Comments on the Applicant's response to Relevant Representation RR-1051

Light Valley Solar - EN0110012

Interested Party	Nick Billingham
Representation	RR-1051
Submission	Deadline 1 - comments on the Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations
Deadline	23:59 on Tuesday 11 August 2026
Document date	10 August 2026

Executive summary

The Applicant has provided responses to many issues associated with RR-1051, but a substantial number are generic cross-references rather than answers to the property-specific and event-specific points raised. The most important unresolved matters concern: (1) contemporaneous evidence of who was notified, when, and what corrections or answers were provided; (2) a transparent audit of how the addition of Sites 6-8 and later survey work affected the EIA scope, baselines and conclusions; (3) a property-specific, integrated assessment of residential amenity, first-floor and winter views, glint and glare, tracker noise and relevant health pathways; (4) mapping, baseline testing and protection of the private drinking-water borehole; (5) BESS fire, plume, firewater and emergency-response parameters that are presently deferred until detailed design; (6) outstanding badger, BNG and habitat delivery controls; and (7) absolute traffic flows, plan reconciliation, cumulative construction scenarios and safe arrangements for Common Lane and affected public rights of way. The response also does not provide a policy-by-policy answer to the adopted local plan points, a transparent comparison of reasonable design and technology alternatives, or a confirmed correction of the relevant land-interest records. This submission narrows and clarifies the original case. It does not contend that a second scoping opinion or two winter bird seasons were automatically mandatory, or that local planning policy overrides the energy National Policy Statements. The issue is whether the Applicant has supplied enough current, site-specific evidence to support its conclusions and whether any remaining uncertainty is controlled by objective and enforceable DCO requirements. I ask the Examining Authority to obtain the information set out below, principally through written questions or a Rule 17 request, before relying on the Applicant's conclusions. Appendix C consolidates the additional questions that I ask the Examining Authority to put to the Applicant or otherwise require the Applicant to answer.

1. Purpose and scope of this submission

I maintain the concerns raised in RR-1051 and its published supporting attachment. This document comments specifically on the Applicant's **Response to Relevant Representations Part 2**, including every issue row in that document tagged RR-1051. It concentrates on points that were not answered, were answered only in general terms, or depend on information and controls that have not yet been supplied.

The published RR-1051 supporting attachment contains the formal objection signed by Nick and Louise Billingham and additional consultation correspondence. The separate online form text was not available in the published attachment reviewed for this draft. Where Part 2 contains additional property-specific issues, this submission uses the Applicant's own summary of the RR-1051 issue as the record of the point it was responding to.

The test applied in this review is not whether the Applicant has cited an Environmental Statement chapter or an outline management plan. It is whether the response identifies the evidence, explains how it answers the specific concern, and points to an objective and enforceable control where detail is to be settled later.

2. Clarifications that narrow and strengthen RR-1051

For precision, I make the following clarifications. They do not withdraw the underlying concerns; they identify the questions that now need to be answered during examination.

- **Scoping:** I do not rely on a proposition that a fresh scoping opinion was automatically required when Sites 6-8 were added. Scoping is optional. The unresolved issue is whether the Applicant clearly identified changed assumptions, new receptors and baselines, re-tested matters previously scoped out, completed appropriate surveys, and documented any effect on the ES scope and conclusions.
- **Bird surveys:** I do not assert that two non-breeding bird seasons were automatically required in every circumstance. The initial consenting programme was however stated by PINS as being for two wintering seasons. The issue is whether the actual dates, coverage, limitations and Natural England agreement demonstrate that the survey effort for the late-added sites was sufficient.
- **Planning policy:** I accept that the energy National Policy Statements are the primary decision-making framework under section 104 of the Planning Act 2008. The adopted development plan and other local policy can nevertheless be important and relevant matters. The complaint is that the one-line cross-reference at DES-49 does not answer the cited policies or explain the weight and balance applied.
- **Equality and accessibility:** I do not rely on a bare assertion that the private Applicant itself necessarily breached the Public Sector Equality Duty. The practical issue remains whether consultation was accessible and inclusive, what equality evidence and outreach informed it, and whether errors or short notice caused prejudice.
- **Procedural remedy:** Acceptance has occurred. I therefore ask the Examining Authority for further information, testing of the evidence and enforceable DCO controls, rather than repeating an acceptance-stage remedy.

3. Consultation, notification, accessibility and unanswered queries

Applicant response references: ENG-02 (p.182), ENG-03 (p.184), ENG-09 (p.186), ENG-15 (p.190); also ENG-08, although RR-1051 is not listed against that row.

