion of construction works and will not physically impact the church or its immediate setting. The solar panels and all associated infrastructure at Solar Development Site 4 would introduce an industrial character to the periphery of the asset's setting, to the north at a distance of c. 600m. However, this impact will be, at most, limited to glimpsed views, as the church is heavily screened by intervening built form and existing natural screening. A similar assessment has been made for views towards the site for the other designated heritage assets within the village. Landscape mitigation measures to minimise views towards the site are set out within the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]** These effects are judged at most to be minor adverse which is not a significant effect Outside of the main village, Birkin House (a Grade II listed residential building) is located in close proximity to Site 4. Its setting is well defined and enclosed within what may have been former gardens or grounds. This is bounded by trees and other natural screening. Part of the area adjacent to the property has been given over to industrial buildings which have introduced an industrial element into its previously rural surrounds. Embedded mitigation measures to strengthen existing natural screening surrounding the property will limit any views to seasonal and glimpsed in nature. These measures are secured through the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]** and within the **Requirement 6 of the Draft DCO [APP-017]**. This is judged to produce a minor adverse effect on the property which is not a significant effect.

2.14 Electromagnetic Fields (EMFs)

Electromagnetic Fields (EMFs)

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Electromagnetic Fields (EMFs)				
EMF-01	RR-1116, RR-0343, RR-0520	Electromagnetic Fields	Respondents expressed concern regarding electromagnetic fields.	Potential effects of electromagnetic fields have been assessed within the **EMF Report [APP-188]** and **ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Matters chapter [APP-054]**. No significant effects are predicted due to the levels of EMF produced by electrical equipment and the distance to any sensitive receptors. The residual effects of EMF from the Proposed Development are expected to be minimal and well within recognised safety guidelines.
EMF-02	RR-0979	Electromagnetic Fields	Respondent has asked if mobile digital operators (telephone etc) been consulted on how they are going to provide a better signal in the area which will be affected by the static created by the increase in electricity distribution created by the proposed infrastructure	Mobile digital operators have not been consulted as part of the application as there is no significant potential for EMFs to affect mobile communications. Any produced EMFs would be at the power frequency of 50Hz rather than radio frequency; it is radio frequency EMFs which would otherwise have the potential to affect mobile communications.

2.15 Glint and Glare

Glint and Glare

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Glint and Glare				
GLI-01	RR-0834, RR-0599, RR-0226, RR-0861, RR-0714, RR-0255, RR-0178, RR-0764, RR-0949, RR-0334, RR-0681, RR-0103, RR-0427, RR-1333, RR-0768, RR-0908, RR-0384, RR-1405, RR-1222, RR-0279, RR-1028, RR-0713, RR-1109, RR-1285, RR-0591, RR-0735, RR-0735, RR-1134, RR-1345, RR-0996, RR-0589, RR-0837, RR-1025, RR-1370, RR-0600, RR-1370, RR-0026, RR-0958, RR-0921, RR-1461, RR-0060, RR-0372, RR-1024, RR-0093, RR-0653, RR-0571, RR-1131	Glint and Glare	Respondents expressed concern about glint and glare from the panels impacting **pilots, drivers, horse riders, walkers and nearby livestock.** Respondents have expressed their concern over glint and glare impacts to local airfields such as **Sherburn and Burn Gliding Club.**	The Applicant acknowledges these comments. As part of the Application, the Applicant submitted a **Glint and Glare Assessment [APP-186]**, which considered the potential effects of the Proposed Development on a range of receptors, including Sherburn-in-Elmet Airfield, Burn Airfield, other aviation receptors, road users, rail users, residential properties, and users of Public Rights of Way (PRoW), including horse riders. The findings of the assessment are discussed further within **ES Volume 1 Chapter 16: Other Environmental Matters [APP-054]**. The Glint and Glare Assessment predicted significant impacts from south-facing and tracking panels on aviation activity at Sherburn-in-Elmet Airfield and Burn Airfield. However, the Empirical Study contained within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.4: Glint and Glare Assessment [APP-186]** indicates that the impacts predicted by the glint and glare modelling do not occur in practice. On this basis, the Applicant considers that no mitigation is required and that no significant effects are anticipated for airfield users. The Applicant is continuing to engage with both airfields in relation to the assessment findings. Temporary significant impacts were predicted for some roads, rail routes and residential properties in the absence of advanced planting. Mitigation in the form of advanced planting, secured through the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**, would reduce these effects to a not significant level. Temporary solar reflections were also identified within a train driver's primary field of view at limited locations along the north-western edge of Solar Development Site 6. With the implementation of advanced planting secured through the **oLEMP [APP-195]**, these effects would similarly be mitigated to a not significant level. No significant impacts are predicted for users of Public Rights of Way, including horse riders, and no mitigation is required in respect of these receptors. Nearby livestock has not been included as a specific receptor within the Glint and Glare Assessment, as there is no evidence that livestock is negatively affected by glint and glare. Livestock are routinely exposed to reflections from a variety of

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				natural and man-made features, including water bodies and agricultural buildings, without adverse effects. On this basis, it is not predicted that there would be any significant glint and glare impacts on livestock arising from the Proposed Development.
GLI-02	RR-0279, RR-1051, RR-0793	Glint and Glare	Respondents expressed concern for panels glaring / reflecting into residential properties.	Glint and Glare impacts have been assessed fully within the **Glint and Glare Assessment [APP-186]** and the **Other Environmental Matters chapter [APP-054]**. No significant impacts are predicted towards nearby dwellings following the implementation of advance planting for a small number of dwellings. This is secured within the **oCEMP [APP-192]** and indicative locations for this are outlined within **Figure 16.1 Advanced Planting for Glint and Glare Mitigation [APP-141]**.
GLI-03	RR-1051, RR-0996	Glint and Glare	Respondents stated that insufficient consideration has been given to aircraft operations at Sherburn airfield, particularly given the property's position beneath established flight paths, raising safety and amenity concerns.	Glint and Glare impacts have been assessed fully within the **Glint and Glare Assessment [APP-186]** and the **Other Environmental Matters chapter [APP-054]**. Due to operational data previously provided by Sherburn-in-Elmet Airfield, custom receptors have been used in this assessment which correspond to Sherburn's circuit routes and flight paths. The Empirical Study (**ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.4: Glint and Glare Assessment [APP-186]**) confirms that the impact predicted by the Glint and Glare modelling does not occur in practice. The modelled results for the Proposed Development are comparable with the results of the model for the airfields identified in the Empirical Study for which real-world experiences of pilots are available. On this basis it is the position of the Applicant that specific mitigation measures are not required. In addition to this, engagement with Sherburn-in-Elmet Airfield has been conducted to understand any other aviation safety concerns that they may have.
GLI-04	RR-0958	Glint and Glare	Respondent expressed concern for the potential glint and glare / reflective impact to people with photo sensitive epilepsy, potentially causing seizures	There is no known potential for glint and glare to affect people with photo sensitive epilepsy. There is no 'flickering' effect inherent to glint and glare, and the Applicant is not aware of any instances of glint and glare causing seizures.
GLI-05	RR-0861	Glint and Glare	Respondent requested specific information on whether they (Woodhaven Kennels) would be impacted by the glare from panels.	Woodhaven Kennels correspond to dwelling receptor W64 in the **Glint and Glare Assessment [APP-186]** and a low impact is predicted towards this receptor. Reflections are geometrically possible and partial screening i between the reflecting panel areas and the receptor limits reflections to less than 3 months per year and less than 60 minutes on any given day.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
GLI-06	RR-0854	Glint and Glare	**[BoR numbers 03-038, 04-001]**: Respondent expressed concern their property directly to the east of Site 4 will suffer detrimentally from glint and glare impacts.	Glint and Glare impacts have been assessed fully within the **Glint and Glare Assessment [APP-186]** and the **Other Environmental Matters chapter [APP-054]**. All dwellings that are within the one-kilometre assessment area and have a potential view of the panels have been included within the assessment, in line with typical practice and Pager Power's Glint and Glare Guidance (Fourth Edition). No significant impacts are predicted towards nearby dwellings, including properties in the vicinity of Site 4.
GLI-07	RR-1051	Glint and Glare	Respondent stated that the glint and glare assessment is inadequate because it is not property-specific and fails to account for first-floor windows and dual-aspect rooms facing south and west.	The **Glint and Glare Assessment [APP-186]** has been conducted in line with industry standards and established guidance. Though receptors are placed to correspond with ground-floor observer heights, upper-storey views are considered within the assessment for properties which have upper-storey living space. Ground-floor views are considered the most sensitive as for most dwellings this is where the primary living spaces are located, where residents are likely to spend most time during daylight hours (when glint and glare is possible); upper-storey views are considered but assigned a lower sensitivity in these circumstances. For flats, all storeys are considered to have the same sensitivity as primary living spaces are located on all floors. Dual-aspect rooms are considered in the same way as any other, as the glint and glare modelling is highly conservative and assumes that there is always a window which faces the reflecting panels.

2.16 Human Health

Human Health – General Comments

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Human Health - General Comments				
HUM-01	RR-0826, RR-0561, RR-0834, RR-0207, RR-0216, RR-0375, RR-0101, RR-0008, RR-0849, RR-1033, RR-0307, RR-1261, RR-0714, RR-1090, RR-0178, RR-0764, RR-0034, RR-0011, RR-0949, RR-0343, RR-0157, RR-1016, RR-0144, RR-0214, RR-0334, RR-0883, RR-0888, RR-0427, RR-0442, RR-0285, RR-1119, RR-0213, RR-0992, RR-1115, RR-0052, RR-0917, RR-0436, RR-1405, RR-1222, RR-1242, RR-1276, RR-0235, RR-0757, RR-0304, RR-1324, RR-0086, RR-0867, RR-0053, RR-0983, RR-0723, RR-0534, RR-0987, RR-1207, RR-0277, RR-1221, RR-0925, RR-1311, RR-0882, RR-0142, RR-0520, RR-1445, RR-1366, RR-0087, RR-0039, RR-0897, RR-0015, RR-1051, RR-0458, RR-0113, RR-0483, RR-0290, RR-0253, RR-1360, RR-0794, RR-0004, RR-0127, RR-1134, RR-0780, RR-0997, RR-0185, RR-0215, RR-0536, RR-0146, RR-1419, RR-0837, RR-1423, RR-0743, RR-0105, RR-0696, RR-1055, RR-1240, RR-0831, RR-1234, RR-0958, RR-0720, RR-0758, RR-0921, RR-0245, RR-0184, RR-1132, RR-1018, RR-0359, RR-0544, RR-0147, RR-0985, RR-0214, RR-0334, RR-0354, RR-0236, RR-0398, RR-0787, RR-1140, RR-0710, RR-1102, RR-0894, RR-0931, RR-0814, RR-0321, RR-0093, RR-0717, RR-1429, RR-0021, RR-0878, RR-0082, RR-1281, RR-0636, RR-1155, RR-0890 RR-0392, RR-0007, RR-0967, RR-0031, RR-0853, RR-1282, RR-0198, RR-0973, RR-0303, RR-1170, RR-0962	Human Health	Respondents expressed concern about the Proposed Development's potential effects on community and/or resident **mental health** and **wellbeing**. Some respondents expressed that the local area and/or access to the local countryside is important for mental health and wellbeing. Some respondents expressed concern about increased stress, anxiety and/or worry as a result of the proposals and/or the application process.	With regard to health, including mental health and wellbeing, the LVS EIA Scoping Report (November 2024) considered the potential effects of the Proposed Development on population health. This considered the likely impacts of the project on the social, economic and environmental determinants of health and the location and sensitivity of the resident population and community receptors. As described in the Scoping Report, no potentially significant effects on population health were identified and human health was scoped out of the Environmental Statement (ES). This conclusion was supported by the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) in their Scoping Opinion. The Applicant considers that the evidence does not suggest a significant adverse effect on physical or mental health at population level as a result of the Proposed Development. However, it is recognised that perceptions and concerns during the planning stages and adverse environmental effects during construction and operation may lead to reduced quality of life and mental wellbeing for some individuals. This is most likely to apply to residents in close proximity to the Order Limits. The Applicant has sought to reduce the effects of this through active and focused community engagement throughout the application process; and through development of a suite of management plans that set out how environmental effects during construction will be managed to reduce any effects, including a construction traffic management plan. In the context of community wellbeing, the Proposed Development will protect and enhance access to recreational spaces with the protection of PRoW and inclusion of new permissive paths, as secured through **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**. These new routes provide an opportunity to create an enhanced and better-connected network of recreational routes within the local area, adding to the existing PRoW network and providing increased opportunity for recreation in the areas surrounding the Proposed Development. In addition, the Applicant has embedded mitigation measures to maintain the amenity of existing Public Rights of Way, including the provision of landscaping and a minimum 15 metre buffer offset

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				from all infrastructure, including fencing; these measures are set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]**. Measures have also 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) [APP-199]** submitted as part of the Application. There are also no significant effects identified on PRoW receptors, as outlined in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]**.
HUM-02	RR-0375, RR-0101, RR-0256, RR-1003, RR-0867, RR-0723, RR-1207, RR-0105, RR-0720, RR-0334, RR-1140, RR-1118, RR-0853, RR-1282, RR-1051	Human Health	Respondents expressed concern about the Proposed Development's potential effects on human health and/or physical health.	The Applicant acknowledges this comment and has addressed in the response above.
HUM-03	RR-0720, RR-0015	Human Health	Respondents expressed concern that the temporary increase in population associated with the Proposed Development could place additional pressure on **NHS services**.	The LVS **EIA Scoping Report (November 2024) [APP-143]** considered the potential effects of the Proposed Development on population health. This looked at the potential impacts during construction, including on access to health and social care and other social infrastructure. It noted that the presence of the temporary construction workforce has the potential to create additional demand for local services. Based on the location of the Proposed Development, it is considered that the majority of construction workers that do not commute to the site will find accommodation in urban areas such as York, Knottingley, Pontefract or Castleford, which are within easy reach of the site, rather than in the smaller rural settlements. Workers dispersed throughout these settlements will not have an impact on demand for services. Furthermore, the majority are unlikely to register with local services such as GPs whilst residing in the area temporarily. It concluded that therefore, no potential impacts on local services are identified. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]**, Table 13-5 in a response to a scoping comment from NYC also notes that as no permanent residential housing is being built as part of the Proposed Development. Consequently, there is no projected increase in the base population, and thus no change in social infrastructure requirements, such as GP services.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Paragraph 13.9.49 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]** further notes that it is considered that health and wellbeing facilities could potentially experience, at worst, adverse effects of a negligible level of significance during the project lifecycle. There is a lack of evidence to suggest that temporary workers register with new GPs during an assignment unless the work is extended significantly, or they have specific health-related issues. Given the 36-month construction period of the Proposed Development, it is considered that the construction phase would need to be significantly extended for this risk to materialise. Supporting this, data from the House of Commons Library GP Dashboard shows that the York region has an average of 1,450 registered patients per GP, which is lower than the national average across England, suggesting relatively lower pressure on primary care services. Furthermore, a review of GP availability in Selby confirms that 19 out of 20 GP practices in Selby are currently accepting new patients, and all accept appointments for temporary residents.

Human Health – Detailed

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Human Health - Detailed				
HUM-04	RR-0042, RR-1008, RR-0847	Human Health	Respondents suggested that according to the WHO, solar farms should be located 2 miles away from properties.	The World Health Organisation (WHO) does not specify a minimum distance between solar farms and residential properties. This is considered on a case-by-case basis through local planning processes, taking into account relevant guidance and safety standards for issues such as electromagnetic fields (EMF), noise, traffic and visual intrusion. The WHO does not currently set its own limits for safe levels of EMF exposure or distances from sources. In its guidance on electromagnetic fields, the WHO notes that 'Countries set their own national standards for exposure to electromagnetic fields. However, the majority of these national standards draw on the guidelines set by the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP), which is recognized by WHO' and that 'Based on a recent in-depth review of the scientific literature, the WHO concluded that current evidence does not confirm the existence of any health consequences from exposure to low level electromagnetic fields'. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Matters [APP-054]**, Section 16.6 Electromagnetic Field (EMF) Assessment, presented a summary of the findings of an assessment of the likely significant effects on human health in relation to EMF as a result of the Proposed Development, with reference to the ICNIRP guidelines. The assessment concluded that no significant electromagnetic impacts are predicted from the proposed infrastructure (cables, conversion units, substations or BESS). Potential effects from noise, traffic and visual intrusion have all been assessed within the **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048], Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**, and **Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement [APP-052]**. With mitigation in place, no significant adverse effects are assessed for noise and vibration, or traffic and movement. The LVIA demonstrates that by Year 15 of operation, once planting has matured, the majority of landscape and visual effects would also reduce to minor or non-significant levels.
HUM-05	RR-0285	Human Health	Respondent stated specific concerns about the impact of the development on a vulnerable individual within their household, noting heightened sensitivity to noise, lighting, visual change, and increased activity, with potential consequences including	The Applicant notes this comment and concerns. The Applicant is willing to engaging with this respondent to understand their concerns, so that the mitigation measures it has already committed to (such as careful construction programming so that activities which may generate significant

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			anxiety, distress, sleep disturbance, sensory overload, and long-term deterioration in mental wellbeing.	noise are planned with consideration given to local occupants and sensitive receptors) can be applied with sufficient regard to the needs of these individuals. The Applicant also notes the conclusions of the **Equality Impact Assessment [APP-212]** in this regard.
HUM-06	RR-1051	Human Health	Respondent stated that the proximity and elevation of Site 6 would result in direct overlooking into private living spaces, including bedrooms and bathrooms, leading to a significant loss of privacy. Respondent stated that this level of overlooking would materially affect the ordinary day-to-day enjoyment and use of their home, extending beyond a simple loss of view into a fundamental residential amenity issue. Respondent concluded that the impacts would have a direct and ongoing effect on family life within the home, due to constant perceived intrusion from nearby development.	The Applicant notes this comment and concerns raised with regards to overlooking. As noted in the **oOEMP [APP-193]** during the operational phase, general activity and personnel on-site within the Proposed Development will be minimal and will be restricted principally to vegetation management and equipment maintenance and servicing, replacement and renewal of any components that fail, and monitoring. Once operational, it is anticipated that no more than 5 visits a month is anticipated and the number of workers would be very limited. Activities would be at ground level and would move across the area of Site 6. Therefore activities in proximity to this property would be temporally limited. The location of residential receptors was factored into the design of the Proposed Development, including minimum set-back of solar panels and other infrastructure from properties; as a result, effects to residential amenity are not identified. With respect to residential visual amenity, Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 01/24 explains in point 6(1) that views from houses and individual properties are a matter of private amenity, noting that it is an established planning principle that there is no right to a view. The LVIA has not identified any significant adverse residual effects on the views of residents that would breach the Residential Visual Amenity threshold and cause serious harm to the living conditions of residents (major adverse) and therefore a Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) has not been carried out. Further information is provided in Table 10-5 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**.
HUM-07	RR-1051	Human Health	Respondent stated strong disagreement with the Applicant's conclusion that there would be no significant adverse human health effects, noting that both they and their spouse have existing health conditions, which they are willing to evidence with medical letters if required.	The EIA process, in line with established guidance, considers potential impacts on health, including mental health and wellbeing at a population level rather than an individual level. The LVS EIA Scoping Report (November 2024) considered the potential effects of the Proposed Development on population health. This considered the likely impacts of the project on the social, economic and environmental determinants of health and the location and sensitivity of the resident population and community receptors. As described in the Scoping Report, no potentially significant effects on population health were

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				identified and human health was scoped out of the Environmental Statement (ES). This conclusion was supported by the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) in their Scoping Opinion. The Applicant considers that the evidence does not suggest a significant adverse effect on physical or mental health at population level as a result of the Proposed Development. However, it is recognised that perceptions and concerns during the planning stages and adverse environmental effects during construction and operation may lead to reduced quality of life and mental wellbeing for some individuals. This is most likely to apply to residents in close proximity to the Order Limits. The Applicant has sought to reduce the effects of this through active and focused community engagement throughout the application process and is committed to continuing to engage with both the community and individuals. The Applicant has engaged with this respondent and welcomes the continued engagement regarding this topic.
HUM-08	RR-1051	Human Health	Respondent stated that there has been no sufficiently focused or standalone human health assessment, despite concerns being raised over an extended period with both the developer and North Yorkshire Council.	With regard to health, including mental health and wellbeing, the LVS EIA Scoping Report (November 2024) considered the potential effects of the Proposed Development on population health. This considered the likely impacts of the project on the social, economic and environmental determinants of health and the location and sensitivity of the resident population and community receptors. As described in the Scoping Report, no potentially significant effects on population health were identified and human health was scoped out of the Environmental Statement (ES). This conclusion was supported by the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) in their Scoping Opinion. There have been ongoing discussions with North Yorkshire Council (NYC)'s Public Health team to confirm that there are no potentially significant effects on population health, including mental health, in combination with other nearby projects. However, it is recognised that perceptions and concerns during the planning stages and adverse environmental effects during construction and operation may lead to reduced quality of life and mental wellbeing for some individuals. The Applicant has sought to reduce the effects of this through active and focused community engagement throughout the application process; and through development of a suite of management plans that set out how environmental effects during construction will be managed to reduce any effects, including an **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]**.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
HUM-09	RR-0853	Human Health	Respondent stated that the Proposed Development conflicts with Policy SP2 (Spatial Strategy) of the Selby Core Strategy, which seeks to protect the countryside from inappropriate development, and that the scale of the proposals is wholly excessive and unreasonable for a rural location, negatively impacting mental health.	As a National Significant Infrastructure Project, NPS EN-1, combined with any technology specific energy NPS where relevant, provides the primary policy for decisions by the Secretary of State. Whilst it is acknowledged that local planning policies, such as those contained in the Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan (2013) and the Revised Publication: Selby Local Plan (2024), may be important and relevant, paragraph 5.10.5 of NPS EN-1 is clear in recognising 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."* Selby Core Strategy 2013 is Policy SP2 (Spatial Development Strategy) part C seeks to limit the type and scale of development within the countryside. It is acknowledged that the Proposed Development is located principally in the Selby Countryside. The location has been informed by: available grid connection at Monk Fryston, site availability within reasonable proximity of the grid connection location, avoiding environmentally (including heritage) constrained land. Further information is set out in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-041]**. With regard to health, including mental health and wellbeing, the LVS EIA Scoping Report (November 2024) considered the potential effects of the Proposed Development on population health. This considered the likely impacts of the project on the social, economic and environmental determinants of health and the location and sensitivity of the resident population and community receptors. As described in the Scoping Report, no potentially significant effects on population health were identified and human health was scoped out of the Environmental Statement (ES). This conclusion was supported by the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) in their Scoping Opinion. The Applicant considers that the evidence does not suggest a significant adverse effect on physical or mental health at population level as a result of the Proposed Development. However, it is recognised that perceptions and concerns during the planning stages and adverse environmental effects during construction and operation may lead to reduced quality

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				of life and mental wellbeing for some individuals. This is most likely to apply to residents in close proximity to the Order Limits. The Applicant has sought to reduce the effects of this through active and focused community engagement throughout the application process; and through development of a suite of management plans that set out how environmental effects during construction will be managed to reduce any effects, including an **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]**.

2.17 Landscape and Visual

Landscape and Visual – General Comments

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Landscape and Visual - General Comments				
LAN-01	RR-0478, RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-0112, RR-0857, RR-0702, RR-0088, RR-0129, RR-1458, RR-0826, RR-0561, RR-1338, RR-0411, RR-1163, RR-0834, RR-0678, RR-0752, RR-0416, RR-0289, RR-0597, RR-1271, RR-0165, RR-0418, RR-1201, RR-1403, RR-1135, RR-0037, RR-0050, RR-0922, RR-0471, RR-1186, RR-1179, RR-0200, RR-0842, RR-0910, RR-0698, RR-0583, RR-0393, RR-1353, RR-0111, RR-0131, RR-0083, RR-1343, RR-1076, RR-1388, RR-1421, RR-0832, RR-0775, RR-0599, RR-0022, RR-0496, RR-0358, RR-1218, RR-0041, RR-1220, RR-1355,RR-0226, RR-1078, RR-0754, RR-0292, RR-1060, RR-0450, RR-0615, RR-0390, RR-0661, RR-1346, RR-1397, RR-0120, RR-0096, RR-0114, RR-1272, RR-1232, RR-0061, RR-1261, RR-1173, RR-0391, RR-0273, RR-0695, RR-0481, RR-0492, RR-0186, RR-0313, RR-0406, RR-0961, RR-1400, RR-1094, RR-1403, RR-0255, RR-0467, RR-0493, RR-0034, RR-1288, RR-0189, RR-0748, RR-1293, RR-0893, RR-0287, RR-0308, RR-0498, RR-1178, RR-1211, RR-0797, RR-0877, RR-1249, RR-0243, RR-0965, RR-0611, RR-1384, RR-0949, RR-1002, RR-0343, RR-1224, RR-1105, RR-0157, RR-1359, RR-1310, RR-0670, RR-0503, RR-1016, RR-1410, RR-1111, RR-0506, RR-1348, RR-1274, RR-1169, RR-1066, RR-1321, RR-0214, RR-0144, RR-0268, RR-1162, RR-0056, RR-0790, RR-0334, RR-0782, RR-0873, RR-0490, RR-0150, RR-1126, RR-0681, RR-0883, RR-0003, RR-1383, RR-0976, RR-1020, RR-0123, RR-	Landscape and Visual	Respondents expressed general concern about the **visual impact of the Proposed Development**, including the potential for it to industrialise the area and / or alter its rural character. Some respondents also raised concerns about potential effects on private views and views from nearby properties.	The Applicant acknowledges that the Proposed Development would introduce changes to the character of parts of the landscape and to some views. It is recognised through NPS EN-1 which states in Section 5.10 that *"virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will impact the landscape"*. Paragraph 5.10.13 explains further that *"all proposed energy infrastructure is likely to have visual effects for many receptors around proposed sites"*. NPS EN-3 provides further policy on solar photovoltaic generation. In paragraph 2.10.19 it notes that *"utility-scale solar farms are large sites that may have a significant zone of visual influence."* A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been carried out by the Applicant, and this is presented in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048].** The LVIA concludes that, with embedded and additional mitigation, the resulting effects would be localised, reversible and would reduce over time. With respect to private views, the Applicant acknowledges that changes to people's views and perceptions of their surroundings can cause concern. The Applicant has sought to understand these concerns through community consultation, including meetings with residents close to the draft Order Limits where requested. Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 01/24 explains in point 6(1) that views from houses and individual properties are a matter of private amenity, noting that it is an established planning principle that there is no right to a view. The LVIA has not identified any significant adverse residual effects on the views of residents that would breach the Residential Visual Amenity threshold and cause serious harm to the living conditions of residents (major adverse) and therefore a Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) has not been carried out. Nevertheless, the Applicant has continued to engage with affected parties and to review and iterate the design to seek to address concerns whilst delivering a scheme which responds to the need to maximise the available grid connection.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	0888, RR-1313, RR-0322, RR-0442, RR-0121, RR-0427, RR-1008, RR-0285, RR-1119, RR-0104, RR-0256, RR-0237, RR-1117, RR-0762, RR-0227, RR-0052, RR-0568, RR-0058, RR-0745, RR-1106, RR-1106, RR-0023, RR-1415, RR-0827, RR-1048, RR-1456, RR-1071, RR-0576, RR-1333, RR-0538, RR-0370, RR-0820, RR-0778, RR-0556, RR-0063, RR-0917, RR-0062, RR-0865, RR-0575, RR-0726, RR-1254, RR-0460, RR-0847, RR-1133, RR-0505, RR-0908, RR-0998, RR-0768, RR-0291, RR-1237, RR-0384, RR-1275, RR-0549, RR-0668, RR-0662, RR-1014, RR-0642, RR-1376, RR-0628, RR-0680, RR-0417, RR-0856, RR-1101, RR-0225, RR-0159, RR-1284, RR-1428, RR-0286, RR-0075, RR-1405, RR-0750, RR-1184, RR-0376, RR-0351, RR-1145, RR-0487, RR-0798, RR-1292, RR-0906, RR-0092, RR-1222, RR-0182, RR-0733, RR-0771, RR-1156, RR-0166, RR-1416, RR-0279, RR-1242, RR-0930, RR-1187, RR-0002, RR-1028, RR-0394, RR-0069, RR-0352, RR-1005, RR-0431, RR-0179, RR-1290, RR-1047, RR-1073, RR-1236, RR-0369, RR-0791, RR-0235, RR-0240, RR-0360, RR-0725, RR-0304, RR-0673, RR-0713, RR-1324, RR-0679, RR-1154, RR-0848, RR-0742, RR-0425, RR-0086, RR-0803, RR-1452, RR-1378, RR-0130, RR-0333, RR-1172, RR-1341, RR-0108, RR-0590, RR-0867, RR-0191, RR-0494, RR-1058, RR-0329, RR-0813, RR-1285, RR-0884, RR-0339, RR-0839, RR-0841, RR-1149, RR-1248, RR-0053, RR-0983, RR-0415, RR-0692, RR-0417, RR-0984, RR-0055, RR-0795, RR-0591, RR-0913, RR-0926, RR-0099, RR-0712, RR-0858, RR-0718, RR-1334, RR-0987, RR-0689, RR-0379, RR-1139, RR-0206, RR-1193, RR-0514, RR-1129, RR-0610, RR-1207, RR-1302, RR-			Further information is provided in Table 10-5 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**. It should be noted that with proposed mitigation in place and following initial establishment, landscape and visual impacts will generally reduce over time. Mitigation measures include substantial new planting, reinforcement of existing vegetation, careful siting of infrastructure, and minimisation of lighting to avoid unnecessary urbanising effects. While landscape mitigation takes time to establish, the LVIA demonstrates that by Year 15 of operation, once planting has matured, the majority of landscape and visual effects would reduce and would not be significant. Mitigation measures are shown on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** and are secured via the **Works Plans [AS-004]**, **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195],** and the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217].**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	0669, RR-0652, RR-1221, RR-0925, RR-1457, RR-1270, RR-0142, RR-0365, RR-0882, RR-0249, RR-1081, RR-0520, RR-0252, RR-1128, RR-0328, RR-0808, RR-0039, RR-0919, RR-0089, RR-0579, RR-0135, RR-0634, RR-1202, RR-0732, RR-0897, RR-0694, RR-0015, RR-0667, RR-0761, RR-0749, RR-0874, RR-0377, RR-0161, RR-0405, RR-0943, RR-0388, RR-0577, RR-1412, RR-0153, RR-0735, RR-0735, RR-0081, RR-1077, RR-0200, RR-0428, RR-0547, RR-0499, RR-0299, RR-0686, RR-0080, RR-0271, RR-1304, RR-1006, RR-0113, RR-0483, RR-0110, RR-1067, RR-0954, RR-0898, RR-0290, RR-1273, RR-0187, RR-0830, RR-0276, RR-1137, RR-0200, RR-0335, RR-0253, RR-1371, RR-0541, RR-0578, RR-0587, RR-0940, RR-1315, RR-0715, RR-1360, RR-0539, RR-0229, RR-0063, RR-0482, RR-0746, RR-0794, RR-1331, RR-0845, RR-0119, RR-0660, RR-0809, RR-0106, RR-0737, RR-1372, RR-0687, RR-1350, RR-0323, RR-1134, RR-0780, RR-1291, RR-0971, RR-0608, RR-0094, RR-0779, RR-1259, RR-1246, RR-0215, RR-0536, RR-0815, RR-0146, RR-0445, RR-0652, RR-0401, RR-1345, RR-0203, RR-1265, RR-0996, RR-1406, RR-0221, RR-0648, RR-0702, RR-0837, RR-1408, RR-1423, RR-0550, RR-0541, RR-0019, RR-1025, RR-1269, RR-1411, RR-0378, RR-1356, RR-1120, RR-0836, RR-0117, RR-0934, RR-0074, RR-0743, RR-0734, RR-1099, RR-1241, RR-0400, RR-0244, RR-1007, RR-0621, RR-0951, RR-0835, RR-0630, RR-0876, RR-1055, RR-0799, RR-0963, RR-1370, RR-0620, RR-1180, RR-0067, RR-0831, RR-0265, RR-0988, RR-1189, RR-1318, RR-1430, RR-1234, RR-0349, RR-1417, RR-0958, RR-0783, RR-0921, RR-0720, RR-1316, RR-0073, RR-0044, RR-			

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	0348, RR-1181, RR-1319, RR-0380, RR-0563, RR-0184, RR-0605, RR-0709, RR-0866, RR-0266, RR-0724, RR-1132, RR-0614, RR-1229, RR-0300, RR-1233, RR-1461, RR-0727, RR-1065, RR-1018, RR-0544, RR-0258, RR-0423, RR-0147, RR-0985, RR-0766, RR-0708, RR-1009, RR-0674, RR-0345, RR-1443, RR-1410, RR-0049, RR-1066, RR-0214, RR-1015, RR-0334, RR-0354, RR-1034, RR-0227, RR-0760, RR-0747, RR-0452, RR-0195, RR-0745, RR-0027, RR-0649, RR-0944, RR-0598, RR-0407, RR-0010, RR-0719, RR-0154, RR-1460, RR-1140, RR-0060, RR-0204, RR-1361, RR-1415, RR-0998, RR-0549, RR-0662, RR-1014, RR-0642, RR-0429, RR-0846, RR-0456, RR-1183, RR-1395, RR-0561, RR-0345, RR-0205, RR-0502, RR-1031, RR-0263, RR-1239, RR-0937, RR-1084, RR-0035, RR-0040, RR-1000, RR-0284, RR-0381, RR-1102, RR-0535, RR-0233, RR-0223, RR-1053, RR-1118, RR-0523, RR-0666, RR-0293, RR-1435, RR-1363, RR-0364, RR-0048, RR-0202, RR-1168, RR-0275, RR-0361, RR-0595, RR-0833, RR-1258, RR-0776, RR-0250, RR-0755, RR-0671, RR-0931, RR-0728, RR-0047, RR-1303, RR-0814, RR-1459, RR-1217, RR-1042, RR-0071, RR-0409, RR-0231, RR-1227, RR-0729, RR-1367, RR-0321, RR-0001, RR-1004, RR-1024, RR-0093, RR-1426, RR-0500, RR-0950, RR-0176, RR-0126, RR-0469, RR-0801, RR-0717, RR-0021, RR-0330, RR-0531, RR-0869, RR-0170, RR-0018, RR-0464, RR-0878, RR-1213, RR-0262, RR-1327, RR-0192, RR-0064, RR-0432, RR-1281, RR-0383, RR-0916, RR-0636, RR-0208, RR-0036, RR-1021, RR-0852, RR-0125, RR-1155, RR-0078, RR-0929, RR-0340, RR-1255, RR-0890, RR-0786, RR-0793, RR-0272, RR-0817, RR-0347, RR-			

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	0448, RR-0392, RR-0555, RR-0269, RR-0647, RR-0811, RR-0980, RR-1192, RR-0280, RR-0007, RR-0274, RR-0054, RR-0638, RR-0967, RR-0031, RR-0853, RR-0942, RR-0999, RR-0885, RR-1282, RR-0198, RR-0197, RR-1322, RR-0303, RR-1138, RR-0098			
LAN-02	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-0857, RR-1116, RR-0129, RR-1458, RR-1059, RR-0561, RR-0241, RR-1338, RR-0834, RR-0903, RR-0774, RR-0289, RR-0165, RR-0193, RR-0646, RR-0050, RR-0216, RR-1179, RR-0387, RR-0842, RR-0698, RR-0393, RR-0131, RR-0083, RR-1343, RR-0588, RR-1388, RR-1421, RR-0832, RR-0599, RR-0041, RR-1355, RR-0226, RR-0754, RR-0788, RR-0292, RR-1060, RR-0615, RR-1346, RR-0519, RR-1397, RR-0796, RR-0120, RR-0254, RR-1272, RR-0956, RR-0273, RR-0128, RR-0524, RR-1030, RR-0406, RR-0927, RR-0714, RR-1400, RR-1094, RR-0868, RR-0493, RR-1288, RR-0893, RR-0457, RR-0804, RR-0498, RR-1178, RR-1178, RR-0844, RR-1205, RR-0301, RR-0611, RR-1152, RR-0949, RR-0141, RR-1002, RR-1442, RR-0157, RR-1310, RR-0503, RR-1016, RR-1111, RR-0651, RR-1066, RR-0214, RR-1015, RR-0334, RR-0663, RR-0873, RR-0782, RR-0490, RR-1126, RR-0681, RR-1020, RR-0123, RR-0864, RR-0322, RR-0121, RR-0442, RR-0427, RR-0285, RR-1119, RR-0992, RR-0522, RR-0237, RR-1034, RR-0052, RR-0568, RR-0023, RR-0818, RR-1071, RR-0576, RR-1097, RR-0538, RR-0370, RR-0063, RR-0917, RR-0062, RR-0865, RR-1254, RR-0962, RR-0460, RR-1237, RR-0384, RR-0549, RR-0668, RR-0642, RR-0628, RR-0417, RR-0856, RR-1101, RR-0225, RR-0159, RR-1284, RR-1428, RR-0286, RR-0075, RR-1405, RR-	Landscape and Visual	Respondents expressed concern about the **scale** of the Proposed Development, stating that it is **too big**. Some respondents requested Proposed Development be reduced in size in general.	As per the description set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [APP-040]** the total area within the DCO Order Limits encompasses approximately 1,270 hectares (ha). Of this, the 'Solar Development Sites' comprise approximately 900 ha of land. Around 680 ha of this land is proposed as being required for installation of solar PV panels and associated infrastructure. The remaining 220 ha would provide areas dedicated to ecological mitigation, measurable Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) delivery, landscaping, offsets and agricultural land managed for environmental enhancement and habitat creation. Section 4.2 of NPS EN-1 sets out the critical national priority for low carbon infrastructure, to which this application for development consent responds. Paragraph 4.2.34 further notes that it is for each location to maximise its capacity to deliver these aims. In this regard, The Proposed Development has been designed to maximise and deliver the greatest possible energy generation benefit from the available land and the available grid connection, whilst avoiding, minimising and/or mitigating harmful environmental effects. Paragraph 5.10.26 of NPS EN-1 states that *"reducing the scale of a project can help to mitigate the visual and landscape effects of a proposed project. However, reducing the scale or otherwise amending the design of a proposed energy infrastructure project may result in a significant operational constraint and reduction in function – for example, electricity generation output."* **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-041]** explains how the Applicant has evolved the design to respond to the opportunities and constraints presented by the Site as part of an environment-led design approach. This has included establishing minimum offsets, which are set out in the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]** and explained further in the context of the design vision and design principles in the **Design Approach Document (DAD) [APP-216]**. The **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** shows the large areas of the Proposed Development which are

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	0750, RR-0376, RR-0487, RR-0798, RR-1164, RR-0182, RR-0771, RR-0279, RR-1369, RR-1187, RR-1028, RR-0069, RR-0402, RR-0431, RR-1047, RR-1236, RR-0369, RR-0235, RR-0725, RR-1324, RR-1154, RR-0086, RR-0803, RR-1378, RR-1172, RR-0867, RR-1263, RR-0612, RR-0494, RR-0329, RR-0813, RR-1285, RR-0341, RR-0983, RR-0841, RR-0986, RR-0415, RR-0692, RR-0723, RR-0055, RR-0379, RR-1139, RR-0447, RR-1129, RR-1207, RR-0046, RR-1357, RR-0652, RR-0669, RR-1001, RR-1457, RR-0142, RR-0520, RR-1128, RR-0087, RR-1266, RR-0039, RR-0919, RR-1049, RR-0579, RR-0135, RR-0694, RR-1374, RR-0761, RR-0161, RR-0388, RR-0609, RR-0153, RR-0081, RR-1077, RR-0458, RR-0428, RR-0080, RR-0483, RR-0290, RR-1273, RR-0187, RR-0830, RR-0276, RR-0253, RR-0336, RR-1360, RR-0063, RR-0968, RR-0746, RR-0809, RR-1372, RR-1350, RR-0780, RR-0608, RR-0438, RR-1246, RR-0215, RR-0815, RR-0146, RR-0028, RR-1345, RR-0203, RR-0221, RR-0105, RR-0837, RR-1408, RR-1411, RR-1099, RR-0400, RR-1287, RR-0776, RR-1055, RR-0495, RR-0799, RR-1370, RR-1180, RR-0265, RR-0831, RR-1130, RR-0217, RR-0988, RR-1430, RR-1234, RR-0720, RR-0921, RR-0380, RR-0563, RR-0828, RR-0605, RR-0709, RR-0560, RR-1132, RR-0211, RR-1229, RR-0727, RR-1018, RR-0544, RR-0258, RR-1009, RR-1130, RR-1066, RR-0214, RR-1015, RR-0334, RR-0354, RR-1034, RR-0747, RR-0218, RR-0247, RR-0060, RR-0549, RR-0561, RR-0622, RR-0765, RR-0624, RR-0381, RR-1102, RR-0535, RR-0259, RR-1118, RR-0557, RR-0666, RR-1013, RR-0202, RR-1168, RR-0595, RR-0755, RR-0931, RR-0209, RR-0554, RR-0814, RR-1459, RR-			proposed for multi-functional environmental mitigation and enhancement, where built development is excluded for example to provide habitats, reducing its scale.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	0629, RR-1042, RR-0071, RR-0133, RR-0321, RR-0463, RR-1253, RR-1150, RR-0800, RR-0500, RR-0950, RR-1330, RR-0018, RR-0878, RR-1339, RR-0440, RR-0571, RR-0208, RR-0136, RR-0786, RR-0793, RR-0272, RR-0793, RR-0817, RR-0392, RR-0555, RR-1153, RR-0647, RR-0967, RR-0853, RR-0999, RR-0198, RR-0197, RR-0242, RR-0211			
LAN-03	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-0857, RR-0088, RR-1458, RR-0826, RR-0165, RR-0375, RR-0700, RR-0599, RR-0754, RR-0615, RR-0661, RR-1397, RR-0120, RR-0949, RR-0157, RR-0214, RR-0334, RR-0123, RR-1034, RR-1347, RR-0908, RR-0998, RR-0750, RR-0376, RR-1222, RR-0279, RR-0369, RR-1341, RR-1285, RR-0076, RR-0983, RR-0694, RR-0080, RR-0119, RR-1372, RR-0608, RR-1246, RR-0105, RR-1055, RR-1370, RR-0563, RR-0605, RR-0709, RR-1132, RR-1034, RR-0205, RR-0814, RR-0994, RR-0500, RR-0170, RR-1327, RR-0852, RR-0980, RR-1282	Landscape and Visual	Respondents expressed concern about the **height** and **size** of the panels. A respondent has asked why panels cannot be closer to 2 metres high.	The **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]** sets out the maximum height of the various components of the Proposed Development, including the ground mounted solar photovoltaic generating stations. There are two options in Table 2-1: • Tracking Solar PV Tables (Option A); and • Fixed Solar PV Tables (Option B) (Work No. 1 (a)) With respect to Option A, tracking panels would have a maximum height of 4.5m Above Ground Level (AGL) at maximum tilt, which would occur at the beginning and end of each day. The Solar PV Panels would reach a horizontal position in the middle of the day and would be positioned horizontally overnight, with a maximum height of 2.5m AGL. Therefore, panels would be lower than the maximum height of 4.5m AGL during the majority of the day. Illustrations of typical tracking panels are provided in Plate 2-1 to Plate 2-3 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [APP-040]**. Paragraph 2.5.9 of ES Chapter 2 explains that east-west single axis tracker Solar PV Panels are the most efficient. If fixed panels are used, these would be 3.5m AGL. Paragraph 4.2.34 of NPS EN-1 notes that it is for each location to maximise its capacity to deliver these aims. In this regard, The Proposed Development, including the selection of the proposed technology, has been designed to maximise and deliver the greatest possible energy generation benefit from the available land and the available grid connection, whilst avoiding, minimising and/or mitigating harmful environmental effects.
LAN-04	RR-1388, RR-0599, RR-0661, RR-1397, RR-0120, RR-0315, RR-0406, RR-0949, RR-0157, RR-0214, RR-0681, RR-0123, RR-0864, RR-1347, RR-0576, RR-0998, RR-0750, RR-0376, RR-1222, RR-0166, RR-1285, RR-0591, RR-0858, RR-0579, RR-	Landscape and Visual	Respondents expressed concern for the visual impact of **security fencing, CCTV, and other associated security infrastructure.**	The **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]** provides details of the various ancillary components of the Proposed Development, including security fencing, CCTV, and other associated security infrastructure. These elements have been designed to be unobtrusive and to minimise landscape and visual impacts, with fencing comprising deer wire mesh and wooden posts which is

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	0694, RR-0735, RR-0735, RR-0080, RR-0483, RR-0290, RR-0587, RR-0794, RR-1372, RR-1246, RR-0955, RR-0734, RR-0105, RR-0921, RR-0214, RR-1460, RR-1140, RR-0060, RR-0937, RR-0814, RR-1042, RR-0500, RR-0852, RR-0793, RR-0272, RR-0853, RR-0580, RR-0853, RR-1034, RR-0211			common with many consented and operational solar farm developments in the UK. As set out in the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]** the maximum height of the CCTV poles will be 3m and these will be galvanized steel and painted in keeping with the prevailing surrounding environment. The CCTV cameras would point directly within the Site boundary and away from land outside The design addresses the point set out in paragraphs 2.10.38 to 2.10.40 of NPS EN-3, which recognises that security of the site is a key consideration for developers. Planting is proposed to enclose the site and provide visual screening, further reducing the impact of such components, as shown on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]**.
LAN-05	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-0834, RR-0599, RR-0315, RR-1249, RR-0949, RR-1310, RR-0103, RR-0123, RR-0568, RR-0750, RR-1073, RR-0086, RR-0612, RR-0494, RR-1149, RR-0591, RR-0161, RR-0153, RR-0155, RR-0483, RR-0996, RR-0105, RR-1102, RR-1153	Landscape and Visual	Some respondents expressed general scepticism about the **effectiveness of the proposed visual mitigation** measures. Some respondents stated that they consider no amount of visual mitigation would be sufficient to address their concerns.	A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been carried out by the Applicant, and this is presented in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**. The Applicant acknowledges that the Proposed Development would introduce changes to the character of parts of the landscape and to some views. However, the LVIA concludes that, with embedded and additional mitigation, the resulting effects would be localised, reversible and would reduce over time. It should be noted that with proposed mitigation in place and following initial establishment, landscape and visual impacts will generally reduce over time. Mitigation measures include substantial new planting, reinforcement of existing vegetation, careful siting of infrastructure, and minimisation of lighting to avoid unnecessary urbanising effects. While landscape mitigation takes time to establish, the LVIA demonstrates that by Year 15 of operation, once planting has matured, the majority of landscape and visual effects would reduce and would not be significant. Mitigation measures are shown on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** and are secured via the **Works Plans [AS-004]**, **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**, and the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]**. As set out in paragraph 4.2.44 of the oLEMP [APP-195], the establishment period is the first five years following planting. Any plants and trees which are found to be dying, damaged or diseased within the establishment period will be replaced with the same species and size to ensure the visual mitigation.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Replacement planting may be required for significant failures which will be identified by ongoing monitoring.
LAN-06	RR-0857, RR-0129, RR-0615, RR-0120, RR-1094, RR-0493, RR-0503, RR-0681, RR-0549, RR-0750, RR-0376, RR-1236, RR-0791, RR-0591, RR-0161, RR-0080, RR-0105, RR-0563, RR-1460, RR-0814, RR-0500, RR-0272	Landscape and Visual	Some respondents raised specific concerns about the visual impact of the proposed **Battery Energy Storage System (BESS)**.	The Applicant notes the concerns regarding visual impacts of the BESS component. The various chapters of the **Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-038 to APP-190]** assess the likely significant effects arising from the BESS at this location and identify mitigation measures where necessary. Overall, the assessment concludes that the siting of the BESS at Solar Development Site 2 presents the lowest potential for significant adverse effects when compared with reasonable alternatives. Further detail on the consideration of alternatives, the design evolution of the Proposed Development and the assessment of potential effects is provided in ES Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-041], which sets out the iterative process undertaken to identify the preferred location and layout for the Proposed Development, including the BESS Compound, in Section 3.4. The **Works Plans [AS-004]** and **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** demonstrate that the BESS Compound is set back from nearby residential receptors. The LVIA **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]** acknowledges that, at Year 1 of operation, the introduction of the BESS and associated infrastructure would result in a noticeable change in landscape character and a reduction in openness at Solar Development Site 2, with moderate adverse effects assessed as significant. However, these effects reduce over time as mitigation planting establishes. By Year 15 of operation, the establishment of hedgerows, trees and woodland planting will filter and partially screen views of the BESS, substation and solar panels, substantially reducing their visual prominence. Residual effects are assessed as minor adverse and not significant, with the Proposed Development becoming increasingly integrated within the surrounding landscape in these views.
LAN-07	RR-0248, RR-0103, RR-0267, RR-1275, RR-1222, RR-0240, RR-0742, RR-0867, RR-0277, RR-1398, RR-1025, RR-0020, RR-1227, RR-0347, RR-1063	Landscape and Visual	Respondents have expressed general concern about the proximity of the Proposed Development to villages and properties.	The Applicant acknowledges the concern regarding the proximity of the Proposed Development to settlements and residential properties. The **Design Approach Document (DAD) [APP-216]** establishes clear principles for the siting of infrastructure, including the avoidance of unacceptable effects on residential amenity and the retention of appropriate separation from properties through embedded design measures.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				In line with these principles, the layout has been iteratively refined to incorporate setbacks from residential receptors, retention of existing field boundaries, and the use of offsets to PRoW and properties, alongside the integration of additional mitigation planting, including hedgerow reinforcement and new woodland belts, to filter and soften views. Where properties are in closer proximity, the design includes localised landscape buffers and planting proposals to maintain visual separation, avoid overbearing and minimise enclosing effects. With respect to private views, the Applicant acknowledges that changes to people's views and perceptions of their surroundings can cause concern. The Applicant has sought to understand these concerns through community consultation, including meetings with residents close to the draft Order Limits where requested. Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 01/24 explains in point 6(1) that views from houses and individual properties are a matter of private amenity, noting that it is an established planning principle that there is no right to a view. The LVIA has not identified any significant adverse residual effects on the views of residents that would breach the Residential Visual Amenity threshold and cause serious harm to the living conditions of residents (major adverse) and therefore a Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) has not been carried out. Nevertheless, the Applicant has continued to engage with affected parties and to review and iterate the design to seek to address concerns whilst delivering a scheme which responds to the need to maximise the available grid connection. Further information is provided in Table 10-5 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**. Mitigation measures are shown on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** and are secured via the **Works Plans [AS-004]**, **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**, and the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]**.
LAN-08	RR-1059, RR-0216, RR-0599, RR-0157, RR-1268, RR-1222, RR-0166, RR-0648, RR-0734, RR-0776, RR-1370, RR-0479, RR-0372, RR-0571, RR-0793	Landscape and Visual	Respondents expressed concern for **light pollution**	As set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10 - Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**, with reference to the England's Light Pollution and Dark Skies map published by CPRE: The Countryside Charity, the Site and surrounding area is influenced by some lighting sources and no part of the area is considered to fall within the darkest nighttime sky category.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				As set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2 The Proposed Development [APP-040]**, it is not anticipated that the Proposed Development would be lit. The exception to this is the BESS and substations where movement sensory triggered lighting will be needed and will follow the best practice to reduce spill light. These elements are located away from the residential receptors and are not expected to significantly affect the amenity of nearby residents.
LAN-09	RR-0385, RR-1096, RR-0810, RR-0983, RR-1447, RR-0850, RR-0558, RR-0677, RR-0194, RR-0264, RR-1182	Landscape and Visual	Respondents express support and / acknowledge the need for the proposed visual mitigation measures.	The Applicant welcomes the support expressed for the proposed visual mitigation measures, which are shown on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** and are secured via the **Works Plans [AS-004]**, **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**, and the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217].**
LAN-10	RR-0123, RR-0750, RR-0214	Landscape and Visual	Respondents stated that the Proposed Development conflicts with EN-1 and EN-3 relating to Landscape and Visual.	Section 10.3 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10 - Landscape and Visual [APP-048]** identifies the relevant legislation, planning policy, standards and guidelines which underpin the assessment methodology for LVIA and have informed the assessment, including the identification of mitigation. This includes an explanation of how the Proposed Development responds to the policies set out in NPS EN1 and NPS EN-3 relating to landscape and visual matters and good design. The LVIA concluded that the Proposed Development is likely to lead to some cumulative landscape and visual effects. These effects reflect changes to the landscape and visual experiences that would emerge delivering an infrastructure project of such scale, as recognised through NPS EN-1 which acknowledges in paragraph 5.10.5 that 'virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will impact the landscape'. The Applicant is confident that the proposed management and mitigation measures set out in the **Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-038 to APP-190]** are comprehensive and robust and that the Proposed Development aligns with national and local planning policy; this is outlined in the **Planning Statement [APP-207]** and **Policy Compliance Document [APP-224]**.
LAN-11	RR-0654, RR-1174	Landscape and Visual	Respondents expressed concern or objection to the use of **tracking panels**	The Applicant notes this comment. Paragraph 2.5.9 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [APP-040]** explains that east-west single axis tracker Solar PV Panels are the most efficient. The **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]** sets

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				out the maximum height of the various components of the Proposed Development, including the ground mounted solar photovoltaic generating stations. There are two options in Table 2-1: • Tracking Solar PV Tables (Option A); and • Fixed Solar PV Tables (Option B) (Work No. 1 (a)) With respect to Option A, tracking panels would have a maximum height of 4.5m Above Ground Level (AGL) at maximum tilt, which would occur at the beginning and end of each day. The Solar PV Panels would reach a horizontal position in the middle of the day and would be positioned horizontally overnight, with a maximum height of 2.5m AGL. Therefore, panels would be lower than the maximum height of 4.5m AGL during the majority of the day. Illustrations of typical tracking panels are provided in **Plate 2-1 to Plate 2-3 of ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [APP-040]**. If fixed panels are used, these would be a consistent 3.5m AGL. A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been carried out by the Applicant, and this is presented in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**. The LVIA has informed the mitigation shown on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** and secured in the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]** and **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**. This includes planting of hedgerows and woodland to assist in integrating the Proposed Development into the landscape and provide visual screening and assimilation of built structures, including the proposed solar photovoltaic generating stations. Section 4.2 of NPS EN-1 sets out the critical national priority for low carbon infrastructure, to which this application for development consent responds. Paragraph 5.10.26 of NPS EN-1 states that *"reducing the scale of a project can help to mitigate the visual and landscape effects of a proposed project. However, reducing the scale or otherwise amending the design of a proposed energy infrastructure project may result in a significant operational constraint and reduction in function – for example, electricity generation output."* NPS EN-1 paragraph 4.2.34 notes that it is for each location to maximise its capacity to deliver these aims. In this regard, The Proposed Development, including the selection of the proposed technology, has been designed to maximise and

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				deliver the greatest possible energy generation benefit from the available land and the available grid connection, whilst avoiding, minimising and/or mitigating harmful environmental effects.
LAN-12	RR-0654, RR-1174	Landscape and Visual	Respondents stated that the setbacks / buffer zones between the Proposed Development and highways / roads are insufficient.	Standard offsets from roads to solar farm development are not defined in law or policy. The **Design Approach Document (DAD) [APP-216]** establishes clear principles for the siting of infrastructure relative to existing features such as roads. The **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** shows how these principles can be applied to provide buffers which act as multi-functional environmental mitigation and enhancement, where built development is excluded for example to provide habitats.
LAN-13	RR-0834, RR-1347	Landscape and Visual	Respondents expressed doubt that any new planting would be undertaken in / around the solar panels, based on a lack of planting at Cleve Hill Solar Park.	Proposed planting will be required to be designed in accordance with the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]** and delivered, established and maintained in accordance with the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**. The DCO for the Cleve Hill Solar Park project was granted in May 2020 and the project is now built and operational. This required that no phase of the authorised development may commence until a written landscape and biodiversity management plan (which accords with the outline landscape and biodiversity management plan) has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority in consultation with Natural England and that the landscape and biodiversity management plan must be implemented as approved. The Applicant cannot comment on the Cleve Hill proposals or the current status of implementation and notes that establishment of planting is seasonably constrained.
LAN-14	RR-0681, RR-0936	Landscape and Visual	Respondent expressed concern about the visual impact of interconnecting cables.	The Applicant notes these comments and confirms that the interconnecting cables would be buried without any permanent roads left within the Cable Route corridor. The Applicant acknowledges that as identified in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048],** visual effects associated

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				with the underground Cable Route Corridor arise primarily during the construction phase. These effects, whilst significant in some cases, are temporary and reversible, reflecting the short-term presence of construction activity. Once the cables are installed below ground and the land is reinstated, there would be no long-term visual impacts associated with this element of the Proposed Development. The assessment therefore confirms that effects would reduce following construction, with no adverse residual effects at operation, and the landscape returning to its baseline condition.
LAN-15	RR-0166	Landscape and Visual	Respondent emphasised the importance of routinely cleaning the panels.	Section 2.10 of the **Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [APP-193]** sets out the measures proposed for panel cleaning during the operational phase of the Proposed Development. This notes that deterioration in output due to dust or dirt is generally low and the cleaning requirements for the Proposed Development can only be accurately determined once operational. The ES assumes an annual cleaning cycle.

