

Representation 2 from Monk Fryston Parish Council (MFPC) following the July 2026 Public Examination with regard to the Light Valley Solar development application:

As a general point, Monk Fryston PC has liaised closely with South Milford PC who are acting as the umbrella voice for the thirteen PC areas impacted by this proposal.

Monk Fryston Parish Council (MFPC) request the Examining Authority consider, during the Examination in Public phase, the following additional points arising from the Examination meetings of 28th, 29th and 30th July 2026 held at the Parsonage Hotel, Escrick.

1. Preliminary Works:

There is a concern that the scope of the 'preliminary works' requested by LVS go far beyond the scope of the minor works. The requested works include removal of vegetation, installation of access points and remediation of land which could in fact entail large-scale ground works. These are works that would require the use of heavy plant machinery. The concern of MFPC is that these works are potentially large-scale activities and will generate additional HGV traffic. These works should not be allowed to be undertaken ahead of the main consented works. Any preliminary works entailing the movement and operation of large plant should be covered by the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) which will include traffic routes and operation hour restrictions. However, early landscape mitigation planting should be encouraged as soon as possible and including this in the preliminary works would be a benefit, provided it is appropriately monitored once the development commences.

2. Maintenance works (replacing installations during the 60-year lifespan):

As indicated by the applicant, over the lifetime of the proposed project major assets such as solar panels and BESS batteries, will need to be replaced.

MFPC ask that the Examining Authority seek to assign conditions to ensure that any replacement asset works are tied to the same controls as the initial construction restrictions (solar panel height for example) unless there is significant good reason for any deviation on the approved design. This is to ensure any replacement installations are not visually more harmful to the character and landscape of the area and all impacts are captured in this Environmental Assessment as the 'worst case scenario'.

3. Agricultural Land Quality/ Best and Most Versatile Land (BMV):

Through discussions the applicant accepted that Best and Most Versatile land parcels had not been considered to ensure minimal use of this type of land in the design process. Equally, 19.1 hectares of land would be taken up by the BESS installation and its associated structures and assets. Over 60 years this is regarded by MFPC as an unacceptable permanent loss of land.

MFPC asks that the Examining authority fully considers this oversight by the applicant in its assessment.

4. Removal of landscape areas at the end of the project:

Notwithstanding the loss of BMV associated with the landscape mitigation areas, MFPC have serious concerns over the proposed removal of these landscaping areas at the end of 60 years at a time when the planting will be mature. If it is LVS's intention to remove this new habitat then it would be wrong to regard this as a positive factor in any BNG calculation. Where it is included in the BNG calculation, the BNG assessment needs to include an additional assessment where these areas are removed.

MFPC asks that the Examining authority requests the applicant to carry out an additional BNG assessment for removal of habitat where appropriate.

5. Noise

The applicant advised that solar panels would have the potential to swivel by means of motor control. MFPC have a particular concern with the excessive noise generated by the BESS installation up to a level of 91dBa. With Monk Fryston residents being immediately affected by this noise pollution.

MFPC ask that the Examining Authority ensure noise mitigation measures are implemented to ensure noise is reduced to an absolute minimum in and around the BESS installation.

MFPC would ask that the Examining Authority ensure the applicant can demonstrate noise impact is minimised to acceptable limits within the design.

6. Traffic/Transport:

As raised before, MFPC have major concerns with regards to traffic issues from the proposed LVS development and other recent and pending schemes which will use the A63 and A162. From the discussions to date by NYC, it has been stated that the A63/A162 roundabout to the West of Monk Fryston is now severely over capacity and NYC are in the process of planning remedial works to counter some of the capacity issues but not resolve them. MFPC are extremely concerned that the LVS scheme will cause further congestion and issues along these routes and would ask that the applicant further address their traffic management plan to minimise the additional disruption. This review should include routes for abnormal loads. Where appropriate, LVS should be contributing financially to the upgrades in line with the impact of their proposals.

MFPC are also concerned that due to the scale and design of the proposal, any future A63 bypass route to the Northeast of Monk Fryston from the A63, will be lost as solar panels will occupy the land corridor required for the bypass. This location is the only viable route left and given the expected rise in traffic volumes by LVS and other consented and future schemes.

MFPC would ask that these considerations are reviewed by the applicant and the design altered accordingly to accommodate future bypass construction.