What the Applicant says

The Applicant relies on the SoCC, newspaper advertising, Local Information Points, events, an online webinar, Royal Mail address data, more than 12,500 Phase One postcards, statutory consultation within a 2 km Core Consultation Zone, the acceptance decision and North Yorkshire Council's adequacy response. It acknowledges that some addresses received a Phase Two postcard but not a Phase One postcard because the consultation zone changed. ENG-09 nevertheless says that addresses close to Sites 6-8 "will have received" a Phase One postcard because South Milford was within the earlier zone. ENG-03 accepts that not every question could be answered at events and says residents were encouraged to submit questions later. ENG-15 says errors are corrected in the normal course and that no identified error affects the substance of the application.

What remains unanswered or inadequate

- **Address-specific notification evidence is missing.** The response does not provide the dispatch list or audit trail for the property and streets said not to have received Phase One material. Nor does it answer the supporting correspondence recording that named project representatives said they would investigate why postcards had not been received.
- **The postcard figures are not reconciled.** The consultation concern referred to an AoCM statement that 14,000 postcards were sent, while Part 2 refers to more than 12,500. The response does not explain the difference, the phases covered, undeliverable or duplicate addresses, or the number actually delivered.
- **Specific timing and error allegations are not answered.** There is no direct response to the allegation that the first statutory postcard arrived on 1 July 2025 only three days before events began, or that an event time or location was wrong. A statement that events occurred at varied times does not establish that the notice given for the affected community was adequate.
- **No South Milford event is only answered generically.** The Applicant points elsewhere to nearby venues and a webinar, but does not explain the decision not to hold an event in the newly affected community, the travel/access implications, or what additional measures were taken for residents close to Sites 6-8.
- **The statutory and community consultee points are not dealt with individually.** Part 2 does not provide a direct answer on Leeds City Council at Phase One, Gateforth Parish Council, Thorpe Willoughby Parish Council, the asserted Gateforth distance error, or the information North Yorkshire Council requested for consultation materials.
- **Accessibility is answered by process, not evidence.** The response lists possible alternative formats and venue accessibility, but does not address the allegations about technical language, low contrast, labelling, plain-English presentation, targeted equality outreach, or whether any accessibility review was undertaken.
- **The unanswered-query complaint remains unresolved.** ENG-03 supplies no log of questions, dates, written responses, contradictions or response times. Telling residents to resubmit questions does not show that acknowledged questions were answered.
- **There is no correction schedule.** ENG-15 does not identify the documents affected, error, correction date, version, notification method or assessment of possible prejudice. It also does not answer the complaint that the public-facing project description remained out of date at a critical point, regardless of who technically controlled the webpage.

- **Hambleton Hough material is not addressed.** The supporting correspondence says residents asked for construction traffic and public-rights-of-way plans for the compound and were directed to an irrelevant map. No specific response or document trail is provided.

> **Requested examination action:** Require a consultation evidence schedule showing, for each disputed matter: the source address dataset; relevant address or street entry; dispatch date and item; returned-mail data; the 12,500/14,000 reconciliation; the event correction and re-notification record; a log of substantive questions and written answers; the statutory and parish consultee list with dates; the accessibility/equality review; the Hambleton Hough traffic/PROW materials supplied; and a document correction/version log. The Applicant should explain any prejudice and remedy, not rely only on acceptance or general compliance assertions.

4. Addition of Sites 6-8, survey completeness and EIA change control

Applicant response references: ENG-09 (p.186), DES-34 (p.308), DES-46 (p.315), DES-47 to DES-48 (p.316), BIO-43 (p.143), ORN-21 (p.289).

What the Applicant says

The Applicant says scoping was optional, the addition of Sites 6-8 did not alter the methodology or scope because the development type was the same, and those sites were assessed at PEIR and ES stage. It says the ES was informed by comprehensive surveys, while acknowledging limited unsurveyed ponds and trees and less than 15% of the cable route without geophysical survey when chapters were finalised. Those later surveys have been progressed and are said to be unlikely to alter the ES conclusions. For birds, the Applicant says Sites 6-8 were surveyed in 2025 across breeding and non-breeding seasons and that the approach was accepted by Natural England. It relies on a Rochdale Envelope and post-consent detailed plans.