Landscape and Visual – Detailed

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Landscape and Visual - Detailed				
LAN-16	RR-0857, RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-1116, RR-0088, RR-0129, RR-1458, RR-1059, RR-0806, RR-0561, RR-0411, RR-0781, RR-1194, RR-0241, RR-0751, RR-0834, RR-0903, RR-0774, RR-0181, RR-0678, RR-0752, RR-0597, RR-1271, RR-1012, RR-1201, RR-1403, RR-0564, RR-0664, RR-1135, RR-0050, RR-0207, RR-1344, RR-0922, RR-1080, RR-0471, RR-1179, RR-0375, RR-0127, RR-0939, RR-0915, RR-0842, RR-0101, RR-0910, RR-1424, RR-0698, RR-0583, RR-0111, RR-0131, RR-0083, RR-0825, RR-0107, RR-1343, RR-0367, RR-0588, RR-0008, RR-0849, RR-1076, RR-1388, RR-1421, RR-1033, RR-0832, RR-0498, RR-0343, RR-0791, RR-1324, RR-0076, RR-1398, RR-0735, RR-0735, RR-1408, RR-0117, RR-0574, RR-0545, RR-0444	Landscape and Visual	Respondents expressed concern regarding the landscape and visual impact of the Proposed Development on **Birkin**.	The Applicant acknowledges that the Proposed Development would introduce changes to the character of parts of the landscape and to some views around Birkin. It is recognised through NPS EN-1 which states in Section 5.10 that '*virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will impact the landscape*'". It should be noted that with proposed mitigation in place and following initial establishment, landscape and visual impacts will generally reduce over time. Mitigation measures include substantial new planting, reinforcement of existing vegetation, careful siting of infrastructure, and minimisation of lighting to avoid unnecessary urbanising effects. While landscape mitigation takes time to establish, the LVIA demonstrates that by Year 15 of operation, once planting has matured, the majority of landscape and visual effects would reduce and would not be significant. Mitigation measures are shown on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** and are secured via the **Works Plans [AS-004]**, **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195],** and the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217].** The changes to the landscape character are included in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]** with detailed baseline and effect assessments provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2: Landscape Baseline and Effects [APP-168].** Birkin's landscape character is represented by LCA 7: Aire Valley and LCA 13: Haddlesey Farmland, both of which are assessed. Impacts on LCA 7 would be very limited and localised, as no solar development areas are located within the character area. LCA 13, within which Solar Development Sites 3 and 4 are located, would experience the most direct and notable landscape effects. Moderate adverse (significant) effects are predicted during construction due to the introduction of temporary construction activity and plant. However, effects would reduce through operation and, following the establishment of mitigation planting, are assessed as minor adverse and not significant at Year 15 of operation, with the development becoming partially integrated into the landscape. While the setting of Birkin was not specifically included as a receptor, the setting of St Mary's Church in included in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage [APP-046].** The assessment concludes that the

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				works will at most result in a minor adverse impact which will result in a minor adverse significance of effect which is not significant (paragraph 8.9.48). Views from the eastern edge of Birkin are represented by VP19. ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2: Visual Baseline and Effects [APP-169] assess the impacts on residents of the local community to be of medium magnitude during construction and year 1 of operation. This is because views would be largely screened or filtered by intervening vegetation. The resulting effects would be moderate adverse, which is significant. The establishment of proposed planting means that by year 15 of operation, the magnitude of impact would reduce to low and the significance of effect would be minor adverse, which is not significant. This is a worst-case assessment and views from within the settlement would be further screened by buildings and vegetation.
LAN-17	RR-0922, RR-0375, RR-0127, RR-0663, RR-1275, RR-1324, RR-1452, RR-0612, RR-1285, RR-0591, RR-0964, RR-0063, RR-0779, RR-1345, RR-1007, RR-0951, RR-1168, RR-1125, RR-0383, RR-0580, RR-0584	Landscape and Visual	Respondents expressed concern regarding the landscape and visual impact of the Proposed Development on **Monk Fryston**.	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding potential impacts on the setting of Monk Fryston. It is recognised through NPS EN-1 which states in Section 5.10 that '*virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will impact the landscape*"'. The changes to the landscape character are included in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]** with detailed baseline and effect assessments provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2: Landscape Baseline and Effects [APP-168].** The settlement of Monk Fryston is physically separated from the Proposed Development, with no infrastructure located within 400m from residential properties. The parish extends further east and includes Solar Development Site 2 and parts of CRC 2-6 and this includes visual receptors including people living in the wider landscape, using public rights of way and the local road network. **ES Volume 2, Figure 10.4.2: Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) - Screened [APP-094]** suggests that there would be very limited visibility within the settlement of Monk Fryston with intervening vegetation and built form screening the views toward the Proposed Development. Visual receptors in the eastern part of the parish associated with representative viewpoints VP14, 27, 66 and 68, as shown in **Figure 10.5: Viewpoints Plan [APP-095]**, are predicted to experience moderate adverse effects (significant) at construction and Year 1 of operation. However, the LVIA assesses that residual effects would reduce to minor or negligible adverse and would not be significant as the mitigation establishes by year 15 of operation.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Monk Fryston lies within LCA 11: Sherburn Farmland, defined in the Selby Landscape Character Assessment, 2019 Taking account of the existing landscape structure and proposed mitigation, ES Chapter 10 concludes that cumulative effects on the landscape (LCA11 Sherburn Farmland) would be significant during construction and year 1 of operation but would not be significant by year 15 of operation. Significant Cumulative visual effects are not predicted on Monk Fryston.
LAN-18	RR-1201, RR-1403, RR-0661, RR-1403, RR-0103, RR-0998, RR-0919, RR-0746, RR-0880, RR-1259, RR-1241, RR-0600, RR-0067, C-0929, RR-0936, RR-0998, RR-0994, RR-0408	Landscape and Visual	Respondents expressed concern regarding the landscape and visual impact of the Proposed Development on **Escrick**.	As set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**, the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has assessed effects of the Proposed Development on the landscape and people's views on the landscape. The majority of the settlement of Escrick lies within LCA 2: York East Fringe. Effects on this receptor are not predicted to be significant during construction or operation. The land to the south of the settlement, which includes the majority of Solar Development Site 1, falls within LCA 3: Skipwith Lowlands. Effects are assessed as moderate adverse (significant) during construction and year 1 of operation. By year 15 of operation effects are assessed as minor adverse, which is not significant. Views towards the Order Limits and the Proposed Development from the settlement of Esrick are very limited, as illustrated by VP1 and VP3. The magnitude of impact ranges from low to very low and at both locations, effects are predicted to be minor adverse in all scenarios, which is not significant. Mitigation measures include substantial new planting, reinforcement of existing vegetation, careful siting of infrastructure, and minimisation of lighting to avoid unnecessary urbanising effects. While landscape mitigation takes time to establish, the LVIA demonstrates that by Year 15 of operation, once planting has matured, the majority of landscape and visual effects would reduce to minor or non-significant levels. Mitigation measures are shown on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** and are secured via the **Works Plans [AS-004], Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**, and the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217].**
LAN-19	RR-0355, RR-0912, RR-0124, RR-0989, RR-1237, RR-0324, RR-0607, RR-0665, RR-0362, RR-0485, RR-	Landscape and Visual	Respondents expressed concern regarding the landscape and visual impact of the Proposed Development on **Field House Farm including** reducing amenity of the location.	A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and is reported in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**. The LVIA assesses the likely significant effects of the Proposed

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	1188, RR-1337, RR-0688, RR-1021, RR-0508, RR-1011, RR-1306			Development on both landscape character and people's views and visual amenity during construction, operation and decommissioning, in accordance with the relevant legislation, policy, standards and guidance set out in **ES Chapter 10, Section 10.3 [APP-048]**. The Applicant acknowledges that the Proposed Development would introduce changes to the character of parts of the landscape. However, the LVIA concludes that, with embedded and additional mitigation, the resulting effects would be localised, reversible and would reduce over time. This approach is consistent with paragraph 5.10.5 of the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (NPS EN 1), which recognises that "*virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will have adverse effects on the landscape*," while also acknowledging that beneficial landscape character effects may arise through mitigation. Field House Farm is located approximately 1.5km away from the closest solar infrastructure located in Solar Development Site 1 and no significant landscape or visual effects are predicted for this location during operation. The property is located approximately 500m away from the CRC 1-4 and whilst temporary construction effects are predicted, these are not likely to be significant. Once the cables are installed below ground and the land is reinstated, there would be no long-term visual impacts associated with this element of the Proposed Development. The assessment therefore confirms that effects would reduce following construction, with no adverse residual effects at operation, and the landscape returning to its baseline condition.
LAN-20	RR-0301, RR-1410, RR-0213, RR-0803, RR-0130, RR-0329, RR-0746, RR-0614, RR-0147, RR-1410, RR-0168, RR-0942	Landscape and Visual	Respondents expressed concern regarding the landscape and visual impact of the Proposed Development on **Skipwith**.	The Applicant acknowledges that the Proposed Development would introduce changes to the character of parts of the landscape and to some views north of Skipwith. It is recognised through NPS EN-1 which states in Section 5.10 that '*virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will impact the landscape"*'. Paragraph 5.10.13 explains further that *"all proposed energy infrastructure is likely to have visual effects for many receptors around proposed sites".* NPS EN-3 provides further policy on solar photovoltaic generation. In paragraph 2.10.19 it notes that "*utility-scale solar farms are large sites that may have a significant zone of visual influence*." A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been carried out by the Applicant, and this is presented in **ES Volume 1 Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				048]. The Applicant acknowledges that the Proposed Development would introduce changes to the character of parts of the landscape and to some views. However, the LVIA concludes that, with embedded and additional mitigation, the resulting effects would be localised, reversible and would reduce over time. It should be noted that with proposed mitigation in place and following initial establishment, landscape and visual impacts will generally reduce over time. Mitigation measures include substantial new planting, reinforcement of existing vegetation, careful siting of infrastructure, and minimisation of lighting to avoid unnecessary urbanising effects. While landscape mitigation takes time to establish, the LVIA demonstrates that by Year 15 of operation, once planting has matured, the majority of landscape and visual effects would reduce and would not be significant. Mitigation measures are shown on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** and are secured via the **Works Plans [AS-004]**, **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**, and the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]**.
LAN-21	RR-0375, RR-0949, RR-1041, RR-1014, RR-0612, RR-0063, RR-0836, RR-0955, RR-0951, RR-0027, RR-0671, RR-0211	Landscape and Visual	Respondent expressed concern regarding the landscape and visual impact of the Proposed Development on **South Milford**	The Applicant acknowledges that the Proposed Development would introduce changes to the landscape character around parts of South Milford. A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and is reported in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**. The LVIA assesses the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development on both landscape character and people's views 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 of the chapter. South Milford straddles two Landscape Character Areas defined in the Selby Landscape Character Assessment, 2019: LCA 8: west Selby Limestone Ridge and LCA 11: Sherburn Farmland. Minor adverse effects are predicted for LCA 8 during construction and year 1 of operation, with no effects by year 15 of operation. With respect to LCA 11, whilst moderate adverse effects (significant) are assessed for construction and year 1 of operation, these would reduce to minor adverse by year 15 of operation, which is not significant. Intervening vegetation and buildings means that views from with the settlement of South Milford are likely to be screened. The design of the Proposed Development has included the establishment of **Design Parameters and Commitments**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				document [APP-217], for example minimum offsets from residential properties. Mitigation measures, secured by the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**, include substantial new planting, reinforcement of existing vegetation, careful siting of infrastructure, and minimisation of lighting to avoid unnecessary urbanising effects. While landscape mitigation takes time to establish, the LVIA demonstrates that by Year 15 of operation, once planting has matured, the majority of landscape and visual effects would reduce to minor or non-significant levels.
LAN-22	RR-0127, RR-0214, RR-1275, RR-1324, RR-1452, RR-1285, RR-0063, RR-0968, RR-0580	Landscape and Visual	Respondents expressed concern regarding the landscape and visual impact of the Proposed Development on **Hillam**.	A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and is reported in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**. The LVIA assesses the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development on both landscape character and people's views and visual amenity during construction, operation and decommissioning, in accordance with the relevant legislation, policy, standards and guidance set out in **ES Chapter 10, Section 10.3 [APP-048]**. The Applicant acknowledges that the Proposed Development would introduce changes to the character of parts of the landscape and to some views around Hillam. However, the LVIA concludes that, with embedded and additional mitigation, the resulting effects would be localised, reversible and would reduce over time. This approach is consistent with paragraph 5.10.5 of the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (NPS EN 1), which recognises that "*virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will have adverse effects on the landscape*," while also acknowledging that beneficial landscape character effects may arise through mitigation. Regarding the visual effects of the Proposed Development on the community of Hillam, these have been assessed with reference to VP14. This is shown on **ES Volume 2, Figure 10.5: Viewpoints Plan [APP-095]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.4: Photography and Photomontages [AS-028]**. The LVIA has concluded that during construction and Year 1 of operation, people living on the eastern edge of Hillam represented by VP14 may experience moderate adverse (significant) effects, reflecting the introduction of solar panels and associated infrastructure within open views. These effects would reduce over time as mitigation planting establishes, with residual effects at Year 15 of operation assessed as minor adverse and not significant. The density of

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				existing buildings and vegetation within Hillam means that there would be no views of the Proposed Development from within the settlement. Further detail is provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: Visual Baseline and Effects [APP-169]**.
LAN-23	RR-0847, RR-0725, RR-0895, RR-0896, RR-0514, RR-0404, RR-0551, RR-0936, RR-0863	Landscape and Visual	Respondents expressed concern regarding the landscape and visual impact of the Proposed Development on **Wistow.**	A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and is reported in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**. The LVIA assesses the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development on both landscape character and people's views and visual amenity during construction, operation and decommissioning, in accordance with the relevant legislation, policy, standards and guidance set out in **ES Chapter 10, Section 10.3 [APP-048]**. Wistow is located approximately 1km away from Cable Route Corridor 1-4 and approximately 5km away from the closest Solar Development Site and significant landscape or visual effects have not been identified at this location. The Applicant acknowledges that the construction phase of the Cable Route Corridor 1-4 element of the Proposed Development would introduce changes to the character of parts of the landscape and to some views around Wistow. However, the LVIA concludes that, with embedded and additional mitigation, the resulting effects would be localised, reversible and would reduce over time.
LAN-24	RR-0782, RR-1222, RR-0612, RR-0063, RR-0997, RR-0708, RR-0779	Landscape and Visual	Respondents expressed concern regarding the landscape and visual impact of the Proposed Development on **Hambleton.**	A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and is reported in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**. The LVIA assesses the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development on both landscape character and people's views and visual amenity during construction, operation and decommissioning, in accordance with the relevant legislation, policy, standards and guidance set out in **ES Chapter 10, Section 10.3 [APP-048]**. The Applicant acknowledges that the Proposed Development would introduce changes to the character of parts of the landscape and to some views around Hambleton, specifically in relation to Cable Route Corridor 1-4. However, the LVIA concludes that, with embedded and additional mitigation, the resulting effects would be localised, reversible and would reduce over time. This approach is consistent with paragraph 5.10.5 of the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (NPS EN 1), which recognises that "*virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will have adverse effects on the landscape*," while also acknowledging

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				that beneficial landscape character effects may arise through mitigation. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), reported in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]** and detailed in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: Visual Baseline and Effects [APP-169]**, has assessed the visual effects on the community of Hambleton with reference to VP64 on the southern edge of the settlement. This is shown on **ES Volume 2, Figure 10.5: Viewpoints Plan [APP-095]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.4: Photography and Photomontages [AS-028]**. The assessment concludes that moderate adverse effects (significant) may occur during construction, relating to the construction of the cable corridor. These effects would be temporary and reversible, with no significant effects predicted during operation. It should be noted that the assessment has been undertaken on a reasonable worst-case basis, taking account of maximum design parameters, simultaneous construction across Order Limits and receptors closest to the construction activities. There would be no views of the Proposed Development within the majority of the village due to the density of existing buildings and vegetation.
LAN-25	RR-1324, RR-0527, RR-1263, RR-1457, RR-0878, RR-0031	Landscape and Visual	Respondents expressed concern regarding the landscape and visual impact of the Proposed Development on **West Haddlesey**.	A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and is reported in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**. The LVIA assesses the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development on both landscape character and people's views and visual amenity during construction, operation and decommissioning, in accordance with the relevant legislation, policy, standards and guidance set out in **ES Chapter 10, Section 10.3 [APP-048]**. The Applicant acknowledges that the Proposed Development would introduce changes to the character of parts of the landscape and to some views around West Haddlesey. However, the LVIA concludes that, with embedded and additional mitigation, and taking into account the distance of over 1.5 km between the settlement and the Order Limits, significant landscape and visual effects have not been identified at this location. This is illustrated by **ES Volume 2, Figure 10.4.2: Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) – Screened [APP-094]** and the photographs for VP23 on the western edge of the settlement shown in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.4: Photography and Photomontages [AS-028]** with **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: Visual Baseline and**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Effects [APP-169] concluding that effects would be negligible adverse and not significant in all scenarios.
LAN-26	RR-1029, RR-1086, RR-0360, RR-0015, RR-0836, RR-0236	Landscape and Visual	Respondents have expressed concern about panels overshadowing and impacting adjoining allotments.	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. Guidance on the assessment of overshadowing, produced by the Building Research Establishment, suggests that significant overshadowing is possible where obstructions subtend an angle of 25° from the observer, which is typically approximated by considering an assessment area of three times the obstruction's height. As the solar panels will be no more than 4.5m tall, the relevant assessment area under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Report, 'Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: a guide to good practice' (BR209) would be 13.5m. The allotments lie outside of this area and will therefore not experience significant overshadowing; shadows would only be possible for a short duration in the evening when the sun is low in the sky. Furthermore, the distance separation between the panels and the allotments is sufficient to mitigate any potential shadowing effects on the allotments, while the perimeter fencing will be deer wire mesh and wooden posts allowing sunlight to pass through. No significant impacts are anticipated in terms of shadowing and therefore amenity value of the allotments.
LAN-27	RR-1041, RR-0344, RR-0428, RR-0063, RR-0779	Landscape and Visual	Respondent expressed concern the setting impact of the Proposed Development on **Sherburn in Elmet.**	The Applicant acknowledges the concern regarding the potential impacts on the setting of Sherburn in Elmet. The Applicant included the assessment of the landscape and visual effects (LVIA) of the Proposed Development within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048].** No views have been identified from within the settlement of Sherburn in Elmet. The LVIA confirms that, while some visual receptors may experience views of the Proposed Development from the eastern part of the parish (VP49), these are typically partial, filtered or experienced sequentially, rather than resulting in continuous enclosure, and mitigation planting is predicted to substantially reduce perceptions of proximity over time. By year 15 of operation, these effects are predicted to be not significant. Mitigation measures are shown on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** and are secured via the **Works Plans [AS-004]**, **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**, and the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]**.
LAN-28	RR-0663, RR-0103, RR-0996, RR-0793	Landscape and Visual	Respondents objected to the extent and siting of panels at Site 2, stating that the whole field should remain free of panels and	The Applicant notes the concerns regarding the extent of the Proposed Development and acknowledges that the Proposed

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			expressing particular concern about panels being located close to the A63. Respondents also raised concerns regarding the lack of adequate visual screening for nearby properties.	Development would introduce changes to the character of parts of the landscape and to some views. The Proposed Development has been designed to maximise the energy generation benefit from the available land and the available grid connection, whilst avoiding, minimising and/or mitigating harmful environmental effects. It is recognised through NPS EN-1 which states in Section 5.10 that '*virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will impact the landscape*'". Paragraph 5.10.13 explains further that *"all proposed energy infrastructure is likely to have visual effects for many receptors around proposed sites"*. NPS EN-3 provides further policy on solar photovoltaic generation. In paragraph 2.10.19 it notes that *"utility-scale solar farms are large sites that may have a significant zone of visual influence."* The Applicant included the assessment of the landscape and visual effects (LVIA) of the Proposed Development within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**. This determined that the sensitivity of the landscape within Solar Development Site 2 is low, based on the low value attached to the landscape and its low susceptibility to the change proposed. With the mitigation proposed, effects would be moderate adverse (significant) in construction, year 1 and year 15 of operation. At the wider landscape scale Solar Development Site 2 lies within LCA 11: Sherburn Farmland. Effects on LCA 11 are predicted to reduce from moderate adverse (significant) in construction, to minor adverse and not significant in year 1 and year 15 of operation. With respect to private views, the Applicant acknowledges that changes to people's views and perceptions of their surroundings can cause concern. The Applicant has sought to understand these concerns through community consultation, including meetings with residents close to the draft Order Limits where requested. Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 01/24 explains in point 6(1) that views from houses and individual properties are a matter of private amenity, noting that it is an established planning principle that there is no right to a view. The LVIA has not identified any significant adverse residual effects on the views of residents that would breach the Residential Visual Amenity threshold and cause serious harm to the living conditions of residents (major adverse) and therefore a Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) has not been carried out. Nevertheless, the Applicant has

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				continued to engage with affected parties and to review and iterate the design to seek to address concerns whilst delivering a scheme which responds to the need to maximise the available grid connection. Further information is provided in Table 10-5 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**. It should be noted that with proposed mitigation in place and following initial establishment, landscape and visual impacts will generally reduce over time. Mitigation measures include substantial new planting, reinforcement of existing vegetation, careful siting of infrastructure, and minimisation of lighting to avoid unnecessary urbanising effects. While landscape mitigation takes time to establish, the LVIA demonstrates that by Year 15 of operation, once planting has matured, the majority of landscape and visual effects would reduce and would not be significant. Mitigation measures are shown on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** and are secured via the **Works Plans [AS-004]**, **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195],** and the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217].**
LAN-29	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-0919, RR-0456	Landscape and Visual	Respondents expressed concern about the visual impact to both residents and passers by on Skipwith Road and Wheldrake Lane, respondents claimed that no credible landscaping strategy has been presented to address views from Skipwith Road or Wheldrake Lane.	Table A-1 of the **Design Approach Document (DAD) [APP-216]** explains that the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]** will secure delivery of the landscape strategy and ecological mitigation for the Proposed Development, which is illustrated on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]**. It is noted in Paragraph 5.10.13 of NPS EN-1 that "*all proposed energy infrastructure is likely to have visual effects for many receptors around proposed sites*". The Applicant has sought to reduce effects on views and visual amenity from the outset through the application of the design principles set out in the **Design Approach Document (DAD) [APP-216]**. With respect to views from Skipwith Road and Weldrake Lane, these have been considered from the outset. Together with the substantial offset from Wheldrake Lane, hedgerows will be reinforced with shrub and tree planting with meadow grass buffers providing further separation.
LAN-30	RR-0994	Landscape and Visual	Respondent has noted that the panels are now sited a field away from properties on Wheldrake Lane, and have requested that it is ensured that the panels will not come any closer than this. The respondent has also requested that screening in this area	The Order Limits are located approximately 180m south of Wheldrake Lane at its closest point, (i.e. a field away from Wheldrake Lane) as shown on the **Works Plans [AS-004]**. No development will be carried out outside of the Order Limits. Existing vegetation which lines the boundaries of the site will be retained, as shown on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** and this, together

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			is done with reasonable sized trees so that screening can be effective more quickly.	with proposed planting, will provide effective visual screening over the Proposed Development from Wheldrake Lane once established. The **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]** explains the measures set out to establish the proposed planting. The majority of planting will be carried out with smaller planting stock, such as nursery transplants, as these plants establish more quickly in the field and are less prone to failure. Some larger standard trees (300-350cm) are proposed within hedgerows (Table 4-3) and feathered trees within woodland areas (4-5).
LAN-31	RR-0216	Landscape and Visual	Respondent expressed concern about landscape impact bordering their property in the south west area of Site 6.	With respect to landscape impacts around the property, Solar Development Site 6 lies within LCA 11: Sherburn Farmland, which is defined in the Selby Landscape Character Assessment, 2019. The LVIA has concluded that the value attached to the landscape and the susceptibility to change of LCA 11 is low, resulting in a low sensitivity to the Proposed Development overall. Whilst effects during construction are predicted to be moderate adverse (significant), during operation effects are assessed to reduce to minor adverse, which is not significant. With respect to private views, the Applicant acknowledges that changes to people's views and perceptions of their surroundings can cause concern. The Applicant has sought to understand these concerns through community consultation, including meetings with residents close to the draft Order Limits where requested. Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 01/24 explains in point 6(1) that views from houses and individual properties are a matter of private amenity, noting that it is an established planning principle that there is no right to a view. The LVIA has not identified any significant adverse residual effects on the views of residents that would breach the Residential Visual Amenity threshold and cause serious harm to the living conditions of residents (major adverse) and therefore a Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) has not been carried out. Further information is provided in Table 10-5 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**. The approach to mitigation in this area is threefold. The **Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM) - Site 6 & 7 [PDA-009]** confirms that no trees or vegetation in the area of this property will be removed. Additionally, as detailed in the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]**, the Applicant will commit to minimum offsets of 30m from the curtilage of residential properties trees and offsets from

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				hedgerows ensuring their protection during construction and operation to mitigate visual impacts. The design commitments that have been made are secured within Schedule 2, Requirement 4 of the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017].** New planting is also proposed as set out in the **OEM [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** including an area of shrub and tree planting around the south western part of Site 6. The Applicant has engaged with the respondent, including attending a meeting (September 2025) at the respondent's property to discuss the Proposed Development and address questions and concerns.
LAN-32	RR-1384	Landscape and Visual	Respondent stated that the Proposed Development would occupy a disproportionately large quantity of land compared to Escrick.	Section 4.2 of NPS EN-1 sets out the critical national priority for low carbon infrastructure, to which this application for development consent responds. Paragraph 4.2.34 further notes that it is for each location to maximise its capacity to deliver these aims. In this regard, the Proposed Development has been designed to maximise and deliver the greatest possible energy generation benefit from the available land and the available grid connection, whilst avoiding, minimising and/or mitigating harmful environmental effects. Paragraph 5.10.26 of NPS EN-1 states that "*reducing the scale of a project can help to mitigate the visual and landscape effects of a proposed project. However, reducing the scale or otherwise amending the design of a proposed energy infrastructure project may result in a significant operational constraint and reduction in function – for example, electricity generation output*." **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-041]** explains how the Applicant has evolved the design to respond to the opportunities and constraints presented by the Site as part of an environment-led design approach. This has included establishing minimum offsets, which are set out in the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]** and explained further in the context of the design vision and design principles in the **Design Approach Document (DAD) [APP-216]**. The **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** shows the large areas of the Proposed Development which are proposed for multi-functional environmental mitigation and enhancement, where built development is excluded for example to provide habitats, reducing its scale.
LAN-33	RR-1131,	Landscape and Visual	**[BoR CAT3]**: Respondent has asked what visual impact the Proposed Development will have on their property.	The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), reported in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10 [APP-048]** and detailed in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: Visual Baseline and Effects [APP-169]**, has assessed visual effects on the

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				community of residents around this location through Viewpoint 14 (VP14). The LVIA has concluded that during construction and Year 1 of operation, receptors at VP14 may experience moderate adverse (significant) effects, reflecting the introduction of solar panels and associated infrastructure within open views. These effects are reduced over time as mitigation planting establishes, with residual effects at Year 15 assessed as minor adverse and not significant. This approach reflects a worst case assessment, taking full account of the scale of development and openness of the receiving landscape, and demonstrates that effects are partially mitigated and reduce over time. The location and extent of development, including any nearby cable corridors, are defined on the **Works Plans [AS-004]** and the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]**, which also show the proposed mitigation planting and offsets from receptors.
LAN-34	RR-1222	Landscape and Visual	Respondent expressed concern for landscape and setting impacts to **Hambleton Hough.**	Paragraph 10.7.7 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]** explains that Hambleton Hough LILA is situated 1.3 km to the east of Solar Development Site 2 and approximately 1 km to the north-east of Solar Development Site 4. Part of the Cable Route Corridor passes through the Hambleton Hough LILA, with associated Cable Construction Compound 4 directed approximately 120 m to the east. The LVIA concludes that although there will be some intervisibility during construction, this will be very limited. This is evidenced with reference to VP41, where the magnitude of impact has been assessed as low to very low in all phases **(Figure 10.5 Viewpoints Plan [APP-095])**. There will be some localised changes to the landscape within the designation due to site clearance, the removal of short sections of hedgerow along the excavations of the cable trench and a worst-case assumption for assessment purposes of removal of approximately 50 m of hedgerow along the southern side of Field Lane to allow for a construction access. However, the majority of the LILA designation and its key characteristics (wooded hills, panoramic views, and recreational value) will remain intact, as the Cable Route Corridor has been routed to avoid permanent impacts on these features. By year 15 of operation, planting proposed to reinstate vegetation removed to facilitate construction will have established to restore the landscape pattern such that changes in the landscape of the Hambleton Hough LILA will be barely distinguishable from the baseline condition.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
LAN-35	RR-1051	Landscape and Visual	Respondent stated that the development would cause severe residential visual amenity harm due to the proximity and elevation of their home relative to Site 6, resulting in unacceptable visual dominance and loss of outlook from a south-facing property.	With respect to private views, the Applicant acknowledges that changes to people's views and perceptions of their surroundings can cause concern. The Applicant has sought to understand these concerns through community consultation, including meetings with residents close to the draft Order Limits where requested. Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 01/24 explains in point 6(1) that views from houses and individual properties are a matter of private amenity, noting that it is an established planning principle that there is no right to a view. The LVIA has not identified any significant adverse residual effects on the views of residents (around Site 6 or otherwise) that would breach the Residential Visual Amenity threshold and cause serious harm to the living conditions of residents (major adverse) and therefore a Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) has not been carried out. Nevertheless, the Applicant has continued to engage with affected parties and to review and iterate the design to seek to address concerns whilst delivering a scheme which responds to the need to maximise the available grid connection. Further information is provided in Table 10-5 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**. The use of buffer zones is set out in the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]** and the **Design Approach Document (DAD) [APP-216]**, which sets out the Applicant's approach to addressing the criteria for good design for energy infrastructure set out in section 4.7 of NPS EN-1 more broadly. As detailed in the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]**, the minimum offset from residential properties will be 30m from the curtilage of properties. This buffer zone was established following pre-application consultation, EIA scoping, and environmental surveys and assessments. It should be noted that with proposed mitigation in place and following initial establishment, landscape and visual impacts will generally reduce over time. Mitigation measures include substantial new planting, reinforcement of existing vegetation, careful siting of infrastructure, and minimisation of lighting to avoid unnecessary urbanising effects. Mitigation measures are shown on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** and are secured via the **Works Plans [AS-004]**, **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195],** and the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217].**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
LAN-36	RR-1051	Landscape and Visual	Respondent stated that Site 6 would be highly visible from their property, including from most windows, leading to concerns that occupants would be required to keep curtains and blinds closed for extended periods, including during construction.	The Applicant notes this comment and concerns raised with regards to overlooking. The relationship between this property and Site 6 of the Proposed Development is shown on **Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM) - Site 6 & 7 [PDA-009]** and secured via **Works Plans [AS-004].** This shows that from the back of this dwelling to the boundary of solar infrastructure of the Proposed Development there is an approximate separation distance of 65m to the south and 45m to the east. The field directly to the east is not included in the Order Limits and will continue to be used in its current use. Activities would be at ground level and would continuously move across the area of Site 6 as per the detailed phasing to be undertaken by the contractor. Therefore activities in proximity to this property would be temporally limited. As noted in the **oOEMP [APP-193]** during the operational phase, general activity and personnel on-site within the Proposed Development will be minimal and will be restricted principally to vegetation management and equipment maintenance and servicing, replacement and renewal of any components that fail, and monitoring. Once operational, it is anticipated that no more than 5 visits a month is anticipated and the number of workers would be very limited. The location of residential receptors was factored into the design of the Proposed Development, including minimum set-back of solar panels and other infrastructure from properties; as a result, effects to residential amenity are not identified. With respect to residential visual amenity, Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 01/24 explains in point 6(1) that views from houses and individual properties are a matter of private amenity, noting that it is an established planning principle that there is no right to a view. The LVIA has not identified any significant adverse residual effects on the views of residents that would breach the Residential Visual Amenity threshold and cause serious harm to the living conditions of residents (major adverse) and therefore a Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) has not been carried out. Further information is provided in Table 10-5 of ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]. With respect to private views, the Applicant acknowledges that changes to people's views and perceptions of their surroundings can cause concern. The Applicant has sought to understand these concerns through community consultation,

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				including meetings with residents close to the draft Order Limits where requested. The use of buffer zones is set out in the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]** and the **Design Approach Document (DAD) [APP-216]**, which sets out the Applicant's approach to addressing the criteria for good design for energy infrastructure set out in section 4.7 of NPS EN-1 more broadly. As detailed in the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]**, the minimum offset from residential properties will be 30m from the curtilage of properties. This buffer zone was established following pre-application consultation, EIA scoping, and environmental surveys and assessments.
LAN-37	RR-1051	Landscape and Visual	Respondent stated that there is a lack of a property-specific residential visual amenity assessment (RVAA) for their home, despite extensive visibility from first-floor levels, and that this represents a methodological gap in the assessment.	With respect to private views, the Applicant acknowledges that changes to people's views and perceptions of their surroundings can cause concern. The Applicant has sought to understand these concerns through community consultation, including meetings with residents close to the draft Order Limits where requested. Paragraph 5.10.13 explains NPS EN-1 states t that "*all proposed energy infrastructure is likely to have visual effects for many receptors around proposed sites*". NPS EN-3 provides further policy on solar photovoltaic generation. In paragraph 2.10.19 it notes that "*utility-scale solar farms are large sites that may have a significant zone of visual influence.*" Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 01/24 explains in point 6(1) that views from houses and individual properties are a matter of private amenity, noting that it is an established planning principle that there is no right to a view. The LVIA has not identified any significant adverse residual effects on the views of residents that would breach the Residential Visual Amenity threshold and cause serious harm to the living conditions of residents (major adverse) and therefore a Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) has not been carried out. Nevertheless, the Applicant has continued to engage with affected parties and to review and iterate the design to seek to address concerns whilst delivering a scheme which responds to the need to maximise the available grid connection. Further information is provided in Table 10-5 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The use of buffer zones is set out in the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]** and the **Design Approach Document (DAD) [APP-216]**, which sets out the Applicant's approach to addressing the criteria for good design for energy infrastructure set out in section 4.7 of NPS EN-1 more broadly. As detailed in the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]**, the minimum offset from residential properties will be 30m from the curtilage of properties. This buffer zone was established following pre-application consultation, EIA scoping, and environmental surveys and assessments. It should be noted that with proposed mitigation in place and following initial establishment, landscape and visual impacts will generally reduce over time. Mitigation measures include substantial new planting, reinforcement of existing vegetation, careful siting of infrastructure, and minimisation of lighting to avoid unnecessary urbanising effects. Mitigation measures are shown on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** and are secured via the **Works Plans [AS-004]**, **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195],** and the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217].**
LAN-38	RR-1051	Landscape and Visual	Respondent stated that they disagree with the Applicant's conclusion that visual effects would reduce to acceptable levels by Year 15, arguing that Site 6 would remain highly visible from first-floor views despite mitigation planting, and that this period would significantly affect their family life.	With respect to private views, the Applicant acknowledges that changes to people's views and perceptions of their surroundings can cause concern. The Applicant has sought to understand these concerns through community consultation, including meetings with residents close to the draft Order Limits where requested. Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 01/24 explains in point 6(1) that views from houses and individual properties are a matter of private amenity, noting that it is an established planning principle that there is no right to a view. The LVIA has not identified any significant adverse residual effects on the views of residents that would breach the Residential Visual Amenity threshold and cause serious harm to the living conditions of residents (major adverse) and therefore a Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) has not been carried out. Nevertheless, the Applicant has continued to engage with affected parties and to review and iterate the design to seek to address concerns whilst delivering a scheme which responds to the need to maximise the available grid connection. Further information is provided in Table 10-5 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken and is reported in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**. Visibility of Solar Development Site 6 and associated infrastructure from this location has been assessed through Viewpoint 46 (VP46), which represents receptors with potential views across this part of the Proposed Development. The assessment acknowledges that, at Year 1, visible infrastructure may result in moderate adverse effects where more open views are available. However, with mitigation in place and following establishment, landscape and visual effects reduce over time. This includes substantial new planting, reinforcement of existing vegetation, careful siting of infrastructure and minimisation of lighting. By Year 15, the assessment concludes that mitigation planting would have established, resulting in filtered and partially screened views of the built elements within Solar Development Site 6, with residual effects reducing to minor adverse, which is not significant. Mitigation measures are shown on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** and secured via the **Works Plans [AS-004]**, **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**, and the **Design Parameters and Commitments Document [APP-217]**.
LAN-39	RR-1051	Landscape and Visual	Respondent stated that viewpoint assessment VP46 is misleading as it is taken at ground level from the road rather than reflecting first-floor views from the property itself, and therefore does not properly represent residential impacts.	The Applicant notes the concern that Viewpoint 46 (VP46) does not reflect views from first-floor windows. The assessment methodology, set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.1 Landscape and Visual Assessment Methodology [APP-167]** is consistent with the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, 3rd Edition (GLVIA3) and subsequent Notes and Clarifications published by the Landscape Institute in August 2024 (TGN 01/24). This determines that visual effects are assessed from representative, publicly accessible viewpoints to reflect how views are typically experienced by communities, rather than from private locations (GLVIA3, paras. 6.18–6.19, 6.31). VP46 has therefore been selected as a representative viewpoint, informed by ZTV analysis, desk study and fieldwork, to capture views experienced by receptors grouped on a community level. With respect to private views, the Applicant acknowledges that changes to people's views and perceptions of their surroundings can cause concern. The Applicant has sought to

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				understand these concerns through community consultation, including meetings with residents close to the draft Order Limits where requested. Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 01/24 explains in point 6(1) that views from houses and individual properties are a matter of private amenity, noting that it is an established planning principle that there is no right to a view. The LVIA has not identified any significant adverse residual effects on the views of residents that would breach the Residential Visual Amenity threshold and cause serious harm to the living conditions of residents (major adverse) and therefore a Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) has not been carried out. Nevertheless, the Applicant has continued to engage with affected parties and to review and iterate the design to seek to address concerns whilst delivering a scheme which responds to the need to maximise the available grid connection. Further information is provided in Table 10-5 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**. It should be noted that with proposed mitigation in place and following initial establishment, landscape and visual impacts will generally reduce over time. Mitigation measures include substantial new planting, reinforcement of existing vegetation, careful siting of infrastructure, and minimisation of lighting to avoid unnecessary urbanising effects. Mitigation measures are shown on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** and are secured via the **Works Plans [AS-004]**, **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195],** and the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217].**
LAN-40	RR-1051	Landscape and Visual	Respondent stated that visual assessments may be based on non-worst-case parameters, including omission of taller tracking panels and winter viewpoints, which they consider may understate the true scale of visual impact.	A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been carried out by the Applicant, and this is presented in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048].** The assumptions on which the LVIA is based are set out in Section 10.6 of Chapter 10. This clearly describes the worst-case scenarios that have been assessed, including the maximum 4.5 height of the proposed solar panels. A winter scenario has been assessed for construction and year 1 of operation and residual effects of operation have been assessed at year 15 in summer to demonstrate the effectiveness of planting once established, in line with best practice.
LAN-41	RR-1051	Landscape and Visual	Respondent stated that visual mitigation measures are overstated and overly reliant on long-term planting	Section 10.6 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]** addresses the assumptions and limitations upon which the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			assumptions that would not provide effective short- to medium-term screening.	based. This includes conservative estimates of the growth rate of proposed planting on 0.3m per year. This will be achieved by the measures set out in the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195].** The residual effects of the Proposed Development have been assessed at year 15 of operation, by which time the proposed planting is expected to have grown by at least 4.5m in height. The growth of plants over this period means that there would generally be more open views in the early years of operation but that effects would gradually reduce over time. Mitigation measures include substantial new planting, reinforcement of existing vegetation, careful siting of infrastructure, and minimisation of lighting to avoid unnecessary urbanising effects. While landscape mitigation takes time to establish, the LVIA demonstrates that by Year 15 of operation, once planting has matured, the majority of landscape and visual effects would reduce and would not be significant. Mitigation measures are shown on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** and are secured via the **Works Plans [AS-004]**, **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195],** and the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217].**
LAN-42	RR-1051	Landscape and Visual	Respondent stated that the development erodes the baseline landscape condition across a wide area rather than being confined to individual site boundaries.	The Applicant acknowledges that the Proposed Development would introduce changes to the character of parts of the landscape and to some views. It is recognised through NPS EN-1 which states in Section 5.10 that '*virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will impact the landscape*'". Paragraph 5.10.13 explains further that "*all proposed energy infrastructure is likely to have visual effects for many receptors around proposed sites*". NPS EN-3 provides further policy on solar photovoltaic generation. In paragraph 2.10.19 it notes that "*utility-scale solar farms are large sites that may have a significant zone of visual influence*." A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been carried out by the Applicant, and this is presented in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048].** The study area defined in Section 10.2 of Chapter 10 has been rigorously defined by evidence and analysis and is supported by North Yorkshire Council. Table 10-22 of Chapter 10 concludes that significant effects on the baseline landscape condition would be confined to the Solar Development Sites 2, 6 and 7 by year 15 of operation. Effects on the wider

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				landscape represented by the Landscape Character Areas defined in the Selby Landscape Character Assessment, 2019 would either return to the baseline condition (LCA 5, 8 12 and 14) or be minor adverse or lower, which is not significant. In summary, with embedded and additional mitigation, the resulting effects would be localised, reversible and would reduce over time.
LAN-43	RR-1051	Landscape and Visual	Respondent stated that Site 6, while described as having low landscape value by the Applicant, is of significant personal and financial value locally, and that this assessment is not accepted.	The Applicant has made an objective assessment of the value attached to the landscape as a resource in its own right, informed by best practice guidance as set out in Section 10.5 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.1: Landscape and Visual Assessment Methodology [APP-167]**. Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 02/21: Assessing landscape value outside national designations (Ref 8) defines landscape value as "*the relative value or importance attached to different landscapes by society on account of their landscape qualities*". The Applicant acknowledges that individuals may have personal and private interests in the landscape, but this assessment considers the value attached to the landscape by society as a whole.
LAN-44	RR-1051	Landscape and Visual	Respondent stated that the baseline landscape assessment for Site 6 (Appendix 10.2 / EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.10.02) is derived from an Applicant-defined source, whereas it should properly reference the Selby Landscape Character Assessment, 2019 as stated elsewhere in the PEIR, raising concerns about consistency and objectivity in the baseline methodology.	The baseline assessment for Site 6 has been informed by the North Yorkshire Council Landscape Character Assessment and the Selby Landscape Character Assessment, 2019 in line with **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.1: Landscape and Visual Assessment Methodology [APP-167]**. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.1: Landscape and Visual Assessment Methodology [APP-167]** provides a detailed explanation on how the Applicant has reviewed and applied the evidence in published landscape character assessments to inform the landscape baseline and assessment of landscape effects. This approach is consistent with published best practice guidance, including the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, third edition.
LAN-45	RR-0161	Landscape and Visual	Respondent stated that ZTV analysis and visual modelling understate actual visibility on the ground.	Section 10.2 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.1: Landscape and Visual Assessment Methodology [APP-167]** explain how the ZTVs have been prepared and used to inform the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). This includes the limitations and purposes of the ZTVs, to help identify potential visual receptor groups and representative viewpoints. ZTVs are not intended to provide a definitive map of actual visibility on the ground.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The ZTVs prepared to support the LVIA have followed best practice guidance, including the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, third edition. Fieldwork has been undertaken to support the LVIA and reference can also be made to the photographs and photomontages presented in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.4: Photography and Photomontages [AS-028]**.
LAN-46	RR-0536,	Landscape and Visual	Respondent expressed concern that the Proposed Development is too close to the **South Milford Community Allotments**, which provide members of the community with a place to relax and enjoy clear views.	A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been carried out by the Applicant, and this is presented in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048].** The LVIA concludes that, with embedded and additional mitigation, the resulting effects would be localised, reversible and would reduce over time. An assessment of the visual impacts specifically on users of South Milford Community Allotments has not been carried out. However, Viewpoint 44 is located on the public right of way to the north western corner of the allotment site. The LVIA concludes that effects on users of the public right of way (35.59/6/1) would be moderate and significant in construction and year 1 of operation, reducing to minor adverse and note significant by year 15 of operation. Whilst the magnitude of impact is likely to be similar for people using the allotment site, their susceptibility to change would be low with reference to Table 1-8 of **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.1: Landscape and Visual Assessment Methodology [APP-167]** and the resulting effects would not be significant in any scenario. Further detail on setbacks is provided below.
LAN-47	RR-0049	Landscape and Visual	Respondent expressed concern that the Proposed Development could restrict light to their gardens, particularly the South Milford Community Allotment.	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. Guidance on the assessment of overshadowing, produced by the Building Research Establishment, suggests that significant overshadowing is possible where obstructions subtend an angle of 25° from the observer, which is typically approximated by considering an assessment area of three times the obstruction's height. As the solar panels will be no more than 4.5m tall, the relevant assessment area under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Report, 'Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: a guide to good practice' (BR209) would be 13.5m. The allotments lie outside of this area and will therefore not experience significant overshadowing; shadows would only be possible for a short duration in the evening when the sun is low in the sky. Furthermore, the distance separation between the panels and the allotments is sufficient to mitigate any potential shadowing effects on the allotments, while the perimeter fencing will be deer wire mesh and wooden posts allowing sunlight to pass

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				through. No significant impacts are anticipated in terms of shadowing and therefore amenity value of the allotments.
LAN-48	RR-1370	Landscape and Visual	Respondent stated that the development conflicts with the sensitivity of the local landscape, including watercourses, wetlands, grasslands, and woodland on the limestone ridge, and is contrary to adopted and emerging Selby planning policies intended to protect rural character and resist urban sprawl.	The emerging Selby Local Plan 2024 is no longer considered relevant policy because it was withdrawn in February 2025. Given the Plan is no longer progressing and will be replaced by the North Yorkshire Local Plan (not yet available) the Applicant has had regard to the Core Strategy until such a time as the North Yorkshire Local Plan is published and in force. However, the Proposed Development is in alignment with adopted local and national policies concerned with climate change, as addressed in the **Planning Statement [APP-207]** and **Policy Compliance Document [APP-224].** As a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project, NPS EN-1, combined with any technology specific energy NPS where relevant, provides the primary policy for decisions by the Secretary of State. Whilst it is acknowledged that local planning policies may be important and relevant, paragraph 5.10.5 of NPS EN-1 is clear in recognising 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*."
LAN-49	RR-1370	Landscape and Visual	Respondent stated that the Applicant's own Zone of Theoretical Visibility mapping demonstrates widespread and unavoidable visibility along key walking and cycling routes between South Milford, Monk Fryston, Hillam, and Birkin. Respondent stated that these concerns align with warnings in the North Yorkshire Council Strategic Committee Report (10 February 2026), which identifies transformative scale, negative cumulative effects, and erosion of the landscape and visual baseline.	A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been carried out by the Applicant, and this is presented in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048].** The LVIA concludes that, with embedded and additional mitigation, the resulting effects would be localised, reversible and would reduce over time. Section 10.2 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.1: Landscape and Visual Assessment Methodology [APP-167]** explain how the ZTVs have been prepared and used to inform the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). This includes the limitations and purposes of the ZTVs, to help identify potential visual receptor groups and representative viewpoints. ZTVs are not intended to provide a definitive map of actual visibility on the ground. Fieldwork has been undertaken to support the LVIA and reference can also be made to the photographs and photomontages presented in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.4: Photography and Photomontages [AS-028]**. The LVIA has explicitly assessed the experience of users travelling through the landscape, including walkers, cyclists

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				and road users along public rights of way and local roads. This includes representative viewpoints where visual receptors are identified as *"people travelling along PRoW"* and *"people travelling on local roads"*, with baseline descriptions confirming that views are experienced sequentially as a series of changing and transient views along routes, rather than as continuous or static panoramas. None of the PRoW identified in between South Milford, Monk Fryston, Hillam and Birkin are promoted routes. The assessment demonstrates that, while there may be points along routes between South Milford, Monk Fryston, Hillam and Birkin where the Proposed Development is visible, these views are typically intermittent, filtered or glimpsed, often influenced by roadside hedgerows, woodland blocks and existing vegetation. With time, the mitigation planting, including hedgerows, woodland belts and field boundary reinforcement, will have established, resulting in further filtering and screening of views. Across the majority of PRoW and local road receptors, residual visual effects are assessed as minor adverse or negligible adverse, and therefore not significant, with visibility reduced to glimpsed or filtered views and the baseline character of the landscape partially restored. Additionally, it is important to clarify that the ZTV is a theoretical model which identifies the maximum potential visibility of any part the Proposed Development based solely on a digital surface model. It does not precisely reflect actual on-the-ground visibility as experienced by people, including the acuity of the eye, and does not take into account any proposed planting intended as mitigation. Nonetheless, **ES Volume 2, Figure 10.4.2: Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) - Screened [APP-094]** indicates a corridor of limited theoretical visibility along the route from South Milford to Monk Fryston and onward through Hillam, with the extent of predicted visibility increasing between Hillam and Birkin. The cumulative effects are assessed within Section 10.14 of the Chapter 10. The assessment results relevant to LVIA are further detailed within Table 17-12 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 17: Cumulative and In-Combination Effects [APP-055]**.
LAN-50	RR-0456	Landscape and Visual	Respondent expressed concern that the 10-15m buffer to the north eastern corner extending to Gilbertsons Wood Ancient Woodland would not be sufficient.	The design incorporates a minimum 15 m buffer from ancient woodland, with the security fencing designed a minimum of 20 m from the woodland edge and the nearest panels positioned beyond this. No construction activities will occur in the offset, which will minimise edge effects, hydrological change and ecological degradation.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
LAN-51	RR-0853	Landscape and Visual	**[BoR numbers 14-025]**: Respondent requested a residential buffer of at least 300 metres.	With respect to private views, the Applicant acknowledges that changes to people's views and perceptions of their surroundings can cause concern. The Applicant has sought to understand these concerns through community consultation, including meetings with this resident at their property. Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 01/24 explains in point 6(1) that views from houses and individual properties are a matter of private amenity, noting that it is an established planning principle that there is no right to a view. The LVIA has not identified any significant adverse residual effects on the views of residents that would breach the Residential Visual Amenity threshold and cause serious harm to the living conditions of residents (major adverse) and therefore a Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) has not been carried out. Nevertheless, the Applicant has continued to engage with affected party and to review and iterate the design to seek to address concerns whilst delivering a scheme which responds to the need to maximise the available grid connection. Further information is provided in Table 10-5 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**. The Applicant has incorporated setbacks from residential properties as set out in the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]** and this is explained further in the **Design Approach Document (DAD) [APP-216]**, which sets out the Applicant's approach to addressing the criteria for good design for energy infrastructure set out in section 4.7 of NPS EN-1 more broadly. Standard offsets from residential properties to solar farm development are not defined in law or policy and the Applicant has established a minimum offset from residential properties of 30m from the curtilage of properties for the Proposed Development. This minimum offset was established following pre-application consultation, EIA scoping, and environmental surveys and assessments, including the LVIA. The layout has been iteratively refined to incorporate setbacks from residential receptors, retention of existing field boundaries, and the use of offsets to properties, alongside the integration of additional mitigation planting, including hedgerow reinforcement and new woodland belts, to filter and soften views. Where properties are in closer proximity, the design includes localised landscape buffers and planting proposals to maintain visual separation, avoid overbearing and minimise enclosing effects. Mitigation measures are shown on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** and are secured via the **Works Plans [AS-004]**, Outline **Landscape and**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195], and the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]**. Regarding this property, the Outline Environmental Masterplan shows that the land immediately to the east of the properties, which was available to the Applicant, has been excluded from the draft Order Limits. A wide grass strip of approximately 50m is included to the west of the property and a graduated band of tree and shrub planting is proposed to the south to maintain separation from the property. With these measures in place, the LVIA acknowledges with reference to VP46 shown on **ES Volume 2, Figure 10.5: Viewpoints Plan [APP-095]** and in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.4: Photography and Photomontages [AS-028]** that the magnitude of impact would be high during construction and at year 1 of operation. Effects would gradually reduce as the planting proposed along the boundaries of the Proposed Development establishes such that by year 15 of operation, effects would be minor adverse and not significant. This detailed assessment is provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: Visual Baseline and Effects [APP-169]**.
LAN-52	RR-0853	Landscape and Visual	Respondent stated that a condition of the Proposed Development should require a CEEQUAL Excellent Rating.	The Applicant notes this comment. The **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]** and the **Design Approach Document (DAD) [APP-216**] sets out the Applicant's approach to addressing the criteria for good design for energy infrastructure set out in section 4.7 of NPS EN-1 more broadly. The DAD sets out the design principles that have been applied throughout the design of the Proposed Development. The Proposed Development has taken into account the principles of good design as set out in the Policy Requirements of NPS EN-1, EN-3 and EN5 as well as the NSIPS: Advice on Good Design. The Proposed Development has been designed to ensure that its scale and form are appropriate to its function as nationally significant infrastructure, while seeking to avoid, minimise and/or mitigate potential harmful effects. The Applicant is committed to good design which is secured through the Design Parameters and Commitments document and a commitment that detailed design must be in accordance with the DPC document.
LAN-53	RR-0303	Landscape and Visual	Respondent expressed concern for their property in Escrick being impacted by site 1, stating that it will be directly outside 80% of the windows in their home.	The Applicant has incorporated setbacks from residential properties as set out in the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]** and this is explained

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				further in the **Design Approach Document (DAD) [APP-216]**, which sets out the Applicant's approach to addressing the criteria for good design for energy infrastructure set out in section 4.7 of NPS EN-1 more broadly. Standard offsets from residential properties to solar farm development are not defined in law or policy and the Applicant has established a minimum offset from residential properties of 30m from the curtilage of properties for the Proposed Development. This minimum offset was established following pre-application consultation, EIA scoping, and environmental surveys and assessments, including the LVIA. The layout has been iteratively refined to incorporate setbacks from residential receptors, retention of existing field boundaries, and the use of offsets to properties, alongside the integration of additional mitigation planting, including hedgerow reinforcement and new woodland belts, to filter and soften views. Where properties are in closer proximity, the design includes localised landscape buffers and planting proposals to maintain visual separation, avoid overbearing and minimise enclosing effects. Mitigation measures are shown on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** and are secured via the **Works Plans [AS-004]**, **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**, and the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]**. NPS EN-1 Paragraph 5.10.13 explains further that "*all proposed energy infrastructure is likely to have visual effects for many receptors around proposed sites*". NPS EN-3 provides further policy on solar photovoltaic generation. In paragraph 2.10.19 it notes that "*utility-scale solar farms are large sites that may have a significant zone of visual influence.*" With respect to private views, the Applicant acknowledges that changes to people's views and perceptions of their surroundings can cause concern. The Applicant has sought to understand these concerns through community consultation, including meetings with residents close to the draft Order Limits where requested. Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 01/24 explains in point 6(1) that views from houses and individual properties are a matter of private amenity, noting that it is an established planning principle that there is no right to a view. The LVIA has not identified any significant adverse residual effects on the views of residents that would breach the Residential Visual Amenity threshold and cause serious harm

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				to the living conditions of residents (major adverse) and therefore a Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) has not been carried out. Nevertheless, the Applicant has continued to engage with affected parties and to review and iterate the design to seek to address concerns whilst delivering a scheme which responds to the need to maximise the available grid connection. Further information is provided in Table 10-5 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**.

2.18 Major Accidents and Disasters

Major Accidents and Disasters

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	Major Accidents and Disasters			
MAD-01	RR-1088, RR-1293, RR-0949, RR-1222, RR-1276, RR-0155, RR-0239, RR-0971, RR-0993, RR-0105, RR-1256, RR-1212, RR-0091, RR-1087, RR-0060, RR-0176, RR-0871, RR-1110, RR-0853, RR-0303, RR-1051	Major Accidents and Disasters	Respondents expressed concern regarding the impact of storms and adverse weather, some citing damaging the development, citing **Camblesforth Solar Farm**.	**ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Climate Change Resilience [APP-045]** assesses the likely significant effects arising from future climate change on the Proposed Development during the operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning phases. The assessment details how the Proposed Development has designed to be resilient against adverse environmental effects of climate change through design development and the consideration of good design principles. The Applicant understands the concerns regarding this, especially in light of what happened at Camblesforth. The solar farm at Camblesforth is currently in its construction phase, and we understand the situation is being investigated by the owner and their contractor. The components of the Proposed Development would be designed to withstand the range of UK weather, including storms. Solar panels are typically rated for up to 140mph wind speeds, equivalent to a mid-range Category 4 hurricane. Although rare, wind speeds above this have been recorded in the UK, but only in highland or coastal areas; inland areas of the UK are much less prone to high wind speeds. The Meteorological Office say that in the Selby and York areas mean wind speeds are up to 15 knots, or just over 17mph. The Applicant intends to use panels that are rated to withstand high wind speeds, as well as other extreme conditions, such as hail. As such, panels are typically tested using the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) 61215 impact test, a long-standing hail impact test used across the industry. If used, tracker panels can move into a position which minimises both wind effects and hail damage. In addition to the testing, rating and in-built technology of solar panels, planted visual mitigation measures would also have the added benefit of serving as windbreaks for the solar panel sites, significantly reducing the impact of wind gusts.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				In the unlikely event that a storm or extreme weather event does hit, plans and measures would be in place and are set out within Section 2.13 of the **Outline Operation Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [APP-193]**.
MAD-02	RR-0661, RR-0306, RR-1248, RR-0060, RR-1044	Major Accidents and Disasters	Some respondents expressed concern that the Proposed Development could alter local weather patterns or contribute to a localised heat island effect.	Evidence from published research indicates that large-scale solar arrays do not give rise to significant or widespread heat island effects. An 18-month study by Fthenakis and Yu (2013) found that solar arrays are typically fully cooled during night-time hours, meaning that sustained heat retention and associated heat island effects are unlikely to occur. Further research by Barron-Gafford et al. (2016) concluded that any temperature increases associated with solar PV installations are localised and do not extend beyond the immediate boundary of the solar farm. As such, any microclimatic effects are limited in extent and rapidly dissipate with distance from the panels. On this basis, the microclimate and heat island effects associated with the Proposed Development are not considered to be significant, and no meaningful thermal stress, discomfort or change in local weather conditions is anticipated for nearby residents or surrounding land uses.
MAD-03	RR-0861, RR-0163	Major Accidents and Disasters	Respondents stated that Woodhaven Kennels is located in an exposed, high-wind area and referenced recent wind damage at another site as raising concerns about similar risks locally. They stated that construction materials could be blown around and that installed solar panels may be vulnerable to wind damage, potentially affecting the kennels. They further stated that frequent high winds associated with the site would cause significant anxiety, sleep disturbance, and ongoing worry for themselves and their children.	The design of the Proposed Development will incorporate a number of good practice measures to ensure its resilience to future changes in climate. These will include adherence to the latest industry standards, specification of durable, resilient materials and choice of solar panels designed to withstand extreme weather conditions such as heat, wind and rainfall. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Climate Change Resilience [APP-045]** assesses the risk of physical damage to assets and safety risks to human receptors as a result of high winds during operation as not significant. The **Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [APP-193]** sets out the measures that will be taken during operation in relation to climate resilience, including high winds. Measures to limit disruption during construction are secured in the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]**. Requirement 12 in Schedule 2 to the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]** secures that a CEMP must be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority, and that the CEMP must be substantially in accordance with the **oCEMP [APP-192]**. All construction works must be carried out in accordance with the approved CEMP.

2.19 Materials and Waste & Minerals

Materials and Waste & Minerals

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Materials and Waste & Minerals				
MAT-01	RR-1368, RR-0236, RR-1183, RR-0571, RR-0347	Materials and Waste & Minerals	Respondents expressed concern that the solar panels will contain toxic chemicals namely Poly Fluoro-Alkyl Substances and Cadmium Telluride, which over time can impact the ground or degrade.	No Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) are to be used in solar panel coatings and on BESS batteries, as outlined within the **Outline Operational Management Plan (oOEMP) [APP-193]**. Cadmium Telluride is not commonly used in solar panels as the lead technology is crystalline silicon (c-si). As such it is not anticipated to be used by Light Valley Solar.