7. Flood Risk and Drainage:

Discussions have indicated that the applicant has not used up to date data for flood risks. This is of particular concern for MFPC, given that solar panels and the BESS would be installed on land with surface water flooding which may require these structures being raised up outside the flood risk level. This could result in solar panels being raised above 4.5 metres, the worst case scenario assessed in application material.

MFPC would ask that the Examining Authority ensures that the applicant designs an installation that meets with the height requirements of any consent granted and that up-to-date flood risk data is used within the design process.

8. **Water Supply and BESS Safety and Health Risks:**

MFPC are concerned with the vague nature of the applicant's response to the water requirements for construction and operation of the installations.

MFPC would ask that the Examining Authority ensures the applicant can demonstrate adequate water supplies are available on a site-by-site basis and not as an overall satisfactory summary.

MFPC also have further concerns with regards to the BESS installation and fire fighting capability. MFPC are to understand that there are currently no universally accepted methods for extinguishing lithium-ion or lithium-ion fires. If this technology is utilised for the proposed BESS installation.

MFPC would ask that the Examining Authority ensure the applicant has considered the extensive risks to residents' health, both in short and long term from these types of fires, in terms of toxic vapour clouds, thermal runaway and explosion.

MFPC ask that the Examining Authority ensure the applicant can demonstrate adequate firefighting capability is available for the installation to minimise these risks and they also can demonstrate the process for capture and the safe disposal of any contaminated water following a fire particularly as there is no extensive body of water in proximity to the proposed BESS location. To this end particular concerns relate to the amount of water required to extinguish these types of fires, typically over several hours or days.

MFPC ask that the Examining Authority to ensure that the applicant can demonstrate that there are suitable mitigations in place to prevent contamination of the drainage ditches. We would like to restate that the site of the BESS is bounded by drainage ditches.

MFPC ask that the ask that the Examining Authority ensures that the Environment Agency and any other appropriate body is engaged to assess and advise the management of risks associated with drainage and potential environmental contamination.

9. **Landscape:**

MFPC are concerned with the cumulative impact on character. Although the applicant suggests that this is limited to sites 2, 6 and 7, MFPC would ask that the Examining Authority explore this more deeply with the applicant, the applicant does not appear to have adequately covered other major developments in this impact assessment. It remains our concern that Monk Fryston residents will feel the visual impact of these and other recently consented energy schemes when travelling in all directions into and out of the village.

Moreover, with regards to landscape mitigation. The use of 'transplant trees' with a growth rate of only 1 foot per year as stated by the applicant, in MFPC's opinion would not mitigate the view of the 4.5-metre-high solar panels for many years to come, thus not adequately addressing glint and glare issues, particularly in the early years of deployment.

10. Visual Impacts on nearby receptors:

Following the July 2026 Public Examination meeting MFPC and individual contributors raised severe concerns with regards to proximity of the proposed development to residential properties. This is having a detrimental effect on individuals mental health.

MFPC ask that the Examining Authority review this topic in greater detail with the applicant, especially in regard to a buffer zone of 250 metres between the development and residential dwellings. This buffer zone has been enforced on other similar schemes across the Country.

From discussions it became clear that individual properties and residents had not been contacted directly to discuss concerns raised. MFPC would suggest this is conflict with reasonable consultation practice.

MFPC would ask that the developer is directed to resolve these matters at the earliest opportunity.

11. Community Benefit:

There have been previous commitments from the developer to deliver Community Benefits as a means of mitigation for the proposed development. However, when the applicant was pressed on this matter at the July 2026 Public Examination meeting, the response conflicted with the original LVS public consultation position. At the July 2026 Public Examination Meeting, the applicant suggested the matter was outside the scope of the examination and governed by a separate legal requirement. This is in fact not the case and a misrepresentation as the Governments community compensation scheme remains in draft and there is currently no other mechanism.

MFPC would ask that the Examining Authority press the applicant to disclose their intentions with regards to Community Benefit as a matter of consultation clarity. Although this aspect may not be required under the Planning process, Community Benefits have been offered, at the applicant's public consultation events, in mitigation. Disclosure of applicant intentions on this matter would provide clarity for affected communities. Some residents may have decided not to submit a response based on the fact the applicant has offered substantial benefits. If this is not in writing then those residents have been prejudiced by the applicants u-turn.