What remains unanswered or inadequate

- **"Same type of development" does not answer the receiving-environment issue.** New land can introduce different homes, water supplies, habitats, flight paths, roads, flood pathways and cumulative interactions even when the technology is unchanged.
- **There is no auditable change-control matrix.** The response does not identify, topic by topic, the description and assumptions used at scoping, the change introduced by Sites 6-8, new receptors and survey needs, matters previously scoped out, the assessment undertaken, consultee agreement, the ES location and any design response.
- **Later survey results are not supplied or tied to an update mechanism.** DES-46 says results are unlikely to change conclusions, but does not give the results, explain the review, identify changed mitigation or state what happens if the assumption proves wrong.
- **Survey limitations are not property- and site-specific.** The response does not set out actual dates, number of visits, weather, coverage, access constraints and recognised windows for Sites 6-8 across relevant topics. A conclusion of sufficiency cannot be checked from the response itself.
- **Natural England agreement is asserted but not evidenced in the response.** ORN-21 is a material answer to the two-season point, but the date, scope and wording of the agreement and the underlying survey schedule are not provided. It also does not explain cumulative functional-land considerations for the late-added sites.
- **The Rochdale Envelope answer is incomplete.** DES-47 does not list the assessment-critical parameters still open, the worst case used for each topic, the exact DCO control, the approving body or the objective acceptance test that prevents a worse outcome at detailed design.
- **Reliance on expertise is not a substitute for missing information.** DES-48 refers to competent experts and legal enforceability in general, but does not answer whether the ES contains sufficient current environmental information for each disputed receptor.

> **Requested examination action:** Require a consolidated EIA change-control and survey-completeness table for Sites 6-8 and all material post-scoping design changes. It should identify the new receptor or baseline, survey dates and limitations, any scoped-out matter re-tested, consultee agreement, effect on conclusions and mitigation, the ES reference, and the precise DCO control. Require publication of later survey results and a defined process for updating the assessment and mitigation if those results differ from the precautionary assumptions.

5. Residential amenity, landscape, privacy, human health, glint and tracker noise

Applicant response references: HUM-06 to HUM-08 (pp.214-215), LAN-35 to LAN-41 (pp.246-251), GLI-07 (p.209), NOI-11 (p.273).

What the Applicant says

The Applicant records approximate separation distances of 65 m to the south and 45 m to the east between the dwelling and the boundary of solar infrastructure, refers to a 30 m minimum residential offset, says operational visits would be limited to about five per month, and concludes that no Residential Visual Amenity Assessment is required because the LVIA does not identify effects at the residential visual amenity threshold. It invokes the absence of a private right to a view, assesses a maximum panel height of 4.5 m, uses a winter scenario for construction and Year 1 and a summer Year 15 scenario for mature planting, and says planting should reach at least 4.5 m by Year 15. Health is treated at population level and was scoped out. GLI-07 says upper storeys are considered but generally at lower sensitivity. NOI-11 relies on a typical tracker motor at about 50 dB(A) at 1 m, intermittent daytime operation, and excludes tracker noise as negligible.

What remains unanswered or inadequate

- **The response conflates different issues.** The absence of a private right to retain a view does not answer whether development would be visually dominant, oppressive, intrusive or materially harmful to living conditions. Likewise, a low number of operational maintenance visits does not answer construction activity, first-floor outlook, perceived surveillance, privacy, lighting, glint or noise.
- **The no-RVAA conclusion is circular.** The response says no property-specific RVAA is needed because the generic LVIA did not identify a threshold breach, while the complaint is that the generic assessment and viewpoints do not represent the elevated dwelling, first-floor rooms and close relationship with Site 6.
- **No property-specific visual evidence is supplied.** There is no first-floor winter/leaf-off wireline or photomontage, topographic section, receptor height, field of view, tracking orientation, maximum tilt, precise infrastructure layout, or clear assessment of construction compounds, fencing, CCTV, access tracks and lighting.
- **Mitigation performance is not demonstrated.** A summer Year 15 assessment does not show winter effectiveness, the first 15 years of effect, failure/replacement scenarios, required opacity or height at each stage, maintenance standards, or what happens if planting cannot screen tracking panels and associated infrastructure.
- **Population-level health scoping does not answer the identified pathways.** The Applicant recognises that close residents may experience reduced quality of life and wellbeing, but offers engagement and generic management plans rather than an integrated assessment of the actual visual, noise, traffic, lighting, glint, construction and safety pathways affecting a sensitive household. The outcome of discussions with North Yorkshire Public Health is not provided.
- **The glint answer is not auditable for the property.** It does not provide the exact receptor coordinates and heights, panels contributing to any reflection, predicted dates, times and duration, screening assumptions, or results for the south- and west-facing first-floor rooms. Assigning lower sensitivity to upper-storey rooms is not explained against the actual use of those rooms.
- **Tracker noise is screened out on an incomplete basis.** A single typical motor level at 1 m does not demonstrate the cumulative effect of multiple or synchronised motors, tonal or impulsive character, low rural background, facade and first-floor levels, meteorological conditions, fixed-versus-tracker optionality, or interaction with other operational plant. There is no verification commitment or receptor noise limit.