2.20 Noise and Vibration

Noise and Vibration – General Comments

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Noise and Vibration - General Comments				
NOI-01	RR-0112, RR-1396, RR-1059, RR-0599, RR-1382, RR-1060, RR-0661, RR-0956, RR-0406, RR-1090, RR-0493, RR-0011, RR-0521, RR-0804, RR-0308, RR-0797, RR-0877, RR-0301, RR-0949, RR-0670, RR-1016, RR-0861, RR-0101, RR-0910, RR-0441, RR-1397, RR-1094, RR-0255, RR-0912, RR-0396, RR-0945, RR-0056, RR-1119, RR-0237, RR-0286, RR-1405, RR-0182, RR-0733, RR-1156, RR-1047, RR-1051, RR-0749, RR-0155, RR-1137, RR-0335, RR-0230, RR-0648, RR-0026, RR-0783, RR-0921, RR-1212, RR-0724, RR-1140, RR-1385, RR-0372, RR-1062, RR-0464, RR-0272, RR-0647, RR-0508, RR-1306, RR-0303, RR-0793, RR-0622, RR-1126, RR-0827, RR-0750, RR-1222, RR-1003, RR-0302, RR-1073, RR-0369, RR-0333, RR-0191, RR-0470, RR-1285, RR-1149, RR-0046, RR-1457, RR-0142, RR-0520, RR-0579, RR-0634, RR-0897, RR-0015, RR-0428, RR-0686, RR-1372, RR-1291, RR-1368, RR-1305, RR-0146, RR-0988, RR-0720, RR-0184, RR-0614, RR-1042, RR-0950, RR-0469, RR-0350, RR-0233, RR-0728, RR-0031, RR-0967, RR-1203, RR-0017, RR-0571, RR-1282, RR-0811, RR-0408, RR-0600, RR-0304, RR-0713, RR-0996, RR-1025, RR-0681, RR-1418, RR-0726, RR-1254, RR-1103, RR-0854, RR-1237, RR-1268, RR-1148, RR-0591, RR-0712, RR-0669, RR-0215, RR-0589, RR-0760, RR-0747, RR-0236, RR-0710, RR-0734, RR-0925, RR-0514, RR-0534, RR-0680, RR-0256, RR-0228, RR-1105, RR-1403, RR-0207, RR-1201, RR-0826	Noise and Vibration	Respondents expressed general concern regarding the potential for increased noise, including references to **'buzzing' or 'humming', and vibration arising from the Proposed Development.** Some respondents raised concerns regarding noise and vibration from specific components of the solar park, including the BESS.	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 [APP-049]**. The assessment of operational likely impacts and effects are provided in Section 11.9. The BS4142 assessment method notes that certain acoustic features can increase the significance of impact over that expected from the difference between the specific sound level (i.e. the sound level from the plant or equipment) and the background sound level. Where such features are present at the receptor, a character correction (penalty) is added to the specific level, which gives a numerically higher 'rating level'. The rating level is then compared with the background sound level to determine the magnitude of impact. In line with BS4142, a 4dB penalty, appropriate to 'clearly perceptible' tonality, has been applied as a reasonable worst-case scenario to determine rating sound levels. Details of noise modelling results and assumptions are presented in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.3: Operational Noise and Vibration Assumptions and Results [APP-173]** and **Figure 11.3: Operational Noise Modelling Results [APP-100]**. This operational noise assessment concludes that although the Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level (LOAEL) (refer to paragraph 11.5.40 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**) is exceeded at a total of five of the closest sensitive receptors, the levels are below the Significant Observed adverse Effect Level (SOAEL) and are assessed as not significant, as set out in Section 11.9 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**. Details of mitigation measures are presented in Section 11.8 of Chapter 11. No impacts are expected due to vibration from operation of the development and have therefore been scoped out. As set out in Table 11-1of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**, this is because operational stationary sources are unlikely to generate sufficient levels of vibration at the Proposed Development. Propagation of any vibration through the ground between the sources and sensitive receivers will further reduce any residual vibration.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
NOI-02	RR-1396, RR-1201, RR-1403, RR-0207, RR-0216, RR-1078, RR-0661, RR-0307, RR-0956, RR-1090, RR-0797, RR-0301, RR-0949, RR-0604, RR-0396, RR-0945, RR-1358, RR-1016, RR-0237, RR-0568, RR-0778, RR-0847, RR-1309, RR-1237, RR-0607, RR-1073, RR-0304, RR-0086, RR-0803, RR-0470, RR-1285, RR-0712, RR-1377, RR-0447, RR-0046, RR-1457, RR-0089, RR-1027, RR-1051, RR-0749, RR-0577, RR-0155, RR-1297, RR-1006, RR-0784, RR-1137, RR-0335, RR-0230, RR-0587, RR-1165, RR-0659, RR-0594, RR-1368, RR-0215, RR-0146, RR-1406, RR-0837, RR-1025, RR-1320, RR-0921, RR-1212, RR-0479, RR-0724, RR-0614, RR-1437, RR-0760, RR-0195, RR-0158, RR-0827, RR-1385, RR-0622, RR-0946, RR-0202, RR-1185, RR-0020, RR-0071, RR-1042, RR-0001, RR-0321, RR-1426, RR-1150, RR-0950, RR-1062, RR-0017, RR-0464, RR-0234, RR-0753, RR-0555, RR-0967, RR-1282, RR-0303	Noise and Vibration	Respondents expressed concern regarding potential increases in noise and vibration arising from **construction activities** associated with the Proposed Development.	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 [APP-049]**. The assessment references British Standard BS 5228:2009+A1:2014 Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites - Noise (Part 1) and Vibration (Part 2). Details of the assessment including plant and equipment assumptions and predicted construction noise levels are presented in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.2: Construction Noise and Vibration Assumptions and Results [APP-172]**. The assessment, which includes noise emissions from horizontal directional drilling and piling, concludes that adverse effects from construction noise and vibration are not significant, following the application of best practicable measures of mitigation.
NOI-03	RR-1396, RR-1201, RR-1403, RR-0207, RR-0216, RR-1078, RR-0661, RR-0307, RR-0956, RR-1090, RR-0797, RR-0301, RR-0949, RR-0604, RR-0396, RR-0945, RR-1358, RR-1016, RR-0237, RR-0568, RR-0576, RR-0230, RR-0068	Noise and Vibration	Respondents expressed concern about the impact of noise on **horses and horse riders**.	The assessment of operational noise impacts upon Public Rights of Way, including those which can be legally used by equestrians, is presented in Section 11.5 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**. The assessment considers plant items most likely to give rise to adverse impacts and uses a 3D noise prediction model. Details of noise modelling for PRoWs are presented in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.3: Operational Noise and Vibration Assumptions and Results [APP-173]** and **ES Volume 2, Figure 11.3: Operational Noise Modelling Results [APP-100]**. For the assessment of all users of PRoWs, the assessment refers to guidelines for sound levels in outdoor amenity spaces taken from the World Health Organization Guidelines for community noise (1999) which are referred to in paragraph 7.7.3.2 of British Standard 8233:2014 Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings (see Table 11-14 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**).

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				As presented in paragraphs 11.9.56 to 11.9.59 of the ES chapter, operational noise impacts on PRoWs are assessed as not significant. Operational noise from new plant would be continuous (except for occasional starting and stopping of cooling fans etc) and if well maintained, is not expected to generate such levels or character of noise that would startle horses. With regard to construction noise impacting horses and riders using the PRoWs, there may be relatively short periods when noise levels from construction activities close to the PRoWs are audible. As construction progresses, works will move further away from these routes, resulting in a reduction in noise levels leading to lower noise levels for the majority of the construction periods, when the works are further away. Mitigation measures for PRoWs, including proposed diversions, are set out in the **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPROWMP) [APP-199]**. To minimise the level of noise to which PRoWs users and horses will be exposed construction activities will be undertaken in accordance with the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192].** The appointed contractor will also apply Best Practicable Means (BPM), to be set out in the detailed CEMP, as defined under Control of Pollution Act 1974 and described in Section 11.8 of the ES Noise and Vibration chapter. Measures to minimise impacts on horses and horse riders will be confirmed in the detailed CEMP and with appropriate mitigation measures in place the Applicant does not anticipate significant effects.
NOI-04	RR-1078, RR-0396, RR-1073, RR-0470, RR-1285, RR-0097, RR-1457, RR-0919, RR-0579, RR-1372, RR-1368, RR-1320, RR-0211, RR-0950, RR-0234, RR-0602	Noise and Vibration	Respondents expressed concern regarding the impact of **noise and vibration from construction vehicles**	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 [APP-049**]. The assessment references British Standard BS 5228:2009+A1:2014 Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites - Noise (Part 1) and Vibration (Part 2). Construction traffic vibration has been scoped out of the assessment since vibration is unlikely to be of sufficient magnitude to result in adverse impact on people or buildings (see Table 11-1 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**).

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The assessment concludes that most road links would be subject to negligible impacts from construction traffic noise, although there would be some minor adverse impacts and one moderate adverse impact (on Common Lane, Hambleton). This moderate adverse impact equates to an average of two to three vehicles per hour during the working day (**ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]** paragraph 11.9.33). This is unlikely to result in an appreciable change in noise levels at the nearby receptors. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement [APP-052]** outlines a range of noise and vibration mitigation measures, including the implementation of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). The measures that would be secured through the final CTMP are detailed in the **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** and include reducing the need for construction vehicles to travel during the network peak hours.
NOI-05	RR-0949, RR-0178, RR-0764, RR-0604, RR-0268, RR-0950, RR-1203, RR-0602, RR-0027	Noise and Vibration	Respondents expressed concern regarding the impact of **vibration on older houses and buildings.** Some respondents reported their properties stand above coal mine workings.	As set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**, the construction plant vibration levels have been calculated in accordance with the procedures in BS 5228-2. Paragraph 11.9.26 of the **Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration [APP-049]** concludes that vibration from construction activities is anticipated to result in levels well below the threshold for risk of cosmetic damage to any properties. Vibration from construction traffic is also unlikely to be of sufficient magnitude to result in adverse impacts on people and is scoped out of the assessment, as presented in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**. This is based on guidance provided in British Standards BS5228-2 and BS7385-2, as well as the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 111. Risk of any damage (even cosmetic damage) to any buildings or other structures, including older houses, starts to occur at levels much higher than those that are perceptible to people. Furthermore, extensive work carried out by the Transport and Road Research Laboratory (TRRL Research Report 246, Traffic Induced Vibration in Buildings by G R Watts) showed that vibration caused by road traffic, even passing very close to historic buildings and on uneven surfaces, did not present a damage risk. As such, no significant effects from vibration are expected. Nevertheless, the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** and **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				include mitigation measures to control and minimise any potential noise and vibration impacts resulting from the construction of the Proposed Development. Where vibration is perceptible for some residents, the oCEMP requires engagement with residents to provide reassurance that properties will not be at risk of damage, particularly where vibration is perceptible. With regard to the coal mine workings, vibration attenuates rapidly with depth below the ground surface, where construction vibration would be generated and is calculated. Any subsurface vibration incident on any mine workings would therefore be of very low magnitude and any risk of disturbance to them would be negligible. The Coal Authority stated in their Relevant Representation that they 'have reviewed the area for the solar panels, cable runs and substations as identified on the Site 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'.
NOI-06	RR-0861	Noise and Vibration	Respondent expressed concern for the noise of the wind whistling through the panels.	The Applicant notes this concern. The noise impacts from the operation of the Proposed Development are assessed in Section 11.9 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049],** with supporting modelling provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.3: Operational Noise and Vibration Assumptions and Results [APP-100]** and **ES Volume 2, Figure 11.3: Operational Noise Modelling Results [APP-100]**. With regard to the solar photovoltaic (PV), the assessment concludes that there would be no associated noise emissions with the fixed solar panel option, and very low levels of noise associated with the tracking panel option. The assessment does not identify the PV panels as a source of noise from the wind since the design of the Proposed Development does not include any elements that have geometric features likely to present a risk of causing wind-induced noise.

Noise and Vibration – Detailed

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Noise and Vibration - Detailed				
NOI-07	RR-0178, RR-0764, RR-0949, RR-1150	Noise and Vibration	Respondents expressed concern regarding the impact of noise on community, wildlife Ramblers, dog walkers, local **dog kennels (Woodhaven)** and horse liveries.	The assessment of operational noise impacts upon Public Rights of Way (PRoW) is presented in Section 11.5 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**. The assessment considers plant items most likely to give rise to adverse impacts and uses a three-dimensional noise prediction model. Details of noise modelling for PRoWs are presented in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.3: Operational Noise and Vibration Assumptions and Results [APP-173]** and **Volume 2, Figure 11.3: Operational Noise Modelling Results [APP-100]** and **Figure 11.5: Operational Noise Modelling Results - Predicted Daytime Sound Rating Level - 1.5m above ground [APP-102]**. For the assessment of all users of PRoWS, the assessment refers to guidelines for sound levels in outdoor amenity spaces taken from the World Health Organization Guidelines for community noise (1999) which are referred to in paragraph 7.7.3.2 of British Standard 8233:2014 Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings (see Table 11-14 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**). As presented in paragraphs 11.9.56 to 11.9.59 of the ES chapter, operational noise impacts on PRoWs are assessed as not significant. Operational noise from new plant would be continuous (except for starting and stopping of cooling fans etc) and if well maintained, is not expected to generate such levels or character of noise that would startle horses or be intrusive to people or their dogs. With regard to construction noise impacting users of PRoWs, there may be relatively short periods when noise levels from activities close to the PRoWs are audible. As construction progresses, works will move further away from these routes, resulting in a reduction in noise levels leading to lower noise levels for the majority of the construction periods, when the works are further away. Mitigation measures for PRoWs, including proposed diversions, are set out in the **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPROWMP) [APP-199]**. To minimise the level of noise to which PRoWs will be exposed, construction activities will be undertaken in accordance with the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192].** The appointed contractor will also apply Best Practicable Means (BPM), to be set out in the detailed CEMP,

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				as defined under Control of Pollution Act 1974 and described in Section 11.8 of the ES Noise and Vibration chapter. Regarding dog kennels, it is well known that dogs have a greater sensitivity to noise than do humans and can particularly be disturbed by sudden loud sounds. Conversely, levels of sound in kennels are often elevated by sound from the animals and most dogs demonstrate some habituation to noise. During operation, sound from the Proposed Development will be continuous and at a low level, with no sudden loud bangs etc, presenting a very low risk of disturbance. The effects on horses in liveries are expected to have similar characteristics to those for dog kennels. Measures to minimise impacts on horses, horse liveries and dog kennels will be confirmed in the detailed CEMP and with appropriate mitigation measures in place the Applicant does not anticipate significant effects on kennels and liveries.
NOI-08	RR-1399, RR-0195	Noise and Vibration	Respondents expressed concern for the impact of vibration for properties along the A19.	Properties along the A19, to the east of Site 4, are outside the construction vibration study area outlined in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]** and therefore beyond the distance for potential significant effects induced by construction activities to occur. Furthermore, construction traffic vibration has been scoped out of the assessment since vibration is unlikely to be of sufficient magnitude to result in adverse impact on people or buildings (see Table 11-1 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049**]). As presented in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**, based on guidance provided in British Standards BS5228-2 and BS7385-2, as well as the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 111, construction traffic vibration is very unlikely to be of sufficient magnitude to result in adverse impacts on people. Furthermore, risk of any damage (even cosmetic damage) to any buildings or other structures, including older houses, starts to occur at levels much higher than those that are perceptible to people. Additionally, extensive work was carried out by the Transport and Road Research Laboratory (TRRL Research Report 246, Traffic Induced Vibration in Buildings by G R Watts) that showed the levels of vibration caused by road traffic, even passing very close to historic buildings and on uneven surfaces, did not present a damage risk.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Existing traffic flows on the A19 already include HGVs so the additional construction vehicles will not materially change the overall vibration exposure of buildings. Therefore, no significant effects from vibration are expected at properties along the A19. The **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** and **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** include mitigation measures to control and minimise any potential noise and vibration impacts resulting from the construction of the Proposed Development. Where vibration is perceptible for some residents, the oCEMP requires engagement with residents to provide reassurance that properties will not be at risk of damage, particularly where vibration is perceptible.
NOI-09	RR-0740	Noise and Vibration	Respondent expressed concern for the noise and vibration impacts in Birkin.	Representative receptors for noise and vibration effects in Birkin are included in the assessment and labelled S4_R2, S4_R3, S4_R8 and S4_R11 in **ES Volume 2, Figure 11.2: Environmental Sound Survey and Assessment Locations [APP-099]**. 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 [APP-049]**. The assessment references British Standard BS 5228:2009+A1:2014 Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites - Noise (Part 1) and Vibration (Part 2). Details of the assessment including plant equipment assumptions and predicted construction noise levels are presented in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.2: Construction Noise and Vibration Assumptions and Results [APP-172]**. The assessment, which includes noise emissions from horizontal directional drilling and piling, concludes that adverse effects from construction noise and vibration are not significant, following the application of best practicable measures mitigation approaches. Construction traffic vibration was scoped out of the assessment. As presented in Table 11-1 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**, based on guidance provided in British Standards BS5228-2 and BS7385-2, as well as the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 111, construction traffic vibration is very unlikely to be of sufficient magnitude to result in adverse impacts on people. Furthermore, risk of any damage (even

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				cosmetic damage) to any buildings or other structures, including older houses, starts to occur at levels much higher than those that are perceptible to people. Additionally, extensive work was carried out by the Transport and Road Research Laboratory (TRRL Research Report 246, Traffic Induced Vibration in Buildings by G R Watts) that showed the levels of vibration caused by road traffic, even passing very close to historic buildings and on uneven surfaces, did not present a damage risk. It is acknowledged that there are a number of older buildings close to roads in Birkin and the conclusions regarding construction traffic vibration risk apply to these. Operational noise impacts at noise sensitive receptors in Birkin are predicted to be well below the typical daytime background sound level (refer to **ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.3: Operational Noise Assumptions and Results [APP-173]**). At some receptor locations, the nighttime noise levels exceed the background but are lower than the Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level (LOAEL) of 5dB above the background sound level. Furthermore, they are below the World Health Organization guidelines for sound levels outside residential properties at night.
NOI-10	RR-0103	Noise and Vibration	Respondent expressed concern about noise and vibration impacts in Escrick.	A representative receptor for noise and vibration effects in Escrick is labelled S1_R3 in **ES Volume 2, Figure 11.2: Environmental Sound Survey and Assessment Locations [APP-099]**. This receptor location is one of the most easterly Noise Sensitive Receptors (NSRs) in Escrick with the large majority of the village being further from the Proposed Development. The assessments of construction and operational noise and vibration undertaken as described in Section 11.5 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049],** demonstrates the effects at this receptor are not significant. The construction noise and vibration assessment in line with BS5228-1 and BS5228-2, concluded that no significant effects would occur at this receptor reference S1_R3. Details of the construction noise and vibration assessment are presented in **Environmental Statement Volume 3, Appendix 11.2: Construction Noise and Vibration Assumptions [APP-172]**. At this receptor, Category A is not predicted to be exceeded neither for the day nor for the night. Vibration levels at this receptor are also not predicted to result in significant effects.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				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. Results of noise modelling presented in **Environmental Statement Volume 3, Appendix 11.3: Operational Noise and Vibration Assumptions and Results [APP-173]** demonstrate that the adopted criteria at receptor S1_R3 is not predicted to be exceeded. As presented in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**, based on guidance provided in British Standards BS5228-2 and BS7385-2, as well as the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 111, construction traffic vibration is unlikely to be of sufficient magnitude to result in adverse impacts on people. Risk of any damage (even cosmetic damage) to any buildings or other structures, including older houses, starts to occur at levels much higher than those that are perceptible to people. As such, no significant effects from vibration are expected. Extensive work was carried out by the Transport and Road Research Laboratory (TRRL Research Report 246, Traffic Induced Vibration in Buildings by G R Watts) that showed the levels of vibration caused by road traffic, even passing very close to historic buildings and on uneven surfaces, did not present a damage risk. Construction traffic vibration was scoped out of the assessment and presents no risk to the properties along the site access route. The **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** and **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** include mitigation measures to control and minimise any potential noise and vibration impacts resulting from the construction of the Proposed Development.
NOI-11	RR-1051	Noise and Vibration	Respondent stated that noise impacts are understated by the Applicant, including concerns about mechanical movement and operational noise from tracking panels in close proximity to the residential boundary.	Noise impacts have been assessed using methods and criteria consistent with national and local policy; British and (where relevant) international standards; authoritative guidance (such as from the World Health Organization); and precedent that has been scrutinised through many previous planning applications and Development Consent Order applications. Source noise levels from operational plant have been obtained from manufacturers/suppliers information, other similar projects, and where necessary, previous planning and DCO applications for solar developments. Details of this information are presented in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.3: Operational Noise and Vibration Assumptions and Results [APP-173]**.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The predicted noise impacts are therefore as robust as is currently possible. Consideration of tracking panels is equally robust. Paragraph 11.9.42 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]** states that either fixed or tracking solar panels may be used in the Proposed Development: *"Fixed panels do not contain moving parts and therefore have no associated noise emissions. Tracking systems operate with small motors and generate very low levels of noise. 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 and has not been included in the noise model or assessment."*
NOI-12	RR-1301	Noise and Vibration	Respondent expressed particular concern about noise impacts from the 'passage way' along Long Lane.	Long Lane is identified in Section 2.5 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [APP-040]** as a Highways Improvement Area for which modifications are planned in order to accommodate AIL vehicle movements along construction routes. However, HGV access is not planned for Long Lane (see **ES Volume 2, Figure 14.4: Construction Routing [APP-113]**. As noted in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**, construction noise associated with Highways Improvement Areas are short-term and temporary in nature and are therefore unlikely to result in significant effects. Moreover, the relatively low speed and number of AIL movements is unlikely to result in a noticeable increase in noise levels that would result in a significant effect.
NOI-13	RR-1069	Noise and Vibration	**[BoR number 04-004]:** The Applicant's newsletter states that the Site 1 substation has been located away from sensitive receptors such as properties and Skipwith Road, reducing noise and visual impacts. That is effectively an acknowledgment that the area around Skipwith and Skipwith Road is sensitive to this type of development. While the Applicant presents this as mitigation, it also reinforces the point that significant harm would arise without such relocation and that the proposal remains capable of affecting nearby residential receptors and the setting of the village.	The locations of substations (and other elements of the scheme) have been selected through a multidisciplinary approach considering relevant environmental and engineering constraints to optimise the layout of the Proposed Development within the available sites. As stated in paragraph 11.8.10 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**, the assessment that has been presented *"is based on an indicative design available at the time of writing to inform a reasonable worst-case assessment"* and further to this, *"Any changes will ensure that resulting operational noise impacts do not lead to significant effects".* Paragraph 11.8.11 states a series of commitments to this effect that are set out in **oOEMP [APP-192]**, specifically that the detailed OEMP will include *"A noise impact*

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				assessment of the finalised detailed design of that part of the Proposed Development to which the OEMP relates. This will be required to demonstrate that the operational noise sources will not lead to materially new or materially different effects that are worse than reported in this chapter".
NOI-14	RR-0996	Noise and Vibration	Respondent expressed concern about BESS noise at Site 2, stating that the proposed 100 metre standoff distance is wholly inadequate. Respondent expressed concern that the potential noise effects of the BESS have not been adequately recognised in the PEIR, and stated that amenity impact and statutory nuisance from a BESS of this scale would be difficult to mitigate and that no acoustic mitigation measures have been proposed or detailed within the PEIR.	The Applicant notes the concerns. The Applicant notes that the **Environmental Statement [APP-038 to APP-190]** superseded the PEIR when the Application was accepted for Examination on March 9 2026. The location of the BESS was determined through an options appraisal and iterative design process, having regard to technical and planning requirements, environmental constraints and potential effects on nearby receptors. The BESS Compound is located at Solar Development Site 2, close to the other Solar development Sites and the on-site substation, which provides operational and efficiency benefits, including minimising transmission losses, maximising storage efficiency, supporting grid balancing, and enabling a rapid and reliable response to network fluctuations. The location of the BESS within Solar Development Site 2 was selected to optimise separation from surrounding receptors and reduce potential adverse impacts, including to residential properties. The **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]** provides an assessment of the operational noise of the Proposed Development, supported by **ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.3: Operational Noise and Vibration Assumptions and Results [APP-100]** and **ES Volume 2, Figure 11.3: Operational Noise Modelling Results [APP-100]**. This includes an assessment of the BESS infrastructure and demonstrates that operational noise levels, taking into account the BESS and other fixed infrastructure, would comply with relevant guidance and would not give rise to significant adverse effects at nearby receptors. This is presented indicatively within the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** and secured via the **Works Plans [AS-004].** The design is expected to continue evolving, and changes may occur, such as modifications to the Conversion Unit locations, the layout of the BESS Compound or changes to plant selection. Any changes will ensure that resulting operational noise impacts do not lead to significant effects, as committed within the **Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [APP-192].**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				In addition, **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]** includes a host of mitigation measures to reduce the impacts of the BESS compound. These include plant orientation to minimise the sound producing equipment facing sensitive noise receptors, and the implementation of up to 5 m high noise barriers around and within the BESS site.
NOI-15	RR-0584	Noise and Vibration	Respondent stated that there has been nothing to demonstrate how audibly the village of Monk Fryston will be affected, stating that examples of houses with up to 132dB will be heard.	Representative receptors for noise and vibration effects in and around Monk Fryston are included in the assessment and labelled S2_R3, S3_R1, S6_R4, CRC_23, CRC_24, CRC_27 and CRC_29 in **ES Volume 2, Figure 11.2: Environmental Sound Survey and Assessment Locations [APP-099]**. 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. The assessments of construction noise and vibration are undertaken in accordance British Standard 5228:2009+A1:2014 Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites - Noise (Part 1) and Vibration (Part 2). Assessments are reported within Section 11.5 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]** and results of the assessment are in Section 11.9 where it is stated that effects of noise and vibration at these receptors are 'assessed as not significant'. Details of the predicted noise levels at the receptors above arising from construction noise and vibration are presented in **Appendix 11.2 Construction Noise and Vibration Assumptions and Results [APP-172]**. Predicted operational noise levels are presented in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.3: Operational Noise and Vibration Assumptions and Results [APP-173]**. The Applicant does not recognise the suggestion that noise from any source, whether during construction or operation, would be up to 132 dB. As reported in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]** and the supporting technical appendices, the assessment concludes that predicted noise impacts are not significant. At representative receptors at Monk Fryston, maximum predicted construction noise levels are approximately 55dB$L_{Aeq,T}$. Maximum predicted operational rating sound levels are approximately 35dB$L_{Ar,Tr}$, and maximum predicted maintenance noise levels are approximately 58dB$L_{Aeq,T}$. The **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** and **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** include mitigation measures to control and minimise any potential noise and

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				vibration impacts resulting from the construction of the Proposed Development.
NOI-16	RR-0215	Noise and Vibration	Respondent requested extensive pre and post condition surveys on building foundations to assess the impacts of traffic and HGV vehicle movement vibrations on properties and compensation provided if damage is expected or surveyed.	The Applicant notes the request for pre- and post- condition surveys of building foundations to assess potential vibration impacts from construction traffic and HGV movements. A detailed assessment of noise and vibration has been undertaken and is reported within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**, supported by **ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.2: Construction Noise and Vibration Assumptions and Results [APP-172].** Chapter 11 concludes, based on guidance provided in British Standards BS5228-2 and BS7385-2, as well as the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges DMRB) LA 111, construction traffic vibration is unlikely to be of sufficient magnitude to result in adverse impacts on people. Risk of any damage (even cosmetic damage) to any buildings or other structures, including older houses, starts to occur at levels much higher than those that are perceptible to people. As such, no significant effects from vibration are expected. Extensive work was carried out by the Transport and Road Research Laboratory (TRRL Research Report 246, Traffic Induced Vibration in Buildings by G R Watts) that showed the levels of vibration caused by road traffic, even passing very close to historic buildings and on uneven surfaces, did not present a damage risk. The **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** and **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** include mitigation measures to control and minimise any potential noise and vibration impacts resulting from the construction of the Proposed Development. Where vibration is perceptible for some residents, the oCEMP requires engagement with residents to provide reassurance that properties will not be at risk of damage, particularly where vibration is perceptible. Given the low magnitude of predicted effects, the requirement for extensive pre- and post-condition surveys of building foundations is not considered necessary or proportionate. However, the oCEMP anticipates that construction works would be undertaken in accordance with the Best Practicable Means to minimise noise and vibration impacts. The oCEMP details that any noise and vibration queries or complaints

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				throughout the construction period will be investigated and appropriate action taken, as required.
NOI-17	RR-0854, RR-0213	Noise and Vibration	. Respondents expressed concern that traffic movements, construction vehicles and heavy machinery could damage the foundations of St Helen's Church (Grade I listed), including concern regarding the absence of any risk assessment and provision for financial restitution should damage occur.	As presented in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**, vibration assessments are based on guidance provided in British Standards BS5228-2 and BS7385-2, as well as the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 111, construction traffic vibration is unlikely to be of sufficient magnitude to result in adverse impacts on people. Risk of any damage (even cosmetic damage) to any buildings or other structures, including older houses, starts to occur at levels much higher than those that are perceptible to people. As such, no significant effects from vibration are expected. Extensive work was carried out by the Transport and Road Research Laboratory (TRRL Research Report 246, Traffic Induced Vibration in Buildings by G R Watts) that showed the levels of vibration caused by road traffic, even passing very close to historic buildings and on uneven surfaces, did not present a damage risk. Nevertheless, the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** and **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** include mitigation measures to control and minimise any potential noise and vibration impacts resulting from the construction of the Proposed Development. Where vibration is perceptible for some residents, the oCEMP requires engagement with residents to provide reassurance that properties will not be at risk of damage, particularly where vibration is perceptible.
NOI-18	RR-0854	Noise and Vibration	**[BoR numbers 03-038, 04-001]**: Respondent expressed concern that traffic movement will damage the foundations of their property on Gateforth Lane.	As presented in **ES Volume 1 Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**, vibration assessments are based on guidance provided in British Standards BS5228-2 and BS7385-2, as well as the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 111, construction traffic vibration is unlikely to be of sufficient magnitude to result in adverse impacts on people. Risk of any damage (even cosmetic damage) to any buildings or other structures, including older houses, starts to occur at levels much higher than those that are perceptible to people. As such, no significant effects from vibration are expected. Extensive work was carried out by the Transport and Road Research Laboratory (TRRL Research Report 246, Traffic Induced Vibration in Buildings by G R Watts) that showed the

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				levels of vibration caused by road traffic, even passing very close to historic buildings and on uneven surfaces, did not present a damage risk. The **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** and **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** include mitigation measures to control and minimise any potential noise and vibration impacts resulting from the construction of the Proposed Development. Where vibration is perceptible for some residents, the oCEMP requires engagement with residents to provide reassurance that properties will not be at risk of damage, particularly where vibration is perceptible.
NOI-19	RR-0606	Noise and Vibration	Respondent reported that their home was built in the 1700s and has no modern foundations. The property already exhibits visible structural cracking on the front exterior wall (photo evidence to be provided). I am gravely concerned that three years of sustained HGV vibration and heavy industrial traffic along Main Road will cause catastrophic structural damage or subsidence to my home. I request that the Examining Authority requires a baseline structural survey and a specific vibration monitoring strategy for historic roadside properties.	As presented in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**, vibration assessments are based on guidance provided in British Standards BS5228-2 and BS7385-2, as well as the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 111, construction traffic vibration is unlikely to be of sufficient magnitude to result in adverse impacts on people. Risk of any damage (even cosmetic damage) to any buildings or other structures, including older houses, starts to occur at levels much higher than those that are perceptible to people. As such, no significant effects from vibration are expected. Extensive work was carried out by the Transport and Road Research Laboratory (TRRL Research Report 246, Traffic Induced Vibration in Buildings by G R Watts) that showed the levels of vibration caused by road traffic, even passing very close to historic buildings and on uneven surfaces, did not present a damage risk. The **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** and **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** include mitigation measures to control and minimise any potential noise and vibration impacts resulting from the construction of the Proposed Development. Where vibration is perceptible for some residents, the oCEMP requires engagement with residents to provide reassurance that properties will not be at risk of damage, particularly where vibration is perceptible.
NOI-20	RR-0848	Noise and Vibration	**[BoR numbers 07-001, 07-002]**: Respondent expressed concern that their property's foundations will be damaged due to the movement of HGVs, AILs and other development activity.	Wistow and Pinfold Hill is identified as a route for Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs) only. These movements would be limited in number and undertaken on an infrequent basis. An Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) Assessment is included in **Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment [APP-178]** and

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				considers the suitability of roads for abnormal indivisible loads. AIL movements will be managed by a specialist haulage company so that the potential effects are mitigated. In addition, to ensure minimal impact upon on the local road network, AIL vehicle movements will be undertaken during off-peak times and delivered in convoy, whenever practicable, to minimise incidents of disruption. This will be coordinated with the local highways authorities and police prior to being undertaken, with the final routes subject to agreement with highways authorities. As presented in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**, vibration assessments are based on guidance provided in British Standards BS5228-2 and BS7385-2, as well as the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 111, construction traffic vibration is unlikely to be of sufficient magnitude to result in adverse impacts on people. Risk of any damage (even cosmetic damage) to any buildings or other structures, including older houses, starts to occur at levels much higher than those that are perceptible to people. As such, no significant effects from vibration are expected. Extensive work was carried out by the Transport and Road Research Laboratory (TRRL Research Report 246, Traffic Induced Vibration in Buildings by G R Watts) that showed the levels of vibration caused by road traffic, even passing very close to historic buildings and on uneven surfaces, did not present a damage risk. Moreover, the relatively low speed and number of AIL movements is unlikely to result in a noticeable increase in noise and vibration levels that would result in a significant effect. The **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192**] and **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** include mitigation measures to control and minimise any potential noise and vibration impacts resulting from the construction of the Proposed Development. Where vibration is perceptible for some residents, the oCEMP requires engagement with residents to provide reassurance that properties will not be at risk of damage, particularly where vibration is perceptible.
NOI-21	RR-0614	Noise and Vibration	**[BoR numbers 04-002]**: Respondent expressed concern that AIL vehicles passing their property in Skipwith will cause vibrational damage to the building.	As presented in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**, vibration assessments are based on guidance provided in British Standards BS5228-2 and BS7385-2, as well as the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 111, construction traffic vibration is unlikely to be of sufficient magnitude to result in adverse impacts on people. Risk of any damage (even cosmetic

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				damage) to any buildings or other structures, including older houses, starts to occur at levels much higher than those that are perceptible to people. As such, no significant effects from vibration are expected. Extensive work was carried out by the Transport and Road Research Laboratory (TRRL Research Report 246, Traffic Induced Vibration in Buildings by G R Watts) that showed the levels of vibration caused by road traffic, even passing very close to historic buildings and on uneven surfaces, did not present a damage risk. Moreover, the relatively low speed and number of AIL movements is unlikely to result in a noticeable increase in noise and vibration levels that would result in a significant effect. The **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** and **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** include mitigation measures to control and minimise any potential noise and vibration impacts resulting from the construction of the Proposed Development. Where vibration is perceptible for some residents, the oCEMP requires engagement with residents to provide reassurance that properties will not be at risk of damage, particularly where vibration is perceptible.
NOI-22	RR-1396	Noise and Vibration	Respondent expressed specific concern for their Grade II listed property in Cliffe. Respondent reports their property has a structural defect in the wall due to early subsidence. Although settled, respondent fears piling vibration will cause further internal structure issues. Property is the only Grade II listed building in Cliffe.	As Cliffe is over 4km away from the Cable Route Corridor and all Solar Development Sites, and there is no nearby construction access route, it would not experience significant effects from the construction or operation phases. Cliffe is outside of the study area for direct noise and vibration assessment within **Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]** and is well beyond the distance for potential significant effects to occur.

2.21 Ornithology

Ornithology – General Comments

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Ornithology - General Comments				
ORN-01	RR-0752, RR-1201, RR-1403, RR-0375, RR-0008, RR-0849, RR-0599, RR-0615, RR-0661, RR-0956, RR-1090, RR-1293, RR-0287, RR-0498, RR-1178, RR-0611, RR-1384, RR-0949, RR-0343, RR-1436, RR-1321, RR-0214, RR-0268, RR-1020, RR-0427, RR-1008, RR-1119, RR-0992, RR-0237, RR-0306, RR-1106, RR-1158, RR-0847, RR-0908, RR-0642, RR-0628, RR-1145, RR-1222, RR-1242, RR-0352, RR-1032, RR-1324, RR-1231, RR-0867, RR-1263, RR-0191, RR-0180, RR-1260, RR-0983, RR-0723, RR-0534, RR-0591, RR-0712, RR-1139, RR-0447, RR-0514, RR-1129, RR-0046, RR-1207, RR-0543, RR-1457, RR-1438, RR-0919, RR-1244, RR-1027, RR-1301, RR-0577, RR-1398, RR-0735, RR-0735, RR-0081, RR-0428, RR-0271, RR-0483, RR-0290, RR-0276, RR-0794, RR-0119, RR-1134, RR-1219, RR-0836, RR-1345, RR-1423, RR-0374, RR-0835, RR-1370, RR-0831, RR-0958, RR-1234, RR-0245, RR-1132, RR-0574, RR-1247, RR-0544, RR-1437, RR-0760, RR-0027, RR-0649, RR-0863, RR-0703, RR-0236, RR-0787, RR-1385, RR-1365, RR-0205, RR-1337, RR-0937, RR-0372, RR-0685, RR-1367, RR-0321, RR-1062, RR-1426, RR-0800, RR-0126, RR-0688, RR-0653, RR-1243, RR-0432, RR-0082, RR-0636, RR-0136, RR-1328, RR-0509, RR-1131, RR-0580, RR-0853, RR-1011, RR-1282, RR-0444, RR-0012, RR-0861, RR-0656	Ornithology	Some respondents expressed concern about potential impacts on **birds**.	The Applicant acknowledges these concerns. All bird species have been considered within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050]**, with particular focus on those associated with the internationally designated sites, including the Lower Derwent Valley SPA and Ramsar site and the Humber Estuary SPA and Ramsar site. A comprehensive desk study was undertaken using data from the North and East Yorkshire Ecological Data Centre, supplemented by records from the British Trust for Ornithology (BTO) and local Yorkshire bird reports. Notably, the search area extended to 50 km from the Order Limits through the BTO Data Report, exceeding standard requirements, as detailed in Section 12.8 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050]**. In addition, a detailed desk and field study, including breeding and non-breeding bird surveys, was undertaken in accordance with recognised guidance and is reported in Section 12.6 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050]**, as well as **ES Volume 3, Appendix 12.1: Breeding Bird Survey Report – Solar Development Sites 1–5 [APP-174], Appendix 12.2: Non-breeding Bird Survey Report [APP-175],** and **Appendix 12.3: Breeding Bird Survey Report – Solar Development Sites 6–8 [APP-176]**. Potential impacts to all relevant bird species have been assessed, and a comprehensive package of embedded and additional mitigation, including habitat retention, habitat enhancement and the Bird Mitigation Area, has been proposed. Almost all of the species considered, particularly raptors, herons and passerines, are not expected to be adversely affected by the Proposed Development. This is because key boundary features that support foraging, roosting and breeding are retained and enhanced within the Order Limits. These measures are anticipated to deliver net benefits through improved habitat quality and connectivity and will be beneficial to all species. Ground-nesting species, including skylark and corn bunting have been comprehensively assessed within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050]**. The Applicant considers that the proposed Bird Mitigation Area will provide significant benefits to both breeding and non-breeding populations, as

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				outlined in Section 12.17. Importantly, the mitigation strategy will reduce existing environmental stressors such as variable land management practices, disturbance and sub-optimal habitat conditions, thereby creating a stable, consistent and predictable habitat resource for the duration of the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development throughout both the breeding and non-breeding periods. The mitigation and enhancement measures are secured via the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]** and the **Outline Bird Mitigation Area Management Plan (oBMAMP) [APP-205]**. The Applicant also notes that the RSPB has expressed support for the approach to the assessment of breeding and non-breeding birds and has agreed the mitigation and enhancement measures proposed, as outlined within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050]** and the **Outline Bird Mitigation Area Management Plan (oBMAMP) [APP-205]**.
ORN-02		Ornithology	Respondents expressed concern about the impact to Red Kite.	Breeding and roosting red kite utilise mature trees which are largely retained throughout the Order Limits. It is important to note that suitable features for this species were mapped and assessed during autumn (mature trees and copses) and therefore, surveys prior to any construction (during the breeding season) as stated within the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** would be carried out to ensure there is no disturbance to this species, whilst nesting. Extensive mature trees and woodland, suitable for nesting red kites, will be retained . As such the Applicant does not consider there will be any impact on nesting, or foraging, red kites. Mapped features for this species can be found in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 12.3: Breeding Bird Survey Report - Solar Development Sites 6-8 [AS-032]**
ORN-03		Ornithology	Respondents expressed concern about the impact to Peregrine Falcon.	This species thrives in urban settings as we see throughout the country. The inclusion of solar which is not comparable to highly urbanised landscapes, is highly unlikely to be considered an impact to this very adaptable, urban and coastal cliff / upland dwelling species. Within the Order Limits, the only potential nesting feature suitable for use by peregrines are pylons. It is important to note that suitable features for this species were mapped and assessed during the breeding season (namely pylons) and therefore, surveys prior to any construction would be carried out to ensure there are no disturbance, as stated in the **oCEMP [APP-192]**.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Mapped features for this species can be found in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 12.3: Breeding Bird Survey Report - Solar Development Sites 6-8 [AS-032]**
ORN-04		Ornithology	Respondents expressed concern about the impact to Marsh Harrier.	Whilst it is acknowledged that this species has been found present within 2 km of the Order Limits (no breeding evidence), Marsh harrier were not recorded during the breeding season and the habitat within the Order Limits is not considered optimal and/or suitable for this species (**ES Volume 3, Appendix 12.3: Breeding Bird Survey Report - Solar Development Sites 6-8 [AS-032]**). On that basis, no impacts to this species are anticipated.
ORN-05		Ornithology	Respondents expressed concern about the impact to Yellowhammer.	This species has been recorded as part of the Site's existing baseline conditions. On site conditions for yellowhammer are not considered optimal. Anecdotal evidence indicates that hedgerows are becoming less dense at base, reducing their suitability for nesting- see paragraph 12.17.3 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050]**. However, with the enhancements proposed within the Order Limits through the creation of hedgerow and the enhancements specified within Table 3.2 of the **Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Report [APP-220],** it is anticipated that conditions will improve and support the species' recovery and continued presence.
ORN-06		Ornithology	Respondents expressed concern about the impact to Skylark.	Skylarks and other ground nesting bird species (lapwing, corn bunting etc.) have been assessed appropriately within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050]** in Section 12.17. Skylark are considered a stable and are increasing within and surrounding the Order Limits based on local bird annual records. The BTO Data Report which has been considered as part of the assessment does not consider this species as "notable" meaning that this species is well within their typical range and numbers. The Bird Mitigation Area will provide a reliable resource for up to 60 years. It is concluded that there will be minor adverse effects on this species at a district/local level. However, it is important to note that there are overarching benefits of the BMA which will provide beneficial outcomes to other ground-nesting birds which are cited as in decline.
ORN-07		Ornithology	Respondents expressed concern about the impact to Hobby.	Breeding hobby utilise mature trees which are largely retained throughout the Order Limits. It is important to note that suitable features for this species were mapped and assessed during the breeding season

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				(mature trees and copses) and therefore, surveys prior to any construction would be carried out to ensure there are no disturbance whilst nesting, as stated in the **oCEMP [APP-192]**. Extensive mature trees and woodland, suitable for nesting hobby, will be retained . As such the Applicant does not consider there will be any impact on nesting, or foraging, hobby. Mapped features for this species can be found in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 12.3: Breeding Bird Survey Report - Solar Development Sites 6-8 [AS-032]**
ORN-08		Ornithology	Respondents expressed concern about the impact to Bittern.	No bittern were recorded within the baseline data, or noted as present within the desk study area of at least 2 km **[AS-032]**. This is a specialist species which thrive in large reed bed areas which are not present or of suitable scale within the Order Limits.
ORN-09		Ornithology	Respondents expressed concern about the impact to Kingfisher.	Suitable habitat for kingfisher has been mapped throughout the Order Limits. Mapped features for this species can be found in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 12.3: Breeding Bird Survey Report - Solar Development Sites 6-8 [AS-032].** Habitats for this species will be retained as part of best practice and surveys prior to any construction would be carried out to ensure there are no disturbance as stated in the **oCEMP [APP-192]**. Therefore, this species will not be impacted as a result of the Proposed Development.
ORN-10		Ornithology	Respondents expressed concern about the impact to Whooper Swan.	No whooper swan were recorded as utilising the Order Limits. However, they were noted utilising the area surrounding the River Aire (0.5 km away from the Order Limits) which will not be developed upon as a result of the Proposed Development. It is also relevant that the Bird Mitigation Area will deliver an extensive area of improved suitability for this species.
ORN-11		Ornithology	Respondents expressed concern about the impact to Great White Egret.	Great white egret were not recorded as utilising the Order Limits as confirmed within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 12.2: Non-breeding Bird Survey Report Part 1 of 3 [AS-029]**. It is also relevant that the Bird Mitigation Area will deliver an extensive area of improved suitability for this species, and that all ditches and watercourses used by the species will be undeveloped and continue to be available.
ORN-12		Ornithology	Respondents expressed concern about the impact to Barn Owl.	The Applicant acknowledges this concern, however tress and infrastructure that supports this species will largely be retained (particularly mature trees and farm buildings). Pre-commencement surveys will be undertaken prior to construction to ensure that any nesting and/or breeding barn owls are identified and appropriately safeguarded from disturbance as stated in the **oCEMP [APP-192]**.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				In relation to foraging, voles and other small mammals form key components of the barn owl diet. These species rely on suitable rough grassland habitats, particularly field margins, which do not need to be extensive in size- it is down to availability and accessibility. Literature states similar- the poorer the foraging habitat, the larger the home-range. Such higher-quality habitats are therefore of significant value to foraging barn owls. For instance, the species is often observed utilising narrow strips of rough grassland alongside road verges (unmanaged). No adverse impacts are concluded for this species, however, it is likely that enhancement such as the proposed meadow grassland margins (up to 108 ha) as stated within Table 3.1 of the BNG Report **[APP-220]** will lead to an increase in quality of habitat / number of small mammals available for barn owls. As such, the Proposed Development is likely to be beneficial to barn owls.
ORN-13	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-0599, RR-0306, RR-1333, RR-0642, RR-1324, RR-0858, RR-0958, RR-0642, RR-0636, RR-0571	Ornithology	Respondents expressed concern that reflective solar panels will be confused with water bodies by birds. Respondents added that there appears to be no mitigation for this.	The risk of birds colliding with panels has been assessed and is discussed in Section 12.18 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050]**. Glint and glare effects on birds are assessed as negligible. There is no robust evidence from UK studies or Natural England reviews that solar PV glint causes disturbance or collision risk to birds. Baseline surveys recorded no regular or directional flight paths over the site, and similar UK solar projects have not identified avian impacts from glint or glare. Potential interactions were judged to be low risk and manageable through site-specific design, with solar farms in temperate agricultural landscapes considered unlikely to pose notable glint-related hazards to avifauna. The Applicant also notes that the RSPB has expressed support for the approach to the assessment of breeding and non-breeding birds and has approved the mitigation and enhancement measures proposed, as outlined within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050]** and the **Outline Bird Mitigation Area Management Plan (oBMAMP) [APP-205]**.

Ornithology – Detailed

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Ornithology - Detailed				
ORN-14	RR-0599, RR-1002, RR-1324, RR-0086, RR-1370	Ornithology	Respondents expressed concern for impacts to Fairburn / Newton Ings, a nationally important wetland habitat.	Due to the substantial overlap between bird species associated with this SSSI and those associated with the SPA and Ramsar sites assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050]**, birds were considered indirectly through the internationally designated sites. This approach reflects the high mobility of bird species, which makes it impracticable to attribute individuals to a specific designated site. There will not be significant impacts on birds associated with the designated site, as set out in the ES, and this conclusion is agreed by RSPB and Natural England. It is also relevant that the BMA, , provides full mitigation for all species associated with these designated sites.
ORN-15	RR-0144, RR-0306, RR-0707, RR-1064, RR-0544	Ornithology	Respondents expressed concern for white owls and other birds nesting in Birkin, as well as geese and swans near Birkin Cafe.	The Applicant assumes white owls refers to barn owl. Barn owl concerns have been addressed in the ORN-12. Potential effects on geese and swans are confined to this area only, which lies outside the Order Limits. As such, no impacts are anticipated, and the presence and numbers of geese and swans will remain unchanged from their current baseline/condition. Regardless, it is relevant that the BMA, agreed through consultation with Natural England, provides full mitigation for all relevant species recorded within the entire Order Limits.
ORN-16	RR-0465, RR-1420, RR-1186	Ornithology	Respondents expressed specific concerns regarding ecological impacts in West Haddlesey, including the presence of Canadian Geese.	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised regarding Site 4, being closest to West Haddlesey. Within the boundary of Site 4, the bird assemblage is predominantly comprised of geese, specifically greylag geese, which are considered a feral population. Canada geese are listed as a Schedule 9 invasive species. Nevertheless, they are known to use the River Aire and the surrounding area and appear to be well established locally and wider. The predominantly arable landscape is not considered to provide optimal habitat for this species, particularly during the breeding season. Potential impacts of the Proposed Development on ecology and biodiversity are assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Biodiversity [APP-044]** and **ES Volume 1 Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050].** The assessment concludes that no unacceptable significant adverse effects on ecology and

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				biodiversity are anticipated including on ecological receptors in West Haddlesey. A comprehensive package of habitat retention, creation, enhancement and long-term management measures is proposed to avoid, reduce and mitigate impacts and to deliver Biodiversity Net Gain. These include the protection of existing habitats, creation of new habitats, and long-term ecological management to improve habitat quality over the lifetime of the Proposed Development. The ecological mitigation and enhancement proposals, including BNG measures, are illustrated on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]**, detailed in the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]** and the **Outline Bird Mitigation Area Management Plan (oBMAMP) [APP-205]**. The **oLEMP [APP-195]** includes provisions for habitat establishment, maintenance and ecological monitoring to confirm that mitigation and enhancement measures are functioning as intended and to identify and implement remedial measures where required.
ORN-17	RR-0935, RR-0180, RR-0793	Ornithology	Respondents raised concerns regarding Barn Owls, a Schedule 1 species, in the locality, stating that they may nest and breed in the area and that disturbance from the Proposed Development could be unlawful under wildlife legislation. Respondents also questioned how the placement of panels on fields used by hunting Barn Owls, particularly at Site 2, could be permitted under applicable legal protections.	The Applicant acknowledges the point regarding disturbance. Pre-commencement surveys will be undertaken prior to construction to ensure that any nesting and/or breeding barn owls are identified and appropriately safeguarded from disturbance as stated in the **oCEMP [APP-192]**. In relation to foraging, voles and other small mammals form key components of the barn owl diet. These species rely on suitable rough grassland habitats, particularly field margins, which do not need to be extensive in size- it is down to availability and accessibility. Literature states similar- the poorer the foraging habitat, the larger the home-range. Such higher-quality habitats are therefore of significant value to foraging barn owls. For instance, the species is often observed utilising narrow strips of rough grassland alongside road verges (unmanaged). Barn owl concerns have been addressed in ORN-12 and ORN-15.
ORN-18	RR-0599	Ornithology	Respondent stated that wintering birds have not been properly surveyed or assessed.	The Applicant is keen to understand the respondent's statement further. Non-breeding birds, which include both passage and wintering surveys have been undertaken accordingly and appropriately which is clearly set out in **ES Volume1, Chapter**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				12: Ornithology [APP-050] and the **Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment (sHRA) [APP-223]**. No concerns have been raised by Natural England with regards to the surveys and the assessment.
ORN-19	RR-1090	Ornithology	Respondent stated that the Proposed Development will decimate habitats in Riccall monitored by the RSPB that provides nesting, food and protection for a wide range of red-listed birds	The Applicant has engaged with the RSPB throughout the pre-application and examination process. The RSPB are satisfied with the surveys, assessment of impacts as well as the mitigation area that will be provided.
ORN-20	RR-1324	Ornithology	Respondent expressed concern that existing ecological surveys may not adequately reflect long-term seasonal bird usage, and that more surveys may be needed to gain accurate data.	The non-breeding bird surveys were undertaken for the duration of one year. Alongside the field survey results, cropping data of up to five years and five years of Wetland Bird Survey data has been utilised to understand the drivers of inter-annual variability and to enable the Bird Mitigation Area to be designed. See A.4 within **Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment (sHRA) [APP-223]**. This approach has been agreed with Natural England;.
ORN-21	RR-1051	Ornithology	Respondent stated that there is insufficient wintering bird survey evidence for Sites 6–8, noting a discrepancy between the Applicant's stated requirement for two winter seasons of data and the submitted surveys covering only a summer period in 2025.	All Solar Development Sites 1–4 and 6–8 were surveyed consistently across both the breeding and non-breeding seasons (see **AS-029, APP-174** and **AS-032** for methodologies and coverage). It should be noted that breeding bird surveys of the solar sites were undertaken between 2024 and 2025. Solar Development Sites 1–5 (with Site 5 later removed during the evolution of the pre-application stage) were surveyed during 2024 and Solar Development Sites 6–8 were surveyed during 2025. Therefore, the staggering caused the reports to be separated and produced at different stages, which may account for any perceived discrepancies. For the avoidance of doubt, the Applicant has not previously committed to undertaking two non-breeding seasons of survey effort. This approach has been agreed with, and subsequently accepted by, Natural England.
ORN-22	RR-1301	Ornithology	Respondent expressed particular concern about the impact of panels and passing HGV traffic on birds along Long Lane and those nesting at Bishopdyke Farm.	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. and confirms that it will only be AIL using this route intermittently. The Applicant considers that impacts on breeding birds along these lanes will be negligible, and highlights that the extensive habitat improvements across the Order Limits will increase overall breeding farmland bird abundance.
ORN-23	RR-0703	Ornithology	Respondent expressed concern for the impact of the proposals on lapwing near Field House Farm.	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. Lapwing populations are declining across the region and are ranked among the top ten most rapidly declining bird species locally. This is largely related to agricultural practice, which is subject to change in any location and highly unlikely to remain static over the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development. The Applicant therefore intends to support both

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				breeding and non-breeding lapwing through the design of a Bird Mitigation Area, providing up to 65.2 ha of land. This exceeds the area required based on the number of territories recorded within the Order Limits. This is also acknowledged in the desk-study, see Section 12.8, specifically Plate 12-1 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050].** Pre-commencement surveys will be undertaken prior to construction to ensure that any nesting and/or breeding lapwings are identified and appropriately safeguarded from disturbance as stated in the oCEMP [APP-192]. Following construction, habitats away from developed areas will be restored and continue to be available to lapwings. The Bird Mitigation Area will ensure there is an extensive area available for the species at all times. The Applicant therefore considers that the Proposed Development will be beneficial to the species overall, and will secure and likely improve local populations.
ORN-24	RR-1282	Ornithology	Respondent stated that the proposed Bird Mitigation Areas must be legally binding, fully funded, and proven to offset the immense disruption to species protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.	The Applicant can confirm that a comprehensive package of embedded and additional mitigation, including habitat retention, enhancement and the Bird Mitigation Area, has been proposed and is secured via the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]** and the **Outline Bird Mitigation Area Management Plan (oBMAMP) [APP-205]** to avoid or reduce effects to a non-significant level, but such measures will also be beneficial to all species. Compliance with the measures in both plans is secured via **Requirements the Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**. As set out in the **Funding Statement [APP-021]**, the Applicant has sufficient access to funds to fund construction and operation of this. It is noted that the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) relates largely to breeding birds.
ORN-25	RR-0656	Ornithology	Respondent raised concerns about loss of habitat at Site 4, which currently provides habitat for geese and swans in summer.	Goose and swan species do not nest within the arable landscape, as this habitat is not considered suitable for them. It is, however, acknowledged that these species may commute through the wider landscape, with movement corridors retained throughout Site 4 and the Order Limits (see **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]**). The BMA will provide improved habitat for these species throughout the year.

2.22 Project Description

Project Description – General Comments

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description) - General Comments				
DES-01	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-1059, RR-1029, RR-0834, RR-1402, RR-0387, RR-0375, RR-0588, RR-0022, RR-1220, RR-0358, RR-1054, RR-1382, RR-0615, RR-0390, RR-0481, RR-0714, RR-0704, RR-1092, RR-0901, RR-0893, RR-0343, RR-0319, RR-1111, RR-0490, RR-1449, RR-0776, RR-1347, RR-0575, RR-0291, RR-0417, RR-1284, RR-0750, RR-0092, RR-1164, RR-0051, RR-1242, RR-0167, RR-0631, RR-0069, RR-0352, RR-1073, RR-0369, RR-0757, RR-0304, RR-1324, RR-1109, RR-0884, RR-0841, RR-0053, RR-0417, RR-0795, RR-0926, RR-1085, RR-1129, RR-1225, RR-0669. RR-0277, RR-0925, RR-1457, RR-0365, RR-0142, RR-0249, RR-0328, RR-0974, RR-0732, RR-0015, RR-1050, RR-0761, RR-0749, RR-0153, RR-0155, RR-0972, RR-0357, RR-1336, RR-0483, RR-1122, RR-0940, RR-0183, RR-0809, RR-0971, RR-0907, RR-0907, RR-0146, RR-0363, RR-1055, RR-0265, RR-0831, RR-0988, RR-0758, RR-0902, RR-1018, RR-0747, RR-1347, RR-0027, RR-0936, RR-0827, RR-0561, RR-0263, RR-0557, RR-0666, RR-0293, RR-1363, RR-0364, RR-0048, RR-1463, RR-1303, RR-0729, RR-0176, RR-0688, RR-0933, RR-0446, RR-0653, RR-0464, RR-0736, RR-1327, RR-1352, RR-1112, RR-0636, RR-0347, RR-1192, RR-0274, RR-0509, RR-0853,	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Some respondents expressed concern that the primary motivation for bringing forward the Proposed Development is financial **profit**. A number of respondents also referred to **"greenwashing"** or questioned the developer's commitment to tackling climate change and supporting Net Zero objectives.	The Applicant notes the concerns about the reasons behind the Proposed Development. The Applicant's **Statement of Need [APP-214]** provides evidence that the Proposed Development aims to help meet national targets for clean energy and net zero targets set out in legislation and policy. The aim is to deliver long term environmental benefit alongside a secure energy supply. The Applicant is committed to meeting all planning, environmental, and construction policies and standards committed to in the DCO and the submitted management plans. The Proposed Development is being developed in line with legal and regulatory requirements, with engagement with all relevant statutory and non-statutory bodies, ensuring quality and accountability throughout. These commitments are made in the context that a breach of them would be a criminal offence.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
DES-02	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-1029, RR-0834, RR-1088, RR-0842, RR-0367, RR-0022, RR-0599, RR-1220, RR-0226, RR-1382, RR-0615, RR-0390, RR-1090, RR-0704, RR-0893, RR-0319, RR-0790, RR-0490, RR-1347, RR-0745, RR-0538, RR-0417, RR-0092, RR-0166, RR-0369, RR-1457, RR-0421, RR-0749, RR-0153, RR-0253, RR-0063, RR-0229, RR-0363, RR-0988, RR-0727, RR-0027, RR-1087, RR-0765, RR-0557, RR-1373, RR-1227, RR-0469, RR-0653, RR-0464, RR-0878, RR-1327, RR-0082, RR-1112, RR-0853, RR-1338	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Some respondents expressed general distrust towards the Applicant. Some respondents raised specific concern regarding the involvement of **Macquarie**.	The Applicant acknowledges the expression of distrust towards the Proposed Development and has demonstrated the Proposed Development's compliance with all statutory requirements under the Planning Act 2008 and applicable legislation such as The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The Applicant is subject to legally binding Development Consent Order (DCO) requirements. The Planning Act 2008 also contains enforcement provisions regarding compliance with the terms of a DCO, with breach of its terms being a criminal offence. The Applicant's parent company has a strong track record of developing Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) scale projects, notably the consented Cottam Solar Project and West Burton Solar Project, alongside a strong pipeline of further applications coming forward. The Applicant confirms that the owners of Island Green Power, Macquarie, has a strong record of long-term UK investment. Since 1999, Macquarie has invested more than £65 billion into UK infrastructure, including energy projects, supporting more than 33,000 UK jobs. **The Funding Statement [APP-021]** in the Application provides details of the corporate structure of Light Valley Solar Limited and how the Proposed Development is being funded.
DES-03	RR-0806, RR-0826, RR-0781, RR-0375, RR-0842, RR-0367, RR-0022, RR-1220, RR-0615, RR-0390, RR-0893, RR-1442, RR-1321, RR-0538, RR-0738, RR-0369, RR-0655, RR-1109, RR-1351, RR-1457, RR-0142, RR-1398, RR-1441, RR-0539, RR-0363, RR-0966, RR-0988, RR-1347, RR-0557, RR-1463, RR-1373, RR-0176, RR-1072, RR-0464	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Some respondents raised concerns about **foreign investment** in the Proposed Development and whether profits would be distributed outside the UK. Some respondents questioned whether the Applicant would pay appropriate taxes in the UK.	The Applicant, Light Valley Solar Limited, is a 100% subsidiary of IGP UK Projects Limited. Both are registered in England and Wales and subject to UK tax law and regulations. Investment may come from a range of sources, including international ones. This is common practice with UK infrastructure projects and helps fund the transition to clean energy at the scale required. **The Funding Statement [APP-021]** submitted with the DCO application demonstrates that the Proposed Development is financially viable and adequately funded to deliver the Proposed Development in full. With regard to national security, panels sold into the UK market must meet applicable standards and this would also be provided for in the Applicant's procurement contracts. The

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				majority of solar panels are produced in China and meet high standards of quality, with external auditing to provide assurance to purchasers. The Applicant follows UK government guidance on the security of electrical and electronic equipment. Threats to solar sites are similar to those that can affect all industries and would be managed by robust cyber security processes that identify, prevent, and mitigate against, potential issues.
DES-04	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-0834, RR-0599, RR-0804, RR-1002, RR-0343, RR-0214, RR-0334, RR-0123, RR-0568, RR-0998, RR-1284, RR-0750, RR-0086, RR-0803, RR-0732, RR-0161, RR-0290, RR-0996, RR-0105, RR-0720, RR-1065, RR-0766, RR-0998, RR-0885	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondents stated that the Proposed Development does not comply with national policy including EN-1 and various NPPFs.	The **Planning Statement [APP-207]** sets out the Proposed Development's compliance with the relevant national planning policies, including the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (NPS EN-1) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).. It is considered that the Proposed Development is in overall compliance with the relevant national policies and particularly the relevant sections of national policy statements NPS EN-1. The Planning Statement also summarises where significant environmental effects have been identified (for instance in relation to visual effects) and how the Applicant considers these should be weighed in the planning balance. It is the Applicant's position that the balance is overwhelmingly in favour of the development consent order being made.
DES-05	RR-1059, RR-0646, RR-1450, RR-0915, RR-0615, RR-1208, RR-0319, RR-1008, RR-0104, RR-0417, RR-0092, RR-0051, RR-0002, RR-0179, RR-1324, RR-1109, RR-0669, RR-0252, RR-0033, RR-0563, RR-0236, RR-0636, RR-0509	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Some respondents raised ethical concerns about solar panels being **procured from China** or other overseas countries, including whether panels would be responsibly sourced. A number of respondents also expressed concern about the potential for **modern slavery** within the supply chain. Some respondents further raised **security** as well as environmental concerns relating to the importation of panels from overseas, including the associated carbon footprint.	The Applicant's parent company is a signatory of the Solar Energy UK Supply Chain Statement, which commits the company and its projects to sourcing materials produced in a sustainable way with a supply chain free of human rights abuses. It is building on this commitment through membership of the Solar Stewardship Initiative, an international supply chain audit programme, and by using independent international standards bodies to review, inspect and accredit suppliers. The **Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan (oSSCEP) [APP-202]** sets out that international suppliers will be held to a minimum quality with regard to professional and ethical working practices as agreed by the members of Solar Energy UK. Panels sold into the UK market must meet applicable standards and this would also be provided for in the Applicant's procurement contracts. The majority of solar panels are produced in China and meet high standards of quality, with external auditing to provide assurance to purchasers.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The Applicant follows UK government guidance on the security of electrical and electronic equipment. Threats to solar sites are similar to those that can affect all industries and would be managed by robust cyber security processes that identify, prevent, and mitigate against, potential issues. While the panels would be sourced and shipped from China, UK manufacturers can supply many of the other components. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Greenhouse Gas Emissions [APP-047]** assesses the greenhouse gas emissions from the transport of materials to the development site; the assessment is included in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment [APP-166]**. The manufacturer of solar photovoltaic (PV) panels has not yet been chosen, however for the purposes of the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment it has been assumed that all panels would be transported by sea from China, with final delivery from the UK arrival port to the Proposed Development by HGV. An assumption of 920,640 (no.) of solar PV panels to be installed when constructing the Proposed Development has been used to inform the assessment. It has been assumed that the BESS, solar PV modules and PV framework will be delivered during the construction phase via sea and HGV from suppliers in China, whereas the rest of the materials are assumed to be sourced more locally. Sea freight distance from China to England is assumed to be 22,000 km (based on the sea freight distance between Shanghai and Dover) and the HGV transport from factory to Shanghai Port and Port of Dover to Site are assumed to be 500 km each.
DES-06	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-0834, RR-1121, RR-0599, RR-0661, RR-0123, RR-0213, RR-1014, RR-0084, RR-0655, RR-0884, RR-0577, RR-0105, RR-0955, RR-0184	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Some respondents expressed concern about whether the **specialists carrying out the environmental assessments** are fully independent and impartial, and questioned the reliability of the findings. A number of respondents suggested that independent specialists should undertake environmental and ecological surveys.	The Applicant disagrees that the team undertaking the environmental assessments are biased. The **Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-038 to APP-190]** and environmental and ecological surveys have been undertaken by competent experts with considerable experience assessing similar Proposed Developments. Details of qualifications, experience and professional institute membership are provided within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 1.4: Statement of Competence [APP-146]**.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
DES-07	RR-1201, RR-1403, RR-0599, RR-1442, RR-1003, RR-1335, RR-0848, RR-0053, RR-0591, RR-0229, RR-0363, RR-0557, RR-0770, RR-0878	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Some respondents expressed concern that the Applicant may not fully comply with the requirements of the Development Consent Order (DCO), if granted. In particular, some respondents highlighted concerns about **compliance** with decommissioning requirements at the end of the Proposed Development's operational life. A number of respondents also raised concerns that, if **ownership of the Proposed Development** were to change in the future, compliance with DCO requirements may not be maintained and/or plans will expand in the future.	The Applicant confirms that, if consent is granted, it has the capability to build, own, and operate the Proposed Development. Compliance with the terms of the DCO is a legislative requirement, enforceable by North Yorkshire Council. The draft DCO submitted with the application includes a requirement dealing with decommissioning. If ownership of the project were to take place, the transferee will be bound by the terms of the DCO and, with limited exceptions, the identity of that transferee would be approved by the Secretary of State.
DES-08	RR-0507, RR-1088, RR-0315, RR-1092, RR-1107, RR-0306, RR-0092, RR-1283, RR-0179, RR-0369, RR-1109, RR-0117, RR-0363, RR-0923, RR-1167, RR-0966, RR-0988, RR-1087	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Some respondents expressed concern about the potential use of **taxpayer funding** or government subsidies in relation to the Proposed Development.	The Applicant confirms that Light Valley Solar is being developed solely through private sector financing and that it has not received, and is not receiving any public money, subsidy or funding in respect of the Proposed Development.
DES-09	RR-0995, RR-0834, RR-1362, RR-0888, RR-0908, RR-0191, RR-0577, RR-1077, RR-1372, RR-0966, RR-0184, RR-1461	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondents expressed concern about the decision on the Proposed Development being taken by the Secretary of State or government rather than North Yorkshire Council or local residents. Some respondents suggested the NSIP process was chosen to avoid consenting via North Yorkshire Council.	Light Valley Solar has an anticipated generating capacity exceeding the 100 MW threshold for a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP). As a result, the Proposed Development is subject to the Planning Act 2008 and must be consented through a Development Consent Order (DCO), examined by the Planning Inspectorate on behalf of the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero, rather than determined by the local planning authority. A full description of the Proposed Development is provided in the **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [APP-040]**. Far from bypassing local government, the pre-Application process has included consultation and engagement with North Yorkshire Council and, if the Proposed Development is consented, the Applicant would work with North Yorkshire Council to discharge the conditions of the consent set out in the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017],** known as Requirements.
DES-10	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-1397, RR-1111, RR-0123, RR-0992, RR-0983, RR-0161, RR-0577, RR-0155, RR-1336, RR-0105	The Proposed Development and DCO Process	Respondents expressed general scepticism about the effectiveness of the Proposed Development's proposed **mitigation measures** and / or ability to reduce impact to local communities.	The Applicant is confident that the proposed management and mitigation measures set out in the **Environmental Statement [APP-038 to APP-190]** are comprehensive and robust and that the Proposed Development aligns with national and local planning policy; this is outlined in the **Planning Statement [APP-207].**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
		(Project Description)		Of particular relevance to the assessment of effects on local communities are **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048], Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**, **Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]**, **Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement [APP-052]**, **and Chapter 16: Other Environmental Matters [APP-054]**, all of which consider potential impacts on residential properties and local communities and include mitigation measures that are based on good practice used on projects across the UK, as well as measures developed in response to the sensitivities of the specific local environment.
DES-11	RR-0901, RR-0343, RR-0285, RR-0306, RR-1335, RR-1263, RR-0097, RR-1324, RR-1395, RR-0250	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Some respondents expressed general concern about the **overall cost** of the Proposed Development and whether sufficient funding has been secured. A number of respondents also questioned whether the Proposed Development would be cost-effective or financially viable in the long term.	The Applicant acknowledges comments regarding the cost effectiveness and profitability of the Proposed Development. However, it is important to clarify that Light Valley Solar is a privately financed development. All financial risks associated with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Proposed Development, including those related to the cable route, are borne entirely by the developer. The commercial viability of the Proposed Development has been assessed as part of the developer's investment decision, including the length of the cable and associated infrastructure. The **Funding Statement [APP-021]** submitted with the Development Consent Order (DCO) application demonstrates that the Proposed Development is financially viable and adequately funded to deliver the Proposed Development in full.
DES-12	RR-1029, RR-0992, RR-1115, RR-1405, RR-1003, RR-0943	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondents expressed concern that the cable route will allow for future expansion of the Proposed Development.	The Applicant notes this concern. The Cable Route serves the Proposed Development alone and the cables installed are for the purpose of the Light Valley Solar Farm alone. The cable therefore cannot be used for the benefit of other solar developments in the area.
DES-13	RR-0834, RR-0417, RR-0363, RR-0236	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Some respondents expressed concern about the proposed use of compulsory purchase or **compulsory acquisition** powers as part of the Proposed Development.	The Applicant's goal is to deliver Light Valley Solar on land where the owner has voluntarily agreed to its use, including for cabling. Meaningful conversations with identified land interests for the solar areas have helped inform the design which in turn assists in avoiding people's land, including homes or gardens. As is standard in Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) solar Proposed Developments, the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]** includes provision for compulsory acquisition of land and rights, but these are subject to controls and limitations. These powers sought are necessary

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				and proportionate to ensure the deliverability of the Proposed Development.
DES-14	RR-0214, RR-0334, RR-0105, RR-0937	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondents stated that the Proposed Development contradicts **Selby District Council's Local Plan.**	The Applicant notes this concern. With regard to the Selby Local Plan, Section 3 of the **Policy Compliance Document [APP-224]** details how the Proposed Development complies with the relevant policies in the Selby District Core Strategy 2013, alongside identifying the relevant documents and chapters of the **Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-038 to APP-190]** that address the policy matters. The **Planning Statement [APP-207]** provides an assessment of how the Proposed Development complies with key policy principles, including environmental and ecological protection, the landscape, and sustainability. Of particular relevance are Section 6: Legislative and Policy Context and Section 7: Planning Assessment, of the Planning Statement which set out an appraisal of the Proposed Development against national and local planning policies.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
DES-15	RR-1012, RR-0387, RR-0385, RR-1343, RR-1096, RR-0588, RR-0317, RR-0008, RR-0849, RR-1388, RR-1033, RR-0599, RR-0043, RR-1346, RR-1175, RR-1397, RR-0120, RR-0956, RR-0406, RR-1090, RR-1226, RR-0189, RR-1205, RR-0301, RR-0949, RR-0246, RR-1224, RR-0312, RR-0373, RR-0546, RR-0503, RR-0214, RR-0334, RR-0681, RR-0883, RR-0103, RR-1020, RR-0888, RR-1034, RR-0143, RR-0658, RR-0810, RR-0023, RR-0370, RR-0063, RR-0917, RR-0062, RR-0305, RR-0305, RR-0865, RR-1254, RR-0998, RR-0738, RR-1101, RR-1284, RR-0075, RR-0750, RR-0733, RR-1003, RR-0887, RR-0402, RR-0431, RR-1047, RR-0369, RR-0235, RR-0757, RR-0673, RR-1154, RR-0848, RR-0024, RR-0655, RR-0086, RR-0803, RR-1378, RR-0130, RR-0612, RR-0494, RR-0329, RR-0859, RR-0884, RR-0983, RR-0712, RR-0399, RR-1245, RR-0610, RR-1357, RR-0652, RR-1081, RR-0261, RR-0694, RR-0080, RR-0898, RR-0187, RR-0924, RR-0940, RR-1315, RR-1372, RR-1368, RR-0542, RR-0779, RR-1246, RR-0536, RR-1447, RR-0203, RR-0105, RR-0934, RR-0074, RR-1314, RR-1320, RR-1340, RR-0265, RR-0831, RR-1430, RR-0720, RR-1319, RR-0932, RR-0605, RR-0709, RR-1147, RR-0354, RR-0760, RR-0190, RR-1140, RR-0247, RR-0787, RR-0204, RR-0840, RR-0998, RR-0205, RR-0561, RR-1031, RR-0622, RR-1053, RR-1043, RR-0821, RR-1373, RR-1185, RR-0439, RR-1227, RR-0729, RR-0736, RR-0412, RR-1110, RR-0793, RR-0786, RR-0392, RR-0555, RR-1216, RR-0156, RR-0054, RR-0967, RR-1282, RR-0444, RR-0211	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Some respondents expressed general support for renewable energy, including solar power, with some indicating that they are not opposed to ground-mounted solar **in principle**.	The Applicant welcomes the support expressed in these responses for solar power.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
DES-16	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-0702, RR-1059, RR-1176, RR-1392, RR-0745, RR-0628, RR-0417, RR-0225, RR-0750, RR-0376, RR-1222, RR-0344, RR-0613, RR-0919, RR-0421, RR-0153, RR-0290, RR-0737, RR-1219, RR-0966, RR-0988, RR-1100, RR-1347, RR-1330, RR-0736	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Some respondents questioned or **doubted the need** for the Proposed Development.	The Applicant has prepared a **Statement of Need [APP-214]** which sets out in full the need and justification for the Proposed Development. The Statement of Need describes the Government's policy that large capacities of low carbon generation will be required to meet increased demand and replace output from retiring (fossil fuel) plants, and that *"a secure, reliable, affordable, Net Zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar"*. The Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (December 2025) states that that the UK has huge potential for solar power and that solar energy is at the heart of the Clean Power 2030 Mission [Paras 3.3.23 & 3.3.24]. NPS EN-1 further confirms that there is an urgent need for renewable energy generation that is a critical national priority [para 3.3.62 & 3.3.63]. The Proposed Development therefore directly contributes towards meeting the national net zero and energy security requirements for the near future.
DES-17	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-0615, RR-1261, RR-1211, RR-1294, RR-0213, RR-0568, RR-0818, RR-1048, RR-1209, RR-1284, RR-1369, RR-0612, RR-0153, RR-0229, RR-0971, RR-0589, RR-1319, RR-0563, RR-0060, RR-0628, RR-1227, RR-0736, RR-0383, RR-0641, RR-0274	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Some respondents expressed concern that **electricity generated** by the Proposed Development would not be used locally. Some respondents suggested that the electricity should be supplied **directly to local households**. A number of respondents also expressed concern that electricity generated by the Proposed Development could be used outside the UK.	**NPS EN-1** explains that it is the Government's view that large-scale electricity generators connected to the NETS, such as the Proposed Development, would offer *"a number of economic and other benefits, such as more efficient bulk transfer of power and enabling surplus generation capacity in one area to be used to cover shortfalls elsewhere"* (**Paragraph 3.3.12**). The Proposed Development will increase the proportion of energy supplied locally from low carbon sources. **Section 4.4** of the **Statement of Need [APP-214]** explains that the Proposed Development is to connect to the existing Monk Fryston 275kV substation. This substation is connected to an existing part of the National Electricity Transmission System (NETS). By connecting to the NETS, generation from the Proposed Development will be transmitted to both local consumers and across the country where it is required. This is a key benefit of the Proposed Development and helps the UK's electricity system operate efficiently which is a benefit to all consumers, including local consumers, who, through their energy bills, pay for the operational costs of the UK's electricity networks. Electricity generated from the Proposed Development will be exported to the National Electricity Transmission System (NETS), and provided to consumers via third party electricity

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				companies, which means that the Applicant cannot commit to the provision of cheaper electricity prices for the specific community surrounding the site. However, building large quantities of renewable generation in the UK is anticipated to keep consumer costs down by capturing and storing energy when it is abundant (therefore cheap) and releasing it when it is needed. Solar remains one of the cheapest forms of electricity generation available with current technologies. Interconnectors flow electricity between countries and are used to balance supply and demand. Government is supportive of increased interconnection for the economic and security of supply benefits they can bring. **NPS EN-1** recognises that interconnection across national borders has an essential role in delivering a secure, low carbon electricity system at low cost (**Paragraph 3.3.32**).
DES-18	RR-1029, RR-0781, RR-0506, RR-0773, RR-0069, RR-0369, RR-0926, RR-0669, RR-0085, RR-0153, RR-0458, RR-0113, RR-1408, RR-0557, RR-0736	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondents expressed **scepticism that energy bills will be lowered** as a result of the Proposed Development.	**Chapter 10** of the **Statement of Need [APP-214]** explains that large-scale solar power decarbonises the electricity system and lowers the market price of electricity by generating power so that expensive and more carbon intensive forms of generation do not need to generate as much. In doing so, solar power delivers national decarbonisation benefits and supports consumer affordability aims, to the benefit of electricity consumers. Further, growing Great Britain's capacities of renewable energy sources, including large-scale solar, supports consumers by reducing the GB energy system's exposure to gas price fluctuations arising from volatile global fossil fuel markets. **Section 5.3** of the **Statement of Need [APP-214]** explains that it is the Government's view that "*reducing our exposure to volatile international gas prices is the only way to reliably bring down bills and protect the UK from global energy shocks".*
DES-19	RR-0385, RR-1096, RR-0246, RR-0373, RR-0810, RR-0694, RR-1368, RR-1447, RR-0850, RR-0558, RR-0677, RR-0194, RR-1182, RR-0886	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Some respondents supported or acknowledged the Proposed Development's **potential contribution to UK energy security.**	The Applicant welcomes the support expressed in these responses for solar power. **Chapter 9** of the **Statement of Need [APP-214]** explains the contribution of large scale solar to system security and at **Section 9.6** explains that growing capacities of British-based renewable energy sources, including large-scale solar, improves energy security by reducing Britain's vulnerability to volatile global fossil fuel markets.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
DES-20	RR-1222, RR-0988, RR-1100, RR-0557	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondents stated that the Proposed Development **will not contribute to long-term energy security.**	**NPS EN-1** explains that it is the Government's view that *"a secure, reliable, affordable, net zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar"* (**Paragraph 3.3.23**). **Chapter 9** of the **Statement of Need [APP-214]** explains the contribution of large scale solar to system security and at **Section 9.6** explains that growing capacities of British-based renewable energy sources, including large-scale solar, improves long-term energy security by reducing Britain's vulnerability to volatile global fossil fuel markets.
DES-21	RR-0086, RR-0803, RR-0074	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Some respondents expressed concerns that the Proposed Development does not align with, or would not deliver against, its stated **design principles.**	The Applicant has prepared a **Design Approach Document (DAD) [APP-216]** which explains how the design principles developed for the Proposed Development have influenced the design of the Proposed Development and been a key consideration in design decisions by the Applicant. The Applicant has dedicated significant resource both internally and through appointment of an experienced team of consultants to develop a high-quality design for the Proposed Development. The design principles developed for the Proposed Development were informed by the local context, national and local policy, and government guidance available at the time. The design of the Proposed Development has been environmentally-led and gives due weight to the intrinsic character and beauty of the surrounding countryside. This is demonstrated in the DAD which explains how good design has been embedded in the design of the Proposed Development, and how the Proposed Development has evolved up to the point of the DCO Application within a clear design framework provided by the Project Objectives, Design Vision, Design Principles, and the Design Parameters and Commitments. The DAD has been prepared in accordance with the Planning Inspectorate's guidance titled 'Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Good Design', setting out the design decisions taken at each step of the development of the Proposed Development, and the rationale for these decisions, as well as the mechanisms by which good design will be secured post consent. The **DAD [APP-216]** and **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-041]** also explain how the mitigation hierarchy has been a key consideration from the outset of the Proposed Development design, and that

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				various changes have been made to the Proposed Development including removal of a portion of Site 1 to provide a Bird Mitigation Area, the removal of some southern areas of Site 4 and the whole of Site 5 to mitigate against flood impacts, and the creation of new habitats and new biodiversity enhancements. The DAD also sets out how the application of the Design Principles to the design process has ultimately led to the measures set out in the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]**, compliance with which is secured via the DCO.
DES-22	RR-0332, RR-0933, RR-0446	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondents stated that power generation, distribution and sales should be nationalised.	Power generation, distribution and sales are not currently nationalised in Great Britain. **NPS EN-1** explains that *"It is not the role of the planning system to deliver specific amounts or limit any form of infrastructure covered by this NPS. It is for industry to propose new energy infrastructure projects that they assess to be viable within the strategic framework set by government. This is the nature of a market-based energy system."* (**Paragraph 3.2.4**). The application is a NSIP under the Planning Act 2008 (PA2008). The designated National Policy Statements (NPSs) for Energy EN1, EN3 and EN5 apply to the examination and to decision making relating to the application. The Proposed Development will be considered and decided in accordance with the designated NPSs and any other applicable policy or considerations deemed to be important and relevant, subject to provisos which are, essentially, that the application must not breach legal or treaty obligations, and that any adverse impact of the Proposed Development would not outweigh its benefits. The Secretary of State, in their decision, is entitled to disregard any representations that relate to the merits of the designated National Policy Statement (NPS). In practice, this means that representations, such as these, that challenge policy set out in NPSs or the validity of NPSs themselves need not be considered in the examination of the application.
DES-23	RR-0790, RR-0047	The Proposed Development and DCO Process	Respondents queried the use of the term solar 'farm' due to landscape and agricultural impacts.	The Applicant notes this comment. As set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**, the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has assessed effects of the Proposed Development on the landscape. The effects of the Proposed

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
		(Project Description)		Development on agricultural land, including land quality and productivity, are assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Agricultural Land and Soils [APP-043]**. This Applicant acknowledges that the Proposed Development would introduce changes to the character of parts of the landscape and to some views but concludes that, with embedded and additional mitigation, the resulting effects would be localised, reversible and would reduce over time. The Applicant also acknowledges that the Proposed Development will result in a temporary and reversible loss of agricultural land for the operational life of the Proposed Development. The Proposed Development would have a direct, long-term, temporary and reversible moderate adverse effect on Grades 1 and 2 agricultural land, which is assessed as significant, and minor adverse effects on Subgrade 3a and 3b agricultural land, which is not significant. During the operational phase of the Proposed Development, the soil resource under the solar PV panels will remain largely undisturbed, and following decommissioning, the soil quality is expected to have improved from its current status, which is assessed as a significant moderate beneficial effect. No permanent loss of agricultural land is anticipated.
DES-24	RR-1283	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondent requested the Applicant provide an updated cost per unit calculation removing any subsidies and including costs from operation to cleanup and restoration of land to original use in the calculations.	The **Funding Statement [APP-021]** submitted with the DCO application demonstrates that the Proposed Development is financially viable and adequately funded to deliver the Proposed Development in full. As set out in the **Funding Statement [APP-021]**, the Applicant has sufficient access to funds to fund operation and decommissioning activities. As Light Valley Solar is a privately financed development, all financial risks associated with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Proposed Development, including those related to the cable route, are borne entirely by the developer. The commercial viability of the Proposed Development has been assessed as part of the developer's investment decision.
DES-26	RR-1450	The Proposed Development and DCO Process	Respondent stated that the presence of this Proposed Development alongside Ferrybridge would be a target for security threats.	The Applicant follows UK government guidance on the security of electrical and electronic equipment and continues to engage with relevant authorities to ensure the Proposed Development aligns with applicable guidance and regulations. The Applicant is committed to providing a high level of security features on the site including cameras,

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
		(Project Description)		perimeter fencing and lighting. These measures as secured as part of the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]** and help reduce security threats on site. With regard to Ferrybridge Next Generation Power Station, it is recognised that appropriate security measures will also be implemented through the consenting of this project.
DES-27	RR-1335	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondent asked what the income of the solar farm would be.	The Applicant acknowledges comments regarding the income of the Proposed Development. However, it is important to clarify that Light Valley Solar Farm is a privately financed development. All financial risks associated with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Proposed Development are borne entirely by the developer.
DES-28	RR-0161	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondent questioned the NSIP threshold criteria due to the multiple separate sites that make up the Proposed Development.	As detailed in the **Planning Statement [APP-207]**, the Proposed Development is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) as, in total, it would have a generating capacity of 500 MW. Under the Planning Act 2008, this exceeds the 100 MW generating threshold and the Proposed Development will be consented through the Development Consent Order (DCO) regime. The seven sites make up one electricity generating station as they are connected together by the Grid Connection Corridor, ultimately connecting to Monk Fryston substation.
DES-29	RR-1043	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondent expressed that the application lacks sufficient detail, relying on vague illustrative layouts without defined parameters for panel density or infrastructure.	The Applicant notes this. The EIA presented within the ES has been undertaken adopting the principles set out in the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note Nine: Rochdale Envelope which provides guidance regarding the degree of flexibility that may be considered appropriate within an application for development consent under the Planning Act 2008. **Environmental Statement Volume 1, Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [APP-040]** and the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]** sets out for each technical discipline, the maximum (and where relevant, minimum) parameters for the elements where flexibility needs to be retained have been assessed under the Rochdale Envelope approach. This includes the design parameters for different Solar PV panel options (tracking and fixed panels), including the maximum and minimum clearance, height and separation distance between the rows.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The approach also recognises that the worst-case parameter for one technical assessment may differ from another, ensuring that worst case overall impacts are predicted. The maximum lateral spatial extents are shown on the **Works Plans [AS-004].** These parameters are not illustrative; they are set and secured via the DCO. The Applicant's approach is consistent with DCO practice for all project types.
DES-30	RR-0661	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondent stated that the Applicant has not made any environmental assessment reports public, respondent expressed doubt that any assessments have actually been undertaken.	The Applicant is confident that a proportionate and robust assessment of the impacts of the Proposed Development has been undertaken in alignment with The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The Applicant has made information on environmental assessments public throughout the pre-application process, including publicising the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) for the Two Statutory Consultation. This allowed technical stakeholders, local communities, individuals and interested parties to develop an informed view on the potential impacts and provide feedback. The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with all legislation and guidance on consultation (See **Consultation Report Appendix 1: Statement of Compliance [APP-025]**), as well as commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation (See **Consultation Report Appendix 4: Statement of Community Consultation Materials [APP-028]**), which in turn was informed by consultation with the relevant host authority. This process is described in Chapter 6 (Preparation for Statutory Section 47 Consultation) of the **Consultation Report [APP-024]**. The environmental assessments undertaken and any proposed management and mitigation measures are set out in the **Environmental Statement [APP-038 to APP-190].** The Applicant considers that the measures proposed are comprehensive and robust and that the Proposed Development aligns with national and local planning policy; this is outlined in the **Planning Statement [APP-207].**

Project Description – Detailed

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description) - Detailed				
DES-31	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-1294, RR-0322, RR-0818, RR-1071, RR-0919, RR-0136, RR-1282, RR-0101	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondents expressed objection to Site 1 specifically.	Solar Development Site 1 (SDS1) has been included following an iterative site selection process which balanced technical constraints, environmental considerations and deliverability, as set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 3.1: Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) [AS-019]**. Solar Development Site 1 is considered to be appropriate for the development of solar infrastructure, consistent with national policy objectives in National Policy Statements (NPSs) for energy, EN-1 and EN-3. Whilst SDS1 is located some distance to the north, its inclusion is considered to be appropriate because: - It's size (344.8 ha) means that it makes a valuable contribution towards the overall size of the solar development sites and the infrastructure capacity of the Proposed Development. This allows the Proposed Development to maximise its renewable energy generation potential, in line with Project Objectives 1 and 3; - Its size also makes it suitable to accommodate solar infrastructure so that the Proposed Development can avoid sensitive receptors and key planning constraints, consistent with the environmentally-led design principles embedded within the Proposed Development; - The Applicant has considered sites closer to Solar Development Sites 2-4 and 6-8, as set out in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 3.1: Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) [AS-019]**. However, the area between SDS1 and the other SDSs is heavily constrained, including large sections of Grade 2 agricultural land and flood zones 2 and 3, and therefore the Applicant's site selection assessment did not reveal any alternative parcels of land closer to the other SDSs which could be used to accommodate the Proposed Development; and - SDS1 is available and owned by a single landowner, which reduces the legal complexities involved in relation to securing the land for development across a number of sites (in the context of the amount of land which currently makes up SDS1). The Applicant considers that there are benefits with developing solar infrastructure on SDS1, including limited impacts on the landscape and people's views of the landscape. **ES Volume 1,**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual [APP-048] demonstrates that views into SDS 1 are limited by roadside woodland, hedgerows and trees within the parkland alongside. Other benefits of the Proposed Development on SDS1 include a Bird Mitigation Area, which is secured via the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]** and the **Outline Bird Mitigation Area Management Plan (oBMAMP) [APP-205],** as well as the provision of new permissive paths, detailed in the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]**.
DES-32	RR-0599, RR-0504, RR-0185	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondents expressed objection to Sites 3 and 4 specifically.	The Applicant notes this general objection. Solar Development Sites 3 and 4 have been included following an iterative site selection process which balanced technical constraints, environmental considerations and deliverability. Further detail on the Applicant's approach to site selection can be found in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 3.1: Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) [AS-019].** The **Environmental Assessment [APP-038 to 190, and AS-017 to 034]** identifies no residual impacts of significance for Solar Development Site (SDS) 3. Assessment findings for SDS 4 do indicate potential significant adverse visual effects on people using the Public Rights of Ways (PRoWs) in the area, and Birkin Fishery to the south of SDS 4 may experience moderate temporary adverse effects during construction. Following the mitigation hierarchy, such impacts as noted above that cannot be designed out will be reduced by using separation buffers and planting between the PRoWs and SDSs, and by implementation of a Construction Traffic Management Plan as outlined in the **oCTMP [APP-201]**, and Construction Environment Management Plan, as outlined in the **oCEMP [APP-192]**. Para 4.1.7 of NPS EN-1 relates to situations where the Secretary of State considers that residual adverse effects would remain after mitigation. In such cases, the Secretary of State should weigh those residual effects against the benefits of the Proposed Development. As the Proposed Development qualifies as Critical National Priority (CNP) Infrastructure, it is likely that the need case will outweigh the residual effects not capable of being addressed by application of the mitigation hierarchy, in all but the most exceptional cases.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
DES-33	RR-1020, RR-0713, RR-1090	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondents stated that the Proposed Development is in conflict with local planning policy including the Escrick Neighbourhood Plan, Selby District Local Plan.	The Applicant is confident that the Proposed Development aligns with local planning policy, including the Escrick Neighbourhood Development Plan 2021-2035 and the Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan 2011-2027. This is outlined in the **Planning Statement [APP-207]** and **Policy Compliance Document [APP-224]**. Additionally, Section 3 Local Policy Accordance Tables, of the **Policy Compliance Document [APP-224]** sets out compliance with relevant Local Plan policies, including the Escrick Neighbourhood Development Plan 2021-2035 and the Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan 2011-2027.
DES-34	RR-0949, RR-1154, RR-1051	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondents expressed concern that the late addition of Sites 6, 7 and 8 materially altered the Proposed Development after scoping had been completed. Respondents argued that this limited opportunities for consultation on the full scheme and raised questions about whether the EIA, PEIR and ES adequately assess the later-added sites.	Although Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping is recognised as a useful preliminary procedure, it is not a mandatory requirement under the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 and any Scoping Opinion is advisory in nature. The purpose of the EIA scoping process is to seek agreement from statutory consultees on the methodologies and scope of the environmental assessments required for the Proposed Development. It is based on the description and nature of the development rather than a fixed red line boundary. EIA scoping is also a technical consultation process and is distinct from public consultation. The addition of Sites 6–8 after the initial Scoping Opinion did not alter the type of development proposed and therefore did not change the assessment methodologies or scope of assessment required. Their inclusion extended the study area to be considered but did not necessitate a fundamentally different EIA approach. Sites 6–8 were subsequently incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development and were included within the Phase 2 Statutory Consultation and the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR). This provided stakeholders, including statutory consultees, local authorities, landowners and members of the local community, with the opportunity to review and comment on the proposals. The environmental, technical and local impacts associated with these sites were assessed and taken into account in the design and mitigation of the Proposed Development. More broadly, the Applicant considers that the pre-application consultation process was robust, thorough and undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008,

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				the EIA Regulations and the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009. The approach to consultation is set out in the **Consultation Report [APP-024]**. The adequacy of the consultation process has been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate through acceptance of the Development Consent Order application for examination and has also been considered sufficient by North Yorkshire Council in its **Adequacy of Consultation Response [AoC-005]**. In addition, the examination process provides a further opportunity for interested parties to comment on the Proposed Development through an independently managed process. The Applicant also provided an extended relevant representation period beyond the statutory minimum to allow additional time for members of the public to review the application documents and register as interested parties. The Applicant is therefore satisfied that appropriate consultation and environmental assessment have been undertaken for Sites 6–8 and for the Proposed Development as a whole, in accordance with the relevant legislative requirements.
DES-35	RR-0654, RR-1174	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondents expressed concern that statutory bodies such as the RSPCA and the RSPB cannot adequately scrutinise the Proposed Development due to the volume of developments being proposed across the UK.	The Applicant acknowledges concerns raised regarding the ability of statutory bodies to adequately scrutinise development proposals given the volume of schemes being proposed nationally. However, it should be noted that whilst the RSPCA and RSPB are not statutory bodies, they have still been provided with opportunities to comment on the Proposed Development. The Applicant has engaged specifically with the RSPB throughout the pre-application, as set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Ornithology [APP-050]**. The RSPB are satisfied with the surveys, assessment of impacts, as well as the mitigation area that will be provided.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
DES-36	RR-0793	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondent expressed concern about the lack of general mitigation for the surrounding properties of Site 2.	The Applicant acknowledges the concern regarding mitigation linked to the proximity of the Proposed Development to residential properties, particularly around Solar Development In line with the principles set out in the **Design Approach Document (DAD) [APP-216]**, the layouts of all Solar Development Sites have been iteratively refined to incorporate setbacks from residential receptors, retention of existing field boundaries, and the use of offsets to PRoW and properties, alongside the integration of additional mitigation planting, including hedgerow reinforcement and new woodland belts, to filter and soften views. Where properties are in closer proximity, the design includes localised landscape buffers and planting proposals to maintain visual separation, avoid overbearing and minimise enclosing effects. Further detail of mitigation measures are shown on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** and are secured via the **Works Plans [AS-004]**, **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**, and the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217].** The Applicant has also included the assessment of the landscape and visual effects (LVIA) of the Proposed Development within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**, which acknowledges that the installation of the panels at Solar Development Site 2, and the presence of the 275 kV substation and BESS (as shown on **ES Volume 2, Figure 2.3: Field Numbering Plan [APP-061]**) will result in a noticeable change to the landscape character and a reduction in openness across Solar Development Site 2. However, landscape led design and secured mitigation has sought to minimise impacts to nearby residents as far as practicable, resulting in significant setbacks of larger-scale infrastructure, such as the substation and the BESS, from residential receptors. This is shown in the **Works Plans [AS-004]** and the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]**. The offsets from the curtilage of the properties will help reduce and screen the Proposed Development at Solar Development Site 2. New planting is proposed along field boundaries and within setbacks. With time, the mitigation planting, including hedgerows, woodland belts and field boundary reinforcement, will have established, resulting in further filtering and screening of views.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
DES-37	RR-1457	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondent expressed objection to Site 4 specifically, highlighting its size.	Solar Development Site 4 has been included following an iterative site selection process which balanced technical constraints, environmental considerations and deliverability. Further detail on the Applicant's approach to site selection can be found in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 3.1: Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) [AS-019].** Site 4 plays an integral part in the Proposed Development's contribution to help meet national targets for clean energy and net zero targets set out in legislation and policy. With respect to the size of Solar Development Site 4, in addition to area of solar panels, this site includes green corridors across the landscape to strengthen the green infrastructure and nature network and incorporating public rights of way and permissive paths. Following an iterative design development process which reflected on the emerging results of the EIA, some southern areas of Solar Development Site 4 were removed from the Proposed Development and solar infrastructure was removed from a large area in the south eastern corner of Solar Development Site 4 (close to Haddlesey Road) for an alternative land use. The **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) - Site 4 [PDA-007 to PDA-008]** provides more detail of the indicative design of Solar Development Site 4.
DES-38	RR-0793	The Proposed Development and DCO Process	Respondents expressed objection to Site 2 specifically.	Solar Development Site 2 has been included following an iterative site selection process which balanced technical constraints, environmental considerations and deliverability. As it accommodates both the 275 kV substation and battery energy storage system (BESS), alongside Solar PV Panels, Site 2 is plays an integral part in the Proposed Development's

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
		(Project Description)		contribution to help meet national targets for clean energy and net zero targets set out in legislation and policy. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-041]** and the **Design Approach Document (DAD) [APP-216]** sets out the rationale for selecting Solar Development Site 2 for the location of the 275 kV substation and BESS. A key consideration in the decision was that Solar Development Site 2 is the most accessible, least at risk of flooding, and least environmentally constrained location for the substation and BESS Compound. The various chapters of the **Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-038 to APP-190]** assess the likely significant effects arising from the Proposed Development, including the BESS, at this location and identify mitigation measures where necessary. Overall, the assessment concludes that the siting of the BESS at Solar Development Site 2 presents the lowest potential for significant adverse effects when compared with reasonable alternatives. The Applicant has sought to minimise potential effects associated with the location of BESS and solar infrastructure within Solar Development Site 2. As shown on the **Works Plans [AS-004]** and the **Outline Environmental Masterplan (OEM) - Site2 [PDA-005]**, the BESS site at Site 2 has been located away from residential receptors. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]** identifies that the installation of the BESS at field 2.4 (refer to **Figure 2.3: Field Numbering Plan [APP-061]**) will introduce a perceptible change to landscape character and a reduction in openness across Site 2 during the early stages of operation. At Year 1, proposed planting within field boundaries and setbacks will not yet be fully established, and the current limited presence of field boundaries means that these changes will be more apparent across the site. Notwithstanding this, the design of the Proposed Development includes a detailed landscape mitigation strategy, including new planting and appropriate setbacks, which will progressively integrate the development into the surrounding landscape as it matures. While the initial magnitude of effect is assessed as having moderate adverse effects in Year 1, which is significant, this reflects the baseline absence of screening features and will reduce over time as mitigation planting establishes. Furthermore, the design approach, including the offset from residential curtilages, will help to reduce the perceived scale of

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				the BESS and construction activity. Intervening vegetation, setbacks from roads, and construction fencing will also provide a degree of filtering and screening, contributing positively to the overall visual mitigation of the Proposed Development.
DES-39	RR-0111	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondent expressed concern regarding the impact of the proposals on Lumby.	The Applicant notes the general concern regarding works around Lumby. As shown on the **Works Plans [AS-004],** around the Lumby area would be solar photovoltaic (PV) infrastructure to the east and works to the National Grid Substation with connection cabling to the south. Whilst the Respondent raises no specific matter of concern, the Applicant is confident that the impacts of the Proposed Development on Lumby will be limited and given Lumby is at minimum 2 km from the Order Limits, it is outside of the study area for many environmental disciplines. Any environmental impacts have been appropriately assessed within these locations in the **Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-038 to APP-190].** Where potential impacts have been identified, appropriate mitigation measures have been incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development, as detailed in the ES and secured through the **Draft DCO [APP-017]** and the production of associated management plans. However, of note and as detailed in Chapter 14, there may be some impacts to the A63 and A162 during construction, which are located in the vicinity of Lumby. However, these impacts would be managed through the preparation of a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). An **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, [APP-201])** has also been prepared which identifies the routes that should be used by construction traffic. The oCTMP also includes measures to minimise any impacts during construction by reducing HGV movements during the peak hours and managing employee movements.
DES-40	RR-0744	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondent stated that the Proposed Development infringed upon the human rights of residents.	The Applicant has considered the impacts on human rights in section 9 of the **Statement of Reasons [APP-020]** which concludes that the DCO strikes a fair balance between the public interest in the Proposed Development going ahead and the interference with the rights that will be affected. The Applicant considers that it would, therefore, be appropriate and proportionate for the SoS to make the DCO.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
DES-41	RR-0532	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondent stated that anyone with a vested interest in the Proposed Development including their families and friends should be named.	The Applicant has submitted the **Book of Reference [APP-022].** This sets out all the land that is included in the Proposed Development and includes all persons that have an interest in the land and may be affected
DES-42	RR-1410	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondent stated that the application documents are technically illiterate, including the use of both 'power' and 'energy' to describe 'electricity' Respondent cited their career in the electricity industry as an engineer, manager, consultant and technical adviser to the regulator, and also having a MSC in Environmental Management.	NPS EN-1 paragraph 3.3.23 explains that the government's analysis shows that *"a secure, reliable, affordable, net zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar."* Chapter 9 of the **Statement of Need [APP-214]** sets out the contribution of large-scale solar to system security. In particular, Figure 31 and 32 address the intermittency of solar generation within a portfolio of other generation technologies and support the conclusions that the average aggregate monthly output per unit installed capacity of a multi-technology portfolio of wind and solar assets is less variable (i.e. less mismatched) than the average monthly output per unit installed capacity of each of the single technology portions of that portfolio; and that a portfolio of low carbon generation which includes solar, onshore and offshore wind, and a low carbon base, if delivered, is capable of closely matching a future projection of national electricity demand on a month-average level. The Applicant confirms that its analysis shows that the total expected annual generation from the Proposed Development is equivalent to the total annual average energy consumption of approximately 115,000 homes. The inclusion of BESS as associated development helps meet the need to reduce 'mismatch' between supply and demand by supporting the operation of the Proposed Development to import and store energy when it is generated in abundance and release it to the grid when demands are greater.
DES-43	RR-0983	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondent expressed concern that the Proposed Development is part of North Yorkshire AI growth zone plans.	The North Yorkshire AI growth plans relate to York and North Yorkshire's bid to become a UK AI Growth Zone, centred on large scale digital infrastructure (such as data centres), linked to renewable energy. The Applicant is aware of the proposals detailed in the bid, however, this has not influenced consideration for the Proposed Development and it can confirm that to date there has been no discussions with the Council in relation to the scheme being supported by them specifically as part of growth zone plans. Notwithstanding this, the Proposed Development aligns with the ambition of the Growth Zone by delivering a large amount of renewable energy into the grid.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The Applicant's **Statement of Need [APP-214]** provides evidence that the Proposed Development aims to help meet national targets for clean energy and net zero targets set out in legislation and policy. The aim is to deliver long term environmental benefit alongside a secure energy supply.
DES-46	RR-1051	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondent stated that surveys and assessments are incomplete, in some cases undertaken late, and do not adequately consider worst-case scenario impacts.	The Applicant can confirm that the **Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-038 to APP-190]** has been informed by a comprehensive programme of surveys and assessments, which have been undertaken in accordance with relevant best practice guidance (including in relation to timing) and The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The surveys and assessments that have been completed are considered sufficient to support a robust assessment of likely significant effects. Across the majority of the Order Limits (including Solar Development Sites and Cable Route Corridor), surveys were completed for the ES and form a reliable basis for the conclusions that have been set out. The Applicant acknowledges that there were limited areas within the Cable Route Corridor had not been subject to survey at the point of finalising **chapters within the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-038 to APP-190].** There are a limited number of features within the Order Limits which could not be directly surveyed due to issues such as access constraints. This includes a small proportion of ponds associated with the cable route, not within the Order Limits itself, but within an additional a precautionary buffer zone where access was not obtained, as well as a limited number of trees with potential for bat roosting, and less than 15% of the cable route for geophysical surveys. Since the preparation of the Chapters, these surveys been progressed. The survey methodology applied is consistent with that reported within the ES for the rest of the Cable Route Corridor and Solar Development Sites. The results of these surveys will be reviewed and, in the Applicant's view, are unlikely to alter the conclusions of the **Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-038 to APP-190]** regarding likely significant effects. The precautionary assumptions previously applied in the ES were conservative and appropriately accounted for any uncertainty associated with un-surveyed areas.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
DES-47	RR-1051	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondent stated that too much reliance is placed on mitigation or further detail to be provided at a later stage rather than being fully assessed within the current submission.	The Applicant notes this comment. The **Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-038 to APP-190]** presents a robust assessment of likely significant effects based on the currently available design information, in accordance with the Rochdale Envelope approach. This includes an evaluation of worst-case parameters to ensure that potential impacts are appropriately understood at this stage. Whilst elements of the detailed design including the detailed mitigation and management plans will be progressed post-consent, this is consistent with the DCO process and does not prevent a full assessment of likely significant effects. The proposed management and mitigation measures set out in the **ES [APP-038 to APP-190]** have been informed by environmental assessment and align with national and local planning policy, as detailed in the **Planning Statement [APP-207].** This approach therefore does not rely on mitigation in place of robust environmental assessments as it follows EIA practice, with assessment being undertaken on a worst-case basis and mitigation applied to reduced identified effects, in accordance with planning policy.
DES-48	RR-1051	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondent stated that this approach may not comply with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, including regulations 5 and 12(2)(b), and is also inconsistent with requirements under regulations 12 and 14 and sections 42, 47, 48 and 49 of the Planning Act 2008.	As detailed in the **Planning Statement [APP-207],** the Applicant has demonstrated the Proposed Development's compliance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations) and the Planning Act 2008. The Application is subject to legally binding Development Consent Order (DCO) requirements. The Planning Act 2008 also contains enforcement provisions regarding compliance with the terms of a DCO, with breach of its terms being a criminal offence. With regard to Regulations 5, 12(2)(b) and 12 of the EIA Regulations, Regulation 5 relates to the EIA process and Regulation 12 relates to consultation statement requirements. The Applicant is satisfied that the EIA process was appropriately followed, with details of the methodology provided in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Approach to EIA [APP-042].** In terms of the consultation undertaken, the Applicant is satisfied that the statutory consultation has been robust, thorough and undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008 (including Sections 42, 47, 48 and 49), the Environmental Impact Assessment

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				(EIA) regulations, and the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009. North Yorkshire Council (NYC) confirmed to the Planning Inspectorate on the 26 February 2026 that in the Authority's view, the Applicant has complied with their duties under sections 42, 47 and 48 of the Planning Act 2008. This is set out in NYC's **Adequacy of Consultation Response [AoC-005]**. Regulation 14 of the EIA Regulations requires that the Applicant prepares and submits an Environmental Statement (ES) as part of the EIA process. It requires that the ES includes sufficient information to assess the likely significant environmental effects of the development. The Applicant is confident that the **ES [APP-038 to APP-190]** and environmental and ecological surveys have been undertaken by competent experts with considerable experience assessing similar Proposed Developments. Details of qualifications, experience and professional institute membership are provided within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 1.4: Statement of Competence [APP-146]**. Therefore, the Proposed Development complies with Regulation 14 of the EIA Regulations.
DES-49	RR-1051	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondent stated that the proposal conflicts with multiple policies in the Selby District Local Plan 2005 and Selby Core Strategy Local Plan 2013, including policies relating to countryside protection, amenity, design, transport, heritage, flood risk, and public rights of way.	The **Planning Statement [APP-207]** and **Policy Compliance Document [APP-224]** demonstrate how the Applicant has considered and responded to national and local policy. This includes the saved policies in the Selby District Local Plan 2005 and the Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan 2011-2017.
DES-50	RR-1051	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondent stated that Site 6 is located outside development limits and within designated countryside under the adopted Selby Local Plan and therefore should be treated as an area with strong policy protection against inappropriate development.	Policy SP2A(c), "Spatial Development Strategy" in the Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan 2011-2017 relates to development in the Countryside. The policy limits development to re-use and replacement / extension of existing buildings, and well-designed new buildings of an appropriate scale which would contribute towards and improve the local economy and where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities, *"or other special circumstances".* The strategic context for the Selby Core Strategy is influenced by national policy and guidance. Paragraph 1.17 confirms how the Strategy aims to reduce carbon emissions by encouraging *"a switch to the use of renewable energy sources"* (page 5) and Core Strategy Objective 15 supports *"making best use of natural resources by promoting energy efficiency, sustainable construction techniques and low-carbon and or renewable energy operations"* (page 25).

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				In the case of the Proposed Development and its location in the countryside, *"other special circumstances"* apply given the need for Critical National Priority (CNP) infrastructure. CNP is explained in Section 4.2 of the National Policy Statement EN-1 where *"Ensuring the UK is more energy independent, resilient and secure requires the smooth transition to abundant, low-carbon energy"* (paragraph 4.2.2). Paragraph 4.2.17 confirms that low carbon infrastructure for electricity generation, including onshore generation not involving fossil fuel combustion is CNP.
DES-51	RR-1051	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondent stated that the Applicant has underplayed the continuing relevance of adopted local plan policies, and that paragraph 12 of the NPPF indicates permission should not normally be granted where development conflicts with the development plan.	Under the Planning Act 2008, decisions on Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) are principally guided by the relevant NPSs, which take precedence over local planning policy and the NPPF. Section 6 of the **Planning Statement [APP-207]**: Legislative and Policy Context explains the policy hierarchy and matters material to decision making for DCO applications. Section 7: Planning Assessment, of the **Planning Statement [APP-207]**, considers the Proposed Development on a thematic basis against both relevant national and local planning policies. Section 3 Local Policy Accordance Tables, of the **Policy Compliance Document [APP-224]**, reports on compliance with relevant Local Plan policies within the: Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan 2011-2027; Selby District Local Plan (2005); North Yorkshire County Council, North York Moors National Park Authority and City of York Council Minerals and Waste Joint Plan; and Escrick Neighbourhood Development Plan 2021-2035. The Policy Compliance Document also considers the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Policy Statements (NPSs) for Energy.
DES-52	RR-1051	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondent stated that policy compliance has been presented selectively and inconsistently across the application documentation, leading to an unbalanced assessment of planning impacts.	In carrying out the Planning Assessment of the Proposed Development, planning judgement is necessary to navigate the extensive and complex policy landscape that is in place locally and nationally. The approach is explained in Section 6: Legislative and Policy Context and Section 7: Planning Assessment, of the **Planning Statement [APP-207]**. A comprehensive **Policy Compliance Document [APP-224]** sets out summaries of relevant local and national planning policies and narrative regarding compliance with signposting to where further information can be found to evidence compliance.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The Examining Authority (ExA) will independently assess the Proposed Development's compliance with relevant national and local planning policy. The ExA will form its own view on compliance as part of its overall assessment and recommendation to the Secretary of State, taking into account the evidence that has been submitted, consultation responses, and any matters raised during the examination process.
DES-53	RR-1051	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondent stated that support for renewable energy in principle does not outweigh the significant local environmental and planning harm identified in this case.	The Applicant's **Statement of Need [APP-214]** provides evidence that an unprecedented capacity of new low-carbon generation Proposed Developments is urgently needed for the UK to meet its legally binding climate change targets. The government has confirmed that solar energy is at the heart of the Clean Power 2030 Mission [NPS EN-3 (2025) Paras 2.10.1 & 2.10.2]. The Statement of Need confirms that the need for the Proposed Development is urgent and that substantial weight should be given to the need for the Proposed Development [NPS EN-1 (2023) Para 3.2.9-3.2.10]. The Applicant is confident that the proposed management and mitigation measures set out in the **Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-038 to APP-190]** are comprehensive and robust and that the Proposed Development aligns with national and local planning policy; this is outlined in the **Planning Statement [APP-207]**. Of particular relevance are Section 6: Legislative and Policy Context and Section 7: Planning Assessment, of the Planning Statement which set out an appraisal of the Proposed Development against national and local planning policies. The Planning Statement concludes that the benefits of the Proposed Development, including meeting the identified urgent need, outweigh its limited adverse impacts.
DES-54	RR-1051	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondent stated that the Applicant's Planning Statement notes that emerging Selby Local Plan policies were not formally considered due to work on the plan being stopped in February 2025, but also acknowledges that such policies may still be relevant to decision-making.	The **Planning Statement [APP-207]** explains that since work on the emerging Selby Local Plan was formally discontinued in February 2025, due to North Yorkshire Council (NYC) deciding to focus on preparing a singular North Yorkshire Local Plan, the draft policies allocations from that document have not been considered in this DCO Application. This approach was agreed with NYC, given there is no clear pathway to the adoption of the previously emerging policies. The Planning Statement and environmental assessments have therefore appropriately focused on the National Policy Statements for energy and the adopted local development plan. It is these policy documents which provide the established policy framework for decision-making.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
DES-55	RR-1051	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondent stated that had the Revised Publication Selby Local Plan 2024 been adopted, Sites 6 and 7 would conflict with multiple policies, including those relating to landscape character, residential amenity, countryside protection, rights of way, green/blue infrastructure, flood risk, and cumulative impacts.	The preparation of the emerging Selby Local Plan has been discontinued as of February 2025, as North Yorkshire Council (NYC) are focusing their resources on preparing a singular North Yorkshire Local Plan. As such, the previously emerging policies will not be adopted. Under the Planning Act 2008, decisions on Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) are principally guided by the relevant NPSs, which take precedence over local planning policy and the NPPF. The Proposed Development is being promoted in the context of a comprehensive suite of national and local development planning policies. Section 3 Local Policy Accordance Tables, of the **Policy Compliance Document [APP-224]**, presents information regarding compliance with relevant Local Plan policies within the: Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan 2011-2027; Selby District Local Plan (2005); North Yorkshire County Council, North York Moors National Park Authority and City of York Council Minerals and Waste Joint Plan; and the Escrick Neighbourhood Development Plan 2021-2035.
DES-56	RR-0600	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondent expressed concern that local grid infrastructure may not have sufficient capacity to support the additional generation from the Proposed Development without significant upgrades.	The Applicant acknowledges this concern. The connection of the Proposed Development to the electricity transmission network is subject to a connection agreement with the National Energy System Operator (NESO), which informs the maximum output of the Proposed Development (500 MW). The **Grid Connection Statement [APP-222]** provides detail on the status of the grid connection offer and provides confirmation that the grid connection forms part of the Proposed Development and the limited works that would be required to make the connection. The Statement confirms that the Applicant has accepted the grid offer by entering into a Bilateral Connection Agreement (BCA) between the Applicant and NESO, which demonstrates that a connection to the Point of Connection at the Monk Fryston 275 kV substation is technically and financially viable. In offering a connection agreement NESO undertook technical studies to assess whether the network can accommodate the proposed generation and concluded that the network's capacity could be managed.
DES-57	RR-0321	The Proposed Development and DCO Process	Respondent expressed general opposition for works planned in Wistow Lordship, Black Fen Lane, Sherburn Road and Wistow Road.	The Applicant notes the general objection to works around Wistow Lordship, Black Fen Lane, Sherburn Road and Wistow Road.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
		(Project Description)		As shown on the **Works Plans [AS-004],** around the Wistow Lordship area would be the construction of the Cable Route Corridor and works to facilitate temporary construction, maintenance and decommissioning access. The works planned for Black Fen Lane, Sherburn Road and Wistow Road are for safety reasons and would be temporary, small scale and short in duration, Whilst the Respondent raises no specific matter of concern, the Applicant is confident that the impacts of the Proposed Development have been appropriately assessed within these locations in the **Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-038 to APP-190].** Where potential impacts have been identified, appropriate mitigation measures have been incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development, as detailed in the ES and secured through the **Draft DCO [APP-017]** and the production of associated management plans.
DES-58	RR-0793	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondent expressed particular concern about Site 2 in relation to how maintenance of panels will work, what happens to this site if ownership changes, what enforceable commitments exist regarding decommissioning and if there is ringfenced funding for decommissioning.	The Applicant acknowledges this concern, with particular regard to Solar Development Site 2. The maintenance of the Proposed Development will be secured through the finalised management Plans, as detailed in the requirements of the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**. The **Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [APP-193]** demonstrates how mitigation measures relevant to operational activities included in the Environmental Statement (ES), including regular planned maintenance of the Proposed Development, will be implemented. This includes activities such as the replacement and cleaning of the Solar PV Panels to maximise efficiency. Further information is also provided in Section 2.8 of **ES Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [APP-040].** Requirement 19 in Schedule 2 of the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]** secures the decommissioning of the Proposed Development. The requirement to decommission the Proposed Development would sit with the owner at the time of decommissioning. Failing to comply with would be a criminal offence. Requirement 19 of the Draft DCO also secures the production of a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan, which outlines measures manage decommissioning and reinstatement, as set out in the **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) [APP-194].** After the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development (60years) the land agreements will have expired and the

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Applicant will no longer have any interest in the land within the Order Limits. Should the Proposed Development change ownership before the decommissioning phase, any new owner remains bound by the commitments and obligations set out within the DCO and associated management plans. **The Funding Statement [APP-021]** submitted with the DCO application demonstrates that the Proposed Development is financially viable and adequately funded to deliver the Proposed Development in full, including decommissioning requirements.
DES-59	RR-0647	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondent opposes general references to 'illustrative layouts', stating that is allows flexibility in later design phases, the respondent urged more clarity in wording when addressing Layout and density of solar panels, Landscaping and screening, Final routing of infrastructure, Preference for Solar Panels Over Other Green Technologies.	The maximum lateral spatial extents are shown on the **Works Plans [AS-004].** These parameters are not illustrative; they are set and secured via the DCO. This therefore establishes the defined development limits within which the Proposed Development must be delivered, providing certainty of land take and the broad location of key infrastructure. The Applicant's approach is consistent with DCO practice for all project types. The detailed design and construction of the Proposed Development will be undertaken within the parameters authorised by the DCO, which offers a degree of flexibility for the routing of infrastructure and arrangement of solar panels, landscaping and associated works. This approach is necessary so that there can be further design refinement at the detailed design stage once there is more information available from ongoing surveys and engagement with stakeholders. With regard to a preference for solar infrastructure, as detailed in Section 3.9 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-041]**, alternative renewable energy technologies been considered in principle. However, the Solar Development Sites are considered suitable for solar energy generation due to their topography and the irradiance levels in this part of the country, proximity to a point of connection, and availability. Given this, and the fact that The Applicant is a solar and battery development company which stands ready to help deliver the Government's ambition in its Clean Power Action Plan (Ref 6) to achieve 45-47 GW of installed solar capacity by 2030, other technologies have not been considered by The Applicant in the development of the Proposed Development.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
DES-60	RR-0853	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondent stated that the proposal relies on illustrative layouts within a Rochdale Envelope approach, leaving the final Proposed Development design unknown.	The EIA presented within the ES has been undertaken adopting the principles set out in the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note Nine: Rochdale Envelope which provides guidance regarding the degree of flexibility that may be considered appropriate within an application for development consent under the Planning Act 2008. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [APP-040]** and the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]** sets out for each technical discipline, the maximum (and where relevant, minimum) parameters for the elements where flexibility needs to be retained have been assessed under the Rochdale Envelope approach. The approach also recognises that the worst-case parameter for one technical assessment may differ from another, ensuring that worst case overall impacts are predicted. The maximum lateral spatial extents are shown on the **Works Plans [AS-004].** These parameters are not illustrative – they are set and secured via the DCO. The Applicant's approach is consistent with DCO practice for all project types. Each technical chapter (**ES Volume 1, Chapter 5 [APP-043] to Chapter 16 [APP-054]**) considers the parameters relevant to their assessment.
DES-61	RR-0853	The Proposed Development and DCO Process (Project Description)	Respondent stated that this conflicts with the Core Strategy requirement that development proposals be supported by sufficient information (para 1.8), as the absence of a fixed layout prevents proper assessment of impacts.	The level of design detail is appropriate for a utility scale solar NSIP at the application stage. The EIA has been undertaken adopting the principles set out in the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note Nine: Rochdale Envelope which provides guidance regarding the degree of flexibility that may be considered appropriate within an application for development consent under the Planning Act 2008. The advice note acknowledges there may be aspects of the Proposed Development design that are not yet fixed and, therefore, it may be necessary for the EIA to assess likely worst-case variations to ensure all foreseeable significant environmental effects of the Proposed Development are considered. For further information regarding the Rochdale Envelope, please refer to **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: The Proposed Development, from 2.4.12 to 2.4.16 [APP-040]**