Requested examination action: Require a property-specific integrated residential amenity addendum, prepared to a defined receptor position and agreed assumptions. It should include first-floor and winter/leaf-off visualisations and sections; construction and operational activity; the maximum tracking configuration; glint results by room orientation and time; cumulative tracker and plant noise with character corrections and a verification limit; lighting/CCTV/privacy effects; and a combined pathway assessment explaining protection of sensitive residents. Any medical evidence should be handled confidentially if the Examining Authority considers it necessary.

6. Private drinking-water borehole, groundwater and flood risk

Applicant response references: WAT-19 (p.431), WAT-01 to WAT-04 (pp.419-421), WAT-20 (p.433).

What the Applicant says

The Applicant acknowledges that the private water supply was mentioned at a June 2025 meeting and says it is willing to engage. It says the water chapter uses the Order Limits plus a 1 km study area, includes licensed and unlicensed abstractions, applies a 50 m stand-off, uses a source-pathway-receptor approach and will monitor receptors during works, including establishing baseline conditions. It says the borehole is likely to lie within the study area and that North Yorkshire Council supplied abstraction records. The generic flood response points to site-specific FRA annexes and a cumulative assessment.

What remains unanswered or inadequate

- **The borehole is still not demonstrated to be a defined receptor.** The response says the location is likely to be within the study area rather than giving a mapped coordinate, verified distance to works, receptor identifier and assessment entry.
- **No property-specific hydrogeological baseline is supplied.** There is no evidence on borehole depth and construction, aquifer, groundwater direction, yield, water-quality parameters, existing variability, sampling frequency or the survey/access steps taken after notification in June 2025.
- **A 50 m rule is asserted but not demonstrated.** The response does not show the borehole-to-work distances, whether all temporary works, drainage, piling, trenches, access tracks, fuel stores and BESS/firewater pathways comply, or why 50 m is protective in the actual hydrogeological setting.
- **Monitoring during works may be too late for a defensible baseline.** The response does not identify when baseline sampling starts, how many rounds are needed, trigger levels, notification and stop-work procedures, causation investigation, remediation, or provision of an alternative potable supply.
- **The addition of Site 6 is not connected to a receptor audit.** Saying Site 6 was known at PEIR and ES stage does not show that the borehole, after it was notified, was entered into the baseline, model and mitigation schedule.
- **The flood response remains generic.** It does not address the interaction with South Milford's local flood-defence measures, parcel-specific compaction and runoff, local flood history, or the precise developments and construction periods used in the cumulative scenario.

Requested examination action: Require the borehole to be mapped and scheduled as a named sensitive receptor before conclusions are relied upon. Require a pre-construction hydrogeological and potable-water baseline, a source-pathway assessment covering construction, operation, decommissioning and BESS firewater, proof of all stand-offs, and enforceable monitoring, trigger, stop-work, remediation, notification and alternative-supply provisions. Require a South Milford-focused flood and drainage note showing local defences, runoff pathways and cumulative construction assumptions.

7. BESS fire, plume, firewater and emergency response

Applicant response references: BAT-01 (p.95), with related water, traffic and design-control responses.

What the Applicant says

The Applicant says BESS is safe and that residents would be protected through an Outline Battery Safety Management Plan developed with North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service. It refers to generic fire-emissions work and states that system- and site-specific plume analysis for sensitive receptors within 1 km, selected-system large-scale fire testing, final spacing, consequence modelling, water requirements and the operational emergency response will be developed at detailed design and agreed with the fire service.