2.23 Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism

Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism – General Comments

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism - General Comments				
SOC-01	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-1163, RR-0834, RR-0216, RR-0922, RR-0375, RR-0842, RR-0008, RR-0849, RR-0599, RR-0496, RR-0358, RR-1355, RR-1054, RR-0754, RR-0788, RR-1060, RR-0450, RR-0615, RR-0661, RR-0120, RR-0315, RR-1261, RR-0956, RR-0637, RR-0273, RR-1040, RR-0714, RR-1400, RR-0255, RR-0521, RR-1293, RR-0804, RR-1205, RR-0900, RR-1462, RR-0949, RR-0343, RR-0396, RR-0503, RR-1410, RR-0049, RR-0144, RR-0214, RR-0268, RR-1312, RR-0268, RR-0740, RR-1020, RR-1313, RR-0864, RR-0427, RR-0762, RR-0810, RR-0538, RR-0847, RR-0989, RR-0443, RR-0908, RR-1237, RR-0324, RR-1275, RR-0607, RR-0436, RR-0665, RR-0362, RR-1376, RR-0680, RR-0417, RR-0225, RR-1145, RR-0798, RR-1292, RR-0906, RR-1222, RR-1148, RR-0302, RR-0352, RR-0402, RR-0235, RR-0240, RR-0673, RR-1324, RR-0742, RR-0655, RR-0199, RR-1172, RR-0867, RR-1285, RR-0053, RR-0983, RR-0055, RR-0591, RR-0718, RR-0514, RR-1245, RR-1207, RR-1302, RR-0823, RR-0277, RR-1457, RR-1221, RR-0142, RR-0882, RR-1081, RR-1445, RR-0087, RR-0039, RR-0974, RR-0579, RR-0135, RR-0015, RR-0749, RR-0458, RR-0428, RR-0686, RR-0483, RR-1067, RR-0290, RR-1441, RR-1308, RR-0239, RR-0659, RR-0594, RR-0780, RR-0997, RR-0185, RR-0907, RR-0779, RR-0461, RR-0215, RR-0146, RR-0203, RR-1419, RR-0648, RR-0837, RR-1423, RR-0486, RR-0374, RR-0829, RR-0105, RR-0734, RR-0630, RR-0397, RR-0600, RR-1370, RR-0831, RR-1318, RR-1430, RR-0756, RR-0958,RR-0921, RR-0563, RR-0709, RR-0866, RR-0724, RR-1229, RR-0544, RR-0889, RR-0147, RR-1437, RR-0708, RR-0095, RR-1410, RR-0214, RR-0334, RR-0354, RR-0238, RR-0195, RR-0027, RR-	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Some respondents expressed general concern about the Proposed Development's potential **impact on recreation, amenity and access to the countryside.** Some respondents raised specific concerns about potential effects on Public Rights of Way (PRoW), permissive paths, footpaths and cycle routes. Some respondents expressed specific concern in relation to dog walking.	The Applicant has embedded mitigation measures to maintain the amenity of Public Rights of Way for users, including dog walkers. These measures include 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 [APP-051]** as well as the provision of new permissive paths. 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) [APP-199]** submitted as part of the Application. There are also no significant effects identified on PRoW receptors, as outlined in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]**.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	0559, RR-0236, RR-1385, RR-0998, RR-0066, RR-1365, RR-1337, RR-1118, RR-0045, RR-0894, RR-1013, RR-0202, RR-0931, RR-0911, RR-0545, RR-0321, RR-1062, RR-0500, RR-1429, RR-0021, RR-1213, RR-0878, RR-1243, RR-0082, RR-1281, RR-0383, RR-0435, RR-0929, RR-1155, RR-0890, RR-0408, RR-0793, RR-0272, RR-1251, RR-0555, RR-0980, RR-0508, RR-0967, RR-0853, RR-0885, RR-0198, RR-0973			
SOC-02	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-0112, RR-1059, RR-0826, RR-0982, RR-0834, RR-0216, RR-0910, RR-1228, RR-1054, RR-0754, RR-1060, RR-1035, RR-0057, RR-0061, RR-0714, RR-0038, RR-0232,RR-0764, RR-0011, RR-1293, RR-0498, RR-0844, RR-0797, RR-0611, RR-1384, RR-1462, RR-0396, RR-1321, RR-0663, RR-0334, RR-0003, RR-1115, RR-0576, RR-0847, RR-0505, RR-1275, RR-1275, RR-0286, RR-1405, RR-0376, RR-0102, RR-1222, RR-1156, RR-0279, RR-0431, RR-0791, RR-0240, RR-0304, RR-0673, RR-0742, RR-0425, RR-0867, RR-0053, RR-0076, RR-0591, RR-1139, RR-1129, RR-1207, RR-1302, RR-0478, RR-1270, RR-0142, RR-0039, RR-1051, RR-0943, RR-1412, RR-0271, RR-1006, RR-0784, RR-0830, RR-0924, RR-0746, RR-0941, RR-0146, RR-0028, RR-0648, RR-1423, RR-0105, RR-0696, RR-0951, RR-1055, RR-0966, RR-0958,RR-0783, RR-0720, RR-0505, RR-1132, RR-1233, RR-0056, RR-0674, RR-0334, RR-0719, RR-0398, RR-1140, RR-0204, RR-0561,RR-0765, RR-0656, RR-1102, RR-0666, RR-0894, RR-1013, RR-1168, RR-0595, RR-1429, RR-1019, RR-1281, RR-0383, RR-0408, RR-0793, RR-0280, RR-0853, RR-0584, RR-0303, RR-1387	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondents expressed concern that the Proposed Development could have an adverse effect on local **property values**.	The Applicant has submitted the **Book of Reference [APP-022].** This includes persons who may be eligible to claim compensation if the Development Consent Order is granted and the Proposed Development developed. Under Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973, property owners (Category 3) are eligible to claim compensation for any physical impacts from the operation of the Proposed Development, such as noise and vibration. However, compensation is not available for loss of value due to visual impacts or diminished views—this is consistent with established planning law. The Applicant will comply with statutory process for any compensation claims submitted and will review and assess each claim in accordance with the relevant legislation under which it is made.
SOC-03	RR-1029, RR-0806, RR-0289, RR-0418, RR-0599, RR-1054, RR-0754, RR-0661, RR-0519, RR-0714, RR-1090, RR-0232, RR-1092, RR-0521, RR-0301, RR-0343,RR-0503, RR-0334, RR-1020, RR-0227, RR-1235, RR-1275,RR-0607, RR-	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondents expressed general concern regarding the potential effects of the Proposed Development on the **local economy** and local businesses. Some respondents considered that the Proposed	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding effects on local businesses. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]** concludes that no significant adverse socio-economic effects are expected once embedded mitigation and additional mitigation measures are applied. The Applicant will continue dialogue with local businesses to

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	0224, RR-0369, RR-0235, RR-0151, RR-0304, RR-1263, RR-0053, RR-0983, RR-0055, RR-1230, RR-0135, RR-0113, RR-0483, RR-1137, RR-1441, RR-0701, RR-0652, RR-1419, RR-0648, RR-0105, RR-0696, RR-0026, RR-0758, RR-1461, RR-0354, RR-0227, RR-0398, RR-0765, RR-0656, RR-0381, RR-1102, RR-0364, RR-0671, RR-0629, RR-0093, RR-1062, RR-0950, RR-0929, RR-0890, RR-0571, RR-0641, RR-0007, RR-0853, RR-0584, RR-1322		Development would not deliver meaningful socio-economic or economic benefits.	address any project specific queries. As set out in the **Outline CEMP [APP-192]** and the chapter, specific mitigation measures for identified businesses have also been proposed. The local economy will benefit through the use of local businesses, such as use of accommodation, cafés and restaurants, by construction workers. The Applicant has proposed measures to maximise local employment, skills development, and socioeconomic benefits throughout the construction, operation, and decommissioning phases. Local recruitment will be prioritised where practicable through engagement with Job Centre Plus, local authorities, and recruitment agencies, alongside initiatives to promote diversity, equality, and inclusion, particularly for underrepresented groups. Support for the local economy will be strengthened through 'meet the buyer' events and proactive supply chain engagement. In parallel, education and skills development will be advanced through apprenticeships and vocational training in relevant sectors, collaboration with further and higher education providers to deliver academic and site-based learning opportunities, and targeted STEM outreach and careers engagement with schools and colleges. These measures are further detailed in and secured via the **Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan (oSSCEP, [APP-202])**.
SOC-04	RR-0289, RR-0949, RR-1079, RR-0442, RR-0285, RR-1119, RR-0052, RR-0820, RR-0417, RR-1222, RR-1351, RR-0187, RR-1441, RR-0746, RR-0489, RR-0146, RR-1419, RR-0105, RR-1099, RR-0932, RR-0828, RR-1233, RR-1461, RR-1018, RR-0658, RR-0426, RR-0554, RR-0950, RR-0432, RR-0571	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondents expressed concern regarding the potential effects of the Proposed Development on **agricultural employment and tenant farmers.** Some respondents specifically raised concerns about potential job losses for agricultural workers and tenant farmers as a result of agricultural land being included within the Proposed Development. Includes comments about impacts to the **local agricultural economy.**	The EIA Scoping Report **ES Volume 3, Appendix 1.1 [APP-143]** proposed to scope out effects on agricultural holdings and farm businesses because all landowners with farm businesses who are involved in the solar and battery elements of the Proposed Development have agreed to be involved in the project on a voluntary basis and have, therefore, considered the potential effects on the overall viability, diversity and resilience of their farm businesses. Agreements will also be in place between the landowners and occupiers of the land should the Proposed Development proceed. The Applicant has provided evidence to PINS that voluntary agreements are in place and that all existing tenancies in these sites are based on short-term licences only, with no long-term tenancy agreements or succession rights affected by the Proposed Development. The Proposed Development would provide a long-term, alternative income source that would remove reliance on direct public support from agri-environment schemes whilst still providing environmental benefits. It would offer a stable diversification option for agricultural businesses and provide financial security against volatility in wholesale food commodity markets and yields, protecting the remaining farm operations.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Alongside this, for contractors there would be ongoing opportunities during the construction phase of the Proposed Development as well as during operation for local workforce to upskill and engage with the employment opportunities offered during the lifecycle of the Proposed Development. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]** notes that no job losses are anticipated 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 of the economy and has therefore been scoped out of further consideration.
SOC-05	RR-0599, RR-0661, RR-1090, RR-0521, RR-0301, RR-0343, RR-0503, RR-0049, RR-1020, RR-1115, RR-1376, RR-1222, RR-0235, RR-0135, RR-0634, RR-0652, RR-0720, RR-0049, RR-0334, RR-0227, RR-0656, RR-0020, RR-0007	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondents expressed concern regarding the potential effects of the Proposed Development on **tourism**. Some respondents specifically raised concerns that impacts on tourism could result in a loss of trade for local businesses, including the potential closure of businesses reliant on tourism.	The Applicant notes concerns regarding potential impacts on tourism. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]** includes an assessment of local businesses including tourism receptors, considering both individual tourism assets and local accommodation. With embedded mitigation in place to minimise construction impacts including those arising from noise (**oCEMP, [APP-192]**) and to restrict construction traffic to set routes and working hours (**oCTMP, [APP-201]**) the assessment concludes that no significant effects on tourism or tourism related businesses are expected. Furthermore, the provision of approximately 8 km (5 miles) of new permissive paths (as shown on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]**) will ensure that access to nature and the countryside for both visitors and the local community is maintained and enhanced. Access to existing routes (with localised diversions implemented where necessary) will be maintained throughout the construction phase, with three permanent diversions planned, as secured through the **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPROWMP, [APP-199])**.
SOC-06	RR-0599, RR-0788, RR-0847, RR-0642, RR-1292, RR-1222, RR-0360, RR-0718, RR-0784, RR-0374, RR-1229, RR-0544, RR-0878, RR-0585	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondents expressed concern about the Proposed Development's impact on **horse-riders and bridleways**.	The Applicant notes the concerns raised regarding horses, including domestic and equine related facilities. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]** has assessed equine receptors both as local businesses and in terms of their recreational and community value. Where the assessment identified likely significant effects, appropriate embedded and additional mitigation has been incorporated into the Proposed Development to minimise disruption, particularly during construction, as detailed in and secured via the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP, [APP-192]**. With these measures applied, no significant residual effects on equine receptors are expected.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				As presented in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**, operational noise impacts on PRoWs, including bridleways, are assessed as not significant. Operational noise from new plant is continuous and well-maintained plant is not expected to generate such levels or character of noise that would startle horses. Maintenance of plant is committed to within the **Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [APP-193]**. With regard to construction noise impacting horses and riders using the PRoWs, there may be relatively short periods when activities close to the PRoWs are audible. As construction progresses, works will move further away from these routes, resulting in a reduction in noise levels. Mitigation measures for PRoWs, including proposed diversions, are set out in the **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPROWMP) [APP-199]**. To minimise the level of noise to which PRoWs will be exposed, construction activities will be undertaken in accordance with the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192].** The appointed contractor will also apply Best Practicable Means (BPM), to be set out in the detailed CEMP, as defined under Control of Pollution Act 1974 and described in Section 11.8 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**. Furthermore, the **oCEMP [APP-192]** sets out further information on how concerns around receptor impacts can be communicated to the project team. Section 2.14 states: The Considerate Constructors Proposed Development (CCS) (Ref 2) will be adopted to assist in reducing pollution and nuisance from the Proposed Development, by employing good practice measures which go beyond statutory compliance. Prior to commencing works on-site, the Contractor(s) will develop and implement a Stakeholder Communications Plan that includes community engagement (including taking account of the proposed Community Liaison Group to be set up) and will detail a complaints procedure. A display board will be installed on-site, and a website will be set up. These will include contact information for the Site Manager or alternative public interface with whom nuisance or complaints can be lodged, and the head or regional office contact information. A logbook of complaints will be prepared and managed by the Site Manager or nominated representative. Any environmental complaints will be investigated, with appropriate action taken and recorded, so that a full audit trail is available should the complainant raise the issue(s) with the local planning authority.A Community Liaison Officer (or alternative) would be

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				appointed to lead discussions with the local community during construction, as part of the proposed Community Liaison Group. This role will provide a clear point of contact for interested parties, including users of nearby PRoW, and will facilitate communication regarding the timing and location of works taking place in proximity to access routes, enabling advance notice of activities and the management of any temporary disruption. Details of the frequency and attendees to the Community Liaison Group will be agreed with the local planning authority pursuant to a requirement in the draft DCO.
SOC-07	RR-1029, RR-0375, RR-0496, RR-0358, RR-0661, RR-0214, RR-0427, RR-0680, RR-0142, RR-1051, RR-0095, RR-0408	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Some respondents expressed concern that new permissive paths and existing PRoWs will be narrow and fenced off, becoming **'industrial corridors'.** Some respondents expressed that they would not want to use these routes.	The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant has embedded mitigation measures to maintain the amenity of Public Rights of Way and the new permissive paths, including the provision of landscaping, involving the planting of hedgerows, and appropriate signage and lighting. For Public Rights of Way a minimum 15 metre buffer offset from all infrastructure, including fencing has been included. For existing PRoW this would mean a corridor of 30m in width where solar is present on both sides of the PRoW. The majority of new permissive paths have been created to take users around the edge of the Solar Development Sites and therefore there would only be solar panels present on one side of the path. These measures are set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]** and in the **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPROWMP) [APP-199]** submitted as part of the Application. Details need to be agreed with local authority officers through commitments within the finalised public right of way management plan.
SOC-08	RR-0599, RR-0642, RR-1292, RR-1222, RR-0784, RR-0374, RR-0238	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondents raised safety concerns that the Proposed Development, including **construction vehicles** associated with it, could **endanger horse riders**.	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding the health and wellbeing of horses and riders. The **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPROWMP) [APP-199]** provides a framework for the management of walking, cycling and horse riding and other public access routes throughout the Site, where impacted by construction traffic requirements. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051],** also does not identify any significant effects on bridleways across the lifecycle of the Proposed Development. The **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, [APP-201])** outlines measures to minimise the impacts of construction traffic movements on other users of the road network, including public awareness raising of the timing of activities, information on traffic routing to avoid conflicts, and banksmen to control movements in and out of sites. This

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				oCTMP will be developed into a CTMP due to the commencement of construction.
SOC-09	RR-1029, RR-0615, RR-0949, RR-0201, RR-0253, RR-0563	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondents expressed scepticism about the **number of local jobs** the Proposed Development would create.	The Applicant understands interest in employment opportunities. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]** confirms temporary construction employment will arise, with no permanent local roles guaranteed, typical of solar developments. Employment impacts have been assessed using established good practice methodologies, including the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) Additionality Guide, with reference to HM Treasury Green Book principles. Based on construction information set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [APP-040]** the Proposed Development is expected to support approximately 520 net additional construction jobs over the build period (of which around 260 would be within the Study Area) and approximately 390 net jobs during decommissioning, following the application of standard additionality assumptions (including leakage, displacement and multiplier effects) to convert gross employment numbers into net additional employment in line with the HCA Additionality Guide. Estimates are informed by professional experience of other solar schemes and information provided by the Applicant, drawing on industry accepted methodologies tested through previous comparable projects. As with comparable schemes, employment numbers are indicative and may vary slightly depending on detailed design, procurement and programme. The Applicant has proposed measures to maximise local employment, skills development, and socioeconomic benefits throughout construction, operation, and decommissioning. Local recruitment will be prioritised where practicable through engagement with Job Centre Plus, local authorities, and recruitment agencies, alongside initiatives to promote diversity, equality, and inclusion, particularly for underrepresented groups. Support for the local economy will be strengthened through 'meet the buyer' events and proactive supply chain engagement. In parallel, education and skills development will be advanced through apprenticeships and vocational training in relevant sectors, collaboration with further and higher education providers to deliver academic and site-based learning opportunities, and targeted STEM outreach and careers engagement with schools and colleges. These measures are further detailed in and secured through the

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan (oSSCEP, [APP-202]). The Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan will be secured under Schedule 2, Requirement 18 of the **Draft Development Consent Order [APP-017]**.
SOC-10	RR-1317, RR-0983	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondents enquired about/requested improvements and extensions to paths, bridleways, cycleways.	Improvements and extensions to all Public rights of way, including footpaths, bridleways and cycleways are detailed in the **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPROWMP) [APP-199].** This includes current requested changes to the Definitive Map through Definitive Map Modification Orders (DMMOS), where relevant requested changes are outlined in Section 2.5, along with the impact the Proposed Development will have on them. Any additional proposed modifications will follow the DMMO process, and will be considered as PRoW as and when they are confirmed.
SOC-11	RR-0911, RR-1322, RR-0155	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondents expressed general concern about the increase in crime as a result of the Proposed Development.	Management Plans are being implemented throughout the project, which outline design considerations with regard to safety and security for the project and local residents. The **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** sets out measures for managing security and reducing the risk of crime during construction. It notes that Site security during construction will be managed by the Contractor(s). The Site security fencing will remain in place throughout the duration of the construction period. Any storage of materials will be kept secure to prevent theft or vandalism. A safe system for accessing the materials storage areas would be implemented by the Contractor(s). Security measures may include security lighting on temporary site compounds and permanent structures; and security fencing. All security measures would be designed in with the ecological clerk of works. The **Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [APP-193]** sets out that during operation the boundary of the Solar Development Sites will be secured by both fencing and by the provision of Closed-Circuit Television (CCTV) equipment. Cameras would be placed on galvanised steel painted green poles with a maximum height of 3 m. Perimeter fencing will be deer wire mesh and wooden post fencing with a maximum height of 2.5 m. All new access tracks will be secured by gates, which will be set back from the public highway. Where existing access tracks are used that also provide access to residential properties, appropriate security

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				measures will be put in place in consultation with the relevant property owner(s). There will be palisade fencing around the substations and BESS compound which will have a maximum height of 3 m. Motion sensing security lighting would be provided within the substation compounds and within the BESS Compound to be used to maintain safe working conditions in winter months, security purposes, and maintenance activities. Regular lighting is not required within the majority of the Solar Development Sites during the operation phase of the Proposed Development Other potential security measures expected to be included comprise: 1) Detection systems such as beam break and image detection to raise alarm when fence breached; 2) Audio announcement when intruder detected to warn alarm triggered and police on way; 3) Barriers / locked gates at main entrances to the Sites; 4) Steel doors on substation buildings; 5) Buried cables, as much as practicable; 6) Remote monitoring; and 7) Alarm response contract with keyholder/security company. Within the **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPROWMP) [APP-199],** Section 3.18 outlines how PRoWs will be managed to ensure security and safety, including appropriate signage and fencing. With these security measures in place the Proposed Development is not anticipated to result in an increase in crime. There is no evidence that the presence of a solar farm leads to increased crime within surrounding communities.
SOC-12	RR-0303, RR-0476	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondents expressed concern that home and motorhome insurance prices will increase as a result of the Proposed Development.	The Applicant has submitted the **Book of Reference [APP-022].** This includes persons who may be eligible to claim compensation if the Development Consent Order is granted and the Proposed Development developed. The Applicant will comply with statutory process for any compensation claims submitted and will review and assess each claim in accordance with the relevant legislation under which it is made.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
SOC-13	RR-0599	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondent expressed concern for the impacts to **equine businesses**.	The Applicant notes the concerns raised regarding horses, including domestic and equine related facilities and horses hacking put along Birkin Lane. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]** has assessed equine receptors both as local businesses and in terms of their recreational and community value. Where the assessment identified likely significant effects, appropriate embedded and additional mitigation has been incorporated into the Proposed Development to minimise disruption, particularly during construction, as detailed in and secured via the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP, [APP-192]**. With these measures applied, no significant residual effects on equine receptors are expected. As presented in paragraphs 11.9.56 to 11.9.59 of ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049], operational noise impacts on PRoWs are assessed as not significant. Operational noise from new plant would be continuous (except for occasional starting and stopping of cooling fans etc) and if well maintained, is not expected to generate such levels or character of noise that would startle horses. Maintenance of plant is committed to within the Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [APP-193]. With regard to construction noise impacting horses within Birkin, there may be relatively short periods when activities are audible. As construction progresses, works will move further away from these routes, resulting in a reduction in noise levels. To minimise the level of noise to which PRoWs will be exposed, construction activities will be undertaken in accordance with the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192].** The appointed contractor will also apply Best Practicable Means (BPM), to be set out in the detailed CEMP, as defined under Control of Pollution Act 1974 and described in Section 11.8 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**. With regard to construction noise impacting horses and riders using the PRoWs, there may be relatively short periods when noise levels from construction activities close to the PRoWs are audible. As construction progresses, works will move further away from these routes, resulting in a reduction in noise levels leading to lower noise levels for the majority of the construction periods, when the works are further away. Mitigation measures for PRoWs, including proposed diversions, are set out in the Outline Public **Rights of Way Management**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Plan (oPROWMP) [APP-199]. To minimise the level of noise to which PRoWs will be exposed, construction activities will be undertaken in accordance with the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan **(oCEMP) [APP-192].** The appointed contractor will also apply Best Practicable Means (BPM), to be set out in the detailed CEMP, as defined under Control of Pollution Act 1974 and described in Section 11.8 of the ES Noise and Vibration chapter. Measures to minimise impacts on horses will be investigated at detailed design. Measures could include recommendations from the British Horse Society in their "Advice on construction sites and horses" including: -Operators shutting off machinery or to stop movement and noise while horses pass and avoid starting up a machine or initiating movement while horses are in range. Machinery or activity should not resume until horses are at least 20m past. -If it is not possible for activity to be halted, staff should be at the location to warn approaching equestrians as appropriate. -If a horse appears distressed - freezes, jerks sideways, prances about, takes flight, spins round or shies away or acts in any way other than a calm forward motion - or an equestrian appears to be struggling for control, or shouts, all movement and noise should cease immediately (where possible) to avoid escalating the situation. Activity should not resume unless the equestrian indicates that it is safe to do so or is out of sight or more than 50m away. Furthermore, the **oCEMP [APP-192]** sets out further information on how concerns around receptor impacts can be communicated to the project team. Section 2.14 states: The Considerate Constructors Proposed Development (CCS) will be adopted to assist in reducing pollution and nuisance from the Proposed Development, by employing good practice measures which go beyond statutory compliance. Public communication and liaison.
SOC-14	RR-0708	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondent stated that the Proposed Development contradicts the following policies: NPPF 92 & 98 – protection of public rights of way and open spaces; NPS EN-1 (5.10.24–5.10.26) – assessment of amenity and recreational impacts.	In terms of NPPF 105 – protection of PRoW and open spaces, the Applicant has sought to protect and enhance PRoW as set out within the **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPROWMP) [APP-199],** and **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051].** Within these two reports, the Applicant demonstrates that all existing Public Rights of Way and open space access will be maintained, with no permanent closures proposed. In addition, the Proposed Development delivers enhancements to the recreational network, including the provision of new permissive paths which increase connectivity and create new route options for users.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Whilst a small number of PRoW diversions are proposed, these are designed to maintain route continuity and usability and are not considered to be detrimental to access or amenity. The assessment confirms that, with embedded design measures and mitigation in place, no significant effects on Public Rights of Way or open space receptors are identified. With regard to public access, the Applicant has embedded mitigation measures to maintain the amenity of PRoW, including the provision of landscaping, involving the planting of hedgerows, and a minimum 15 metre buffer offset from all infrastructure, including fencing; these measures are set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]** as well as the provision of new permissive paths. With mitigation, views of the Proposed Development from PRoW will be filtered. 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) [APP-199]** submitted as part of the Application. NPS EN-1 – assessment of amenity and recreational impacts has been addressed within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048],** as well as **ES Volume 1, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage [APP – 046]** and were therefore scoped out of the socioeconomic chapter. However, amenity is considered in relation to Public Rights of Way, Village Greens and community/business receptors that may act as a recreational resource for local communities. For these receptors, the significance of effect has been assessed in line with policy NPS EN-1, measuring the sensitivity of the receptor alongside the magnitude of the effect, with no individual recreational receptor experiencing a significant impact as a result. **The Planning Statement [APP-207]** and **Policy Compliance Document [APP-224]** demonstrate how the Applicant has considered and responded to national and local policy. It is therefore considered that the Proposed Development is compliant with local and national policy in respect to the principle of development.
SOC-15	RR-0942	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	A respondent has requested that all new permissive paths are made permanent PRoWs instead.	Detail on Permissive Paths is outlined in Section 4.2 of the **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPROWMP) [APP-199]** and **Outline Landscape and**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP- 195]. The DCO requires that the measures in the detailed LEMP (which will provide the full details of the permissive paths) must be maintained for the lifetime of the Proposed Development. As at the date of decommissioning, as defined in the DCO Application, the requirement to provide the permissive paths will cease at the end of the operational period, in order that the land can be returned to its pre-development state including original PRoWs and the removal of permissive paths, unless the landowners decide to retain them.
SOC-16	RR-0332	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	A respondent has expressed support that farmers receive income from Proposed Developments like these.	The Applicant notes this comment. The Proposed Development would provide a long-term, alternative income source that would remove reliance on direct public support from agri-environment schemes whilst still providing environmental benefits. It would offer a stable diversification option for agricultural businesses and provide financial security against volatility in wholesale food commodity markets and yields, protecting the remaining farm operations.
SOC-17	RR-0285	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondent stated that the residential amenity assessment does not adequately reflect the needs of vulnerable residents living immediately adjacent to the site.	The LVIA has not identified any significant adverse residual effects on the views of residents that would breach the Residential Visual Amenity threshold and cause serious harm to the living conditions of residents (major adverse) and therefore a Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) has not been carried out. Further information is provided in Table 10-5 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048]**. However, the Applicant has considered the impacts on vulnerable persons during the construction period within **the Equality Impact Assessment [APP-212]** Table 9.2 outlines the potential impacts to protected characteristic groups during construction, operation and decommissioning phases. The EqIA generally looks at protected characteristic groups rather than individuals, as data about individuals is generally not known and would not be shared publicly. The EqIA concludes that several potential temporary negative equality impacts have been identified during the construction phase. These include impacts related to PRoW diversions and changes to journey lengths or routes; elevated levels of traffic, noise, and air pollutants; changes to pedestrian amenity, fear and intimidation; and accessibility and severance. These may have differential impacts on older people, disabled people, and pregnant women, who may be more sensitive to disruption or access changes. In some cases, there may also be a risk of disproportionate impacts, particularly in rural areas where alternative options are limited

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				or baseline health vulnerabilities are higher than average. These impacts are expected to be limited in duration, and the Applicant has proposed embedded and additional mitigation measures to reduce or manage their effects. These include the implementation of an **Outline CEMP [APP-192]**, **Outline PRoW Management Plan (oPROWMP) [APP-199]**, and **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP- 201]**. The assessment has concluded that, with mitigation in place, most negative equality impacts are not likely to be substantial. The **oCEMP [APP-192]** sets out further information on how concerns can be communicated to the project team. Section 2.14 states: The Considerate Constructors Proposed Development (CCS) will be adopted to assist in reducing pollution and nuisance from the Proposed Development, by employing good practice measures which go beyond statutory compliance. Public communication and liaison. Prior to commencing works on-site, the Contractor(s) will develop and implement a Stakeholder Communications Plan that includes community engagement (including taking account of the proposed Community Liaison Group to be set up) and will detail a complaints procedure. A display board will be installed on-site, and a website will be set-up. These will include contact information for the Site Manager or alternative public interface with whom nuisance or complaints can be lodged, and the head or regional office contact information. A logbook of complaints will be prepared and managed by the Site Manager or nominated representative. Any environmental complaints will be investigated, with appropriate action taken and recorded, so that a full audit trail is available should the complainant raise the issue(s) with the local planning authority. A Community Liaison Officer (or alternative) would be appointed to lead discussions with the local community during construction, as part of the proposed Community Liaison Group. Details of the frequency and attendees to the Community Liaison Group will be agreed with the local planning authority pursuant to a requirement in the **draft DCO [APP-017]**.

Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism – Detailed

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism - Detailed				
SOC-18	RR-0834, RR-0797, RR-0861, RR-0949, RR-0237, RR-0962, RR-1145, RR-0360, RR-0356, RR-1419, RR-0462, RR-0728, RR-0047, RR-0001, RR-1150, RR-1030, RR-0212, RR-0508, RR-0393, RR-0861	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondents expressed concern for potential impacts to **Woodhaven Kennels,** including for the welfare of the animals.	Woodhaven Kennels have been assessed within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]. ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.1: Socioeconomic Receptors Impact Assessment [APP-177],** which outlines the assessed impacts of the Proposed Development on this receptor. The receptor is identified as having a medium sensitivity to change, reflecting the importance of the environment for its business, but only a low adverse impact, due to the temporary and minor changes in amenity caused by construction works. As a result, overall impacts to the receptor are considered minor adverse and not significant. The construction dust assessment, **ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.1 Construction Dust Assessment [APP-183]** looks at potential impacts on sensitive receptors. The construction dust assessment concludes that with the appropriate best practice mitigation measures suitable for high-risk sites in place, there is likely to be no significant effects on existing receptors from the dust-generating activities onsite. On this basis, it is therefore assumed that there would be unlikely to be significant effects on animals as well. This receptor has been assessed within **Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**. No significant noise or vibration effects have been assessed for this receptor, for human receptors, during construction or operation. Regarding dog kennels, it is well known that dogs have a greater sensitivity to noise than humans and can particularly be disturbed by sudden loud sounds. Conversely, levels of sound in kennels are often elevated by sound from the animals and most dogs demonstrate some habituation to noise. During operation, sound from the Proposed Development will be continuous and at a low level, with no sudden loud bangs etc, presenting a very low risk of disturbance. Measures to minimise impacts on the dog kennels will be confirmed in the detailed CEMP and with appropriate mitigation measures in place the Applicant does not anticipate significant effects on kennels. The **oCEMP [APP-192]** sets out further information on how concerns around receptor impacts can be communicated to the project team. Section 2.14 states: The Considerate Constructors Proposed Development (CCS) (Ref 2) will be adopted to assist in reducing pollution and

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				nuisance from the Proposed Development, by employing good practice measures which go beyond statutory compliance. Prior to commencing works on-site, the Contractor(s) will develop and implement a Stakeholder Communications Plan that includes community engagement (including taking account of the proposed Community Liaison Group to be set up) and will detail a complaints procedure. A display board will be installed on-site, and a website will be set-up. These will include contact information for the Site Manager or alternative public interface with whom nuisance or complaints can be lodged, and the head or regional office contact information. A logbook of complaints will be prepared and managed by the Site Manager or nominated representative. Any environmental complaints will be investigated, with appropriate action taken and recorded, so that a full audit trail is available should the complainant raise the issue(s) with the local planning authority. A Community Liaison Officer (or alternative) would be appointed to lead discussions with the local community during construction, as part of the proposed Community Liaison Group. Details of the frequency and attendees to the Community Liaison Group will be agreed with the local planning authority pursuant to a requirement in the draft DCO.
SOC-19	RR-1137	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	**[BoR numbers 10-007, 10-008, 10-009, 10-010, 10-011, 10-013, 10-014, 10-015, 10-017, 10-018, 10-019, 10-020, 10-022, 10-023, 10-024, 10-028]**: Respondent expressed concern that the proposals would impact the number of dog boarders they get, impacting their ability to fund their strays.	The Applicant assumes the respondent is referring to Woodhaven Kennels. The Kennels have been assessed as a local business within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]. ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.1: Socioeconomic Receptors Impact Assessment [APP-177],** which outlines the assessed impacts of the Proposed Development on this receptor type. These receptors are identified as having a medium sensitivity to change, reflecting the importance of the environment for its business, but only a low adverse impact, due to the temporary and minor changes in amenity caused by construction works. As a result, overall impacts to the receptor are considered minor adverse and not significant. The construction dust assessment, **ES Volume 3, Appendix 16.1 Construction Dust Assessment [APP-183]** looks at potential impacts on sensitive receptors. The construction dust assessment concludes that with the appropriate best practice mitigation measures suitable for high-risk sites in place, there is likely to be no significant effects on existing receptors from the

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				dust-generating activities onsite. On this basis, it is therefore assumed that there would be unlikely to be significant effects on animals as well. This receptor has been assessed within **Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]**. No significant noise or vibration effects have been assessed for this receptor, for human receptors, during construction or operation. Regarding dog kennels, it is well known that dogs have a greater sensitivity to noise than humans and can particularly be disturbed by sudden loud sounds. Conversely, levels of sound in kennels are often elevated by sound from the animals and most dogs demonstrate some habituation to noise. During operation, sound from the Proposed Development will be continuous and at a low level, with no sudden loud bangs etc, presenting a very low risk of disturbance. Measures to minimise impacts on the dog kennels will be confirmed in the detailed CEMP and with appropriate mitigation measures in place the Applicant does not anticipate significant effects on kennels. The Applicant has submitted the **Book of Reference [APP-022].** This includes persons who may be eligible to claim compensation if the Development Consent Order is granted and the Proposed Development developed. Under Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973, property owners (Category 3) are eligible to claim compensation for any physical impacts from the operation of the Proposed Development, such as noise and vibration. However, compensation is not available for loss of value due to visual impacts or diminished views—this is consistent with established planning law. The Applicant will comply with statutory process for any compensation claims submitted and will review and assess each claim in accordance with the relevant legislation under which it is made. The **oCEMP [APP-192]** sets out further information on how concerns around receptor impacts can be communicated to the project team. Section 2.14 states: The Considerate Constructors Proposed Development (CCS) (Ref 2) will be adopted to assist in reducing pollution and nuisance from the Proposed Development, by employing good practice measures which go beyond statutory compliance. Public communication and liaison

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Prior to commencing works on-site, the Contractor(s) will develop and implement a Stakeholder Communications Plan that includes community engagement (including taking account of the proposed Community Liaison Group to be set up) and will detail a complaints procedure. A display board will be installed on-site, and a website will be set-up. These will include contact information for the Site Manager or alternative public interface with whom nuisance or complaints can be lodged, and the head or regional office contact information. A logbook of complaints will be prepared and managed by the Site Manager or nominated representative. Any environmental complaints will be investigated, with appropriate action taken and recorded, so that a full audit trail is available should the complainant raise the issue(s) with the local planning authority. A Community Liaison Officer (or alternative) would be appointed to lead discussions with the local community during construction, as part of the proposed Community Liaison Group. Details of the frequency and attendees to the Community Liaison Group will be agreed with the local planning authority pursuant to a requirement in the draft DCO.
SOC-20	RR-0819, RR-1323, RR-0519, RR-0521, RR-0029, RR-1307, RR-1070, RR-0778, RR-0703, RR-0066, RR-1337, RR-0212, RR-1243, RR-0567, RR-0508, RR-1306, RR-1047	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondents expressed concern regarding the impact of the Proposed Development on **Field House Farm**, primarily arising from the proposed access road adjacent to the business on Skipwith Road. Respondents added that this would impact the commercial viability of the business as a result of the traffic, including destruction of the areas tranquillity.	Field House Farm has been assessed within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]. ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.1: Socioeconomic Receptors Impact Assessment [APP-177],** outlines the assessed impacts of the Proposed Development on this receptor. The receptor is identified as having a medium sensitivity to change, reflecting the importance of the environment for its business, but only a low adverse impact, due to the temporary and minor changes in amenity caused by construction works due to it being next to a Cable Route Corridor access. As a result, overall impacts to the receptor are considered minor adverse and not significant, and therefore unlikely to affect the viability of the business. Field House Farm is located approximately 1.5 km from the closest solar infrastructure within Solar Development Site 1 and therefore no significant landscape or visual effects are predicted for this location during operation. The property is located approximately 500 m from CRC 1-4 and, whilst temporary construction effects are predicted, these are not likely to be significant. The effects on the wider landscape, including tranquillity, are assessed within **ES Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				[APP-048] and **Appendix 10.2: Landscape Baseline and Effects [APP-168].** The area around Field House Farm is assessed within LCA 3: Skipwith Lowlands, as illustrated in **ES Volume 2, Figure 10.3.2: Selby District Published Landscape Character Areas [APP-092]**. Within LCA 3: Skipwith Lowlands, effects on tranquillity are primarily associated with the construction phase, where increased activity such as traffic movements, machinery, temporary lighting and construction compounds would result in a temporary reduction in tranquillity across parts of the Landscape Character Area, particularly within the northern and central areas. These effects are assessed on a reasonable worst-case basis, reflecting the maximum extent of construction activity. Whilst they may be notable, they are assessed as short term, localised and reversible. During early operation, any reduction in tranquillity would be more limited and locally confined to areas in proximity to above-ground infrastructure. Over time, and with reinstatement of the Cable Route Corridor and establishment of mitigation planting, the influence of the Proposed Development on tranquillity would diminish and is not expected to be significant. The **oCEMP [APP-192]** sets out further information on how concerns around receptor impacts can be communicated to the project team. Section 2.14 states: The Considerate Constructors Proposed Development (CCS) (Ref 2) will be adopted to assist in reducing pollution and nuisance from the Proposed Development, by employing good practice measures which go beyond statutory compliance. Public communication and liaison Prior to commencing works on-site, the Contractor(s) will develop and implement a Stakeholder Communications Plan that includes community engagement (including taking account of the proposed Community Liaison Group to be set up) and will detail a complaints procedure. A display board will be installed on-site, and a website will be set-up. These will include contact information for the Site Manager or alternative public interface with whom nuisance or complaints can be lodged, and the head or regional office contact information. A logbook of complaints will be prepared and managed by the Site Manager or nominated representative. Any environmental complaints will be investigated, with appropriate action taken and recorded, so that a full audit trail is

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				available should the complainant raise the issue(s) with the local planning authority. A Community Liaison Officer (or alternative) would be appointed to lead discussions with the local community during construction, as part of the proposed Community Liaison Group. Details of the frequency and attendees to the Community Liaison Group will be agreed with the local planning authority pursuant to a requirement in the **draft DCO [APP-017]**.
SOC-21	RR-1146, RR-1307, RR-0592, RR-0066, RR-1337, RR-0196, RR-0508, RR-1306, RR-0403, RR-1322, RR-0730, RR-0975, RR-1177	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondents expressed concern for the **security of their campervan**, stored at **Field House Farm** during the construction phase.	Field House Farm has been assessed within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]. ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.1: Socioeconomic Receptors Impact Assessment [APP-177],** outlines the assessed impacts of the Proposed Development on this receptor. The receptor is identified as having a medium sensitivity to change, reflecting the importance of the environment for its business, but only a low adverse impact, due to the temporary and minor changes in amenity caused by construction works due to it being next to the Cable Route Corridor. As a result, overall impacts to the receptor are considered minor adverse and not significant. No impact is expected on the security of assets within receptors adjacent to the Proposed Development. We recognise concerns regarding security, continued access to properties and land uses, including Field House Farm, and the presence of construction traffic on routes providing access to Field House Farm. *Management Plans are being implemented throughout the project, which outline design considerations with regard to safety and security for the project and local residents.* *The **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** sets out measures for managing security and reducing the risk of crime during construction. It notes that Site security during construction will be managed by the Contractor(s). The Site security fencing will remain in place throughout the duration of the construction period. Any storage of materials will be kept secure to prevent theft or vandalism. A safe system for accessing the materials storage areas would be implemented by the Contractor(s). Security measures may include security lighting on temporary site compounds and permanent structures; and security fencing, including the Cable Route Corridor.* *With these security measures in place the Proposed Development is not anticipated to result in an increase in*

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				crime. There is no evidence that the presence of a solar farm leads to increased crime within surrounding communities
SOC-22	RR-0599, RR-0962, RR-0714, RR-0309, RR-1457, RR-0142, RR-0135, RR-0559, RR-1337, RR-0878, RR-0082, RR-0929	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondents expressed concern for potential impacts to **Birkin Fisheries and Tea Rooms**.	Birkin Fisheries Tea Room has been assessed within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]**, with further detail provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.1: Socioeconomic Receptors Impact Assessment [APP-177]**. The assessment identifies the receptor as having a medium sensitivity to change, reflecting its role as a local business with some reliance on its surrounding environment and amenity to attract customers. Given its close proximity (approximately 20 m) to the Order Limits, the potential for construction activities, including increased HGV movements along Haddlesey Road and associated noise, disturbance and changes in the setting of outdoor seating areas, has been identified as resulting in a medium magnitude of impact. This leads to an initial significance of effect of moderate adverse. The Applicant acknowledges that these effects are of concern to the operation of the business, particularly in relation to temporary changes in amenity during the construction phase. However, these effects are temporary and localised to the construction period. It is also noted that these effects would not occur for the entirety of the construction period but only whilst works are occurring in this area. As a result, targeted mitigation is identified in **Section 13.10.5 of ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]**,

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				including measures to manage HGV routing and timing of movements to reduce interaction with receptors, provide advance notice of periods of higher construction activity, and consider the use of temporary screening along the Order Limits to reduce visual disturbance. These measures are designed to directly address the key pathways through which effects may occur (i.e. noise, traffic and visual amenity). With these measures in place, the magnitude of impact is reduced, such that the residual effect is assessed as minor adverse and not significant. This reflects that, whilst some short-term disruption may still occur, the business will remain operational, access will be maintained, and the overall amenity impacts will be limited in duration and extent. **Section 2.14 of the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** further sets out the approach to communication and liaison with affected receptors. This includes the implementation of a Stakeholder Communications Plan and the appointment of a Community Liaison Officer, who will provide a point of contact for local businesses and enable advance notification of works in proximity to receptors such as Birkin Fisheries Tea Room, allowing any concerns to be raised and managed proactively during the construction period.
SOC-23	RR-1168, RR-1051, RR-0847	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondents expressed concern about loss of recreation, including walking and running, around Common Lane.	The impact of the Proposed Development on Footpaths surround Common Lane has been assessed within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]. ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.1: Socioeconomic Receptors Impact Assessment [APP-177]** and the **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPROWMP) [APP-199]** outline the assessed impacts of the Proposed Development on these Public Rights of Way. The **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPROWMP) [APP-199]** details that wherever practicable, Public Rights of Way will remain open, and if temporary closure is required, alternative permissive paths will be installed to ensure there is no loss of recreation. Further information can be found in Section 3 of the document. The Applicant has embedded mitigation measures to maintain the amenity of PRoW, 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 [APP-051]** as well as the provision of new permissive paths. With mitigation, views of the Proposed Development from PRoW will be filtered. In addition, measures have been identified to minimise disruption and

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				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) [APP-199]** submitted as part of the Application.
SOC-24	RR-1041, RR-0514	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondents expressed concern about the recreational impact to Wistow, particularly on single track lanes with little traffic and circular routes for people to enjoy.	The impact of the Proposed Development on the recreational lanes and circular routes around Wistow have been assessed within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]. ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.1: Socioeconomic Receptors Impact Assessment [APP-177]** and the **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPROWMP) [APP-199]** outline the assessed impacts of the Proposed Development on these Public Rights of Way. The **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPROWMP) [APP-199]** details that wherever practicable, Public Rights of Way will remain open, and if temporary closure is required, alternative permissive paths will be installed to ensure there is no loss of recreation. Further information can be found in Section 3 of the document. With regard to public access, the Applicant has embedded mitigation measures to maintain the amenity of PRoW, 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 [APP-051]** as well as the provision of new permissive paths. With mitigation, views of the Proposed Development from PRoW will be filtered. 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) [APP-199]** submitted as part of the Application. An Outline Construction **Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** has been prepared, which includes measures to minimise impacts during construction, including reducing HGV movements during the peak hours and speed management measures where required. The final CTMP will be agreed with North Yorkshire Council prior to construction and will include measures to manage construction traffic and ensure that vehicles operate in a controlled manner on rural roads.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Measures will also be included to control vehicle speeds and ensure safe interaction with other road users, including those accessing adjacent land and properties. Given the presence of sensitive land uses in this location, the final CTMP and Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) will take account of these constraints to ensure that movements are undertaken in a controlled and proportionate manner, minimising disruption to single track users. Appropriate passing points will be implemented to ensure users can safely access single track roads where HGVs are present.
SOC-25	RR-0983, RR-0724	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondents enquired whether access will be maintained to walk from Birkin to Gateforth Woods.	Access will be maintained to walk from Birkin to Gateforth Woods. The **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPROWMP) [APP-199]** identifies that the Footpath leading from Birkin to Gateforth woods is 35.10/2/1, which travels directly through Solar Development Site 4. The PRoW will not however be closed during construction, although it may experience temporary disruption due to vehicle crossings. As well as this, two new permissive paths are being put in, as outlined in section 4.2.10 and 4.2.11, which will improve accessibility from this footpath to other Public Rights of Way within the local area, improving connections to Gateforth Woods.
SOC-26	RR-0656, RR-0545	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondents expressed concern about the potential loss of outdoor access, particularly where existing footpaths in Site 4 may be overtaken by solar panel development.	Outdoor access will be maintained around Solar Development Site 4. The **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPROWMP) [APP-199]** identifies three new Permissive Paths for Pedestrians, Cyclists and Equestrians in proximity to this Solar Development site, in sections 4.2.10, 4.2.11 and 4.2.12. As well as this, no PRoW are anticipated to need closure during construction of the Proposed Development, so any disruption to access will be short-term and localised. Existing footpaths may experience disruption as construction vehicles need to cross – these are identified in table 3-1. With regard to public access, the Applicant has embedded mitigation measures to maintain the amenity of PRoW, 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 [APP-051]** as well as the provision of new permissive paths. With mitigation, views of the Proposed Development from PRoW will be filtered. 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.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				These are set out in the **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPROWMP) [APP-199]** submitted as part of the Application.
SOC-27	RR-0615	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondent expressed opposition to the removal of the California Dog Field on Common Lane and covering it as part of the Proposed Development.	The Applicant notes that the California Dog Field is not proposed to be removed or directly affected by the Proposed Development. As set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051] and ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.1: Socioeconomic Receptors Impact Assessment [APP-177],** the receptor is located approximately 500 m from the Order Limits and will therefore not experience direct land take or physical change. The assessment identifies the receptor as having a low sensitivity to change and a low magnitude of impact, reflecting its distance from construction activities and the limited potential for any perceptible changes to its baseline conditions. As such, the overall significance of effect is assessed as negligible (not significant). The Applicant acknowledges that concerns have been raised regarding potential loss or change to the use of this facility; however, given the separation distance and absence of direct effects, the Proposed Development will not result in the removal of the dog field, nor will it materially affect its operation or amenity. The **oCEMP [APP-192]** sets out further information on how concerns around receptor impacts can be communicated to the project team.
SOC-28	RR-1079	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondent stated that the Proposed Development will impact **Birkin Church**, which relies on events and weddings.	Birkin Church has been assessed within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]. ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.1: Socioeconomic Receptors Impact Assessment [APP-177],** outlines the assessed impacts of the Proposed Development on this receptor. The receptor is identified as having a low sensitivity to change, reflecting the importance of the environment for its business, and a low adverse impact, due to the temporary and minor changes in amenity caused by construction works being 580m away. As a result, overall impacts to the receptor are considered minor adverse and not significant. Embedded mitigation within the scheme will also contribute to ensuring that the Proposed Development will have no significant impact on Birkin Church. The **oCEMP [APP-192]** sets out these measures, such as: - Best Practicable Means to manage noise impacts.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				- A commitment to put in place a communication strategy for prior warning of activities with the potential to cause disturbance. - Reduce peak numbers of construction workers and movements, where practicable The Applicant also notes that no construction works are currently anticipated to take place on Sunday afternoons or Sundays, which will further reduce the potential for interaction between construction traffic and peak periods of activity associated with church use. The **oCEMP [APP-192]** also sets out further information on how concerns around receptor impacts can be communicated to the project team.
SOC-29	RR-0144	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondent expressed concern for the impact of the Proposed Development on BBM Revolution Cycle Club in Birkin, concern was raised about the impact of the Proposed Development on other cycling clubs in the area.	Cycling clubs in the local area, including BBM Revolution Cycle Club, should not experience any significant impact due to the Proposed Development. This is because as outlined in the **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPROWMP) [APP-199],** only 3 public rights of way will be closed, all around Solar Development Site 1. These will be diverted to ensure they still connect to existing Public Rights of Way, therefore can still be used in a similar and comparable way to existing Public Rights of Way. Section 3.7 of the **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** outlines how traffic will be routed during the construction phase of the Proposed Development. Section 3.13 also outlines working hours for HGVs, detailing when and where these will be most common on the roads, including mitigation to discourage them from travelling during peak hours, The detailed CTMP to be developed will include management to ensure the HGV movements are kept in line with restrictions set out above, therefore reducing the impact on cycling in the local area, when using main roads. As well as this, the **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPROWMP) [APP-199]** lays out six new permissive paths that will be designated as part of the Proposed Development, including three within Solar Development Site 4, near Birkin, all of which will allow access for cyclists.
SOC-30	RR-0708	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondent has expressed concern about recreational access around Station Road in Hambleton.	The impact of the Proposed Development on recreational access around Hambleton has been assessed within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]. ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.1: Socioeconomic Receptors**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Impact Assessment [APP-177] and the **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPROWMP) [APP-199]** outline the assessed impacts of the Proposed Development on Public Rights of Way around Hambleton. The **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPROWMP) [APP-199]** details that wherever practicable, Public Rights of Way will remain open, and if temporary closure is required, alternative permissive paths will be installed to ensure there is no loss of recreation. Further information can be found in Section 3 of the document. With regard to public access, the Applicant has embedded mitigation measures to maintain the amenity of PRoW, 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 [APP-051]** as well as the provision of new permissive paths. With mitigation, views of the Proposed Development from PRoW will be filtered. 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) [APP-199]** submitted as part of the Application. The **oCEMP [APP-192]** sets out further information on how concerns around receptor impacts can be communicated to the project team.
SOC-31	RR-1297	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	[South Milford Royal British Legion]: Our members will be unable to use the outside amenities.	The Royal British Legion Club has been assessed within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]**, with further detail provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.1: Socioeconomic Receptors Impact Assessment [APP-177].** The receptor is located approximately 910 m from the Order Limits and is separated from the Proposed Development by existing infrastructure, including local roads and the railway line. At this distance, construction activities would not give rise to perceptible levels of noise, dust or visual disturbance that would affect the use of the Club's outdoor amenities. Whilst the receptor is identified as having a medium sensitivity due to its community value, the magnitude of impact is assessed as negligible given the absence of a clear pathway for effects to occur.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The assessment therefore concludes that the impact on the Royal British Legion Club would be minor adverse and not significant, and the Proposed Development would not prevent or materially affect the continued use of its outside facilities.
SOC-32	RR-1059	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondent stated that the Proposed Development threatens to drive residents out of the area, even though there isn't affordable housing in nearby towns / cities.	**ES Volume 1, Chapter 18 – Conclusions and Summary of Effects [APP-056]** provides a high level summary of the potential significant environmental effects of the Proposed Development. This highlights, that aside from the identified temporary landscape and visual effects during construction there are not assessed to be any other significant environmental effects on the houses and communities nearby. Environmental effects are even less during operation with visual impacts, following mitigation, only affecting one residential property and a handful of PRoWs that run directly through or adjacent to Solar Development Sites. As a result, there is no reason for local people to move out of the area. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]** sets out that the demand from workers on local housing will be 4% of the Private Rental Sector stock. This level of demand is considered absorbable within the existing rental market, and therefore the impact of workers on local accommodation was assessed not to be significant. During operation and maintenance these numbers will be even lower, and negligible in terms of impact on the private rental sector.
SOC-33	RR-1121	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondent expressed concern that the cricket club which uses the same field as Monk Fryston United Football Club has not been included as a receptor for socio-economics, adds that this proves the research and assessments were done poorly.	While Monk Fryston Cricket Club has not been assessed as an independent receptor, as it uses the same facilities as Monk Fryston Football Club, the impact has been included in one entry to avoid double counting. We acknowledge and accept any frustration around both sporting entities not being explicitly referenced. Regrettably this matter was not brought to our attention during non-statutory or statutory consultations, however the impacts on the physical receptor asset, being the playing field, are judged to be the same for both the Football and Cricket Clubs given it is a shared facility. As such there is no gap in the assessment of receptor assets through the Environmental Statement. The error in not including Monk Fryston Cricket Club does not undermine the integrity of the assessment, as the methodology remains robust and impartial. The playing field used by Monk Fryston United Football Club (and the cricket club) has been assessed within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]. ES Volume 3, Appendix 13.1: Socioeconomic Receptors Impact**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Assessment [APP-177], outlines the assessed impacts of the Proposed Development on this receptor. The receptor is identified as having a medium sensitivity to change, reflecting the importance of the environment for its operations as well as its limited options for substitution, and a low adverse impact, due to the temporary and minor changes in amenity caused by construction works being 365m away. As a result, overall impacts to the receptor are considered minor adverse and not significant, due to the distance from the Proposed Development. The **oCEMP [APP-192]** sets out further information on how concerns around receptor impacts can be communicated to the project team.
SOC-34	RR-0983	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondent enquired whether there would be walkways provided to walk to church or the Birkin Fisheries and Ponds.	Section 4.2 of the **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPROWMP) [APP-199]** provides details of new permissive paths which are designed to improve accessibility and connectivity within the local area. This includes new routes between existing PRoW, the formation of new circular walking routes, and opportunities for pedestrian, cyclist and, where appropriate, equestrian use, thereby enhancing the overall recreational network. Whilst the permissive paths do not explicitly provide a direct route linking Birkin Fisheries, St Mary's Church and the ponds, the Applicant notes that the Proposed Development includes new off-road connections in the wider area, including routes parallel to Wood Lane and along Haddlesey Road, which connect existing PRoW and provide alternative walking routes away from the road network. These routes therefore assist in improving access and provide enhanced recreational opportunities for users. The Applicant therefore considers that, rather than resulting in a loss of amenity, the Proposed Development introduces new routes and improves the connectivity and usability of the PRoW network. The proposals have been discussed and informed through engagement with relevant stakeholders as set out in the oPROWMP, and the detailed design will be finalised within the PRoW Management Plan (PRoWMP).
SOC-35	RR-1051	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	**[BoR numbers: 14-025]**: Respondent stated that access to their home would effectively involve travelling through an industrial construction environment along an adopted highway, which they consider inappropriate and a significant loss of amenity.	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding the changes to the character of routes through the landscape that would affect the amenity of users. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual [APP-048]** recognises that the Proposed Development would result in the introduction of construction activity that would include the presence and movement of construction plant, the excavation of cable

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				corridors and the installation of above ground infrastructure. The LVIA identifies these effects as temporary and reversible, reflecting the short-term nature of the construction phase. Paragraph 5.10.5 of EN-1 notes 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*". As noted in paragraph 10.8.3 of Chapter 10, the LVIA has been key to achieving the criteria for good design set out in NPS EN-1 and the NSIP Advice on Good Design (The Planning Inspectorate 2024) and this has been a key consideration from the outset, including with respect to the siting of infrastructure. Chapter 10 details embedded mitigation measures which would mitigate the effects of the Proposed Development on the landscape, reducing the significance of adverse effects and maximise opportunities for beneficial effects. This will be secured through the measures set out in the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]** and the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]**. As shown on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans (OEM) [PDA-003 to PDA-010]** and secured in the **Works Plans [AS-004]**, the solar development will be set back from Common Lane generally by more than 10 metres and separated from the road by retained vegetation as well as proposed mitigation planting. Existing trees, hedgerows and other landscape features along the road have been retained wherever possible and incorporated into the design. Additionally, substantial landscape mitigation is proposed, including reinforcement of existing hedgerows and the establishment of new native hedgerows and trees along Common Lane and the wider Site. These measures have been specifically designed to strengthen the existing landscape framework, filter views of infrastructure and assist the integration of the Proposed Development into its surroundings. As recognised in the LVIA, the greatest effects will occur during construction and the early years of operation before mitigation planting has become established. Over time, as planting matures, views will become increasingly filtered and softened, reducing the perception of development from Common Lane and strengthening the rural character of the route. The **oCEMP [APP-192]** sets out further information on how concerns around impacts can be communicated to the project team.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
SOC-36	RR-0784	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	**[BoR numbers 08-033]**: Respondent expressed specific concern that their property value will be devalued due to its proximity to the Proposed Development.	The Applicant has submitted the **Book of Reference [APP-022].** This includes persons who may be eligible to claim compensation if the Development Consent Order is granted and the Proposed Development developed. Under Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973, property owners (Category 3) are eligible to claim compensation for any physical impacts from the operation of the Proposed Development, such as noise and vibration. However, compensation is not available for loss of value due to visual impacts or diminished views—this is consistent with established planning law. The Applicant will comply with statutory process for any compensation claims submitted and will review and assess each claim in accordance with the relevant legislation under which it is made.
SOC-37	RR-0674	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	**[BoR numbers 14-016, 14-019, 14-020]**: Respondent expressed specific concern that their property value will be devalued due to its proximity to the Proposed Development.	The Applicant has submitted the **Book of Reference [APP-022].** This includes persons who may be eligible to claim compensation if the Development Consent Order is granted and the Proposed Development developed. Under Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973, property owners (Category 3) are eligible to claim compensation for any physical impacts from the operation of the Proposed Development, such as noise and vibration. However, compensation is not available for loss of value due to visual impacts or diminished views—this is consistent with established planning law. The Applicant will comply with statutory process for any compensation claims submitted and will review and assess each claim in accordance with the relevant legislation under which it is made.
SOC-38	RR-1131	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	**[BoR Cat 3]**: Respondent expressed specific concern that their property value will be devalued due to its proximity to the Proposed Development.	The Applicant has submitted the **Book of Reference [APP-022].** This includes persons who may be eligible to claim compensation if the Development Consent Order is granted and the Proposed Development developed. Under Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973, property owners (Category 3) are eligible to claim compensation for any physical impacts from the operation of the Proposed Development, such as noise and vibration.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				However, compensation is not available for loss of value due to visual impacts or diminished views—this is consistent with established planning law. The Applicant will comply with statutory process for any compensation claims submitted and will review and assess each claim in accordance with the relevant legislation under which it is made.
SOC-39	RR-0211	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondent expressed concern that Site 7 includes public footpaths and recreational routes used by the community. Respondent considered that the Proposed Development would enclose and affect these routes, resulting in a loss of amenity.	Detail on the impact on Public Rights of Way around Site 7 can be found in the **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPROWMP) [APP-199].** Footpath 35.59/5/1, which led along the Northern edge of SDS 7 has been subject to a separate Rail Crossing Extinguishment Order, under Section 118A of the Highways Act 1980., promoted by Network Rail (Order reference: ROW/3344780) The decision to close the path was confirmed by the Planning Inspectorate in November 2025. The Applicant has committed to an additional permissive path to be created around Solar Development Site 7, connecting to Common Lane and onward to PRoW 35.59/6/1 to the south, see **Outline Environmental Masterplan - Site 6 & 7 [PDA-009]**. The design and implementation of the permissive paths is set out in the **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPROWMP) [APP-199]** and **oLEMP [APP-195]** and secured by a Requirement in the **Draft DCO [APP-017]**. The oLEMP outlines measures for establishing and maintaining the amenity value of new permissive paths through measures including regular maintenance and planting. The final detail of all permissive path including signage, surfacing and widths will be agreed in advance with North Yorkshire Council as part of approval of the detailed LEMP(s).
SOC-40	RR-1459	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondent expressed concern for potential impacts to their business, Zk Performance ltd, during the construction phase and in relation to traffic.	Zk Performance ltd has not been identified as a receptor within the study area for socioeconomics, and was not brought to our attention during non-statutory and statutory consultation. A search on Companies House indicated a presence of a company with the same name registered in York, but we are unsure if this is the receptor being raised. If premises are located at the business address, this would place them 16km away from the Proposed development, where

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				they would feel minimal traffic impact. The only main road nearby that may experience traffic impacts is the A64, but even there it is unlikely there will be a change in traffic volumes that would impact business deliveries as changes of less than 10% can reasonably assumed to be within the expected range of daily fluctuation and would go unnoticed to the majority of other road users. The Applicant invites Zk Performance Ltd to get in touch and provide more information on where they are located if they have further concerns.
SOC-41	RR-0314	Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism	Respondent expressed concern regarding the impact the construction of the cable may have on the Public Right of Way between Escrick and Hambleton.	No Public Rights of Way between Hambleton and Escrick have been identified to be stopped up and diverted, as set out in the **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPROWMP) [APP-199].** During the construction period, there may be minor disruption to Public Rights of Way where construction vehicles use them as crossings, but these are likely to be minor and temporary in nature. For example, there may be instances where temporary closures may be necessary, due to practical and safety purposes while work is ongoing. The PRoWs will need to be managed, and a range of proposed measures have been identified as follows: Wider access tracks will be considered to ensure vehicles can pass all PRoW users safely or temporary fences will be put in to segregate PRoW users; Appropriate signage will be installed along the PRoW to make PRoW users aware of the construction activity. This will include: - Information on construction times and contact details for the Site Manager; - The provision of banksmen to hold vehicles if a PRoW user is present and advise PRoW users of the presence of construction vehicles; - Vehicle speeds across and on the approach to the PRoW to be limited to 10mph; - Drivers will stop at all PRoW crossings; and - The PRoW will be kept clear of construction vehicles and apparatus outside of permitted construction hours so far as is practicable.

2.24 Transport and Access

Transport and Access – General Comments

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Transport and Access - General Comments				
TRA-01	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-0112, RR-0129, RR-1059, RR-0781, RR-1194, RR-0241, RR-0751, RR-0834, RR-0903, RR-0774, RR-1271, RR-1201, RR-1403, RR-0050, RR-0207, RR-1080, RR-1450, RR-0375, RR-0842, RR-0700, RR-0101, RR-0032, RR-1146, RR-0385, RR-1096, RR-0588, RR-1388, RR-0775, RR-0599, RR-1220, RR-1355, RR-1078, RR-0292, RR-1060, RR-0450, RR-0615, RR-1346, RR-0519, RR-1277, RR-1035, RR-0057, RR-1272, RR-0307, RR-0956, RR-0061, RR-1261, RR-0695, RR-0186, RR-0519, RR-1040, RR-0927, RR-0406, RR-1090, RR-0714, RR-0704, RR-1094, RR-0868, RR-0255, RR-0178, RR-0764, RR-1262, RR-0521, RR-1293, RR-1434, RR-0804, RR-0287, RR-0308, RR-0498, RR-0138, RR-0797, RR-0301, RR-1141, RR-1294, RR-1152, RR-0900, RR-1462, RR-0141, RR-0949, RR-0343, RR-0604, RR-0396, RR-0945, RR-1105, RR-0157, RR-1358, RR-0670, RR-1016, RR-1111, RR-0049, RR-1066, RR-0214, RR-1162, RR-0056, RR-0334, RR-0790, RR-0873, RR-0490, RR-1126, RR-0883, RR-0682, RR-0228, RR-0976, RR-0888, RR-0123, RR-0864, RR-0121, RR-1008, RR-1104, RR-0427, RR-1115, RR-1399, RR-0237, RR-0238, RR-0762, RR-0058, RR-0568, RR-0810, RR-0023, RR-0370, RR-0556, RR-0063, RR-0726, RR-1254, RR-1309, RR-1041, RR-0505, RR-0908, RR-0768, RR-0384, RR-1275, RR-0642, RR-0607, RR-0628, RR-0417, RR-1101, RR-1284, RR-0286, RR-0075, RR-1405, RR-0376, RR-0102, RR-0627, RR-1145, RR-0487, RR-0650, RR-1222, RR-0182, RR-0733, RR-0201, RR-1242, RR-0279, RR-1369, RR-1003, RR-0302, RR-1329, RR-0816, RR-0822, RR-0352, RR-0402, RR-1290, RR-1032, RR-1047, RR-1073, RR-1010, RR-0235, RR-1324, RR-0673, RR-0713, RR-1154, RR-0848,	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed concern about the Proposed Development's impact on **increased traffic and general disruption** to roads during construction. Respondents have asked for more information on the traffic impact during construction.	The Applicant notes this comment. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement [APP-052]** presents the impact assessment undertaken for traffic and details the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development on traffic and movement. The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** has been prepared to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction. The conclusions of the TA are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network. There are consequently no transport related reasons why the Proposed Development should not be granted consent. An **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, [APP-201])** has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic, based on the findings of the TA These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas. The oCTMP also includes measures to minimise impacts during construction by reducing HGV movements during the peak hours and managing employee movements. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement [APP-052]** includes mitigation measures including the already mentioned implementation of an **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, [APP-201])** to formalise measures mitigating construction-related effects; the provision of suitable access points for construction vehicles; and the provision of appropriate protection or separation between existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) and construction routes where necessary. Further measures include restricting HGV and Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) movements to designated routes, undertaking improvement works where required to facilitate AIL access, and allowing within the Order Limits for the provision of passing places on narrow rural roads to enable the safe movement of construction vehicles. Where needed, these passing places would be located away from residential properties.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	RR-0742, RR-0488, RR-0425, RR-1109, RR-0086, RR-0803, RR-1378, RR-0333, RR-0527, RR-0130, RR-0867, RR-1263, RR-0191, RR-0480, RR-0329, RR-0470, RR-1285, RR-0097, RR-1199, RR-0053, RR-0076, RR-0417, RR-0591, RR-0712, RR-0718, RR-1334, RR-1377, RR-0447, RR-1193, RR-1245, RR-1129, RR-1207, RR-0046, RR-1302, RR-0277, RR-0504, RR-0478, RR-1270, RR-0142, RR-0882, RR-0249, RR-1445, RR-0087, RR-1266, RR-1049, RR-0919, RR-0089, RR-0579, RR-0634, RR-0897, RR-1374, RR-0749, RR-0161, RR-0081, RR-0577, RR-0686, RR-0271, RR-1297, RR-0784, RR-1006, RR-0115, RR-1137, RR-0335, RR-0230, RR-0587, RR-0229, RR-0063, RR-0838, RR-0239, RR-0659, RR-0701, RR-0594, RR-0941, RR-1331, RR-0845, RR-1307, RR-1372, RR-0323, RR-0880, RR-0780, RR-1291, RR-1368, RR-0298, RR-1305, RR-0542, RR-0185, RR-0779, RR-0461, RR-0145, RR-0146, RR-1447, RR-0850, RR-0558, RR-0445, RR-0028, RR-0194, RR-1345, RR-0203, RR-1182, RR-0996, RR-0648, RR-0702, RR-0837, RR-1423, RR-1025, RR-0074, RR-0829, RR-0743, RR-1099, RR-0734, RR-0696, RR-1427, RR-1314, RR-1055, RR-1320, RR-1370, RR-0600, RR-0067, RR-1417, RR-0921, RR-1061, RR-0479, RR-0380, RR-0505, RR-0709, RR-1233, RR-1461, RR-0766, RR-0049, RR-1066, RR-1162, RR-0354, RR-0238, RR-0760, RR-0747, RR-0452, RR-0649, RR-0944, RR-0805, RR-0158, RR-0451, RR-0236, RR-0559, RR-1087, RR-0787, RR-0066, RR-0561, RR-0205, RR-0502, RR-0946, RR-1337, RR-0937, RR-0765, RR-1000, RR-0372, RR-0381, RR-1043, RR-0666, RR-0202, RR-1168, RR-1124, RR-0361, RR-0426, RR-1431, RR-1185, RR-0911, RR-1459, RR-0629, RR-0071, RR-0311, RR-1042, RR-0001, RR-1004, RR-0093, RR-1062, RR-1426, RR-0500, RR-0196, RR-0469, RR-1432, RR-1429, RR-0283, RR-0017, RR-0464, RR-1327, RR-1339, RR-0262, RR-0192, RR-0234, RR-0753, RR-0721, RR-0082,			Temporary Traffic Management (TTM) measures would also be implemented where required.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	RR-0383, RR-0036, RR-0234, RR-0585, RR-0408, RR-0136, RR-0571, RR-0272, RR-0817, RR-0068, RR-1251, RR-0555, RR-0647, RR-0811, RR-0509, RR-1023, RR-1414, RR-0967, RR-0031, RR-0645, RR-0885, RR-0198, RR-0164, RR-0973, RR-1322, RR-1306, RR-0303, RR-1387, RR-1338			
TRA-02	RR-0112, RR-0751, RR-0834, RR-0050, RR-1080, RR-0466, RR-0375, RR-0842, RR-0032, RR-1146, RR-0775, RR-1355, RR-1078, RR-1060, RR-0450, RR-1277, RR-1035, RR-0057, RR-0307, RR-0519, RR-0704, RR-1094, RR-0178, RR-0764, RR-1238, RR-0521, RR-1293, RR-1434, RR-0498, RR-0797, RR-0301, RR-1141, RR-1294, RR-1152, RR-0900, RR-1462, RR-0141, RR-0949, RR-0604, RR-0670, RR-1111, RR-0268, RR-0334, RR-0103, RR-1008, RR-0213, RR-0427, RR-1399, RR-0238, RR-1235, RR-0370, RR-1158, RR-0847, RR-1309, RR-0854, RR-0908, RR-1014, RR-0642, RR-0607, RR-1376, RR-0628, RR-0417, RR-0159, RR-1284, RR-1405, RR-0376, RR-1145, RR-0487, RR-1222, RR-1148, RR-0733, RR-1047, RR-0235, RR-1324, RR-1154, RR-0848, RR-0488, RR-0425, RR-0086, RR-0803, RR-1378, RR-0527, RR-0130, RR-0867, RR-1263, RR-1285, RR-0097, RR-0053, RR-0983, RR-0076, RR-0534, RR-0591, RR-1245, RR-1207, RR-1302, RR-0277, RR-1457, RR-0478, RR-0142, RR-0328, RR-0089, RR-1027, RR-0161, RR-0405, RR-0609, RR-0081, RR-0784, RR-1137, RR-0230, RR-1308, RR-0239, RR-0659, RR-0594, RR-0845, RR-1372, RR-0780, RR-0298, RR-0185, RR-0779, RR-0461, RR-0145, RR-0445, RR-1345, RR-0996, RR-0589, RR-1423, RR-1025, RR-0074, RR-1055, RR-1370, RR-0600, RR-1417, RR-0720, RR-0709, RR-0211, RR-1233, RR-0354, RR-0238, RR-0760, RR-0452, RR-0649, RR-0944, RR-1364, RR-0863, RR-0158, RR-0066, RR-0642, RR-1337, RR-0937, RR-0765, RR-1000, RR-0381, RR-1013, RR-0426, RR-0671, RR-0911,	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed **safety concerns** regarding an increased **risk of accidents and injury** as a result of construction vehicles and increased traffic associated with the Proposed Development. Respondents highlighted they are concerned about the safety of children, horse riders, pedestrians, dog walkers and cyclists	The Applicant notes this comment. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement [APP-052]** presents the impact assessment undertaken for traffic and details the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development on traffic and movement. The ES includes an assessment of road safety and fear and intimidation. The review of baseline accidents and safety conditions concluded that there was no evidence of accident clustering within the Study Area that would indicate significant road safety concerns. The assessment demonstrates that construction traffic associated with the Proposed Development would result in relatively small and temporary increases in traffic flows on the local network. On this basis, the magnitude of change is not considered sufficient to materially alter existing road safety conditions or increase the likelihood of accidents. The assessment of fear and intimidation in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement [APP-052]** calculates a 'degree of hazard' score, which takes into account the average two-way flow, the HGV composition and vehicle speed. The assessment shows that the majority of road links within the study area have a 'Small' or 'Moderate' level of fear and intimidation in both the baseline and 'with construction' scenarios. There are roads that are classified as having a 'Great' level of fear and intimidation in the baseline, including Wheldrake Lane, Wistow Road and Dam Lane, reflecting their existing traffic characteristics. Across all assessed links, there is no step change in the category of fear and intimidation as a result of the Proposed Development. All routes assessed experience the same level of fear and intimidation with the Proposed Development as in the baseline. Therefore, the temporary increase in traffic during the construction phase is not expected to significantly alter levels of fear and intimidation.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	RR-0629, RR-1062, RR-1426, RR-0500, RR-0196, RR-0283, RR-1339, RR-1243, RR-0739, RR-1203, RR-0383, RR-0916, RR-0234, RR-0585, RR-0272, RR-1251, RR-0647, RR-0509, RR-1414, RR-1131, RR-0031, RR-1282, RR-0645, RR-0303,			The Applicant reiterates its commitment to road safety and notes that, with implementation of the final version of the **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]**, roads would be no less safe than they currently are. Construction activities affecting these routes would be temporary and managed through the implementation of the CTMP. Measures may include temporary diversions, signage, traffic management, routing strategies and timing restrictions to maintain safety for all users and, where practicable, reduce interaction between construction traffic and pedestrians. In addition, the Proposed Development includes the provision of Highway Improvement Areas (HIAs). HIAs are sections of the highway network where localised improvements are proposed, such as improvements to deteriorated road edges, provision of temporary passing places within the existing highway boundary, traffic management measures, provision of visibility splays, and temporary highway and traffic works required to safely accommodate Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) deliveries. While these measures will facilitate the movement of construction traffic, including AILs, they will also enhance road safety and the general usability of the highway network for all road users. For example, the provision of passing places on narrower roads will enable regular traffic and construction vehicles to pass each other more safely and efficiently. Accordingly, appropriate mitigation would be in place to ensure there is no increased risk of accidents on the road network during the construction phase of the Proposed Development, and the temporary construction traffic associated with the Proposed Development is not expected to significantly affect existing road safety conditions or levels of fear and intimidation. There is also an Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (oPROWMP) [APP-199] which sets out measures that will be put in place to manage impacts on users of recreational routes including pedestrians, children, horseriders, dog walkers and cyclists during construction. There are instances where the works and associated tracks cross PRoWs within the Order Limits. In these instances, public access to PRoWs will be retained so far as is practicable to do so. However, the PRoWs will be managed throughout the construction period through the use of techniques such as widening paths, providing banksmen, appropriate signage and reduced speed limits to ensure the safety of all users. These measures will be outlined further in the detailed PRoWMP.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
TRA-03	RR-1201, RR-1403, RR-1362, RR-0050, RR-0471, RR-0842, RR-0700, RR-0588, RR-0599, RR-1220, RR-1078, RR-0615, RR-1277, RR-1035, RR-0057, RR-0956, RR-0695, RR-0519, RR-0714, RR-0704, RR-1094, RR-0255, RR-0178, RR-0764, RR-1293, RR-0797, RR-1152, RR-1462, RR-0604, RR-0945, RR-0157, RR-1358, RR-1016, RR-0297, RR-0268, RR-0056, RR-0873, RR-0103, RR-0682, RR-0864, RR-0213, RR-0427, RR-1115, RR-1399, RR-0237, RR-0058, RR-0370, RR-1166, RR-1405, RR-1145, RR-0650, RR-1222, RR-0182, RR-0733, RR-1242, RR-1329, RR-0816, RR-0822, RR-0352, RR-0402, RR-1047, RR-0713, RR-1154, RR-0086, RR-0803, RR-0130, RR-0480, RR-1017, RR-1139, RR-0504, RR-0142, RR-0897, RR-0749, RR-0161, RR-1137, RR-0335, RR-0230, RR-0659, RR-0594, RR-1307, RR-1305, RR-0185, RR-0445, RR-0203, RR-1345, RR-0996, RR-0648, RR-0374, RR-0696, RR-1314, RR-1055, RR-1370, RR-0600, RR-0966, RR-1417, RR-0921, RR-0380, RR-1461, RR-0214RR-0354, RR-0238, RR-1364, RR-1087, RR-0827, RR-0066, RR-1365, RR-0205, RR-1337, RR-0937, RR-0765, RR-1000, RR-0372, RR-0381, RR-1062, RR-0500, RR-0469, RR-1432, RR-0464, RR-0272, RR-0571,RR-0817, RR-0068, RR-0647, RR-0509, RR-1023, RR-1414, RR-1131, RR-0645, RR-0885, RR-0198, RR-0164, RR-0973, RR-1322, RR-1306, RR-0303, RR-1387	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed concern that construction vehicles, including HGVs and Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs), could cause **damage to local roads and verges.** Some respondents also queried whether any damage arising from construction traffic, including potholes, would be repaired.	An Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) Assessment is included in **Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** and considers the suitability of roads for abnormal indivisible loads. AIL movements will be managed by a specialist haulage company so that the potential effects are mitigated. In addition, to ensure minimal impact upon on the local road network, AIL vehicle movements will be undertaken during off-peak times and delivered in convoy, whenever practicable, to minimise incidents of disruption. This will be coordinated with the local highways authorities and police prior to being undertaken, with the final routes subject to agreement with highways authorities. It has been identified that some highway improvement works are required to facilitate access to the Proposed Development during the construction period for AILs. Highways Improvements Areas, as shown in **ES Volume 2, Figure 1.2 [APP-058]** are sections of the highway network that will contain localised improvements, such as improvements to the road edge where it is deteriorated, and provision of temporary passing places within the existing highways boundary, traffic management, and provision of visibility splays, or temporary highway and traffic works required to safely accommodate the AIL deliveries and other construction vehicles. These areas will support the movement of construction vehicles on narrower sections of the local highway network within parts of the construction vehicle routes to the Site and, to the extent that the AIL dimensions and sizing still require these changes to be made at the time of construction, the relevant Highways Improvement Areas works must take place prior to the relevant AIL movements which could affect those areas. **ES Volume 1 Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement [APP-052]** includes a host of mitigation measures including the implementation of an **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, [APP-201])** to formalise measures mitigating construction-related effects. This includes a requirement for a road condition survey to be carried out prior to commencement of construction. The survey scope, including the routes to be surveyed, would be agreed with NYC prior to a road condition survey being undertaken.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The Applicant notes that any sections of highway used by construction traffic or abnormal load movements would be returned to their original condition, or as agreed with the relevant highway authority, following completion of the works. On this basis, the Applicant considers that risks associated with abnormal load movements can be appropriately managed through established processes and controls.
TRA-04	RR-1029, RR-0573, RR-0411, RR-0834, RR-1362, RR-0050, RR-1080, RR-0466, RR-0471, RR-0842, RR-0700, RR-0032, RR-1146, RR-0588, RR-0775, RR-0599, RR-1220, RR-1355, RR-1078, RR-0788, RR-1060, RR-0450, RR-0615, RR-0661, RR-1277, RR-1035, RR-0057, RR-0307, RR-0956, RR-0061, RR-0519, RR-0320, RR-1040, RR-0714, RR-0704, RR-1094, RR-0255, RR-0178, RR-0764, RR-1238, RR-1434, RR-0804, RR-0287, RR-0498, RR-0138, RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-1293, RR-0797, RR-1294, RR-1152, RR-0900, RR-0141, RR-0949, RR-0343,RR-0604, RR-0945, RR-0157, RR-1358, RR-0670, RR-1016, RR-1111, RR-0214, RR-0790, RR-0490, RR-1126, RR-0681, RR-0682, RR-0228, RR-0427, RR-1115, RR-1399, RR-0237, RR-0238, RR-0058, RR-0827, RR-0062, RR-1254, RR-0768, RR-1014, RR-0642, RR-1166, RR-0628, RR-0417, RR-1405, RR-0376, RR-0102, RR-1145, RR-0487, RR-1222, RR-0182, RR-0201, RR-1242, RR-1369, RR-1003, RR-0816, RR-0822, RR-0352, RR-0402, RR-1047, RR-1073, RR-1010, RR-1324, RR-0848, RR-1109, RR-1378, RR-0333, RR-1263, RR-0191, RR-0480, RR-1285, RR-1017, RR-1139, RR-1245, RR-0504, RR-1270, RR-0142, RR-0459, RR-0087, RR-1026, RR-1266, RR-0919, RR-0634, RR-0897, RR-0749, RR-0161, RR-0405, RR-0609, RR-0577, RR-0081, RR-1464, RR-0271, RR-0784, RR-1137, RR-0276, RR-0335, RR-0230, RR-0063, RR-0239, RR-0659, RR-0183, RR-0594, RR-1307, RR-1372, RR-1064, RR-0323, RR-0025, RR-0780, RR-0298, RR-0779, RR-0445, RR-0203,	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed concern regarding the **capacity** of the local road network and associated infrastructure to accommodate construction traffic. Some respondents have mentioned the **cumulative impact of traffic.**	The Applicant notes this comment. **A Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** has been prepared which assesses the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction. **ES Volume 1 Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement [APP-052]** presents the impact assessment undertaken for traffic and details the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development on traffic and movement. The TA has been prepared to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction. The conclusions of the TA are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network. **An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** has been prepared which identifies the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road network and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas. The oCTMP also includes measures to minimise impacts during construction by reducing HGV movements during peak hours, managing employee movements, and controlling construction vehicle arrival and departure times to avoid network peak hours. The TA demonstrates that the majority of routes within the assessed study area (36 of 43) have an average percentage change in traffic flows, as a result of the Proposed Development, of less than 10%, which is reasonably assumed to be within the expected range of daily fluctuation and would go unnoticed by the majority of road users. The cumulative assessment findings show that none of the committed developments will impact the routes that

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	RR-1345, RR-0648, RR-0221, RR-0619, RR-1423, RR-0582, RR-1099, RR-0696, RR-1314, RR-1370, RR-0067, RR-1417, RR-0921, RR-0380, RR-0709, RR-0211, RR-1233, RR-1461, RR-1065, RR-0889, RR-1437, RR-0760, RR-0452, RR-0190, RR-0551, RR-0649, RR-0944, RR-0158, RR-0451, RR-0236, RR-0559, RR-1087, RR-0827, RR-0066, RR-1365, RR-0205, RR-1337, RR-0937, RR-0765, RR-1000, RR-0372, RR-0381, RR-1043, RR-1168, RR-0595, RR-0426, RR-0911, RR-1459, RR-1217, RR-0321, RR-1004, RR-0093, RR-1062, RR-1426, RR-0950, RR-0500, RR-0469, RR-1432, RR-0283, RR-0464, RR-1327, RR-0753, RR-0082, RR-0916, RR-0036, RR-0234, RR-0408, RR-0136, RR-0272, RR-0817, RR-0068, RR-1206, RR-0647, RR-0509, RR-1023, RR-1414, RR-0645, RR-0885, RR-0198, RR-0164, RR-0973, RR-1322, RR-1306, RR-0303, RR-1056			experience a greater than 10% increase in traffic from the Proposed Development. Furthermore, the Proposed Development typically results in a 1–2% impact on traffic flows on those routes also affected by other committed developments. Construction phasing of all committed developments will also be considered when updating the CTMP, to ensure that the construction routing of traffic associated with the Proposed Development would not have an unacceptable cumulative effect on local traffic conditions. These traffic management measures, to be secured through the detailed CTMP, will further minimise the magnitude of any cumulative impact. Overall, it is considered that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the CTMP, and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network.
TRA-05	RR-0413, RR-1349, RR-0954, RR-0664, RR-0521, RR-0301, RR-0949, RR-1016, RR-1086, RR-0267, RR-0730, RR-0975, RR-1222, RR-1193, RR-0579, RR-0081, RR-1025, RR-0426, RR-0911, RR-0311, RR-0950, RR-0017, RR-1243, RR-0739, RR-0555	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed concern about **access issues to properties, business and/or schools** as a result of the Proposed Development. Individual properties were not specified in the feedback.	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding effects on local businesses. **ES Volume 1 Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]** concludes that no significant adverse socio-economic effects are expected once embedded mitigation and additional mitigation measures are applied. The Applicant will continue dialogue with local businesses to address any project specific queries. As set out in the **Outline CEMP [APP-192]** and the chapter, specific mitigation measures for identified businesses have also been proposed. An **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, [APP-201])** has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas. The oCTMP also includes measures to minimise any impacts during construction by reducing HGV movements during the peak hours and managing employee movements. There are not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network or access issues to properties, businesses or schools.
TRA-06	RR-0956, RR-0949, RR-1237, RR-0650, RR-0669, RR-1301, RR-1320, RR-0805, RR-0622, RR-1185, RR-0321, RR-0647,	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed concern about the impacts of **widening roads** as a result of the Proposed Development.	The Applicant notes this comment. Road widening and the provision of passing places are not proposed as a blanket measure across the highway network. Such works would only

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			This includes the impact on flood risk.	be undertaken where necessary to safely accommodate construction traffic, including HGVs and Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs), and would be limited to specific localised sections of the highway network identified through the **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]**. Highways Improvement Areas (HIAs), as shown in **ES Volume 2, Figure 1.2: Elements of the Proposed Development [APP-058]**, are sections of the highway network that will contain localised improvements such as improvements to the road edge where it is deteriorated, provision of temporary passing places within the existing highway boundary, traffic management measures, provision of visibility splays, and temporary highway and traffic works required to safely accommodate AIL deliveries. These areas support the movement of construction vehicles on narrower sections of the local highway network within parts of the construction vehicle routes to the Site. The works would be temporary, small scale and short in duration. It is not proposed for any widening or straightening of highways to be permanent unless requested to be retained by the Highways Authority. Where required, these works form part of the HIAs and will be designed to minimise their extent and environmental impact where practicable. The environmental effects of such works, including in relation to surface water, drainage, sediment control and flood risk, are addressed through the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]**. The oCEMP sets out the framework for managing environmental impacts during construction, including measures to control surface water runoff, drainage, sediment mobilisation and potential flood risk, alongside monitoring procedures to ensure that construction activities do not give rise to unacceptable effects on the receiving environment. This includes the implementation of appropriate drainage controls, management of runoff and sediment, and monitoring procedures to ensure that construction activities do not give rise to unacceptable effects on the receiving environment. The detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan, secured through the **Draft Development Consent Order [APP-017]**, will include site-specific measures to manage these risks in accordance with the approved framework. Alteration works to roads are not anticipated to affect or worsen flood risk, as set out in the **Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) [APP-179]**, which provides further detail on flood risk

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				considerations. On this basis, any works associated with road widening, passing places or other HIA measures would be carefully controlled and managed to ensure that flood risk and wider environmental effects are appropriately addressed during the construction phase.
TRA-07	RR-1420, RR-0827, RR-1324, RR-1457, RR-0142, RR-0238, RR-0827	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed concern regarding the impact of construction traffic on **local bridges**, citing weight restrictions.	The Applicant is aware of weight restrictions on some routes on the network and has identified construction routes that avoid these weight restrictions. Access routes are detailed in **ES Volume 2, Figure 14.4 Construction Routing [APP-113]**. The Applicant is also aware of consultation undertaken by NYC regarding weight limits in March on some additional routes within the study area. The Applicant is in regular discussion with North Yorkshire Council as the local highway authority in relation to construction traffic and access arrangements. An **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP 201]** has been prepared, which includes measures to minimise impacts during construction, including reducing HGV movements during the peak hours and managing employee movements. The final CTMP will be developed in consultation with and agreed by North Yorkshire Council prior to construction, ensuring that construction traffic is managed in a manner that is appropriate for the local highway network and aligned with the highway authority's requirements.
TRA-08	RR-0956, RR-0949, RR-1237, RR-0417, RR-0919	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed opposition to the **Highways Improvement Areas (HIAs)**, and some suggesting alternative routes be used which require less road alterations, hedge and tree trimming.	The routing of Abnormal Indivisible Loads has been determined through a detailed Abnormal Load Report (Annex C of the **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]**), which considers highway geometry, junction layouts and structural constraints, and identifies the routes that are capable of safely accommodating these vehicles. Given the physical constraints on the highways and within the Order Limits these routes are considered to be the most appropriate routes, with alternatives requiring more road alterations and / or vegetation management. Prior to movement, the abnormal load operator is required to obtain the necessary permits and comply with the relevant procedures set by the highway authorities, which includes consideration of route constraints and structural sensitivities. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement [APP-052]** includes a host of mitigation measures including the implementation of an **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, [APP-201])** to formalise measures mitigating construction-related effects. This

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				includes a requirement for a road condition survey to be carried out prior to commencement of construction. The survey scope, including the routes to be surveyed, would be agreed with NYC prior to a road condition survey being undertaken. The Applicant notes that any sections of highway used by construction traffic or abnormal load movements would be returned to their original condition, or as agreed with the relevant highway authority, following completion of the works. On this basis, the Applicant considers that risks associated with abnormal load movements can be appropriately managed through established processes and controls.
TRA-09	RR-0104, RR-0847, RR-0621	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed concern about a **temporary haul road** being built along the cable route. A respondent expressed concern about this road in Wistow.	The provision of a temporary haul road to install the cable route reduces the number of access points required and limits construction traffic on the public road network. Where there is an access off the public highway, the majority of the Cable Route Corridor access locations will be temporary access locations to access the haul road. Only a small number will remain to allow access for inspections and maintenance during the operational phase, as detailed in Table 4-2 in the **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]**.
TRA-10	RR-1035, RR-0057	Transport and Access	Respondents stated that their community would need clear information on road closures.	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that information on road closures would be communicated in advance through the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), which will include procedures for liaison with the local highway authority and relevant stakeholders. An **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, [APP-201])** has been prepared. In Section 3.2 it outlines roles and responsibilities, including the commitment to a Community Liaison Officer who will be appointed to lead discussions with local communities and also act as the primary point of contact should there be any queries or complaints. Any road closures or temporary traffic management measures would also be notified in the local newspaper at least 7 days in advance. Construction activities affecting these routes would be temporary and managed through the implementation of the CTMP. Measures may include temporary diversions, signage, and traffic management to maintain safety for users. Construction traffic will also be controlled through routing strategies and timing restrictions, minimising impact of construction traffic where practicable.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Any traffic management measures, and the placement of traffic signs (e.g. Chapter 8 of the Traffic Signs Manual: signage for roadworks and temporary situations (Ref 2)) would be agreed with NYC Highways.
TRA-11	RR-1399, RR-0568	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed concern for the impact of traffic during the maintenance of the Proposed Development.	During the operation and maintenance phase of the Proposed Development, there will only be a small number of daily vehicle trips, with additional staff attending when required for maintenance and cleaning activities. The Proposed Development is expected to receive approximately five maintenance visits per month, typically by car, appropriate 4x4 type vehicle or LGVs. HGVs may be required for the ad-hoc replacement of batteries, inverters and transformers associated with the substations and the BESS. As the expected operational traffic is so low, it is considered that no additional mitigation measures are required.
TRA-12	RR-0911, RR-1243	Transport and Access	Respondents enquired whether all suitable access roads have been explored.	The Applicant notes this comment. The routing of construction traffic was developed through an iterative process which first identified sensitive receptors and local constraints, including residential areas, community facilities and roads with limited suitability for HGV movements. These considerations informed the selection of appropriate corridors, with routes then refined to minimise potential impacts where possible. Following this initial appraisal, the proposed routes were agreed in consultation with North Yorkshire Council and National Highways. An **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, [APP-201])** has also been prepared which identifies the routes that should be used by construction traffic. The oCTMP also includes measures to minimise any impacts during construction by reducing HGV movements during the peak hours and managing employee movements.
TRA-13	RR-1027	Transport and Access	Respondent disagreed with the construction routing set out for the Proposed Development.	The Applicant notes this comment. The routing of construction traffic was developed through an iterative process which first identified sensitive receptors and local constraints, including residential areas, community facilities and roads with limited suitability for HGV movements. These considerations informed the selection of appropriate corridors, with routes then refined to minimise potential impacts where possible. Following this initial appraisal, the

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				proposed routes were agreed in consultation with North Yorkshire Council and National Highways. An **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, [APP-201])** has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. These routes take into account the existing condition of the road and seek, where practicable, to avoid residential areas. The oCTMP also includes measures to minimise any impacts during construction by reducing HGV movements during the peak hours and managing employee movements. The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** has been prepared to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction. The conclusions of the TA are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network.
TRA-14	RR-1436	Transport and Access	Respondent stated support for passing places on single track roads.	The Applicant welcomes support for provision of passing places on single track roads.
TRA-15	RR-0908	Transport and Access	Respondent expressed concern that traffic lights would be needed to negotiate construction infrastructure.	The Applicant notes this comment. Temporary traffic management measures, including the use of temporary traffic signals where required, would be implemented only where necessary to safely facilitate construction activities. Powers to undertake temporary alterations to the highway, including the use of traffic management measures, are secured through the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]** and associated documents, including the **Book of Reference [APP-022]** and **Streets Plan [AS-007]**. All temporary traffic management measures would be agreed with North Yorkshire Council Highways as set out in the **oCTMP [APP-201]** and implemented in accordance with standard traffic management procedures (including Chapter 8 of the Traffic Signs Manual), ensuring that any disruption to road users is appropriately managed and minimised.
TRA-16	RR-0123	Transport and Access	Respondents stated that the Proposed Development conflicts with NPS EN-1 relating to Traffic and Access.	The Applicant notes this comment and does not agree that the Proposed Development conflicts with National Policy Statement EN-1. The transport impacts of the Proposed Development have been fully assessed within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 14:**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Traffic and Movement [APP-052] and the **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]**. These demonstrate that construction traffic would result in relatively small and temporary increases in traffic flows, with effects on the highway network assessed as not significant. The conclusions of the TA are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network. National Policy Statement EN-1 advises that if there are transport impacts, the Applicant must have sought to mitigate these impacts. NPS EN-1 also highlights that *'The Secretary of State should only consider refusing development on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe, or it does not show how consideration has been given to the provision of adequate active public or shared transport access and provision.'* The measures outlined in the **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]**, including timing restrictions and the use of shared transport, are sufficient to reduce the temporary impact of the Proposed Development to acceptable levels. The **Planning Statement [APP-207]** and **Policy Compliance Document [APP-224]** demonstrate how the Applicant has considered and responded to national and local policy. On this basis, the Proposed Development accords with the relevant provisions of NPS EN-1 relating to traffic and transport.
TRA-17	RR-0847	Transport and Access	Respondent stated that the traffic impact goes against NPPF (2021) para. 110.	The Applicant notes this comment and does not agree that the Proposed Development conflicts with paragraph 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 110 of the NPPF states that development should only be refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or if the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** demonstrates that the Proposed Development would result in relatively small and temporary increases in traffic on the local highway

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				network, and that impacts on highway safety and capacity are limited and not significant. The conclusions of the TA are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network. The **Planning Statement [APP-207]** and **Policy Compliance Document [APP-224]** demonstrate how the Applicant has considered and responded to national and local policy. On this basis, the Proposed Development would not result in unacceptable or severe impacts and is therefore consistent with the requirements of the NPPF.

Transport and Access – Detailed

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Transport and Access - Detailed				
TRA-18	RR-0834, RR-1450, RR-0375, RR-0320, RR-0949, RR-0663, RR-0334, RR-0103, RR-0285, RR-0159, RR-1405, RR-0882, RR-0161, RR-0230, RR-0659, RR-0594, RR-1134, RR-0779, RR-1345, RR-0996, RR-0221, RR-1025, RR-0766, RR-0662, RR-1365, RR-0383, RR-0314, RR-0326, RR-1063, RR-0255, RR-1324, RR-0534, RR-0178	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed concern about the impact of traffic on the **A63**.	The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** has been prepared to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction, incorporating a worst-case scenario for workforce trips. Table 6-1 in the TA outlines the increase from the baseline traffic flows associated with construction on assessed links. It shows that the A63 at Monk Fryston would see a 1% increase in daily movements and 10% increase in HGV composition during the construction phase of the Proposed Development. Changes of less than 10% can reasonably assumed to be within the expected range of daily fluctuation and would go unnoticed to the majority of other road users. While consultation feedback indicates that local routes can experience higher levels of traffic during peak periods, the data does not suggest that the highway links are subject to such severe capacity issues that would hinder access. Additionally, NYC Highways have advised that design work is already underway for improvements to the A63/A162 roundabout to provide additional capacity for a range of committed developments within the surrounding area. These improvements are being implemented by NYC Highways as their project, and it is anticipated that these works will be completed by 2028. The conclusions of the TA are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network.
TRA-19	RR-0101, RR-1090, RR-1294, RR-0945, RR-1310, RR-0049, RR-1074, RR-0368, RR-0103, RR-1284, RR-1242, RR-1010, RR-1324, RR-1263, RR-1199, RR-1171, RR-1049, RR-0276, RR-0335, RR-1070, RR-1423, RR-0067, RR-1233, RR-0766, RR-0049, RR-0195, RR-0628, RR-1000, RR-0435	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed concern about the impact of traffic on the **A19**	The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** has been prepared to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction, incorporating a worst-case scenario for workforce trips. Table 6-1 in the TA outlines the increase from the baseline traffic flows associated with construction on assessed links. It shows that the A19 at Chapel Haddlesey would see a 1% increase in daily movements and up to 6% increase in HGV composition during the construction phase of the Proposed Development. Similarly at Escrick, the A19 would see a 0% increase in daily movements, and a 3% increase in HGV composition. Changes of less than 10% can reasonably assumed to be

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				within the expected range of daily fluctuation and would go unnoticed to the majority of other road users. While consultation feedback indicates that local routes can experience higher levels of traffic during peak periods, the data does not suggest that the highway links are subject to such severe capacity issues that would hinder access. The conclusions of the TA are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network.
TRA-20	RR-0819, RR-1146, RR-1323, RR-0519, RR-0521, RR-0301, RR-1349, RR-1237, RR-0607, RR-0029, RR-0325, RR-1188, RR-0313, RR-0124, RR-0066, RR-1337, RR-0020, RR-1243, RR-1021, RR-1306	Transport and Access	Respondents oppose the proposed access road adjacent to **Field House Farm**, Skipwith Road. Some respondents called for other alternative access points to be explored on this section. Some respondents who keep their caravans at Field House Farm also expressed concern about continued access. Some respondents expressed concern that access road adjacent to Field House Farm will cause greater insurance risk for caravans being stored there.	The Applicant notes this comment. The location of Cable Route Corridor access points, including the access adjacent to Field House Farm, has been developed through the design process taking account of highway suitability, safety, access to the site and the need to connect to the existing road network in an efficient and appropriate manner. Alternative access arrangements have been considered as part of this process; however, the identified access is considered to represent an appropriate solution having regard to the characteristics of the local highway network and the overall construction strategy. The access at Field House Farm would be used solely for access into the Cable Route Corridor during the construction period and only for the period required to install this section of the Cable Route Corridor. Construction activities associated with this access would therefore be temporary in nature. An **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** has been prepared and includes measures to minimise the impacts of construction traffic, with Section 3.17 referring specifically to the Cable Route Corridor. Final details relating to routing, timing of vehicle movements, access arrangements and associated traffic management controls will be agreed with the Local Highway Authority and incorporated within the detailed CTMP. Construction traffic will be associated with authorised site activities only and will be managed in a controlled manner. The Applicant recognises the presence of adjacent

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				properties and land uses, including Field House Farm, and will implement appropriate traffic management measures to minimise disruption to local users. Access for existing users would be maintained throughout construction, with any temporary restrictions managed through traffic management measures agreed with the relevant highway authority.
TRA-21	RR-0842, RR-0320, RR-1238, RR-0797, RR-1321, RR-1285, RR-0964, RR-0882, RR-0161, RR-0779, RR-1345, RR-1427, RR-0354, RR-0580, RR-1387, RR-0375, RR-0534, RR-0178, RR-0766	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed concern regarding the impact of traffic through **Monk Fryston.** A respondent has referred to the traffic strain on the **roundabout in Monk Fryston** combined with other traffic developments.	The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** has been prepared to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction, incorporating a worst-case scenario for workforce trips. Table 6-1 in the TA outlines the increase from the baseline traffic flows associated with construction on assessed links. It shows that the A63 at Monk Fryston would see a 1% increase in daily movements during the construction phase of the Proposed Development. Changes of less than 10% can reasonably assumed to be within the expected range of daily fluctuation and would go unnoticed to the majority of other road users. The conclusions of the TA are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network. Additionally, NYC Highways have advised that design work is already underway for improvements to the A63/A162 roundabout to provide additional capacity for a range of committed developments within the surrounding area. These improvements are being implemented by NYC Highways as their project, and it is anticipated that these works will be completed by 2028. On this basis, movements associated with the construction phase of the Proposed Development are not considered to significantly alter traffic conditions in Monk Fryston.
TRA-22	RR-0654, RR-1174, RR-1294, RR-1349, RR-0919, RR-1406, RR-0614, RR-1087, RR-0168, RR-0435, RR-0136, RR-0272, RR-1282, RR-1322	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed concern about the impact of traffic on **Skipwith Road** and Skipwith in general, including a lack of turning manoeuvring space.	**ES Chapter 14 Traffic and Movement [APP-052]**, Table 14-6 notes in response to consultation comments from Skipwith Parish Council that an **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. An access route, located off Skipwith Road and north of Main Street, has been identified to minimise movements through the village. This route will be used by the majority of construction vehicles. Skipwith Main Street will only be used for movement of Abnormal Loads. Arrangements for transport of the Abnormal Loads will need

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				to be made under licence with the Local Highway Authority to ensure it can be done safely, and to minimise impacts. To accommodate Abnormal Loads, the authorised works on Main Street will be temporary (see Schedule 5 to the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**, 'Alteration of Streets', Part 2 'Temporary Alteration of Layout', and shown on the **Streets Plan [AS-007]**, Sheet 4 of 22). No other works activities are proposed in Skipwith Village.
TRA-23	RR-0664, RR-0515, RR-0847, RR-0157, RR-0725, RR-0895, RR-0404, RR-1051, RR-1370, RR-0551, RR-0863, RR-1022	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed concern about the impact of traffic in **Wistow**. A respondent has expressed concern about the route down Long Lane onto Station Road. A respondent has expressed concern about the route down Lordship Lane. A respondent has stated that Pinfold Hill is the only place that parents can park when dropping their kids at school, and fears the safety of this.	The Applicant notes these concerns regarding the impact of construction traffic in Wistow, including movements along Long Lane, Lordship Lane and Pinfold Hill. Long Lane and Pinfold Hill are identified as routes for Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs) only. These movements would be limited in number and undertaken on an infrequent basis. AIL movements are subject to a separate approval and permitting process, requiring coordination with and approval from the relevant authorities, including North Yorkshire Council and the police, to ensure that they are undertaken safely and with appropriate traffic management measures in place. The Applicant recognises the sensitivity of local receptors in Wistow, including locations such as Pinfold Hill where on-street parking and school-related activity takes place. Construction traffic will be managed to minimise interaction with peak local activity where practicable, and appropriate traffic management measures will be implemented where required to ensure the safe movement of vehicles and protection of road users. The identified construction routes have been selected to utilise the most appropriate roads available, and to avoid where practicable, designated protected areas, height and weight restrictions, and residential areas. The conclusions of the **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network.
TRA-24	RR-0854	Transport and Access	**[BoR numbers 03-038, 04-001]:** Respondent expressed concern that construction traffic from the Proposed Development would impact their property on Westfield in Skipwith (Site 1). .	The Applicant notes this concern. The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** has been prepared to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				An Outline Construction **Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** has been prepared, which includes measures to minimise impacts during construction, including reducing HGV movements during the peak hours and speed management measures where required. The final CTMP will be agreed with North Yorkshire Council prior to construction and will include measures to manage construction traffic and ensure that vehicles operate in a controlled manner on rural roads. The conclusions of the **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there are not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network. Routing by Westfield, Skipwith will only be used for movement of Abnormal Loads. Arrangements for transport of the Abnormal Loads will need to be made under licence with the Local Highway Authority to ensure it can be done safely, and to minimise impacts. These movements would be limited in number and undertaken on an infrequent basis. To accommodate Abnormal Loads, the authorised works on this route will be temporary (see Schedule 5 to the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**, 'Alteration of Streets', Part 2 'Temporary Alteration of Layout', and shown on the **Streets Plan [AS-007]**, Sheet 4 of 22).
TRA-25	RR-0834, RR-0797, RR-0949, RR-1014, RR-1032, RR-0591, RR-0221, RR-1014, RR-0500, RR-0853	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed concern about the impact of traffic on **Common Lane in South Milford** One respondent stated that Common Lane is an adopted highway used by the public on foot, with no footpaths along its length, meaning pedestrians, cyclists, and horse riders currently share the carriageway with vehicles, increasing safety risks.	The Applicant notes this concern. Common Lane forms part of the construction routing strategy to access Solar Development Sites 6 and 7, having been identified as the most appropriate route following consideration of available alternatives and the characteristics of the local highway network. Consequently, the Outline Construction **Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** has been prepared to include measures to minimise impacts of construction traffic on Common Lane during construction, including reducing HGV movements during the peak hours and managing employee movements. The final CTMP will include controls on routing, timing of vehicle movements and traffic management measures, and will be agreed with North Yorkshire Council prior to construction. This will ensure that traffic impacts are appropriately managed during the construction phase. Note that the Environmental Statement includes an assessment of fear and intimidation on users of Common

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Lane in **ES Volume 1 Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement [APP-052]**. This calculates a degree of hazard score, which takes into account the average two-way flow, the HGV composition and the vehicle speed. Table 14-30 and Table 14-31 shows that Common Lane, South Milford is subject to a 'Small' level of fear and intimidation in both the baseline (existing) and 'with construction' scenarios. Therefore, the temporary increase in traffic during the construction phase is not expected to significantly alter the levels fear and intimidation. The Applicant reiterates its commitment to road safety, and notes that with implementation of the final version of the **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]**, roads should be no less safe than they currently are. Construction activities affecting pedestrian routes would be temporary and managed through the implementation of the CTMP. Measures may include temporary diversions, signage, and traffic management to maintain safety for users. Construction traffic will also be controlled through routing strategies and timing restrictions, reducing interaction with pedestrians where practicable. On this basis, any impacts on pedestrian connectivity would be temporary and appropriately mitigated.
TRA-26	RR-0834, RR-1060, RR-0320, RR-0255, RR-0949, RR-0285, RR-0221, RR-1370, RR-1013, RR-0500, RR-1014, RR-0779, RR-1051	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed concern about the impact of traffic on **Common Lane in South Milford**	The Applicant notes this concern. The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** has been prepared to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction. The impact of construction traffic on Common Lane in South Milford on pedestrians is discussed in the previous response. The assessment indicates that the Proposed Development would result in a relatively small increase in traffic on Common Lane, typically around 10% on average across the construction period. In absolute terms, this represents a limited number of additional vehicle movements and is temporary in nature. Furthermore, a variation of 10% is generally assumed to be within the expected range of daily fluctuation in flows. The peak assessment shows that there could be a 29% increase in traffic flows on Common Lane during construction. This is a worst-case scenario. The Applicant recognises that Common Lane is used by a range of users, including pedestrians, cyclists and other non-motorised users. Construction traffic will be managed

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), which will include controls on routing, timing of vehicle movements and traffic management measures where required, to minimise interaction with local users and maintain safe conditions. The conclusions of the TA are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network.
TRA-27	RR-1073, RR-1285, RR-0577, RR-1064, RR-0445, RR-0177, RR-0354, RR-0326, RR-0580, RR-1056	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed concern about the impact of traffic on **Hillam**	The Applicant notes this concern. The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** has been prepared to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction. The assessment indicates that the Proposed Development would result in a relatively small increase in traffic on Hillam Lane, typically around 6% on average across the construction period. In absolute terms, this represents a limited number of additional vehicle movements and is temporary in nature. Table 6-1 in the TA shows that with an average of 28 additional HGV movements per day associated with construction of the Proposed Development on Hillam Lane, the HGV composition would increase by 134% when assessed as a worst-case scenario (i.e. all movements arriving by the same access route). However the percentage increase is exaggerated due to the low baseline HGV numbers on this link, and the absolute number of vehicles added to the network is low. The conclusions of the TA are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network.
TRA-28	RR-1080, RR-0185, RR-0461, RR-0145, RR-0074, RR-0574, RR-1152, RR-1056, RR-0599, RR-1064	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed concern about the impact of traffic in **Birkin.**	The Applicant notes this concern. The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** has been prepared to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Access to Solar Development Site 4 will be via Haddlesey Road and Roe Lane. This could add an average of 78 movements onto these routes during construction. Routing through Birkin via Main Street will primarily be used for movement of Abnormal Loads. Arrangements for transport of the Abnormal Loads will need to be made under licence with the Local Highway Authority to ensure it can be done safely, and to minimise impacts. Furthermore, these movements would be limited in number and undertaken on an infrequent basis, and therefore not expected to significantly alter conditions on the road network in Birkin.
TRA-29	RR-0103, RR-0919, RR-0880, RR-0025, RR-0272, RR-1023, RR-1282	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed concern about the impact of traffic in **Escrick.**	The Applicant notes this concern. Access routes are detailed in **ES Volume 2, Figure 14.4: Construction Routing [APP-113].** This shows that access to Solar Development Site 1 is proposed via Wheldake Lane to the north to avoid, where practicable, vehicles accessing the site via Escrick village. The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** has been prepared to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction, incorporating a worst-case scenario for workforce trips. Table 6-1 in the TA outlines the increase from the baseline traffic flows associated with construction on assessed links. It shows that the A19 at Escrick would see a less than 1% increase in daily movements and a 3% increase in HGV composition during the construction phase of the Proposed Development. Changes of less than 10% can reasonably assumed to be within the expected range of daily fluctuation and would go unnoticed to the majority of other road users. While consultation feedback indicates that local routes can experience higher levels of traffic during peak periods, the data does not suggest that the highway links are subject to such severe capacity issues that would hinder access. The conclusions of the TA are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network.
TRA-30	RR-1372, RR-0230, RR-0996, RR-1345, RR-0354	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed concern about the impact of traffic on **Fryston Common Lane**	The Applicant notes these comments. Fryston Common Lane has been removed from the construction routing for the Proposed Development, however, has been retained as an alternative emergency access route.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
TRA-31	RR-0320, RR-1041, RR-0856, RR-1137, RR-0027	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed concern about the impact of traffic in **South Milford and Sherburn in Elmet**	The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** has been prepared to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction, incorporating a worst-case scenario for workforce trips. Table 6-1 in the TA outlines the increase from the baseline traffic flows associated with construction on assessed links. It shows that the Bishopdyke Road (B1222) and the A162 at South Milford would both see a less than 1% increase in daily movements and a less than 3% increase in HGV composition during the construction phase of the Proposed Development. Changes of less than 10% can reasonably assumed to be within the expected range of daily fluctuation and would go unnoticed to the majority of other road users. The conclusions of the TA are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network.
TRA-32	RR-1201, RR-1403, RR-0136	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed concern about the capacity of access routes in **Escrick**.	The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** has been prepared to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction, incorporating a worst-case scenario for workforce trips. Table 6-1 in the TA outlines the increase from the baseline traffic flows associated with construction on assessed links. It shows that the all links assessed for access routes around Escrick would see a less than 6% increase in daily movements. Changes of less than 10% can reasonably assumed to be within the expected range of daily fluctuation and would go unnoticed to the majority of other road users. The conclusions of the TA are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network.
TRA-33	RR-1086, RR-0536, RR-0049	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed concern for continued access to the **South Milford Community Allotments**	The Applicant notes this concern regarding continued access to the South Milford Community Allotments. Access for existing users would be maintained during construction, with any temporary restrictions managed through appropriate traffic management measures agreed with the relevant highway authority. Construction activities in this area would be temporary in nature, and any interaction with the local highway network

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				would be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). The CTMP will be developed in consultation with North Yorkshire Council as the local highway authority, and approved by North Yorkshire Council as planning authority. This will include appropriate traffic management measures, arrangements for access during construction and, where necessary, the identification of suitable alternative access arrangements to ensure that impacts on users are appropriately managed.
TRA-34	RR-0654, RR-1174	Transport and Access	Respondent expressed concern that commuters between Escrick and Skipwith will face 9 mile diversions	The Applicant notes this concern. Construction activities may require temporary traffic management measures on parts of the local highway network; however, these would be limited in extent and duration. Any road closures or restrictions would be temporary and managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), with appropriate diversion routes identified and agreed with North Yorkshire Council where required. The conclusions of the TA are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network. On this basis, while some localised and temporary disruption may occur, this is not expected to result in severe or prolonged impacts on network connectivity.
TRA-35	RR-0251, RR-0664	Transport and Access	**[BoR numbers 07-004]**: Respondent expressed concern about access going past their property in Wistow.	The Applicant notes this concern regarding construction traffic passing the respondent's property in Wistow. The construction routing strategy has been developed to utilise suitable routes within the local highway network, taking account of highway characteristics, safety and access requirements. In this location, traffic movements have been assessed as part of the **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** which demonstrates that increases in traffic are relatively small and temporary in nature, and are not considered to result in significant impacts on the operation of the network or surrounding receptors. Where routes in the Wistow area are used for Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs), these movements would be limited in number and undertaken on an infrequent basis. AIL movements are subject to a separate approval process,

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				requiring coordination with and approval from the relevant authorities, including North Yorkshire Council, to ensure they are undertaken safely and with appropriate traffic management measures in place. An **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** has been prepared, which includes measures to minimise impacts during construction by reducing HGV movements during the peak hours and managing employee movements. The conclusions of the TA are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network.
TRA-36	RR-0861, RR-0779	Transport and Access	Respondent stated that the existing access to Common Lane from the bypass is already heavily trafficked and poorly designed, with limited capacity for vehicles waiting to turn right, creating a risk of obstruction and collisions. They stated that the road is a fast route used by HGVs and commuter traffic, and that speed enforcement is frequently required due to speeding concerns. They further stated that the left turn onto Common Lane lacks a slip road and has poor visibility, meaning that any significant increase in traffic would make the junction more dangerous for motorists.	The Applicant notes this concern regarding the left-turn movement into Common Lane. This movement forms part of the existing highway arrangement and is already undertaken by vehicles using the local network, including HGVs and agricultural traffic. While the Applicant recognises that localised visibility and road condition constraints may exist, these reflect the baseline characteristics of the junction and are not considered to prevent its current operation. The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** indicates that the Proposed Development would result in a 10% increase in daily movements on average across the construction period on Common Lane. In absolute terms, this represents a limited number of additional vehicle movements and is temporary in nature. Table 6-1 in the TA shows that there will be an average of 6 additional HGV movements per day associated with construction of the Proposed Development on Common

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Lane, which equates to an increase in composition of up to 32% when assessed as a worst-case scenario (i.e. all movements arriving by the same access route). However these percentages are exaggerated due to the low baseline HGV numbers on these links, and the absolute number of vehicles added to the network is low. The Applicant recognises that Common Lane is used by a range of users, including pedestrians, cyclists and other non-motorised users. Construction traffic will be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), which will include controls on routing, timing of vehicle movements and traffic management measures where required, to minimise interaction with local users and maintain safe conditions. The conclusions of the TA are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network.
TRA-37	RR-0889, RR-1437	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed particular concern about traffic impacts on Beal Bridge.	The Applicant notes this concern. Access routes are detailed in **ES Volume 2, Figure 14.4 Construction Routing [APP-113]**. Beal Bridge does not form part of the construction traffic routes identified for the Proposed Development. Construction routing has been developed through the **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** to utilise appropriate sections of the highway network and to avoid more constrained or sensitive routes where practicable. As such, construction HGV traffic will not use Beal Bridge.
TRA-38	RR-0889, RR-1437	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed particular concern about traffic impacts on Roe Lane.	The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** has been prepared to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction, incorporating a worst-case scenario for workforce trips. Table 6-1 in the TA outlines the increase from the baseline traffic flows associated with construction on assessed links. It shows that Roe Lane would see a 14% increase in total vehicles and 30% increase in HGV composition. However these percentages are exaggerated due to the low baseline flows on Roe Lane, and the absolute number of vehicles added to the network is low. The conclusions of the TA are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network.
TRA-39	RR-0659, RR-0594	Transport and Access	Respondents stated that the presence of a water main within the roadside verge increases concern regarding potential infrastructure damage.	The Applicant notes this concern. An **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [APP-192]** and an **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** have been prepared, which set out the framework for managing environmental and construction impacts. The final CEMP and CTMP will include specific measures to protect existing infrastructure, including controls for working within verges and safeguarding statutory undertaker assets. Construction works in the vicinity of utilities will be undertaken in accordance with standard industry practice and in consultation with the relevant statutory undertakers pursuant to the protective provisions in Part 1 of Schedule 15 to the **Draft Development Consent Order [APP-017]**.
TRA-40	RR-0659, RR-0594	Transport and Access	Respondents stated that no commitment has been provided regarding pre- or post-construction dilapidation surveys, despite requests.	The Applicant notes this comment. The impact of construction traffic on the condition of the local highway network has been considered within the **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]**. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement [APP-052]** includes a host of mitigation measures including the implementation of an **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** to formalise measures mitigating construction-related effects. This includes a requirement for a road condition survey to be carried out prior to commencement of construction. The survey scope, including the routes to be surveyed, would be agreed with NYC prior to a road condition survey being undertaken. The Applicant notes that if required, any sections of highway used by construction traffic or abnormal load movements would be returned to their original condition, or as agreed with the relevant highway authority, following completion of the works.
TRA-41	RR-0659, RR-0594	Transport and Access	Respondents stated that requested details regarding transport logistics (including vehicle dimensions, gross weights, axle loads, and delivery frequency) have not been provided by the Applicant. The Respondent also stated that responses received to date are generic and do not address specific concerns about construction traffic impacts.	The Applicant notes this comment. The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** provides an assessment of construction traffic based on reasonable worst-case assumptions, consistent with standard methodologies used for nationally significant infrastructure projects. **An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** has been prepared which identifies the

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				routes that should be used by construction traffic. The final CTMP will set out detailed transport logistics, including routing and delivery arrangements, and will be submitted to and agreed with the relevant authorities prior to construction. Detailed construction activities, including specific vehicle types will be defined during the detailed design and contractor procurement stages. This approach ensures that construction impacts are robustly assessed at this stage, while allowing detailed arrangements to be finalised and controlled through the approved CTMP. An Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) Assessment is included in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** and considers the suitability of roads for abnormal indivisible loads and provides images of the type AIL vehicles that will deliver to the site. AIL movements will be managed by a specialist haulage company so that the potential effects are mitigated. In addition, to ensure minimal impact upon on the local road network, AIL vehicle movements will be undertaken during off-peak times and delivered in convoy, whenever practicable, to minimise incidents of disruption. This will be coordinated with the local highways authorities and police prior to being undertaken, with the final routes subject to agreement with highways authorities.
TRA-42	RR-0659, RR-0594	Transport and Access	Respondents stated that there is no operational need for construction access via the road outside Bell Cottage, and that alternative access routes are available. Respondents stated that the road in question is unsuitable for large, heavy construction vehicles due to its rural character and limited capacity.	The Applicant notes this concern. The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** has been prepared to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction. Routing on the road outside Bell Cottage will only be used for movement of Abnormal Loads. Arrangements for transport of the Abnormal Loads will need to be made under licence with the Local Highway Authority to ensure it can be done safely, and to minimise impacts. These movements would be limited in number and undertaken on an infrequent basis. To accommodate Abnormal Loads, the authorised works on this route will be temporary (see Schedule 5 to the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**, 'Alteration of Streets', Part 2 'Temporary Alteration of Layout', and shown on the **Streets Plan [AS-007]**, Sheet 4 of 22).
TRA-43	RR-0354	Transport and Access	Respondent expressed concern about the impact of traffic on **Austfield Lane**, Stocking Lane and Chapel Street.	The Applicant notes this concern impact of traffic on specific routes around Hillam. Access routes are detailed in **ES**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Volume 2, Figure 14.4: Construction Routing [APP-113]. Stocking Lane and Chapel Street do not form part of the construction traffic routes identified for the Proposed Development. The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** has been prepared to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction, including on Austfield Lane. Table 6-1 in the TA outlines the increase from the baseline traffic flows associated with construction on assessed links. It shows that Austfield Lane would see a 3% increase in total vehicles. Changes of less than 10% can reasonably assumed to be within the expected range of daily fluctuation and would go unnoticed to the majority of other road users. The assessed worst-case scenario would be a 52% increase in HGV composition. However this percentage is exaggerated due to the low baseline number of HGVs on Austfield Lane, and the absolute number of vehicles added to the network is low.
TRA-44	RR-0847	Transport and Access	Respondent expressed concern about the impact of upgrading Carr Lane and Blackfenn Lane.	The Applicant notes this concern regarding the upgrading of Carr Lane and Blackfenn Lane. The proposed works in this location are limited to localised Highways Improvement Areas (HIAs), as shown in **ES Volume 2, Figure 1.2: Elements of the Proposed Development [APP-058]**, which are required to facilitate access to the cable corridor and accommodate Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) movements where necessary. The works would be temporary, small scale and short in duration. It is not proposed for any widening or straightening of highways to be permanent unless requested to be retained by the Highways Authority. An **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** has been prepared. The final CTMP will be developed in consultation with and agreed by North Yorkshire Council prior to construction and will include detailed measures to manage vehicle movements, minimise disruption and control environmental effects during the construction phase.
TRA-45	RR-1049	Transport and Access	Respondent expressed concern about the impact of traffic in **Riccall.**	The Applicant notes this comment. Access into the Cable Route Corridor is required at Riccall. From discussions with North Yorkshire Council, construction traffic routes were agreed, and this includes requiring vehicles to approach the A19 Riccall junction from the south.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** has been prepared to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction, incorporating a worst-case scenario for workforce trips. Table 6-1 in the TA outlines the increase from the baseline traffic flows associated with construction on assessed links. It shows that the A19 at Riccall would see a 1% increase in daily movements and a 10% increase in HGV composition during the construction phase of the Proposed Development. Changes of up to 10% can reasonably assumed to be within the expected range of daily fluctuation and would go unnoticed to the majority of other road users. The conclusions of the TA are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network. Regarding concerns over the playground, routes have been designed such that construction traffic does not pass directly adjacent to the playground. Construction traffic would turn onto Checker Lane, which is approximately 150 metres southeast of the park entrance, such that vehicles would not pass the access and no direct interaction with users of the recreational space and playground is anticipated. As such, no direct interaction between construction traffic and users of the playground is anticipated. The construction access routes for the Cable Route Corridor are detailed within **ES Volume 2, Figure 14.4: Construction Routing [APP-113]**. Section 3.11 of the **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** discusses the potential use of qualified and experienced banksmen to facilitate arrivals and departures – which could further help reduce risk to children travelling to and from the playground.
TRA-46	RR-0691	Transport and Access	**[BoR numbers 16-003, 16-005, 16-006, 16-007, 17-009, 17-011]**: Respondent expressed concern about access going past their property at Site 8.	The Applicant notes this concern regarding construction traffic passing in proximity to the respondent's property at Site 8. The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** has been prepared to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction. The conclusions of the TA are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network. An **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** has been prepared. The final CTMP will be developed in consultation with and agreed by North Yorkshire Council prior to construction and will include controls on routing, timing of vehicle movements and traffic management measures where required, to minimise disruption to local receptors, including properties located adjacent to construction routes.
TRA-47	RR-1450, RR-0861	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed concern about the traffic impact on Woodhaven Kennels.	The Applicant notes this concern regarding the potential impact of construction traffic on Woodhaven Kennels and the continued use of local routes in this area. Common Lane is the public highway route into Solar Development Sites 6 and 7. The construction traffic strategy has been developed through the **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]**, taking account of the characteristics of the local highway network and the need to utilise suitable connections to the Strategic Road Network. The conclusions of the TA are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts on Common Lane from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network. An **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** has been prepared, which includes measures to minimise impacts during construction by reducing HGV movements during the peak hours and managing employee movements. The final CTMP will be developed in consultation with and agreed by North Yorkshire Council and will include measures to manage traffic movements and minimise disruption to local businesses and receptors, including facilities such as Woodhaven Kennels.
TRA-48	RR-0066, RR-1337	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed concern that access to Field House Farm raises issues around security with unknown vehicles and individuals using the lane. This includes concerns about theft, trespass and unauthorised access.	The Applicant notes this concern regarding security and the presence of construction traffic on routes providing access to Field House Farm. **ES Volume 2, Figure 14.1: Construction Routing [APP-113]** identifies the access at Field House Farm as an access into the Cable Route Corridor for use during the construction period only. Use would therefore be temporary, and only

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				during the period that access to that part of the Cable Route Corridor is required. An **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** has been prepared, which includes measures to minimise the impacts of construction traffic with Section 3.17 referring to the Cable Route Corridor. Final details in relation to controls on routing, timing of vehicle movements and access arrangements will be agreed with the Local Highway Authority and included within the detailed CTMP. Construction traffic will be associated with authorised site activities only and will be managed in a controlled manner. The Applicant will take account of the presence of adjacent properties and land uses in implementing appropriate traffic management and security measures to minimise disruption to local users.
TRA-49	RR-0861	Transport and Access	Respondent stated that repeated delays, particularly during periods when large wagons deliver solar panels, could lead to permanent loss of customers due to ongoing traffic congestion.	The Applicant notes this concern from Woodhaven Kennels on Common Lane regarding potential business impacts arising from delays associated with construction traffic. Access for existing users would be maintained during construction, with any temporary restrictions managed through appropriate traffic management measures agreed with the relevant highway authority. The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** indicates that the Proposed Development would result in a relatively small increase in traffic on Common Lane, typically around 10% on average across the construction period. In absolute terms, this represents a limited number of additional vehicle movements and is temporary in nature. Furthermore, a variation of 10% is generally assumed to be within the expected range of daily fluctuation in flows. An **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** has been prepared, which includes measures to minimise impacts during construction by reducing HGV movements during the peak hours and managing employee movements. The final CTMP will include further measures to manage traffic movements, including routing controls and traffic management where required, and will be developed in consultation with and agreed by North Yorkshire Council prior to construction to minimise disruption to local businesses where practicable.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
TRA-50	RR-0861	Transport and Access	Respondent stated that although a time plan for quiet customer arrival periods was suggested, it would not be effective because customers arrive throughout the day at their own convenience. The respondent added that customer arrivals do not occur between 12:00 and 13:00 due to staff lunch time, although staff often leave the site during this period to obtain lunch.	The Applicant notes this comment regarding customer arrival patterns and the potential limitations of managing impacts through defined quiet periods. The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** demonstrates that construction traffic associated with the Proposed Development would result in relatively small and temporary increases in traffic flows, and impacts are not considered to be significant. Construction traffic accessing the site will be managed such that vehicles enter the site directly from the highway, and arrangements will be in place to ensure that vehicles do not wait on the highway prior to access. This will minimise the potential for delays or disruption to passing traffic. An **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** has been prepared, which includes measures to minimise impacts during construction by reducing HGV movements during the peak hours and managing employee movements. The final CTMP will be developed in consultation with and agreed by North Yorkshire Council prior to construction and will include flexible, site-specific measures to manage construction traffic, taking account of local conditions and nearby businesses.
TRA-51	RR-1090	Transport and Access	Respondent expressed traffic safety concerns for the recreational space and playground close to where the cable crosses the A19 south of Riccall (Checker Lane).	The construction access routes for the Cable Route Corridor are detailed within **ES Volume 2, Figure 14.4: Construction Routing [APP-113]**. Routes have been designed such that construction traffic does not pass directly adjacent to the playground. Construction traffic would turn onto Checker Lane, which is approximately 150 metres southeast of the park entrance, such that vehicles would not pass the access and no direct interaction with users of the recreational space and playground is anticipated. Section 3.11 of the **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** discusses the potential use of qualified and experienced banksmen to facilitate arrivals and departures – which could further help reduce risk to children travelling to and from the playground.
TRA-52	RR-0981	Transport and Access	Respondent expressed concern about the impact of traffic on **Dam Lane**	The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** has been prepared to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction, including on Dam Lane. Table 6-1 in the TA outlines the increase from the baseline traffic flows associated with construction on assessed links. It shows that Dam Lane would see a 2%

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				increase in total vehicles. Changes of less than 10% can reasonably assumed to be within the expected range of daily fluctuation and would go unnoticed to the majority of other road users. The assessed worst-case scenario would be a 41% increase in HGV composition. However this percentage is exaggerated due to the low baseline number of HGVs on Dam Lane, and the absolute number of vehicles added to the network is low. The conclusions of the TA are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network.
TRA-53	RR-1214	Transport and Access	**[BoR numbers 20-035, 20-036, 20-038]**: Respondent expressed specific concerns regarding the construction compound on Fairfield Lane. The compound borders their paddock which includes 17 horses and other livestock. Access is a single-track road with water drainage dikes on either side of the road. It is a serious concern that the compound will cause total disruption to the road which is used several times on a daily basis by the respondent and many local people.	The Applicant notes this concern regarding the construction compound on Fairfield Lane and the potential for disruption to local access and surrounding land uses. Fairfield Lane is identified primarily as a route associated with Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) movements, which are limited in number and undertaken on an infrequent basis. The Applicant recognises the constrained nature of Fairfield Lane, including its single-track configuration and the presence of drainage ditches and adjacent land uses such as paddocks and livestock. Arrangements for transport of the Abnormal Loads will need to be made under licence with the Local Highway Authority to ensure it can be done safely, and to minimise impacts. As such, Fairfield Lane has been identified as requiring localised improvements, shown by the provision of a Highways Improvement Area (HIA) in **ES Volume 2, Figure 1.2: Elements of the Proposed Development [APP-058]**. These movements will therefore be planned and undertaken in a controlled manner. Measures will also be included to control vehicle speeds and ensure safe interaction with other road users, including those accessing adjacent land and properties. Given the presence of livestock and other sensitive land uses in this location, the final CTMP and CEMP will take account of these constraints to ensure that movements are undertaken in a controlled and

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				proportionate manner, minimising disruption to both the highway and surrounding land uses. The Applicant has engaged with representatives of the respondent regarding their concerns relating to the location of a construction compound and met with a representative on 12th January 2026. A discussion was had regarding possible mitigation measures which could be implemented and the representative was satisfied further discussions were to be had following detailed design. Should the respondent have further queries or concerns relating to the siting of the compound, construction or mitigation measures, the Applicant welcomes the opportunity to continue to engage with them.
TRA-54	RR-0942	Transport and Access	**[BoR numbers 04-004]**: I am the occupier of [REDACTED] Main Street, Skipwith. My property is directly affected by elements of the proposal, particularly the proposed use of Main Street, Skipwith for Abnormal Indivisible Loads. The Applicant's March 2026 newsletter confirms that, although Main Street has been removed as a route for main construction traffic, it would still be used for AIL movements. The Applicant confirms that Main Street in Skipwith will still be used for Abnormal Indivisible Loads, with deliveries coordinated by specialist transport planners. I am particularly concerned about large abnormal loads passing directly along Main Street outside my home, with the resulting impact on safety, access and daily living conditions. Main Street is a narrow village road with residential properties directly fronting onto it. That makes the proposed use of the road for abnormal loads especially concerning. In my view, routing very large vehicles through a narrow residential street in a village environment gives rise to clear and foreseeable planning harms in terms of highway safety, residential disturbance, noise, temporary obstruction, and the general suitability of the road network for this form of traffic. Given the narrowness of Main Street and the fact that homes sit directly on the road, even temporary passage of abnormal loads would have a material effect on day to day access, safety and residential amenity. The fact that deliveries may be managed or coordinated does not remove those impacts. It simply confirms that the loads are large enough to require special handling in the first place. The draft DCO also seeks powers to temporarily close, prohibit the use of, restrict the use of, stop up, alter or divert any street or public right of way, and allows temporarily closed routes to be used as temporary working sites. That is important because	The Applicant notes this comment. An Abnormal Load Assessment in included within the **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178].** This identifies the routes the abnormal loads are expected to take, the swept path analysis and any required mitigation measures. The temporary modifications to the highway that are required, such as the removal of street furniture, widening of junctions, and vegetation removal, are referred to as Highways Improvement Areas. Skipwith Main Street will be used for movement of Abnormal Loads. It is not identified as a construction route for other general construction vehicles. Arrangements for the transport of the Abnormal Loads will need to be made under licence with the Local Highway Authority to ensure it can be done safely, and to minimise impacts. To accommodate Abnormal Loads, there is proposed works on Main Street in Skipwith which will be temporary (see Schedule 5 to the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]**, 'Alteration of Streets', Part 2 'Temporary Alteration of Layout', and shown on the **Streets Plan [AS-007]**, Sheet 4 of 22). No other works activities are proposed in Skipwith Village. AIL movements will be managed by a specialist haulage company so that the potential effects are mitigated. In addition, to ensure minimal impact upon on the local road network, AIL vehicle movements will be undertaken during off-peak times and delivered in convoy, whenever practicable, to minimise incidents of disruption. This will be coordinated with the local highways authorities and police prior to being undertaken, with the final routes subject to agreement with highways authorities.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			it shows the application seeks substantial powers over local access arrangements in order to facilitate the development.	**ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement [APP-052]**, Table 14-6 notes in response to consultation comments from Skipwith Parish Council that an **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** has been prepared to identify the routes that should be used by construction traffic. An access route, located off Skipwith Road and north of Main Street, has been identified to minimise movements through the village. This route will be used by the majority of construction vehicles. The powers under the draft DCO provide a framework to enable the safe and efficient delivery of the Proposed Development where required and are subject to appropriate controls and safeguards. Section 3 of the oCTMP includes measures to manage construction activity and associated communications, including advance notification and ongoing engagement with affected communities. The final CTMP will ensure that any temporary arrangements are clearly communicated and appropriately managed to minimise disruption, including through the use of community liaison arrangements where necessary.
TRA-55	RR-0285	Transport and Access	Respondent stated that construction traffic would impact livestock transport and other farming activities.	The Applicant notes this concern. An **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** and **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [APP-192]** have been prepared. The final CTMP and CEMP will be developed in consultation with and agreed by North Yorkshire Council and relevant stakeholders prior to construction and will include detailed measures to manage vehicle movements, maintain access and minimise disruption to local receptors during these activities. Measures will be included to control vehicle speeds and ensure safe interaction with other road users, including those accessing adjacent land and properties. Given the presence of livestock and other sensitive land uses, the final CTMP and CEMP will take account of these constraints to ensure that movements are undertaken in a controlled and proportionate manner, minimising disruption to both the highway and surrounding land uses.
TRA-56	RR-0163	Transport and Access	Respondent expressed concern about the safety of members of the public exiting and entering Birkin Parochial Church.	The Applicant notes this concern regarding the safety of members of the public accessing Birkin Parochial Church. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement [APP-052]** presents the impact assessment undertaken for traffic and details the likely significant effects of the Proposed

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Development on traffic and movement. The assessment demonstrates that construction traffic associated with the Proposed Development would result in relatively small and temporary increases in traffic flows, which are not considered to be significant. Routing through Birkin via Main Street will primarily be used for movement of Abnormal Loads. Arrangements for transport of the Abnormal Loads will need to be made under licence with the Local Highway Authority to ensure it can be done safely, and to minimise impacts. Furthermore, these movements would be limited in number and undertaken on an infrequent basis, and therefore not expected to significantly alter conditions on the road network in Birkin. An Outline Construction **Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** has been prepared, which includes measures to minimise impacts during construction, including reducing construction traffic movements during peak hours and managing employee movements. The final CTMP will be developed in consultation with and agreed by North Yorkshire Council prior to construction and will include additional traffic management measures, where required, to ensure safe interaction between vehicles and pedestrians at sensitive locations. The Applicant also notes that no construction works are currently anticipated to take place on Sundays, which will further reduce the potential for interaction between construction traffic and peak periods of activity associated with church use.
TRA-57	RR-1309	Transport and Access	**[BoR numbers 07-001, 07-002]**: Respondent expressed concern that construction traffic route runs alongside the boundary of their property and that some of their garden will have to be removed for this route to be made accessible. Further clarification is requested on this point.	The Applicant notes this concern regarding construction traffic passing alongside the respondent's property on Pinfold Hill in Wistow and the potential implications for adjacent land. The identified Highway Improvement Area on the construction route along Pinfold Hill is entirely within the existing adopted highway and does not require the removal or permanent use of private garden areas to facilitate access. The route has been selected following consideration of local constraints and to utilise the most appropriate roads available, while avoiding, where practicable, sensitive receptors and unsuitable links. The conclusions of the **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network.
TRA-58	RR-0017	Transport and Access	**[BoR numbers 08-010, 08-011, 08-013]**: Respondent expressed specific concern regarding access to their property	The Applicant notes this concern regarding access to the respondent's property at Lodge Farm Cottages during construction. Lordship Lane forms one of the access routes to the Cable Route Corridor. Access for existing users would be maintained during construction, with any temporary restrictions managed through appropriate traffic management measures agreed with the relevant highway authority. Lordship Lane has also been identified as a route for Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs). These movements would be limited in number and undertaken on an infrequent basis. AIL movements are subject to a separate approval and permitting process, requiring coordination with and approval from the relevant authorities, including North Yorkshire Council and the police, to ensure that they are undertaken safely and with appropriate traffic management measures in place. The identified construction routes have been selected to utilise the most appropriate roads available, and to avoid where practicable, designated protected areas, height and weight restrictions, and residential areas. The conclusions of the **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network.
TRA-59	RR-0286	Transport and Access	Respondent stated that many NHS workers in the locality work nights, which late night construction traffic may impact.	The Applicant notes this concern regarding the potential impact of construction traffic on local residents working shifts. The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** has been prepared to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction. The conclusions of the TA are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network. An Outline Construction **Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** has been prepared, which includes measures to minimise impacts during construction. The final CTMP will be

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				developed in consultation with and agreed by North Yorkshire Council prior to construction and will include controls on the timing and distribution of construction traffic movements, taking account of local conditions and sensitive receptors. These measures will provide an appropriate framework to manage construction traffic in a proportionate manner and to minimise disturbance to local residents, including those with non-standard working patterns, where practicable. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: Proposed Development [APP-040]** sets out that core construction working hours (not including start up and shut down works) are defined as Monday to Friday from 07:00 to 18:00 and Saturday 08:00 to 13:30. Start-up and shut-down activities on site will involve low-noise tasks, including security checks, unlocking and locking gates, and conducting toolbox talks. If any work is required outside of the core working hours, the Contractor will seek prior approval from the relevant authority for works outside the core hours. Some activities may be required outside of the core working hours (such as the arrival and departure of construction workers, the delivery of abnormal loads, concrete pours for foundations, HDD, nighttime working for cable construction works in public highways, or in emergencies). The Contractor(s) will seek prior approval from the relevant authority for works outside the core working hours. Where night working is required and (with the exception of HDD or similar trenchless solution and emergency works) agreed with NYC, materials for night-time working shall be delivered, where practicable, during normal working hours and be placed as close as possible to the work area for which they are required. The assessment in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049**] concludes that most road links would be subject to negligible impacts from construction traffic noise, although there would be some minor adverse impacts and one moderate adverse impact (on Common Lane, Hambleton). This moderate adverse impact equates to an average of two to three vehicles per hour during the working day (**ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]** paragraph 11.9.33). This is unlikely to result in an appreciable change in noise levels at the nearby receptors.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
TRA-60	RR-1222	Transport and Access	Respondent stated that an estate of 20 properties within Hambleton Hough will lose access to their only access road as it is to be used as a compound access route for the Proposed Development.	The Applicant notes this concern regarding access to the respondent's property during construction. While the Cable Route Corridor crosses this location, there are no proposals which would result in a permanent loss of access to properties. Construction activities associated with the cable route would be temporary and localised in nature, and access would be maintained during works to ensure that properties remain accessible. It should be noted that the Cable Route Corridor would not be accessed by construction traffic from Hough Lane, but from Field Lane to the east. An Outline Construction **Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** has been prepared, which includes measures to minimise impacts during construction, including reducing HGV movements during the peak hours and managing employee movements. The final CTMP will include controls on routing, timing of vehicle movements and the management of construction access, and will be agreed with North Yorkshire Council prior to construction to ensure that access to properties is appropriately managed during construction activities.
TRA-61	RR-1324	Transport and Access	Respondent stated that North Yorkshire Council recently consulted on a Heavy Commercial Vehicle Prohibition Order for roads including the entirety of the proposed construction route, which concluded that the roads are unsuitable for heavy goods vehicles due to safety and amenity impacts.	The Applicant is aware of consultation undertaken by NYC regarding weight limits in March on some routes within the study area. The Applicant is in regular discussion with North Yorkshire Council as the local highway authority in relation to construction traffic and access arrangements. An Outline Construction **Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** has been prepared, which includes measures to minimise impacts during construction, including reducing HGV movements during the peak hours and managing employee movements. The final CTMP will be developed in consultation with and agreed by North Yorkshire Council prior to construction, ensuring that construction traffic is managed in a manner that is appropriate for the local highway network and aligned with the highway authority's requirements.
TRA-62	RR-0983	Transport and Access	Respondent requested a speed limit of 20mph be enacted in areas where construction traffic is due to take place.	The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** has been prepared to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction. An **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP, [APP-201])** has also been prepared which identifies the routes that should be used by construction traffic. The oCTMP also includes measures to minimise any impacts during construction by reducing HGV movements during the peak hours and the possibility to explore temporary speed limit reductions, subject to agreement with NYC Highways.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The **oPROWMP [APP-199]** describes that the majority of the Solar Development Sites and the Cable Route Corridor have been designed in such a way so as to ensure that construction vehicles will not need to cross PRoWs. In the case that construction traffic does cross PRoWs, speed will be limited to 10mph. The conclusions of the TA are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network.
TRA-63	RR-0504	Transport and Access	Respondent expressed concern about the presence of multiple single track bridges on the access routes to Sites 3 and 4 near Birkin, and questioned whether these bridges and the surrounding narrow country roads are suitable to accommodate construction traffic.	The Applicant is aware of a small number of weight restrictions on local bridges and confirms that where necessary, alternative routes are in place for heavy vehicles to avoid these weight restrictions. Access routes including these alternate HGV routes are detailed in **ES Volume 2, Figure 14.4 Construction Routing [APP-113]**.
TRA-64	RR-1051	Transport and Access	Respondent stated concerns about emergency access and response constraints due to the single-track, dead-end nature of Common Lane, referencing previous incidents requiring significant emergency service attendance.	The Applicant notes this concern regarding potential constraints on emergency access and response along Common Lane due to its single-track and dead-end characteristics. The design of the Proposed Development includes localised Highways Improvement Areas (HIAs) along Common Lane, as shown in **ES Volume 2, Figure 1.2: Elements of the Proposed Development [APP-058]**, and the **Draft Development Consent Order [APP-017]** includes provision for permanent alterations to the highway where required. These measures, including the provision of passing places, are intended to address existing constraints and facilitate the safe and effective operation of the route, including for larger vehicles and emergency access where necessary.
TRA-65	RR-1051	Transport and Access	Respondent stated that North Yorkshire Council is failing in its duty under the Highways Act 1980 to ensure the safety of users of Common Lane given its current condition and usage.	The Applicant notes this concern. Public Rights of Way (PRoW) and pedestrian routes within the study area have been identified and assessed as part of the **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]**. Routes for construction traffic have been chosen to avoid and minimise the impact on settlements where possible. The Environmental Statement includes an assessment of fear and intimidation in **ES Volume 1 Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement [APP-052]**. This calculates a degree of hazard score, which takes into account the average two-way flow, the HGV composition and the vehicle speed. Table 14-30 and Table 14-31 shows that

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Common Lane, South Milford is subject to a 'Small' level of fear and intimidation in both the baseline (existing) and 'with construction' scenarios. Therefore, the temporary increase in traffic during the construction phase is not expected to significantly alter the levels fear and intimidation. The Applicant reiterates its commitment to road safety, and notes that with implementation of the final version of the **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]**, roads should be no less safe than they currently are. Construction activities affecting pedestrian routes would be temporary and managed through the implementation of the CTMP. Measures may include temporary diversions, signage, and traffic management to maintain safety for users. Construction traffic will also be controlled through routing strategies and timing restrictions, reducing interaction with pedestrians where practicable. On this basis, any impacts on pedestrian connectivity would be temporary and appropriately mitigated.
TRA-66	RR-1051	Transport and Access	Respondent stated that there are inconsistencies between access plans, street plans, and later consultation materials, raising concerns about clarity and reliability of the proposed access strategy.	The Applicant notes this concern regarding the relationship between access plans, street plans and consultation materials. The Applicant does not consider that there is an inconsistency in the submitted application documents; however, it is recognised that the application comprises a suite of documents which are intended to be read together. Within the submitted application, the **Works Plans [AS-004]** and **Access to Works Plans [AS-006]** identify the location of works and the points at which access is taken to the Proposed Development. The **Street Plans [AS-007]** identify the highways affected by the Proposed Development, including those subject to works or temporary control. T The Transport Assessment then sets out the routing strategy and assesses the effects of construction traffic on the network. Taken together, these documents provide a consistent and sufficiently detailed basis to understand the proposed access strategy and assess its likely effects as part of the DCO examination.
TRA-67	RR-1051	Transport and Access	Respondent stated that personal observation indicates very low existing traffic volumes outside of occasional dog walkers and drainage vehicles, suggesting a mismatch between survey data and lived experience.	The Applicant notes this comment. Baseline traffic levels have been established through site-specific traffic surveys, as set out in the **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]**. These surveys have been undertaken in accordance with standard industry methodologies and are designed to capture representative traffic conditions over defined survey periods.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The Applicant recognises that individual perceptions of traffic levels at a particular location may vary; however, the baseline data used in the assessment is based on recorded survey data and provides a consistent and robust basis for assessing potential impacts. The TA adopts a reasonable worst-case approach to construction traffic, ensuring that impacts are not underestimated. On this basis, the assessment provides a robust evaluation of potential effects on the local highway network.
TRA-68	RR-1051	Transport and Access	Respondent stated that inaccuracies and outdated PROW mapping in the application undermine confidence in the robustness and reliability of the overall assessment.	The Applicant notes this comment. The assessment of PRoW and recreational routes presented in **Environmental Statement Volume 1, Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-051]** is based on a combination of data sources and field-based verification, including the PRoW definitive mapping data from North Yorkshire Council, National Trails and Ordnance Survey maps. The assessment has also been informed by ground-truthing surveys, which provide validation of the baseline conditions and ensure that the assessment reflects the on-site situation. On this basis, the Applicant considers that the assessment is robust and proportionate, and that the baseline used for the assessment provides an appropriate and reliable foundation for assessing likely effects. The assessment provides a description of the perceived impact on each PRoW and the mitigation measures proposed. The assessment concludes that the residual effects on the PRoW and recreational routes will be minor adverse, but that these effects are not categorised as significant. Furthermore, embedded design measures to remove array areas and offset areas from the PRoW, the management of traffic through the oCTMP and the provision of diversions in the **oPROWMP [APP-199]** will reduce the significance of effects on the PRoW network wherever practicable and possible to do so.
TRA-69	RR-1051	Transport and Access	Respondent stated that the Gascoigne Wood development relied on Common Lane as a pedestrian and cycling route in its approved traffic modelling, and that this has not been properly considered in cumulative impact assessments for the current proposal.	The Applicant notes this comment. The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** considers committed development and future baseline conditions, ensuring that the potential for cumulative effects is taken into account within the assessment. It is acknowledged that when operational, the Gascoigne Wood development is expected to generate more walking

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				and cycling trips on Common Lane which is an existing popular recreational route. As the only access route to Solar Development Sites 6 and 7, an Outline Construction **Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** has been prepared to include measures to minimise impacts of construction traffic on Common Lane during construction, including reducing HGV movements during the peak hours and managing employee movements. The final CTMP will include controls on routing, timing of vehicle movements and traffic management measures, and will be agreed with North Yorkshire Council prior to construction. This will ensure that traffic impacts, including any cumulative effects and interactions with pedestrians and cyclists, are appropriately managed during the construction phase. The Proposed Development also includes the provision of permissive paths and enhancements to the local access network, as set out in **Environmental Statement Volume 1 Chapter 13: Socioeconomics [APP-147]**. These measures provide additional linkage opportunities within the area to improve overall connectivity for recreational users.
TRA-70	RR-1051	Transport and Access	Respondent stated that overlapping timelines with other developments could significantly increase risks to public safety on Common Lane, and that cumulative effects have not been adequately assessed, further undermining confidence in the application.	The Applicant notes this comment. The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** considers committed development and future baseline conditions, ensuring that the potential for cumulative effects is taken into account within the assessment. The assessment identifies that, taking account of these cumulative conditions, the Proposed Development would not result in unacceptable cumulative impacts on the operation or safety of the local highway network. An Outline Construction **Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** has been prepared, which includes measures to minimise impacts during construction, including reducing HGV movements during the peak hours and managing employee movements. These measures have been taken into account within the assessment. The final CTMP will be developed in consultation with and agreed by North Yorkshire Council prior to construction and will provide a detailed refinement of these measures, ensuring that construction traffic associated with the Proposed Development is managed in a controlled manner and does not give rise to significant cumulative effects.
TRA-71	RR-0081	Transport and Access	Respondent expressed particular concern about road safety, traffic impacts, and access issues for schools in the vicinity of	The Applicant notes these concerns regarding the impact of construction traffic in the vicinity of Long Lane and Bishopdyke Road.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			Long Lane and Bishopdyke Road, including at the Bishopdyke Junction.	Long Lane and Bishopdyke Road are identified as routes for Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs). These movements would be limited in number and undertaken on an infrequent basis. AIL movements are subject to a separate approval and permitting process, requiring coordination with and approval from the relevant authorities, including North Yorkshire Council and the police, to ensure that they are undertaken safely and with appropriate traffic management measures in place. The junction of Bishopdyke Road and Long Lane has been identified as Highway Improvement Area (HIA), as shown in **ES Volume 2, Figure 1.2: Elements of the Proposed Development [APP-058]**. HIAs are sections of the highway network that will contain localised improvements such as improvements to the road edge where it is deteriorated, provision of temporary passing places within the existing highway boundary, traffic management measures, provision of visibility splays, and temporary highway and traffic works required to safely accommodate AIL deliveries. These areas support the movement of construction vehicles on narrower sections of the local highway network within parts of the construction vehicle routes to the Site. It is not proposed for any widening or straightening of highways to be permanent unless requested to be retained by the Highways Authority. The AIL approval process itself provides a key mechanism for mitigation, as routes, timing and traffic management requirements are agreed in advance with the relevant highway authorities and the police to ensure safe operation on the local network. This process will be reflected within the final **Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)**, which will secure the implementation of these measures and ensure that AIL movements are undertaken in a controlled and safe manner.
TRA-72	RR-1069	Transport and Access	Respondent stated that the application materials relating to AIL routes are incomplete, with limited information beyond mapped routes and annotated works areas (e.g. Works No. 8A/8B near Skipwith).	The Applicant notes this comment. Highways Improvement Areas (HIAs) are shown within **ES Volume 2, Figure 1.2: Elements of the Proposed Development [APP-058]**, which forms part of the submitted application documentation. HIAs are sections of the highway network that will contain localised improvements such as improvements to the road edge where it is deteriorated, provision of temporary passing places within the existing highway boundary, traffic management measures, provision of visibility splays, and temporary highway and traffic works required to safely accommodate AIL deliveries.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The Applicant confirms Abnormal Indivisible Loads will be routed through Skipwith. These movements would be limited in number and undertaken on an infrequent basis. AIL movements are subject to a separate approval and permitting process, requiring coordination with and approval from the relevant authorities, including North Yorkshire Council and the police, to ensure that they are undertaken safely and with appropriate traffic management measures in place.
TRA-73	RR-1069	Transport and Access	Respondent stated that there are no accompanying schedules of works, descriptions of construction activities, or clear definitions of work types, preventing proper assessment of impacts.	The Applicant notes this comment. The Proposed Development is being promoted through a Development Consent Order, and therefore a proportionate approach to defining construction activities and methods has been adopted at this stage. The assessment presented in the **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** is based on a robust worst-case scenario, ensuring that while detailed construction activities, sequencing and delivery will be developed at a later stage, sufficient information has been provided to enable a full assessment of likely effects based on the worst case. It is expected that any potential impacts following detailed design will be lower than presented in the application. An Outline Construction **Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** has been prepared, which includes measures to minimise impacts during construction. The final CTMP will be submitted to and agreed by North Yorkshire Council prior to construction and will provide detailed information on construction traffic generation, vehicle movements and associated management measures. This approach ensures that sufficient flexibility is retained to deliver the Proposed Development while securing appropriate controls on its implementation.
TRA-74	RR-1069	Transport and Access	Respondent stated that referenced documents (including Highways Improvement Areas ES Vol 2 Fig 2.4) are missing from the application library, meaning key assessment material is not publicly available or examinable as part of the DCO submission.	The Applicant notes this comment regarding referenced documents within the application. The Highways Improvement Areas (HIAs) are shown within **ES Volume 2, Figure 1.2: Elements of the Proposed Development [APP-058]**, which forms part of the submitted application documentation. These figures identify the location of proposed highway works required to facilitate the Proposed Development and are supported by the wider Environmental Statement and Transport Assessment.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The application has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Development Consent Order process, and the submitted documents provide sufficient information to enable the likely impacts of the Proposed Development to be assessed.
TRA-75	RR-1069	Transport and Access	Respondent stated that there is no evidence of consideration of alternative AIL routes or justification for the selected alignments, particularly in relation to the cable corridor leaving Site 1.	The Applicant notes this comment. The alignment of the Proposed Development, including the cable corridor, has been developed through an iterative design process taking account of environmental, engineering and land use constraints. The approach to site selection and alternatives is set out within **Environmental Statement Volume 1 Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-041]**, which describes how different options were considered and how the preferred design was identified. The selected alignment reflects a balance between these factors, including minimising environmental effects, reducing land take and maintaining an efficient and deliverable route between project components. The approach to the identification and management of Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) routes is set out within the **Abnormal Loads Report, Annex C of the Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]**, which identifies appropriate routes based on vehicle requirements, highway geometry and existing constraints on the network. The assessment demonstrates that routes have been selected having regard to their suitability for abnormal loads, including their ability to accommodate vehicle movements safely. This routing strategy reflects a balance between highway suitability, environmental constraints and land requirements.
TRA-76	RR-1069	Transport and Access	Respondent stated that the absence of route comparison, risk assessment, and environmental justification prevents proper evaluation of impacts on Skipwith, agricultural operations, traffic safety, and nearby heritage assets. Respondent stated that, without this information, it is not possible to properly assess the effects of the proposed AIL routes, and that this represents a significant gap in the application requiring further clarification.	The Applicant notes this comment. The effects of construction traffic on the highway network, including traffic safety, environmental effects and impacts on sensitive receptors, are assessed within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement [APP-052]**. This assessment considers the interaction between the Proposed Development and the local highway network and concludes that effects would not be significant. The AIL approval process itself provides a key mechanism for mitigation, as routes, timing and traffic management requirements are agreed in advance with the relevant highway authorities and the police to ensure safe operation on the local network. This process will be reflected within the final **Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)**, which will secure the implementation of these measures and

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				ensure that AIL movements are undertaken in a controlled and safe manner. The application is supported by the **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]**, which assesses the effects of construction traffic based on a robust worst-case scenario. This approach ensures that potential impacts are not underestimated at this stage. The conclusions of the TA are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there are not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network. An Outline Construction **Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** has been prepared, which includes measures to minimise impacts during construction. The final CTMP will be developed in consultation with and agreed by North Yorkshire Council prior to construction and will include detailed management measures to control traffic and mitigate impacts where required.
TRA-77	RR-1345	Transport and Access	Respondent expressed concern for the impact to Water Lane, a narrow road off the A63 which leads to Monk Fryston, and is already prone to traffic jams at peak times.	The Applicant notes this concern. Access routes are detailed in **ES Volume 2, Figure 14.4 Construction Routing [APP-113]**. Water Lane does not form part of the construction traffic routes identified for the Proposed Development. Concerns around traffic impacts on the A63 itself through Monk Fryston have been addressed in a separate response (TRA-018).
TRA-78	RR-1370	Transport and Access	Respondent stated that the cumulative impact of traffic from this and other developments (including Sherburn Industrial Estate expansions and the Gascoigne Interchange) has not been adequately assessed. Respondent added that the Applicant has failed to demonstrate compliance with NPPF TR6.	The Applicant notes this comment. The application is supported by a **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]**, which assesses the effects of construction traffic based on a robust worst-case scenario. This includes a Cumulative Effects assessment in Chapter 6. Table 6-6 within the **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** shows that the Proposed Development would have minimal impact (1% to 2%) on the routes that are forecast to see a change in baseline traffic conditions due to the committed developments. Whilst the impact of the additional trips associated with the Proposed Development is assessed as being minimal in the cumulative scenario, there is a commitment in Section 3.7 of the Outline Construction **Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** to consider the construction phasing of all the committed developments when updating the CTMP to ensure that the construction routing of traffic associated with the Proposed Development

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				would not have an unacceptable cumulative effect on local traffic conditions. The **Planning Statement [APP-207]** and **Policy Compliance Document [APP-224]** demonstrate how the Applicant has considered and responded to national and local policy. On this basis, the Proposed Development would not result in unacceptable or severe impacts and is therefore consistent with the requirements of the NPPF.
TRA-79	RR-0574	Transport and Access	Respondent expressed concern that, as Birkin lacks public transport, residents need to walk to Beal or Hillam, something which may not be possible in future because of the Proposed Development.	The Applicant notes this concern regarding the potential impact on walking routes used by residents of Birkin to access nearby settlements. Access routes are detailed in **ES Volume 2, Figure 14.4 Construction Routing [APP-113]**. Beal does not form part of the construction traffic routes identified for the Proposed Development. Roe Lane forms the route between Birkin and Hillam, which would be used by construction traffic accessing Solar Development Site 4. Access along local roads and PRoW will be maintained wherever practicable. Where temporary restrictions or closures are required, these will be limited in duration and suitable alternative arrangements will be provided. Measures to manage construction traffic, including routing, timing of movements and traffic management, will be secured through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan, to be developed in consultation with North Yorkshire Council. The Environmental Statement includes an assessment of fear and intimidation on users of Roe Lane in **ES Volume 1 Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement [APP-052]**. This calculates a degree of hazard score, which takes into account the average two-way flow, the HGV composition and the vehicle speed. Table 14-30 and Table 14-31 shows that Roe Lane is subject to a 'Small' level of fear and intimidation in both the baseline (existing) and 'with construction' scenarios. Therefore, the temporary increase in traffic during the construction phase is not expected to significantly alter the levels fear and intimidation. During the operational phase, each Solar Development Site is only expected to receive approximately five maintenance visits per month. The Applicant therefore considers that, with the implementation of appropriate construction traffic

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				management measures, conditions for pedestrians and other users of local roads and PRoW, including around Birkin, would be no less safe than at present, and no significant adverse effects are anticipated.
TRA-80	RR-0068	Transport and Access	Respondent expressed concern for the impact of traffic on Burton Salmon.	The Applicant notes this concern. Access routes are detailed in **ES Volume 2, Figure 14.4 Construction Routing [APP-113]**. Burton Salmon does not sit on the construction traffic routes identified for the Proposed Development, though Hillam Lane nearby is used for the construction of the cable route. The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** has been prepared to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction, including on Hillam Lane. The assessment indicates that the Proposed Development would result in a relatively small increase in traffic on Hillam Lane, typically around 6% on average across the construction period. In absolute terms, this represents a limited number of additional vehicle movements and is temporary in nature. Table 6-1 in the TA shows that there will be an average of 28 additional HGV movements per day associated with construction of the Proposed Development on Hillam Lane, which equates to an increase in composition of up to 134% when assessed as a worst-case scenario (i.e. all movements arriving by the same access route). However the percentage increase is exaggerated due to the low baseline HGV numbers on this link, and the absolute number of vehicles added to the network is low. The conclusions of the TA are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network.
TRA-81	RR-1282	Transport and Access	Respondent expressed concern for traffic and road / residential safety on Wheldrake Lane and Skipwith Road, respondent stated neither road is suitable as access routes or for HGVs and AILs. Respondent added that the junction of Skipwith Road and Wheldrake Lane is entirely unsuited for the turning circles of HGVs and AILs.	The Applicant notes this concern regarding traffic and road/residential safety on Wheldrake Lane and Skipwith Road. Access routes are detailed in **ES Volume 2, Figure 14.4: Construction Routing [APP-113].** This shows that access for HGVs to Solar Development Site 1 is proposed via Wheldake Lane to the north to avoid heavy vehicles accessing the site via Escrick village and the referenced junction with Skipwith Road.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Baseline traffic surveys presented within the **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** demonstrate that both routes are already used by HGVs, indicating that they are not unaccustomed to such traffic. Wheldrake Lane will only accommodate HGV access to Solar Development Site 1, and not Abnormal Loads – which will directly follow Skipwith Road from Escrick. Arrangements for transport of the Abnormal Loads will need to be made under licence with the Local Highway Authority to ensure it can be done safely, and to minimise impacts. Where localised constraints are identified, Highways Improvement Areas (HIAs) are proposed, as set out in **ES Volume 2, Figure 1.2: Elements of the Proposed Development [APP-058]**, to ensure that construction vehicles can operate safely on the network. An **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** has been prepared. The final CTMP will include controls on routing, timing of vehicle movements and traffic management measures where required, and will be agreed with North Yorkshire Council as the local highway authority prior to construction.
TRA-82	RR-1282	Transport and Access	Respondent objected to the Applicant's proposal to temporarily remove traffic calming measures on Skipwith Road and Main Street to accommodate HGVs and AILs, noting that speeding is already a documented concern for Escrick Parish Council. As Skipwith Road is a primary pedestrian and cycle route for children attending Escrick Primary School and the local Pre-School, the introduction of heavy industrial traffic and removal of safety infrastructure would create an unacceptable risk to vulnerable road users, as defined in the NPPF. Respondent further noted that the proposal may conflict with the Education Act 1996 and could justify an "Exclusion Zone" for construction traffic during school drop-off and pick-up hours.	The Applicant notes this concern. The need for any temporary modifications to the highway, including the removal of traffic calming features, has been identified through the design and assessment process to facilitate the safe movement of construction vehicles where required. Where such measures are necessary, they would be temporary and limited in duration. The Applicant notes this concern regarding traffic on Skipwith Road. Access routes are detailed in **ES Volume 2, Figure 14.4: Construction Routing [APP-113].** This shows that access for HGVs to Solar Development Site 1 is proposed via Wheldake Lane to the north to avoid heavy vehicles accessing the site via Escrick village and along Skipwith Road. Therefore the Applicant feels that potential risk for vulnerable road users has been appropriately mitigated. The final CTMP will include detailed controls on the routing and timing of construction traffic, and will incorporate site specific traffic management measures at sensitive locations, including near schools and pedestrian routes. This may include speed control measures, briefing of drivers and

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				appropriate signage, as well as restrictions on vehicle movements during peak school drop off and pick up periods, where required. The final CTMP will be developed in consultation with North Yorkshire Council. The conclusions of the **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network.
TRA-83	RR-1282	Transport and Access	Respondent stated that if consent is granted, the DCO must include strict, legally enforceable, and actively monitored restrictions on working hours, HGV routing, and a total ban on the idling of construction vehicles on or near Skipwith Road and Wheldrake Lane.	The Applicant notes this comment. The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** has been prepared to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction. An **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** has been prepared, which sets out the framework for controlling construction traffic. The final CTMP will be developed in consultation with and agreed by North Yorkshire Council as the local highway authority prior to construction. The final CTMP will include appropriate controls on construction traffic, including routing strategies, timing restrictions and traffic management measures, taking into account local constraints and sensitive receptors. Requirement 14 in Schedule 2 to the **Draft Development Consent Order [APP-017]** requires that the construction works must be carried out in accordance with the approved construction traffic management plan. A breach of a DCO Requirement, including compliance with the management plans approved under the Requirement, is automatically a criminal offence under the Planning Act 2008. The conclusions of the TA are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network. On this basis, appropriate and proportionate measures to manage construction traffic will be secured through the CTMP and agreed with the relevant authorities.
TRA-84	RR-1306	Transport and Access	Respondent specifically requested an alternative to the C2 access lane being used.	The Applicant notes this comment. The location of access points, including the access adjacent to Field House Farm (CA2), has been developed through the design process taking account of highway suitability, safety, access to the

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				site and the need to connect to the existing road network in an efficient and appropriate manner. Alternative access arrangements have been considered as part of this process; however, the identified access is considered to represent an appropriate solution having regard to the characteristics of the local highway network and the overall construction strategy. The Applicant recognises concerns regarding continued access to properties and land uses in this location, including Field House Farm. Construction activities would be temporary in nature and access for existing users would be maintained during construction, with any temporary restrictions managed through appropriate traffic management measures agreed with the relevant highway authority. Measures to manage construction traffic, including routing, timing controls and traffic management where required, will be secured through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), to minimise disruption to local receptors.

Transport and Access – Detailed Comments relating to West Haddlesey

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Transport and Access - Detailed Comments relating to West Haddlesey				
TRA-85	RR-1462, RR-0945, RR-1324, RR-0527, RR-1263, RR-0097, RR-1457, RR-1158, RR-0606, RR-0298, RR-0709, RR-1141, RR-1310, RR-1358, RR-0268, RR-0056, RR-1399, RR-0827, RR-0628, RR-1010, RR-0742, RR-0488, RR-0076, RR-0707, RR-1171, RR-0735, RR-0735, RR-0445, RR-0589, RR-0486, RR-0724, RR-1364, RR-1000, RR-1325, RR-0629, RR-1062, RR-0878, RR-1339, RR-0739, RR-1203, RR-0602, RR-0082, RR-0234, RR-1414, RR-0031, RR-0164, RR-0604, RR-0142, RR-1040	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed concern about the impact of traffic on Haddlesey / West Haddlesey. Respondents expressed concern about the safety of members of the public from oncoming traffic when using: • Chapel Haddlesey Primary School (School lacks a traffic warden) • The playpark in West Haddlesey, which has entrances and exits onto the main road. • The Doorstep Green community park • Haddlesey Church Community Hall • The telephone box library One respondent suggested adding speed bumps along the construction route through the village. Some respondents suggested that speed of over 50mph through Haddlesey/West Haddlesey will be particularly problematic. Respondents expressed concern regarding the impact to cyclists using this area.	The Applicant makes note of these comments and can confirm that a letter has been issued to West Haddlesey Parish Council on 17 April 2026 thanking the Parish Council for their comments on the sensitivity classification of this route. As set out in the response to West Haddlesey, whilst the assessments describe this route as largely rural in character, it is acknowledged that sections of the route pass through residential areas and near community facilities. As such, parts of the route could reasonably be considered to have a higher sensitivity to traffic changes. However, even where a higher sensitivity classification is assumed, the very small increase in HGV movements associated with the Proposed Development means that the overall conclusions remain unchanged, following the application of industry assessment guidance. The route from the A19 through West Haddlesey to Solar Development Site 4 was selected as it represents the most direct connection to the strategic road network. Alternative routes via the A63 or A1 would require significantly longer journeys and would pass through a greater number of residential areas and communities. On this basis, the selected route was considered the most appropriate option. The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** has been prepared to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction. Construction traffic routes and access points have been developed to utilise the most appropriate sections of the highway network and to minimise use of constrained rural routes where practicable. Table 2-1 in the TA outlines the baseline traffic flows associated on assessed links, showing that Haddlesey Road / Birkin Road accommodates HGV movements at present. Therefore, the baseline condition already includes interaction between large vehicles and local users, and the relatively small and temporary increase associated with the Proposed Development is not expected to materially change the existing level of risk. More generally, construction traffic will be managed through measures included within the **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]**, which will be

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				developed further through a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) as secured through the DCO. These measures are applied across the full project site, and include: • Scheduling deliveries to avoid peak travel periods, including school pick up and drop off times. This commitment would also avoid the breakfast club timescales and be ahead of the pick-up times for afterschool clubs when parents are dropping off or collecting children. • Clear signed routing for construction vehicles. • Contractor management procedures, including strict penalties for drivers who do not comply with standards. • Temporary speed management measures, to be agreed with the North Yorkshire Council. • The oCTMP will also include consideration of the presence of cyclists and shared use of the carriageway, with measures implemented to reduce the potential for conflict and ensure safe interaction with other road users.
TRA-86	RR-0032, RR-1434, RR-0498, RR-0343, RR-1158, RR-0604, RR-1462, RR-0945, RR-1310, RR-0268, RR-0056, RR-0827, RR-0628, RR-1010, RR-1324, RR-0742, RR-0488, RR-0527, RR-1263, RR-0097, RR-0076, RR-0707, RR-1457, RR-0142, RR-0606, RR-0589, RR-0709, RR-0724, RR-1364, RR-1000, RR-1325, RR-1062, RR-0878, RR-0739, RR-0602, RR-0234, RR-1414	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed concern regarding the impact on **Tankard's Bridge** in Haddlesey. Some respondents highlighted the lack of footpaths on this bridge.	The Applicant makes note of this comment. Traffic surveys were undertaken in January 2025 to inform the **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]**. A count location was established to the west of West Haddlesey and Tankards Bridge (Link 8 on Figure 14.5). Weekday (Monday–Friday) data for this location indicates an average of 29 HGV movements per day in 2025, reducing to an average of 24 movements when weekend flows are included. It is reasonable to assume that the majority of these existing HGV movements travel through West Haddlesey via the A19 junction. During the construction period, a worst-case scenario in which all traffic associated with Solar Development Site 4 travels via the A19 through West Haddlesey and across Tankards Bridge would result in an average daily increase of up to 3 additional HGV trips to and from the Proposed Development (the equivalent uplift of 6 daily HGV movements). This uplift is comparable with observed day-to-day variation in baseline flows, with survey data recording 32 HGV movements on Monday 3 February 2025 compared to

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				25 movements on Tuesday 28 January 2025 (a difference of 7 movements). In addition to HGV movements, the assessment forecasts that there could be an average daily increase of up to 36 other vehicle trips (72 two-way movements) expected to access Solar Development Site 4 on an average day. The assessment confirms that these construction movements would result in a temporary change in the composition of traffic flows on the route through West Haddlesey and over Tankards Bridge. However, with the implementation of the management measures set out in the **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201**], the effects of these additional trips can be appropriately managed. Furthermore, Solar Development Site 4 will be served by four access locations: one on Haddlesey Road and three on Roe Lane. As such, construction traffic will be distributed across these access points. This means that the number of daily trips using the route via West Haddlesey is expected to be lower than the worst-case scenario assessed – which assessed each link as if they were to accommodate 100% of the construction traffic for the relevant site. The proposed construction routing **(ES Volume 2, Figure 14.4 [APP-113)** indicates alternative routes to Solar Development Site 4 via the A1(M) and M62. Notwithstanding this, the assessment has applied a consistent uplift on traffic across all access routes to ensure a robust assessment. No abnormal load traffic will use the route via West Haddlesey. The Applicant reiterates its commitment to road safety, and notes that with implementation of the final version of the **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]**, roads should be no less safe than they currently are. Construction activities affecting pedestrian routes would be temporary and managed through the implementation of the CTMP. Measures may include temporary diversions, signage, and traffic management to maintain safety for all users.
TRA-87	RR-1434, RR-0498, RR-0945, RR-1310, RR-1358, RR-0268, RR-0056, RR-0628, RR-1242, RR-1010, RR-1324, RR-0527, RR-1263, RR-1171, RR-1457, RR-0142,	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed safety concern over the **A19 crossroads** and the lack of turning space for HGVs.	The Applicant notes this comment. Accident statistics for the period 2014 to 2024 (the latest available) indicates that two 'slight' accidents have occurred at the A19 / Millfield Road junction. With Department for Transport data showing

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
	RR-0735, RR-0735, RR-0195, RR-1364, RR-0629, RR-0878, RR-0739, RR-0602, RR-0082, RR-0234, RR-1414			average daily flows of 9,902 vehicles on this section of the A19, the forecast increase in traffic associated with construction, equating to approximately a 1% increase, is not expected to materially alter traffic composition or increase accident risk. Traffic surveys were undertaken in January 2025 to inform the **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]**. A count location was established to the west of West Haddlesey and Tankards Bridge (Link 8 on Figure 14.5). Weekday (Monday–Friday) data for this location indicates an average of 29 HGV movements per day in 2025, reducing to an average of 24 movements when weekend flows are included. It is reasonable to assume that the majority of these existing HGV movements travel through West Haddlesey via the A19 junction, and it is therefore deemed that the use of the junction is appropriate. The Applicant reiterates its commitment to road safety, and notes that with implementation of the final version of the **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]**, roads should be no less safe than they currently are. Construction activities affecting pedestrian routes would be temporary and managed through the implementation of the CTMP. Measures may include temporary diversions, signage, and traffic management to maintain safety for all users.
TRA-88	RR-1324, RR-1457, RR-0709, RR-0628, RR-0878, RR-0602, RR-0500, RR-0589, RR-0486	Transport and Access	Respondents stated that the **ES / Chapter 14 / Transport Assessment for Site 4 / West Haddlesey** does not adequately identify or assess key hazards and sensitive receptors along the proposed route, including • Chapel Haddlesey Primary School, • West Haddlesey Village Hall, • children's recreation areas, • narrow and discontinuous footways, • pedestrian movements, • cyclists and horse riders, • and Tankards Bridge	The Applicant makes note of these comments and can confirm that a letter has been issued to West Haddlesey Parish Council on 17 April 2026 thanking the Parish Council for their comments on the sensitivity classification of this route. As set out in the response to West Haddlesey, whilst the assessments describe this route as largely rural in character, it is acknowledged that sections of the route pass through residential areas and near community facilities. As such, parts of the route could reasonably be considered to have a higher sensitivity to traffic changes. However, even where a higher sensitivity classification is assumed, the very small increase in HGV movements associated with the Proposed Development means that the overall conclusions remain unchanged, following the application of industry assessment guidance. The route from the A19 through West Haddlesey to Solar Development Site 4 was selected as it represents the most

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				direct connection to the strategic road network. Alternative routes via the A63 or A1 would require significantly longer journeys and would pass through a greater number of residential areas and communities. On this basis, the selected route was considered the most appropriate option. The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** has been prepared to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction. Construction traffic routes and access points have been developed to utilise the most appropriate sections of the highway network and to minimise use of constrained rural routes where practicable. Table 2-1 in the TA outlines the baseline traffic flows associated on assessed links, showing that Haddlesey Road / Birkin Road accommodates HGV movements at present. Therefore, the baseline condition already includes interaction between large vehicles and local users, and the relatively small and temporary increase associated with the Proposed Development is not expected to materially change the existing level of risk. More generally, construction traffic will be managed through measures included within the **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]**, which will be developed further through a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) as secured through the DCO. These measures are applied across the full project site, and include: • Scheduling deliveries to avoid peak travel periods, including school pick up and drop off times. This commitment would also avoid the breakfast club timescales and be ahead of the pickup times for afterschool clubs when parents are dropping off or collecting children. • Clear signed routing for construction vehicles. • Contractor management procedures, including strict penalties for drivers who do not comply with standards. • Temporary speed management measures, to be agreed with the North Yorkshire Council. • The oCTMP will also include consideration of the presence of cyclists and shared use of the carriageway, with measures implemented to reduce the potential for conflict and ensure safe interaction with other road users.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
TRA-89	RR-1355, RR-0450	Transport and Access	Respondents reported that the road between West Haddlesey and Birkin is unsuitable for HGV traffic, added that they use the road for cycling, which they believe they will no longer be able to do.	The Applicant makes note of this comment. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement [APP-052]** presents the impact assessment undertaken for traffic and details the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development on traffic and movement. The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** has been prepared to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction. Construction traffic routes and access points have been developed to utilise the most appropriate sections of the highway network and to minimise use of constrained rural routes where practicable. Table 2-1 in the TA outlines the baseline traffic flows associated on assessed links, showing that Haddlesey Road / Birkin Road accommodates HGV movements at present. Therefore, the baseline condition already includes interaction between large vehicles and local users, and the relatively small and temporary increase associated with the Proposed Development is not expected to materially change the existing level of risk. Table 6-1 in the TA shows that there will be an average of 6 additional HGV movements per day associated with construction of the Proposed Development. It should be noted that this is a worst case forecast to ensure a robust assessment, where in reality these 6 daily movements would be spread across the access routes rather than all arriving via one as has been assessed. Note that the Environmental Statement includes an assessment of fear and intimidation on users of Haddlesey Road / Birkin Road in **ES Volume 1 Chapter 14: Traffic and Movement [APP-052]**. This calculates a degree of hazard score, which takes into account the average two-way flow, the HGV composition and the vehicle speed. Given the relatively percentage increase in construction traffic, Haddlesey Road / Birkin Road were not taken forward for detailed fear and intimidation assessment, and the Proposed Development is therefore not expected to materially alter existing levels of fear and intimidation on these routes. The conclusions of the TA are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there is not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				The final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) will set out the detailed measures to manage construction traffic, including timing and traffic management arrangements, and will be subject to approval by the relevant planning authority in consultation with the highway authority. This process will ensure that appropriate measures are identified to manage potential interactions with sensitive receptors, including school locations, where relevant.
TRA-90	RR-0298, RR-0878	Transport and Access	Respondents suggested that all construction traffic to be routed through Chapel and West Haddlesey instead be routed down the A63.	The Applicant notes these comments. The construction traffic routing strategy was developed to prioritise the most direct and appropriate routes from the Strategic Road Network to the site, while also taking account of additional factors including highway suitability, safety and the presence of local constraints. The route from the A19 through West Haddlesey to Solar Development Site 4 was selected as it represents the most direct connection to the strategic road network. Alternative routes via the A63 or A1 would require significantly longer journeys and would pass through a greater number of residential areas and communities. On this basis, the selected route was considered the most appropriate option.
TRA-91	RR-0739, RR-1203	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed concern for properties in West Haddlesey such as theirs which have restricted visibility when turning out of driveways, meaning they would be unable to see coming HGVs.	The Applicant notes this comment. The **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** has been prepared to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport network during construction. Construction traffic routes and access points have been developed to utilise the most appropriate sections of the highway network and to minimise use of constrained rural routes where practicable. Table 2-1 in the TA outlines the baseline traffic flows associated on assessed links, showing that Haddlesey Road / Birkin Road accommodates HGV movements at present. Therefore, the baseline condition already includes interaction between large vehicles and local users, and the relatively small and temporary increase associated with the Proposed Development is not expected to materially change the existing level of risk. Table 6-1 in the TA shows that there will be an average of 6 additional HGV movements per day associated with construction of the Proposed Development. It should be noted that this is a worst case forecast to ensure a robust assessment, where in reality these 6 daily movements would be spread across the access routes rather than all arriving via one as has been assessed.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				An Outline Construction **Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]** has been prepared, which includes measures to minimise impacts during construction, including reducing HGV movements during the peak hours and speed management measures where required. The final CTMP will be agreed with North Yorkshire Council prior to construction and will include measures to manage construction traffic and ensure that vehicles operate in a controlled manner on narrow rural roads. The conclusions of the **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there are not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network.
TRA-92	RR-0142	Transport and Access	Respondents expressed concern for potential damage to the cottages along the narrow road through West Haddlesey.	The Applicant notes this comment. The identified construction routes have been selected to utilise the most appropriate roads available, and to avoid where practicable, designated protected areas, height and weight restrictions, and residential areas. During the construction period, a worst-case scenario in which all traffic associated with Solar Development Site 4 travels via the A19 through West Haddlesey, would result in an average daily increase of up to 3 additional HGV trips to and from the Proposed Development (the equivalent uplift of 6 daily HGV movements). This uplift is comparable with observed day-to-day variation in baseline flows, with survey data recording 32 HGV movements on Monday 3 February 2025 compared to 25 movements on Tuesday 28 January 2025 (a difference of 7 movements). Construction traffic is therefore not expected to generate adverse impacts on residential properties. In addition to HGV movements, the assessment forecasts that there could be an average daily increase of up to 36 other vehicle trips (72 two-way movements) expected to access Solar Development Site 4 on an average day. The assessment confirms that these construction movements would result in a temporary change in the composition of traffic flows on the route through West Haddlesey. However, with the implementation of the management measures set out in the **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201**], the effects of these additional trips can be appropriately managed, which includes measures to

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				minimise impacts during construction, including reducing HGV movements during the peak hours and speed management measures where required. The final CTMP will be agreed with North Yorkshire Council prior to construction and will include measures to manage construction traffic and ensure that vehicles operate in a controlled manner on narrow rural roads. The conclusions of the **Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-178]** are set out in full in Section 7; overall, the TA concludes that any temporary impacts from the Proposed Development can be managed through the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and there are not expected to be any long-term significant impacts on the transport network or residential properties.
TRA-93	RR-0878	Transport and Access	Respondent reported that, in reference to the "Traffic Plan", the Applicant has confirmed that the 50 baseline HGV movements should in fact be 9 movements, and that the Applicant cannot provide any breakdown of the category of HGV movements during construction.	The Applicant makes note of this comment and can confirm that a letter has been issued to West Haddlesey Parish Council on 17 April 2026 thanking the Parish Council for identifying the issue and confirming that the correct baseline flow for Link 7 (Haddlesley Road) is 9 HGVs rather than 50 as previously reported. The Applicant also confirmed a broader check of the Transport Assessment dataset was carried out and no other errors were identified. The Applicant also advised that the assessment indicates that HGV movements on Haddlesey Road would increase to approximately 15 HGVs per day during peak construction, representing an increase of six HGV movements per day associated with the Proposed Development. Due to this low absolute number of HGVs added to the network, the impacts of construction traffic remain negligible. Vehicle type would be determined on panel choice and configuration at detailed design stage but it is unlikely that the HGV movements for the Proposed Development would be made up only of 44-tonne articulated lorries.

2.25Water Resources and Flood Risk

Water Resources and Flood Risk – General Comments

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Water Resources and Flood Risk – General Comments				
WAT-01	RR-0129, RR-0037, RR-0471, RR-0441, RR-1388, RR-0255, RR-0457, RR-0287, RR-1178, RR-1002, RR-0618, RR-0343, RR-1162, RR-0228, RR-0864, RR-1008, RR-0516, RR-0306, RR-0568, RR-0576, RR-0847, RR-0998, RR-0750, RR-0309, RR-0182, RR-0733, RR-1276, RR-0352, RR-0713, RR-0488, RR-1231, RR-1245, RR-0533, RR-0520, RR-1398, RR-0587, RR-1219, RR-0907, RR-1246, RR-0215, RR-0145, RR-0074, RR-0621, RR-0632, RR-1370, RR-0600, RR-0265, RR-0921, RR-1212, RR-0211, RR-1229, RR-1197, RR-0760, RR-0205, RR-0381, RR-1102, RR-0283, RR-1019, RR-0432, RR-0347, RR-0555, RR-1387, RR-1051, RR-0811	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Respondents expressed concern that the Proposed Development could **increase flood risk**, including concerns that the installation of solar panels would lead to increased flooding. Some respondents specified that this could occur as a result of increased surface water run-off from the panels. Some respondents specified flooding will increase due to drainage issues. Some respondents noted that the area is already **prone to flooding**. Some respondents expressed that flood risk has **not been adequately considered** or assessed.	Flood risk from all relevant sources has been carefully considered within the **Flood Risk Assessment (FRA, [APP-179])**. The FRA assesses both the risk of flooding to the development itself and the potential effects of the Proposed Development on flood risk elsewhere, including from surface water runoff, in line with current planning policy and guidance. The assessment has been informed by consultation and engagement 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 (ODS) [APP-182]** to ensure that surface water run-off or flood risk is not increased as a result of the development. Section 9 of the **Flood Risk Assessment (FRA, [APP-179])** provides a summary of the assessment conclusions, stating that that the primary source of flood risk to the Proposed Development is from fluvial flooding. Other sources of potential flood risk to the development include surface water and groundwater flooding, which are considered further on a site-by-site basis in Annex A – Annex H of the FRA. The FRA also acknowledges that certain elements of the Proposed Development are considered sensitive to flooding, including the BESS enclosures and substations. A sequential approach has been followed, and no such elements have been located within fluvial Flood Zone 3, or Flood Zone 2 as far as reasonably practical. The Applicant has and continues to engage with key stakeholders on issues related to flood risk and drainage.
WAT-02	RR-1116, RR-1059, RR-0061, RR-0695, RR-0949, RR-1002, RR-1016, RR-0818, RR-0576, RR-0235, RR-1109, RR-0086, RR-0335, RR-0230, RR-1368, RR-1305, RR-0993, RR-0996, RR-0026, RR-0966, RR-0958,RR-1212, RR-1365, RR-0950, RR-0853, RR-0949, RR-1002, RR-1199, RR-0520, RR-1212, RR-0571, RR-1051	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Respondents expressed general concern regarding the potential for **contamination** arising from the Proposed Development. Some respondents raised concerns about the use of cleaning products or other **chemicals** during operation. Some respondents also expressed concern that chemicals contained within the solar panels could **leach or leak** into the surrounding land.	The Applicant can confirm the use of chemicals within the Proposed Development would be minimal, with no PFAS (forever chemicals) present in solar panel coatings or on BESS batteries. The solar cells would be made from silicon, a material with properties almost the same as sand. They may contain very small amounts of heavy metals, but these are well within the limits set by law; this is confirmed by the Applicant checking the results of testing in independent laboratories. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [APP-040]** confirms that no chemical cleaning

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				products would be used, with stubborn dirt brushed or wiped off the panels. The Solar PV Panels would be cleaned using water only, using deionised water transported to site by tanker. The **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan and Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan** secure the commitments in this regard. Ground contamination was considered as part of the **Ground Conditions Preliminary Risk Assessment (PRA) [APP-185]** undertaken for ground conditions. The PRA is further detailed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Other Environmental Issues [APP-054]**, where it is acknowledged that while risks from contamination to the Proposed Development are typically low for the Solar Development Sites, the conceptual site model will be confirmed through a further ground investigation, to be undertaken post consent, prior to the start of construction activities. The Applicant has prepared an **Outline Pollution and Spillage Response Plan (oPSRP) [APP-198]** for the construction, operation, and eventual decommissioning of the Proposed Development, setting out the intended strategies for managing pollution and spillage incidents on site. Upon detection of a contaminant pollution incident, the source must be identified and both the Site Manager and ECoW (for the purposes of ecological protection) notified. All activities that could exacerbate the incident must be halted, and any spill or leak should be stopped and contained, provided it is safe to do so. Containment measures are intended to prevent any ongoing spill or leak from entering soils, groundwater, watercourses, or other sensitive water features. These procedures include the deployment of appropriate pollution control equipment, such as spill kits, drip trays, and earth or sand bunds, together with inspections to confirm that pollutants have not reached drainage systems, watercourses, or other sensitive receptors. The **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP**, **[APP-192])** also includes measures to prevent any spillages or potential contamination specifically during construction, including provision that locations identified as being at greater risk from contamination releases have a non-permeable 'Durabase Mat System' or a similar non-ground penetrating mat system installed to protect groundwaters during construction. During the operational phase, the **Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				(oOEMP, **[APP-193])** includes further measures, such as securing that bulk fuels and any chemicals used on the Sites will be stored appropriately, within an impervious bund of 110% of the volume of the container to reduce the potential for any contamination source in the event of a container failure / leak of battery fire and associated fire waters. Additionally, the **Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-182]** sets out measures to manage runoff from components with a potentially higher pollution risk (including BESS), ensuring that any contaminants are appropriately controlled and do not pose a risk to the surrounding environment.
WAT-03	RR-0186, RR-1008, RR-0306, RR-0576, RR-0750, RR-0352, RR-0713, RR-0841, RR-0533, RR-0374, RR-0074, RR-1370, RR-0265, RR-0921, RR-0381, RR-0853, RR-0571	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Respondents expressed concern that **soil compaction** resulting from surface water run-off could increase flood risk.	The potential effects of soil compaction during construction have been considered within **the Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-182]** and the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** which considers appropriate construction-phase measures to be implemented to manage this risk. Furthermore, the **Outline SRMP [APP-203]** sets out good practice measures to avoid damage to soil structure, including measures to both minimise ground compaction and ensure remedial action is undertaken where ground is compacted. Utilising grass or wildflower cover will help to enhance interception and root growth, promoting effective rainwater infiltration and interception.
WAT-04	RR-0998, RR-1051, RR-0811	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Respondents expressed concern regarding the Proposed Development's impact on drainage patterns.	The **Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-182]** sets out the Applicant's assessment of surface water runoff from the development including Solar PV areas. The Proposed Development is in accordance with all relevant national standards and guidelines on the management of surface water, including NPS EN-3 on the management of runoff from solar panels. Furthermore, appropriate mitigation measures are proposed within the **Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) [APP-179]** and the **Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-182]** to ensure that surface water run-off or flood risk is not increased as a result of the development.
WAT-05	RR-1229, RR-0998	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Respondents expressed scepticism as to whether the proposed **flood mitigation measures** would be effective.	Mitigation measures relating to flood risk are set out within **Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) [APP-179]** prepared for the Proposed Development, and are secured by the **Works Plans and the Design Parameters and Commitments Document**. These include measures applicable to the design, construction, operation and decommissioning phases

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				of the Proposed Development, to manage flood risk on-site and to ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Evidence provided within the flood risk assessments carried out for each Solar Development Site (see Annex A - Annex G of the FRA) demonstrates that the Proposed Development can be designed to be safe from flooding over its lifetime, considering the vulnerability of its users, and without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
WAT-06	RR-1002, RR-0847	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Respondents stated that the Proposed Development must adhere to the requirements of EN-1 and NPPF paragraph 159 in relation to flooding.	The **Planning Statement [APP-207]** and **Policy Compliance Document [APP-224]** set out how the Proposed Development complies with the relevant national and local planning policies including EN-1 and the NPPF and the **Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) [APP-179]** has been prepared in accordance with both.
WAT-07	RR-1002, RR-1105	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Respondents stated that the cumulative flooding impact has not been adequately assessed, and requested that a comprehensive cumulative assessment is undertaken.	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 including flooding. The cumulative assessment has taken into account nearby developments, including other solar projects, that fall within the relevant zones of influence for each topic to evaluate potential combined effects. A formal assessment of cumulative effects is reported within Section 15.14 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water Resources and Flood Risk [APP-053]**, drawing upon the methodology set out in **Chapter 17: Cumulative and In-Combination Effects [APP-055].** Within Chapter 15, the cumulative assessment considers the interaction of the Proposed Development, across multiple parcels and infrastructure corridors, with other existing and committed developments, assessing where effects may combine spatially and temporally at identified receptors. The cumulative assessment concludes that, taking into account the spatial extent of the study area, the nature of the works, and the implementation of embedded mitigation measures, the Proposed Development would not materially increase flood risk and therefore there is no potential for significant cumulative effects on flood risk. Accordingly, whilst the FRA underpins the assessment through detailed hydraulic modelling and parcel-level analysis, the consideration of cumulative flood risk effects is

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				explicitly addressed within the ES (Chapter 15 and Chapter 17), ensuring that potential interactions across the full extent of the Proposed Development and with other schemes have been robustly assessed.
WAT-08	RR-1002	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Respondent has requested a full catchment-wide flood risk assessment and a proper application of the Sequential Test is undertaken.	The **Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) [APP-179]** sets out a comprehensive assessment of flood risk across the Proposed Development, which spans multiple hydrological catchments, including the Aire and Calder and Wharfe and Lower Ouse catchments. The assessment draws on available Environment Agency datasets and site-specific hydraulic modelling to characterise flood risk across the wider catchment context, including the influence of upstream and downstream processes (Sections 4; 5; 6). The FRA includes site-specific assessments for each Solar Development Site and the Cable Route Corridor (Annexes A–H), which collectively consider flood risk from all relevant sources, including fluvial, surface water, groundwater, and artificial sources, under current and future climate change scenarios. This approach ensures that flood risk is assessed across the full spatial extent of the Proposed Development and in the context of the surrounding catchment (Section 6). Furthermore, the Sequential Test has been undertaken and is documented in Section 7 of the **FRA [APP-179]**. A full **Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) [AS-109]** has also been prepared, which considers reasonable alternative sites and applies a risk-based approach to locating development away from areas of highest flood risk. This demonstrates that site selection and design have been informed by a risk-based approach, with development directed to areas of lowest flood risk where reasonably practicable. In addition, a sequential approach has been embedded within the site layouts, with more vulnerable infrastructure steered away from areas of highest flood risk and located preferentially within Flood Zone 1 or lower-risk areas within sites (Section 7). Accordingly, the **FRA [APP-179]** provides a robust, policy-compliant assessment of flood risk at both the catchment and site scale, and demonstrates that the Sequential Test has been appropriately applied in line with national guidance.
WAT-09	RR-0215	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Respondent expressed concern that flood risk evidenced in the DCO application breaches government's own ambitions to reduce flooding risk.	The **Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) [APP-179]** demonstrates that the Proposed Development has been designed in accordance with national policy and guidance, including the requirement that development should be safe

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				for its lifetime and should not increase flood risk elsewhere (Section 2; Section 7). The FRA includes detailed hydraulic modelling and supplementary volumetric assessment to assess the potential impact of the Proposed Development on floodplain storage and flood levels. The assessment demonstrates that the presence of infrastructure would result in only negligible changes in flood levels; subsequent analysis, which will be included within a future revision of the FRA, demonstrates increases of less than 1mm, and no material increase in flood risk beyond the Order Limits (Section 6.3). In addition, the design has been informed by a sequential approach that avoids the highest risk areas where possible, and incorporates embedded mitigation measures to ensure that floodplain function is maintained, flood flows are not impeded, and more vulnerable infrastructure is located outside areas of highest risk (Sections 4; 7; 8). The FRA also demonstrates that areas at highest flood risk (Flood Zone 3b – functional floodplain) have been avoided in the design, with these areas excluded from development to maintain their flood storage function. This approach is consistent with national policy objectives to direct development away from areas of greatest flood risk. The FRA also sets out a range of mitigation and resilience measures, including appropriate finished floor levels, flood-resilient design, and flood risk management procedures, to ensure the Proposed Development remains safe throughout its operational lifetime (Section 8). Accordingly, the FRA demonstrates that the Proposed Development does not conflict with Government objectives to manage and reduce flood risk. Instead, it shows that flood risk has been robustly assessed and managed, with the development designed to avoid increasing flood risk elsewhere and to remain safe and resilient over its lifetime.
WAT-10	RR-1093	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Respondent expressed general concern for disruption to waterways.	**ES Volume 3, Appendix 15.2 Water Environment Regulations (WER) Assessment [APP-180]** and **ES Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water Resources and Flood Risk [APP-053]** assess the potential effects of the Proposed Development on watercourses and the wider water environment. The assessment identifies all relevant water bodies within and hydraulically connected to the Order Limits and evaluates potential impacts in accordance with the

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				requirement to prevent deterioration in water body status. Embedded mitigation measures are incorporated to avoid disruption to waterways (Appendix 15.2 Section 5.2). These include maintaining a minimum 10 m stand-off from watercourses, using existing crossings where practicable, applying trenchless techniques (e.g. horizontal directional drilling) for crossings of main rivers and sensitive watercourses, and reinstating any temporary works to baseline or better condition following construction. Culverting of watercourses is avoided where practical; where culverts are required, they would be appropriately designed and sized to maintain flow conveyance and avoid increasing flood risk, ensuring no impediment to the existing drainage function (in line with **Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) [APP-179]** Section 8.2.1.7). In addition, any works to waterways will also be controlled through the relevant approval processes with the EA, IDBs and LLFA. This might include relevant permits and pre-condition surveys as set out in the oCEMP **[APP-192].** This is secured through protective provisions within the DCO. Construction activities will be managed through the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP**, **[APP-192])** and associated management plans to manage contamination risk, minimise disturbance, and manage pollution and spillage incidents (Appendix 15.2 Section 5.2). The WER Assessment concludes that the Proposed Development is not expected to result in deterioration of water body status or prevent the achievement of WER objectives (Appendix 15.2 Sections 2.1; 7; 8). Accordingly, whilst concerns regarding disruption to waterways are acknowledged, the assessment demonstrates that potential effects are avoided where practicable and appropriately mitigated, such that no significant adverse effects on watercourses are anticipated.
WAT-11	RR-0078	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Respondent expressed concern that flood defences will be damaged along the cable corridor.	Section 6.1.7 of **Appendix 15.1 Flood Risk Assessment [APP-179]** states: "*the assessment considers the interactions between the Cable Route Corridor and EA flood defence assets using the AIMS Spatial Flood Defence dataset, ensuring that any potential impacts on the integrity and performance of these defences are identified and addressed."* **ES Volume 3, Appendix 15.1: Flood Risk Assessment**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				[APP-179] Annex H Section H.4 provides an assessment of interactions between the cable corridor and EA flood defence assets. Trenchless construction techniques such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) are proposed for crossings beneath flood defences, which are minimally invasive methods. This approach avoids direct disturbance to flood defence assets, thereby reducing the potential for damage and maintaining the integrity and function of existing defences (paragraph H.4.10). The Applicant has also committed to post-consent condition surveys (pre- and post-construction) for cable crossings of EA flood defence assets in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 15.1: Flood Risk Assessment [APP-179]**, Section 3.3.4 (4). The **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** will be updated no later than Deadline 1 to record this. At detailed design stage the design of the cable route/construction methodology will be completed in such a way that any pre-existing piled foundations (including under flood defences) are not disrupted. This detail will be added to the **oCEMP [APP-192]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 1.3 Commitments Register [APP-145]** no later than Deadline 1.

Water Resources and Flood Risk – Detailed

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Water Resources and Flood Risk - Detailed				
WAT-12	RR-0145, RR-0074	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Respondents expressed concern that the installation of steel piles for Site 4 could impact the water table in the Birkin area, which is already prone to flooding, and raised concerns about increased surface water run-off and flood risk to nearby homes.	Environment Agency groundwater level monitoring data has been reviewed. The text in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water Resources and Flood Risk [APP-053]** in Section 15.7.30 sets out a generalised position for the whole area, and it is acknowledged that this simplified approach omits some detail of areas where groundwater level is closer to ground level than 5 mbgl. It is acknowledged that in some locations the maximum groundwater level from the monitoring sites are in the range 0.25 mbgl to 3.2 mbgl. However, this does not change the conclusions of the ES. Substation in Solar Development Site 4 is in Breighton Sand Formation (Secondary B) which is likely to be in hydraulic continuity with Sherwood Sandstone Principal Aquifer. There is therefore potential for shallow groundwater to be encountered by foundation excavations and therefore for dewatering to be required, however GI would confirm this. The assessment acknowledges that site specific ground investigation, including groundwater levels, needs to be undertaken for the substation sites in order to establish whether construction dewatering will be required. There are two main potential mechanisms for increased groundwater levels associated with steel piling which have been identified: (i) the establishment of hydraulic connectivity with a deeper confined aquifer, and (ii) localised disruption to groundwater flow paths. However, the risk associated with both mechanisms is considered negligible. This reflects the existing hydraulic continuity between the aquifer and shallow groundwater, together with the discrete nature of the proposed load-bearing piles, which will not form a continuous barrier to groundwater flow. Other potential effects, such as localised permeability changes or temporary construction-related groundwater fluctuations, are expected to be minor, highly localised, and transient in nature. As such, no significant effects on groundwater levels are anticipated. Potential localised and temporary effects during construction, including disturbance to groundwater flow paths, localised changes in permeability, and the risk of vertical hydraulic

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				connectivity, will be managed through appropriate pile design and installation controls. The **Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-182]** sets out the Applicant's assessment of surface water runoff from the development including Solar PV areas. The Proposed Development is in accordance with all relevant national standards and guidelines on the management of surface water, including NPS EN-3 on the management of runoff from solar panels. Furthermore, appropriate mitigation measures are proposed within the **Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) [APP-179]** and the **Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-182]** to ensure that surface water run-off or flood risk is not increased as a result of the development.
WAT-13	RR-0599	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Respondent stated that the Old Eye watercourse in Birkin has not been properly surveyed or assessed.	Section 6.5.2 of **ES Volume 3, Appendix 15.2: Water Environment Regulations (WER) Assessment [APP-180]** states: *"For very high, high and moderate value watercourses where reconnaissance surveys have not been undertaken expert judgement has been used to assign a receptor value (as described in Section 2.4)."* The Old Eye watercourse at Birkin was not surveyed during the watercourse surveys, however it has been assigned a "High" importance in the assessment, as seen on Table 1 of **Appendix 15.3: Water Resources and Flood Risk Preliminary Assessment Table [APP-181].** Expert judgement was used to assign this high receptor value, with this high receptor value, the watercourse has been properly assessed.
WAT-14	RR-1002,	Water Resources and Flood Risk	The Proposed Development is located within the River Aire / River Ouse floodplain system, one of the most flood-prone areas in England. Large parts of the site fall within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and function as active flood storage (washland). This directly conflicts with national policy. The Pitt Review (2008) states: "Development in floodplains should be exceptional, not routine." DEFRA's Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy (2020) states: "Development should be directed away from areas at highest flood risk." This proposal does the opposite.	**ES Volume 3, Appendix 15.1: Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) [APP-179]** identifies that the Proposed Development is located within the River Aire / River Ouse floodplain system, with areas within Flood Zones 2 and 3. The assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), and National Policy Statements (including NPS EN-1), which recognise that certain forms of development, including essential infrastructure, may be appropriate in higher flood risk areas subject to the application of the Sequential and Exception Tests . The Proposed Development is classified as Essential Infrastructure and the Sequential and Exception Tests are set out in the FRA(Sections 2.1; 7). The site layout has been informed by application of the Sequential Test, with flood-sensitive infrastructure directed to areas of lowest flood risk where practical, and development

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				within higher risk areas limited to uses that are appropriate to that level of risk (Section 7, 7.3.1–7.3.23). Where development within Flood Zones 2 and 3 is unavoidable, the FRA sets out that the Exception Test has been applied, demonstrating that the development provides wider sustainability benefits and can be delivered safely for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere (Section 7.4). Furthermore, embedded design measures ensure that infrastructure does not impede flood flows, with development avoided in the deepest flood areas where practicable and designed to remain operational and safe during flood events (Sections 4.2; 8.2). Additional mitigation, including finished level design, flood resilience measures, and a Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan, is included to manage residual risk (Section 8). Accordingly, whilst the site lies within a recognised floodplain, the FRA demonstrates that the Proposed Development does not conflict with national policy. Instead, it aligns with the NPPF and NPS EN-1 approach of managing and mitigating flood risk through the Sequential and Exception Tests, ensuring floodplain function is preserved and that development is safe without increasing risk elsewhere (Sections 2; 7; 9.1). The Applicant can confirm that no part of the development lies within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b).
WAT-15	RR-0847	Water Resources and Flood Risk	A respondent has expressed concern that drains and dykes in Wistow could be impacted by the Proposed Development, causing flooding.	The Applicant recognises the concerns raised in relation to existing drains and dykes. These have been assessed and considered within the FRA [APP-179] of which Annex H also looks at the interactions of the proposed Cable Route Corridor and flood defence assets. The **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** commits to consultation with affected landowners to investigate the current extent of land drainage. Where necessary, pre-construction land drainage will be explored with the aim of maintaining the efficiency of the existing drainage system and the integrity of the working areas during construction. Any land drains temporarily disturbed or damaged

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				during construction would be reinstated, diverted, or otherwise made good to their original condition upon completion of the works to ensure that existing surface water and land drainage arrangements are maintained post-construction. Furthermore, the **Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-182]** sets out a design approach that maintains existing land drainage function by limiting changes to runoff characteristics and ensuring that surface water is managed in line with existing runoff rates.
WAT-16	RR-0343	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Respondent raised concern that a pumping station discharges water on fields which are part of the Proposed Development (station and fields not specified)	The Applicant acknowledges the concern raised regarding the potential discharge of water from a pumping station onto fields within the Proposed Development. However, the representation does not identify a specific location, and any such infrastructure would form part of the existing baseline environment rather than the Proposed Development itself. The Applicant is continuing to engage with the local IDBs, who would typically operate such pumping stations, and this issue has not been raised to date. Existing discharges from third-party infrastructure are regulated under separate consenting regimes and are outside the control or responsibility of the Applicant. Notwithstanding this, the Proposed Development includes measures to ensure that any construction-related water management (such as temporary drainage or dewatering) is appropriately controlled. These measures, secured through the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP**, **[APP-192])**, ensure that any discharges are managed, treated where necessary, and undertaken in accordance with relevant regulatory requirements. Accordingly, the Proposed Development would not introduce new uncontrolled discharges to land, nor would it give rise to effects that would exacerbate any existing conditions associated with third-party infrastructure.
WAT-17	RR-0516	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Respondent stated that the area already has a weak/dated drainage system, which suffers many drainage problems since Selby Coalfield.	The Applicant recognises the concerns raised in relation to existing flooding and drainage issues. However, responsibility for addressing pre-existing issues do not rest with the Applicant nor do any remedial works in respect of such matters. Notwithstanding this, the Proposed Development includes appropriate mitigation measures to manage surface water

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				and flood risk arising from the works. These measures are intended to ensure the Proposed Development does not create new flooding impacts on third-party land nor exacerbate or worsen any existing issues.
WAT-18	RR-0306	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Respondent expressed that despite the adjustment of boundaries around Birkin, channelled surface run-off from remaining arrays will be pushed off the site, creating an 'artificial flooding' risk.	The **Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-182]** sets out the Applicant's assessment of surface water runoff from the development including Solar PV areas. The solar panels are not expected to increase runoff volumes or peak runoff rates, or adversely affect time to peak, compared with pre-development conditions. Utilising grass or wildflower cover will help to enhance interception and root growth, promoting effective rainwater infiltration and interception. Case studies such as Ref. 20 within the **Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-182]** indicate that where panels are installed above well-maintained grassland, changes in runoff volume and peak discharge are negligible. The same study demonstrates that ground cover is a key factor in controlling runoff, with well-managed vegetation helping to maintain drainage performance across solar array areas. Furthermore, the Proposed Development is in accordance with all relevant national standards and guidelines on the management of surface water, including NPS EN-3 on the management of runoff from solar panels. Furthermore, appropriate mitigation measures are proposed within the **Flood Risk Assessment (FRA, [APP-179])** and the **Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-182]** to ensure that surface water run-off or flood risk is not increased as a result of the development.
WAT-19	RR-1051	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Respondent raised concerns regarding potential impacts on their private domestic groundwater borehole used for drinking water, stating that it has not been properly identified or assessed within the Environmental Statement (ES) or PEIR. Respondent noted that the supply has been inconsistently treated as an "unlicensed abstraction" rather than a defined site-specific receptor, despite its known location and proximity to Site 6, and that no hydrogeological modelling or adequate baseline assessment appears to have been undertaken. Respondent further stated that the addition of Site 6 after scoping meant the borehole may not have been fully considered in earlier assessment stages, and that they were not contacted for access or survey despite notifying the Applicant of the supply in June 2025.	The Applicant notes that the issue around the respondent's water supply was mentioned during a meeting between the two parties in June 2025, although there was no formal request to take this away as an action during the meeting or since. However, the Applicant is willing to engage with the respondent on this issue. The Applicant acknowledges the concern raised regarding the private domestic groundwater supply and its consideration within the assessment. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water Resources and Flood Risk [APP-053]** defines the study area as the Order Limits plus a 1 km buffer, selected to ensure that all receptors in hydraulic continuity with the Proposed Development, including groundwater abstractions, are identified and assessed Section 15.2.5–15.2.6). Whilst the respondent has

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				not mapped the exact location of his concern, with this study area in place, the Applicant considers that it is likely caught within that study area. Groundwater receptors, including both licensed and unlicensed abstractions, are explicitly included within the scope of the assessment (Sections 15.1.3; 15.7; Table 15-18 of **Chapter 15 [APP-053]**) and have informed the identification of receptor sensitivity and the evaluation of potential impacts (Section 15.5; Section 15.9 and table 1 of **ES Volume 3, Appendix 15.3: Water Resources and Flood Risk Preliminary Assessment Table [APP-181]**). The embedded mitigation includes a stand off of 50m from all abstractions, both licensed and private water supplies. In response to Environment Agency consultation, the assessment has been refined to ensure that potential receptors for mobile contamination include groundwater abstractions (licensed and unlicensed), aquifers, and Source Protection Zones, and to ensure that disturbance or mobilisation of contaminants to these receptors is appropriately considered (Section 15.9 of **Chapter 15 [APP-053]**). The assessment of impacts has been undertaken using a source–pathway–receptor approach, with specific consideration of construction, operational and decommissioning phase activities that could give rise to contamination, including those associated with foundations, trenchless crossing techniques and other construction works (Section 15.9 of **Chapter 15 [APP-053]**). Embedded mitigation measures secured through the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP**, **[APP-192])** and associated plans ensure that potential pollutant sources are controlled at source, including measures to prevent contaminant mobilisation and protect both groundwater and surface water receptors, this includes the commitment to monitor receptors during works, including establishing baseline conditions (see sections 15.8; 15.9 of **Chapter 15 [APP-053]**). With regard to the evolution of the design, Chapter 15 has been prepared on the basis of the final Order Limits and study area, and therefore includes receptors identified within the study area at the time of Environmental Statement submission. The assessment concludes that, with embedded

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				mitigation in place, no significant adverse effects on groundwater quality receptors are anticipated (Sections 15.9; 15.11 of **Chapter 15 [APP-053]**). Accordingly, whilst the Applicant acknowledges the importance of private water supplies as sensitive receptors, the Environmental Statement demonstrates that groundwater abstractions have been considered within the assessment framework and that appropriate mitigation measures are in place to protect such receptors from potential contamination pathways. The addition of Solar Development Site 6 was known for both PEIR and ES stage, and all abstractions recorded with North Yorkshire Council were provided for a larger area than the 1km study area used for the Water Resources and Flood Risk Assessments.
WAT-20	RR-1051	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Respondent stated that flood risk assessments may not fully capture cumulative impacts across all parcels of land and infrastructure corridors.	The **Flood Risk Assessment (FRA, [APP-179])** provides a detailed assessment of flood risk across the Proposed Development, including consideration of risks from the Proposed Development as a whole as well as site-specific assessments for each Solar Development Site and the Cable Route Corridor within Annex A – H, taking into account all relevant sources of flooding and their interactions across the scheme. The assessment is informed by site-specific hydraulic modelling of the River Aire and River Ouse catchments, which enables the interaction of flood mechanisms across the site to be robustly understood. A formal assessment of cumulative effects is reported within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water Resources and Flood Risk [APP-053]**, drawing upon the methodology set out in **Chapter 17: Cumulative and In-Combination Effects [APP-055].** Within Chapter 15, the cumulative assessment considers the interaction of the Proposed Development, across multiple parcels and infrastructure corridors, with other existing and committed developments, assessing where effects may combine spatially and temporally at identified receptors. The cumulative assessment concludes that, taking into account the spatial extent of the study area, the nature of the works, and the implementation of embedded mitigation measures, the Proposed Development would not materially increase flood risk and therefore there is no potential for significant cumulative effects on flood risk.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Accordingly, whilst the FRA underpins the assessment through detailed hydraulic modelling and parcel-level analysis, the consideration of cumulative flood risk effects is explicitly addressed within the ES (Chapter 15 and Chapter 17), ensuring that potential interactions across the full extent of the Proposed Development and with other schemes have been robustly assessed.
WAT-21	RR-0996	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Respondent expressed concern about the impact of the Proposed Development on watercourses running through Site 2, including a dyke and water mains serving the surrounding area, and raised concern about the potential for pollutants from the BESS and solar panels to contaminate these watercourses.	The Applicant notes this comment and acknowledges the presences of dykes and water mains serving the area. These have been considered within the assessment and are shown on **Figure 15.1 [APP-115]**. Mitigation measures including setbacks have been embedded into the design including a 10m buffer from the bank top of watercourses as secured in the **Design Parameters and commitments Document [APP-217].** The **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017]** includes protective provisions for the benefit of the water main owner / operator to ensure that construction does not cause impact / damage. Construction would also follow relevant standards and best practice for working around utilities. **T**he Applicant is committed to minimising impacts. Construction activities will be managed through the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP**, **[APP-192])** and associated management plans to manage contamination risk, minimise disturbance, and manage pollution and spillage incidents (**Appendix 15.2 Section 5.2 [APP-180]**). The **WER Assessment [APP-180]** concludes that the Proposed Development is not expected to result in deterioration of water body status or prevent the achievement of WER objectives (**Appendix 15.2 Sections 2.1; 7; 8 [APP-180]**). The Applicant can confirm the use of chemicals within the Proposed Development would be minimal, with no PFAS (forever chemicals) present in solar panel coatings or on BESS batteries. The solar cells would be made from silicon, a material with properties almost the same as sand. They may contain very small amounts of heavy metals, but these are well within the limits set by law; this is confirmed by the Applicant checking the results of testing in independent laboratories. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [APP-040]** confirms that no chemical cleaning

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				products would be used, with stubborn dirt brushed or wiped off the panels. The Solar PV Panels would be cleaned using water only, using deionised water transported to site by tanker. Accordingly, the Proposed Development does not introduce a pathway for chemical contamination to surface water or groundwater receptors, as assessed within the water quality impact assessment set out in Section 15.9 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water Resources and Flood Risk [APP-053]ES Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water Resources and Flood Risk [APP-053]**, which considers potential contaminant sources and confirms that mitigation and management measures prevent pollutant migration to watercourses. The Applicant has prepared an **Outline Pollution and Spillage Response Plan (oPSRP) [APP-198]** for the construction, operation, and eventual decommissioning of the Proposed Development, setting out the intended strategies for managing pollution and spillage incidents on site. Upon detection of a contaminant pollution incident, the source must be identified and both the Site Manager and ECoW (for the purposes of ecological protection) notified. All activities that could exacerbate the incident must be halted, and any spill or leak should be stopped and contained, provided it is safe to do so. Containment measures are intended to prevent any ongoing spill or leak from entering soils, groundwater, watercourses, or other sensitive water features. These procedures include the deployment of appropriate pollution control equipment, such as spill kits, drip trays, and earth or sand bunds, together with inspections to confirm that pollutants have not reached drainage systems, watercourses, or other sensitive receptors. These measures ensure that, in the unlikely event of a spill associated with construction activities or BESS infrastructure, identified source–pathway–receptor linkages are controlled through mitigation embedded within the assessment presented in Section 15.9 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water Resources and Flood Risk [APP-053]ES Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water Resources and Flood Risk [APP-053]**, thereby preventing pollutants from reaching nearby watercourses and other sensitive receptors. The **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP**, **[APP-192])** also includes measures to prevent any spillages or potential contamination specifically during construction, including provision that locations identified as being at greater risk from contamination releases have a non-

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				permeable 'Durabase Mat System' or a similar non-ground penetrating mat system installed to protect groundwaters during construction. During the operational phase, the **Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP**, **[APP-193])** includes further measures, such as securing that bulk fuels and any chemicals used on the Sites will be stored appropriately, within an impervious bund of 110% of the volume of the container to reduce the potential for any contamination source in the event of a container failure / leak of battery fire and associated fire waters. Together, these embedded mitigation and management measures align with the embedded and good practice mitigation set out in Section 15.8 and the assessed outcomes in Section 15.9 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water Resources and Flood Risk [APP-053]**, which demonstrate that significant adverse effects on water quality receptors, including watercourses within Site 2, are not anticipated. Additionally, the **Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-182]** sets out measures to manage runoff from components with a potentially higher pollution risk (including BESS), ensuring that any contaminants are appropriately controlled and do not pose a risk to the surrounding environment.
WAT-22	RR-1102	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Respondent expressed concern regarding the impact of the proposals on flooding in Birkin.	Flood risk from all relevant sources has been carefully considered within the **Flood Risk Assessment (FRA, [APP-179])**. 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 including relevant climate change allowances. The Proposed Development has been informed by site-specific flood modelling and subsequent assessment to determine the impact of the proposals on existing flood risk, including development in the floodplain. The **FRA [APP-179]** confirms that Solar Development Site 5 was removed from the Order Limits of the Proposed Development partly due to flood risk reasons. The early assessment demonstrated that flood depths on this site largely exceeded 1m. In contrast, significantly lower flood depths are expected on Solar Development Site 4 (the nearest Site to Birkin). Site 4 remains free from flooding in the design event, and Section 6.3 of the **FRA [APP-179]** reports that in the credible maximum scenario, depths are estimated to generally remain below the lowest panel edge in events up to and including the credible maximum scenario.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Evidence provided within the flood risk assessments carried out for each Solar Development Site (with Site 4 and Birkin covered withint Annex D of the FRA) demonstrates that the Proposed Development can be designed to be safe from flooding over its lifetime, considering the vulnerability of its users, and without increasing flood risk elsewhere. The assessment has been informed by consultation and engagement with the Environment Agency, Lead Local Flood Authority, and relevant Internal Drainage Boards. Furthermore, appropriate mitigation measures are proposed within the FRA and the **Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-182]** to ensure that surface water run-off or flood risk is not increased as a result of the development. Flood risk was also one of many factors considered in the site selection process. This is discussed fully in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 3.1: Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) [AS-019]**.
WAT-23	RR-0629	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Respondent expressed concern about the potential increased risk of flooding in relation to Site 4.	Flood risk from all relevant sources has been carefully considered within the **Flood Risk Assessment (FRA, [APP-179])**. 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 including relevant climate change allowances. The Proposed Development has been informed by site-specific flood modelling and subsequent assessment to determine the impact of the proposals on existing flood risk, including development in the floodplain. The **FRA [APP-179]** confirms that Solar Development Site 5 was removed from the Order Limits of the Proposed Development partly due to flood risk reasons. The early assessment demonstrated that flood depths on this site largely exceeded 1m. In contrast, significantly lower flood depths are expected on Solar Development Site 4. Site 4 remains free from flooding in the design event, and Section 6.3 of the **FRA [APP-179]** reports that in the credible maximum scenario, depths are estimated to generally remain below the lowest panel edge in events up to and including the credible maximum scenario. Evidence provided within the flood risk assessments carried out for each Solar Development Site (with Site 4 covered in Annex D of the FRA) demonstrates that the Proposed Development can be designed to be safe from flooding over its lifetime, considering the vulnerability of its users, and

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				without increasing flood risk elsewhere. The assessment has been informed by consultation and engagement with the Environment Agency, Lead Local Flood Authority, and relevant Internal Drainage Boards. Furthermore, appropriate mitigation measures are proposed within the FRA and the **Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-182]** to ensure that surface water run-off or flood risk is not increased as a result of the development. Flood risk was also one of many factors considered in the site selection process. This is discussed fully in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 3.1: Site Selection Assessment Report (SSAR) [AS-019]**.
WAT-24	RR-0283	Water Resources and Flood Risk	Respondent expressed concern regarding the potential impacts to drainage systems caused by the cable installation.	The **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** commits to consultation with affected landowners to investigate the current extent of land drainage. Where necessary, pre-construction land drainage will be explored with the aim of maintaining the efficiency of the existing drainage system and the integrity of the working areas during construction. Any land drains temporarily disturbed or damaged during construction would be reinstated, diverted, or otherwise made good to their original condition upon completion of the works to ensure that existing surface water and land drainage arrangements are maintained post-construction.

2.26 Land Interest Specific Feedback

Land Interest Specific Feedback

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
Land Interest Specific Feedback				
LND-01	RR-0684	Land Interest Specific Feedback	[BoR numbers 13-037, 13-038, 13-039, 13-041, 13-042, 13-044, 13-045, 13-046]: Light Valley Solar's (LVS) Proposed Development impacts severely on my land at (REDACTED). The cables from the nearby designated Solar and Battery Storage areas pass under large parts of my agricultural land, including land that is outside the Green Belt, and therefore has potential for development for uses other than strictly agricultural. I have been in the process of developing potential Proposed Developments of my own for this land, but the Light Valley Solar Proposed Development would prevent me from progressing with these Proposed Developments now or in the future. AS recommended by the LVS agents, I have previously instructed an agent of my own to liaise with them to reach a solution agreeable to all parties. LVS indicated that they would pay for this agent. Despite this, I have found LVS's representatives to be unwilling to discuss either amendments to the route of their cables, nor to have sensible discussion over compensation for my losses. LVS have terminated the funding of an agent, and I was left with the prospect of paying £150 per hour for the continuation of their services. LVS are unwilling to negotiate with me and we can not reach a fair Head Of Terms agreement. I am unhappy that LVS are trying to (REDACTED) me into a forced and unfair settlement which would severely impact my business and the future of my family.	The Applicant remains committed to meaningful engagement with all land interests and confirms that negotiations are tracked in the **Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker [APP-023].** The Applicant wishes to deliver Light Valley Solar on land where the owners have voluntarily agreed to the Proposed Development. The basis for the payment of agent's fees was set out by the Applicant from the outset, and the Applicant remains committed to paying reasonable agent fees on receipt of signed terms. This has been communicated to the Respondent's agent and the Applicant is working with the agent in question to reach an agreed set of terms. The Applicant welcomes continued engagement from the Respondent. In this context it is helpful to note that the precise location of the cable route, within the defined Cable Route Corridor, will not be confirmed until post-consent. As set out in **ES Chapter 2: Proposed Development [APP-40]**, the Cable Route Corridor is one aspect of the Proposed Development that requires design flexibility. Decisions are yet to be taken regarding detailed cable routing within the parameters of the Cable Route Corridor. Ongoing engagement with landowners can inform the detailed design stage. New development can take place either side of easements. The only prohibition on development is over an easement area.
LND-02	RR-1079	Land Interest Specific Feedback	Respondent raised concerns regarding the approach taken by the developer in relation to land access. Respondent stated that they have been repeatedly and persistently contacted by representatives of the Proposed Development team seeking agreement to Heads of Terms for a cable route across my land. The Respondent added that this engagement has not felt balanced or voluntary. The respondent also stated that it has been implied that if they do not agree, compulsory access or purchase powers may be pursued, which the responded	The Draft Development **Consent Order [APP-017]** includes provision for compulsory acquisition of land and rights, but these are subject to controls and limitations. These powers sought are necessary and proportionate to ensure the deliverability of the Proposed Development. The Applicant remains committed to meaningful engagement with all land interests and confirms that negotiations are tracked in the **Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker [APP-023].**

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			argued created a coercive environment in which landowners and tenants feel pressured into agreements under the threat of legal enforcement.	
LND-03	RR-0474	Land Interest Specific Feedback	**[BoR numbers 13-036, 13-037, 13-040, 13-043, 13-044]**: Respondent stated that the proposed underground cable route would cross over 40 acres of their agricultural land, sterilising land earmarked for their own development, while repeated failures by the developer to engage meaningfully, provide fair terms, or fund adequate professional representation have left them exposed to significant disruption, loss of future development potential, and uncompensated harm despite their continued cooperation with surveys.	The Applicant acknowledges the concern expressed by the respondent. The Applicant remains committed to meaningful engagement with all land interests and wishes to continue discussions regarding heads of terms with the respondent and their appointed agent. The Applicant confirms that negotiations are tracked in the **Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker [APP-023].** The Applicant seeks to minimise disruption to affected farming businesses where practicable and is committed to working with all land interests to achieve this. Where there are any residual impacts on farm businesses, the Applicant will engage with landowners to compensate them through voluntary agreements or the compensation mechanisms available for the use of compulsory acquisition powers. The Applicant is continuing to engage with landowners to understand potential impacts on their businesses and welcomes engagement from the respondent. As set out in **ES Chapter 2: Proposed Development [APP-40]**, the Cable Route Corridor is one aspect of the Proposed Development that requires design flexibility. Decisions are yet to be taken regarding detailed cable routing within the parameters of the Cable Route Corridor. Ongoing engagement with landowners can inform the detailed design stage. New development can take place either side of easements. The only prohibition on development is over an easement area. It is also noted that, as set out in the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]**, where manhole covers are required as part of the cable corridor, every effort will be made to place them within field margins where reasonably practicable to do so or in other technically suitable locations in consultation with the landowner. If it is not practicable to place the manhole covers in field margins, the area would be clearly fenced or otherwise demarcated to ensure farmers can avoid the manhole covers during normal agricultural operations.
LND-04	RR-1207	Land Interest Specific Feedback	**[BoR numbers 13-050, 14-016, 14-019]**: Respondent stated that their family home would be almost completely surrounded by solar panels on all sides as the landowner has leased all surrounding land to the Proposed Development, and	The Applicant acknowledges the concern regarding the proximity of the Proposed Development to the property.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			expressed concern about the impact on the physical and mental health of their family and on the value of their property.	In designing the layout for the Proposed Development, the Applicant has had regard to their Design Principles as set out in the **Design Approach Document (DAD) [APP-216]** including number 6, to minimise landscape and visual impact to residents, ensuring consideration of layout of the Proposed Development including siting, to minimise visual impact (Table 3-5). With reference to sheet **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.4: Photography and Photomontages [AS-028]**, VP47S: Turpin Lane, public footpath (35.59/6/1) next to Milford Grange, shows the size and maturity of planting surrounding the southern boundary of the residential property in question. It is understood that the residential extents of the property are surrounded on all sides by this type of extensive and mature planting. Sheet 14 of the **Works Plans [AS-004]** shows how the residential property in question would be separated from the solar photovoltaic panels by over 100 m to the west, and north, and by some 30 m to the east, when measured from the perimeter. To the immediate north of the residential property are agricultural buildings and equipment. There are no panels in the fields to the south. No risk to physical health is expected as a result of the Proposed Development.
LND-05	RR-0277	Land Interest Specific Feedback	**[BoR numbers 13-050, 14-016, 14-019]**: Respondent stated that their property would be surrounded on all sides by solar panels as the landowner has leased all surrounding land, leaving them with no remaining views. Respondent expressed concern about the impact on their mental health and the long-term change to the rural character of the area for a minimum of 40 years.	The Applicant acknowledges the concern regarding the proximity of the Proposed Development to the property. The layout of the Proposed Development has been iteratively refined to incorporate setbacks from residential receptors, retention of existing field boundaries, and the use of offsets to PRoW and properties, alongside the integration of additional mitigation planting, including hedgerow reinforcement and new woodland belts, to filter and soften views. With regards to the respondent's property, extensive hedgerow and scrub planting are proposed to the eastern boundary to maintain a degree of openness to the views. Across other boundaries to the solar photovoltaic panels, meadow grassland planting margins are proposed, which will work alongside existing mature planting on the boundaries of the property to mitigate visual impacts.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
LND-06	RR-1051	Land Interest Specific Feedback	**[BoR numbers 14-025]**: Respondent stated concerns regarding land interests and Book of Reference accuracy, including the assertion that they may be incorrectly categorised despite being among the most affected properties.	The Applicant during pre-application conducted thorough diligent inquiry to identify legal interests within the proposed Order Land through the methods outlined in chapter 8 of the **Statement of Reasons [APP-020]**. The Applicant acknowledges the potential for missing legal interests, and kindly requests the respondent informs the Applicant's Land Agents of any incorrect categorisation. These interests will then be corrected within the next version of the **Book of Reference [APP-022]** submitted during examination.
LND-07	RR-1051	Land Interest Specific Feedback	**[BoR numbers 14-025]**: Respondent stated concerns that not all affected persons or legal interests have been properly identified within the application documentation.	The Applicant during pre-application conducted thorough diligent inquiry to identify legal interests within the proposed Order Land through the methods outlined in chapter 8 of the **Statement of Reasons [APP-020].** The Applicant acknowledges the potential for missing legal interests, and kindly requests the respondent informs the Applicants Land Agents of any missing parties. These interests will then be included within the next version of the **Book of Reference [APP-022]** submitted during examination.
LND-08	RR-1025	Land Interest Specific Feedback	Respondent stated that their property is located on proposed Site 2, and that their home will be surrounded by solar panels on all sides, with views from windows obstructed and the property surrounded by a construction site for the duration of the three year build period.	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised and confirms that there are no properties within the Order limits for Site 2 but that there are individual properties in proximity to Site 2. The relationship between this property and Site 2 of the Proposed Development is shown on **OEM [PDA-005]** This shows solar photovoltaic panels are positioned to the west of the dwelling, where the residential property is separated from the Proposed Development by an outbuilding. To the south, the perimeter of the Proposed Development is approximately 40 m to the south of the existing garden perimeter (approximately 70m this dwelling to the Order Limits). Native Hedgerow with tree planting is proposed on this boundary, and between that hedgerow and the perimeter of the panels area an area of scrub and trees is proposed plus meadow grassland margins. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), reported i**n ES Volume 1 Chapter 10 [APP-048] and detailed in ES Volume 3 Appendix 10.3 Visual Baseline and Effects [APP-169]**, has assessed visual effects on residents around Site 2 with reference to Viewpoint 10 (VP10) and Viewpoint 11 (VP11).

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				Viewpoint 10 which is in proximity to this property lies shown in **ES Volume 2, Figure 10.5: Viewpoints Plan [APP-095]**. Sheet 15 of **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.4: Photography and Photomontages [AS-028]** shows the baseline views from VP10 in winter and summer. The adjacent residential property is screened from view from VP10 by outbuildings and tall conifer trees to the west of the property, but the extent of views to the south from the ground floor of the house are similar. The landscape is flat and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.3: Visual Baseline and Effects [APP-169]** explains that views extend to the background, where distant trees and the busy A63 create a simple, low skyline. Photomontages for VP10 are shown on Sheet 16 of Appendix 10.4, this indicates that there would be close distance views from Fryston Common Lane to the solar panels proposed within the northern part of Solar Development Site 2 and that by year 15 of operation, the proposed planting would substantially screen the Proposed Development and the existing longer distance views. With respect to views from t the edge of the garden of this property is set back by approximately 40m from the draft Order Limits within a large private garden. Mitigation is proposed which would assist in reducing the magnitude of impact on views of residents of Siddle House by year 15 of operation from very high in year 1 of operation, to high by year 15 of operation. This will be achieved by incorporating a minimum offset of 30m, which has been applied between the curtilage of the property and the closest solar panels, as shown on **Sheet 13 of the Works Plans [AS-004].** A hedgerow with trees and shrubs beyond is proposed along the northern edge of Solar Development Site 2 to integrate the development into the landscape and to assist in screening views of the proposed solar panels. Most built development would be screened by these mitigation measures, but this would also reduce the openness of views. With respect to private views, Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 01/24 explains in point 6(1) that views from houses and individual properties are a matter of private amenity, noting that it is an established planning principle that there is no right to a view. Whilst moderate adverse significant effects would remain at Siddle Farm House with the proposed mitigation planting established, these effects would not breach the residential visual amenity threshold because they would not cause serious harm to the living conditions of residents (major

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				adverse) and therefore a Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) has not been carried out. Further information is provided in Table 10-5 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [APP-048].** Construction phase information is included within Section 2.7 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [APP-040]** including an indicative construction programme. Construction would start at the earliest in 2028 and as set out in **Chapter 2 The Proposed Development [APP-040]**, whilst the total durations is approximately 24-36 months in total, it is unlikely that construction would occur on all of the solar Development sites in all locations at the same time. The duration of the construction works for Solar Development Site 2 is shown as lasting 12 months in the indicative construction programme and the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) element around 26 months. Measures to mitigate impacts and disruption during construction are secured in the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** and **the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-201]**.
LND-09	RR-1215	Land Interest Specific Feedback	**[BoR numbers 20-014, 20-015, 20-016, 20-017, 20-018, 20-019, 20-020]:** Respondent claimed they are being blackmailed regarding their land the cables need to go into	The Applicant acknowledges the concern raised by the respondent but does not accept the suggestion of blackmail. The Draft Development **Consent Order [APP-017]** includes provision for compulsory acquisition of land and rights, but these are subject to controls and limitations. These powers sought are necessary and proportionate to ensure the deliverability of the Proposed Development, but remain a last resort with the Applicant seeking the land and rights required for the Proposed Development by agreement. The Applicant has issued Heads of Terms to the respondent and will continue to engage in a meaningful manner with the respondent to seek to agree a voluntary agreement as documented within the **Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker [APP-023].**
LND-10	RR-0517	Land Interest Specific Feedback	**[BoR numbers 10-019]**: 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, as shown in Consultation Report Appendix 9: Targeted Consultation Materials - Document Reference: EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01.09 (and APP-034).	The Applicant notes the comment and is committed to continued engagement with the respondent.

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			The land is received outline planning permission for up to 140 dwellings on 19th December 2025. The site access will be subject to a S278 in due course onto Leeds Road. Land to the west of Dam Lane (Change 19, shown in Consultation Report Appendix 9: Targeted Consultation Materials - Document Reference: EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01.09 (and APP-034)) 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. Whilst Hallam do not object to the changes, it is important that these changes do not prejudice the outline planning permission and the delivery of much needed houses in a Local Authority (North Yorkshire Council, formerly Selby District Council) that has seen a significant increase in their housing requirement under the Government's nationally set Standard Methodology housing requirement. Hallam have had dialogue with Dalcour Maclaren on numerous occasions, and this is very much appreciated. Hallam welcome further dialogue in respect of Changes 19 and 20 at the appropriate time.	
LND-11	RR-1391	Land Interest Specific Feedback	**[BoR numbers 09-016, 10-005, 11-002, 11-003, 11-004, 11-005, 11-006, 11-007, 11-010, 11-011, 11-013, 11-014, 11-015, 11-016, 11-018, 11-019, 11-020, 11-027, 11-029, 11-030, 11-031, 11-033, 11-034, 12-013, 12-014, 12-015, 12-021, 12-022, 12-023, 12-025, 12-027, 12-028, 12-030, 12-034, 12-037, 12-038, 12-039, 12-043, 12-044, 12-045, 12-046, 12-047, 12-048, 12-058, 12-059, 12-060, 12-062, 15-004, 15-005, 15-006, 15-007, 15-008, 15-009, 15-010, 16-010, 16-012, 18-001]**: As a local landowner that owns in excess of 100 acres of land owned by the Hey family that is affected by grid connection for this Proposed Development , I would like to state I completely disagree to the complete disregard to landowners wishes, I do not agree with such large scale solar parks and taking land out of production that is currently growing high value crops in such cases as Potatoes and carrots. On another note as a landowner that is required to allow the grid connection through my land, I have no say as to whether I wish to allow grid connection through my land. It is either accept the small sum of compensation or compulsory powers are put in place to obtain entry. The cables that are going to be placed underground in our land without our choice may affect what we might wish to do in these areas in the future for instance future development, underground infrastructure regarding pipes for irrigation, future potential drainage of the land	The Draft Development **Consent Order [APP-017]** includes provision for compulsory acquisition of land and rights, but these are subject to controls and limitations. These powers sought are necessary and proportionate to ensure the deliverability of the Proposed Development. Details of the permanent and temporary rights to be acquired are set out in **the Book of Reference [APP-022]**. The Applicant remains committed to meaningful engagement with all land interests and confirms that negotiations are tracked in the **Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker [APP-023**]. It is also noted that signed Heads of Terms in respect of this property have been returned to the Applicant. The Applicant seeks to minimise disruption to affected farming businesses where practicable and is committed to working with all land interests to achieve this. As set out in **ES Chapter 2: Proposed Development [APP-40**], the Cable Route Corridor is one aspect of the Proposed Development that requires design flexibility. Decisions are yet to be taken regarding detailed cable routing within the parameters of the Cable Route Corridor. Ongoing engagement with landowners can inform the detailed design stage. New development can take place either side of easements. The only prohibition on development will be over easement area

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				It is also noted that, as set out in the **Design Parameters and Commitments document [APP-217]**, where manhole covers are required as part of the cable corridor, every effort will be made to place them within field margins where reasonably practicable to do so or in other technically suitable locations in consultation with the landowner. If it is not practicable to place the manhole covers in field margins, the area would be clearly fenced or otherwise demarcated to ensure farmers can avoid the manhole covers during normal agricultural operations. With regard to drainage, the Applicant encourages the respondent to review the **Environmental Statement Volume 3, Appendix 15.4: Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-182]** which details the management of surface water for the Proposed Development. Additionally, the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** commits to consultation with affected landowners to investigate the current extent of land drainage. Where necessary, pre-construction land drainage will be explored with the aim of maintaining the efficiency of the existing drainage system and the integrity of the working areas during construction. Any land drains temporarily disturbed or damaged during construction would be reinstated, diverted, or otherwise made good to their original condition upon completion of the works to ensure that existing surface water and land drainage arrangements are maintained post-construction. The Applicant encourages the respondent to review the **Environmental Statement Volume 3, Appendix 15.4: Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-182]** and **the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-192]** which details the management of surface water for the Proposed Development in particular that during construction, measures will be implemented to prevent adverse impacts on field drainage ditches including consultation with affected landowners and pre-construction land drainage if required. Cables will be laid to a depth of up to 2 m within farmland, unless ground conditions render this impracticable, to ensure no interference with agricultural use.
LND-12	RR-0526	Land Interest Specific Feedback	Harworth is supportive in principle of the Proposed Development for which consent is being sought and recognises its importance in the energy transition agenda. Harworth is committed to ongoing engagement with the	The Applicant welcomes the support for the Proposed Development. A comprehensive package of habitat retention, creation, enhancement and long-term management measures is proposed to avoid, reduce and mitigate impacts

Comment Reference	Reference ID	Themes	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			Applicant to ensure alignment with its own strategic objectives and ambitions for the wider North Yorkshire region. The observations in the statuary consultation response, principally in relation to Solar Development sites 6 and 8 remain pertinent to the pending DCO examination; with reference to these and in summary they comprise requests for further information in relation to: Detailed ecological and biodiversity plans, including opportunities for collaboration on biodiversity net gain initiatives; The ability to align development timelines and exploration of shared infrastructure; Harworth rights beyond their demise- it is noted that Harworth is not listed in the Book of Reference ("BoR"); can it therefore be confirmed that none of their rights are affected; Construction and Operational Access for Site 8; Works number 8A and 8B look to comprise the only southern access options to the site, on this understanding Harworth has no further comment to make. Harworth welcomes the opportunity to continue to work with the Applicant on the matters raised above.	and to deliver Biodiversity Net Gain. The ecological mitigation and enhancement proposals, including BNG measures, are illustrated on the **Outline Environmental Masterplans [PDA-001 to 010]** and detailed in the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-195]** and the **Outline Bird Mitigation Area Management Plan (oBMAMP) [APP-205]**. It is expected that the Proposed Development will have a gain of approximately 70% Habitat BNG, including 78.58% for habitats, 73% for hedgerows, and 10.42% for watercourses based on the current development proposals. Full details of the gain are set out in the **Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Report [APP-220]**. The Applicant welcomes ongoing engagement over the construction timelines and opportunities for collaboration. The Applicant confirms that the main access points for Site 8 are from the south, with a further option to the north. The Applicant notes the respondents' comments regarding their interests in land outside of their demise. During the pre-application, the Applicant undertook diligent inquiry, as outlined in chapter 8 of the **Statement of Reasons [APP-020],** which includes interrogation of registers filed at HM Land Registry. The Applicant had identified rights interests related to the respondent but has incorrectly omitted these rights interests at DCO submission. The Applicant will include reference to them in the next Book of Reference update to Examination at Deadline 2. To ensure the Applicant has captured all the respondents' rights outside their demise and within the Order Land, the Applicant kindly requests the respondent contacts their appointed Land Agents to share further details of their interests. Assessment on the effects to those interests will be undertaken once confirmed, and the Applicant will confirm to the respondent.