What remains unanswered or inadequate

- **The key conclusion is stated before the key evidence exists.** The response confirms that the selected chemistry/system, large-scale test evidence, final layout and spacing, site-specific plume modelling and water requirement are not yet fixed.
- **No property-specific consequence is given.** There is no result for the nearby dwelling and borehole under credible worst-case weather, fire duration, multiple-unit escalation, toxic products, smoke deposition or shelter/evacuation assumptions.
- **Firewater is not integrated with groundwater protection.** The response discusses boundary cooling but does not demonstrate containment capacity, drainage isolation, contaminated-water storage, overflow scenario, sampling, disposal or the pathway to the private water supply and surface-water receptors.
- **Emergency access is not closed out.** There is no response-time assessment, independently confirmed route and passing provision, simultaneous access/egress plan, incident command area, resident warning protocol, or objective evidence that Common Lane constraints are acceptable for the final BESS design.
- **The DCO acceptance criteria are not identified.** Saying that details will be agreed with NYFRS does not state the maximum inventory, chemistry, enclosure size, separation, plume thresholds, water/containment capacity, design fire, no-escalation criterion, approving consultees or grounds for refusing a non-compliant design.

Requested examination action: Require a consent-stage worst-case BESS design envelope and a receptor-specific assessment of plume, deposition, firewater, groundwater, emergency access and public warning. The DCO should contain objective limits and a no-worse-than test, with final approval by the relevant authority after consultation with NYFRS, the Environment Agency and environmental health. The requirement should prevent construction unless the selected system and layout demonstrate compliance with those limits.

8. Ecology, badgers and biodiversity net gain delivery

Applicant response references: BIO-04, BIO-06 and BIO-07 (pp.116-118), BIO-43 (p.143), BIO-45 (p.144), ORN-21 (p.289).

What the Applicant says

The Applicant says ecological surveys were undertaken to consistent methods, all recorded badger setts will be retained, a further pre-commencement badger survey will cover the Order Limits and 30 m where access is possible, and garden access would assist. It says any new setts will be protected under legislation and that garden setts are likely to be sufficiently buffered. It reports quantified BNG gains and relies on the detailed LEMP and DCO requirements for long-term delivery.

What remains unanswered or inadequate

- **The response confirms a gap in the current badger baseline.** The resident's direct evidence and adjoining garden were not fully surveyed where access was unavailable. A future survey is proposed, but no record is given of when access was requested or why the evidence was not resolved before submission.
- **"Likely buffered" is unsupported.** No sett location, status, activity area, foraging route, quantified buffer, disturbance assessment or design contingency is supplied. It is unclear whether the final layout can move if a significant sett or route is confirmed.
- **The pre-commencement survey control is not sufficiently described.** The response does not state timing, competency, reporting, consultation, confidential handling, licence pathway, stop-work provisions or how a finding can alter works rather than simply be mitigated after design is fixed.
- **BNG figures are not a delivery mechanism.** The response does not clearly identify monitoring frequency, habitat-condition milestones, failure thresholds, remedial triggers, responsible body, funding/security, public reporting and treatment at decommissioning for the gains relied upon.
- **Cumulative functional habitat remains unclear.** The bird response does not connect survey results for Sites 6-8 with displacement, flight lines, other solar/industrial schemes and the aviation concern about increased bird activity.

Requested examination action: Require a confidential badger baseline and response schedule covering the resident evidence, access history, survey timing, sett/route buffers, design flexibility, licences and stop-work provisions. Require a BNG and habitat delivery table giving each target, baseline, location, timing, condition milestone, monitoring interval, failure threshold, remedy, responsible body, funding and DCO hook. Require the bird evidence for Sites 6-8 to be related expressly to cumulative functional habitat and aviation pathways.

9. Common Lane, construction traffic, public rights of way and cumulative development

Applicant response references: TRA-26 (p.376), TRA-64 to TRA-70 (pp.397-400), SOC-07 (p.329), SOC-23 (p.345), SOC-35 (p.352).

What the Applicant says

The Applicant says construction traffic would increase Common Lane flows by about 10% on average and up to 29% in a worst-case peak; it characterises the absolute increase as limited and temporary. It relies on Highways Improvement Areas, passing places, routing and timing controls, a final CTMP agreed with North Yorkshire Council, a fear-and-intimidation assessment, surveyed baseline flows and consideration of committed development. It says affected rights of way will normally remain open or be diverted and refers to a 15 m infrastructure buffer and new permissive paths.

What remains unanswered or inadequate

- **Percentages do not disclose the actual exposure.** The response does not give, in the RR response, the absolute daily and hourly cars, HGVs and abnormal loads on Common Lane; the construction months and peaks; employee traffic; vehicle dimensions; or the combined traffic from overlapping schemes. A low baseline can make a modest absolute increase look large as a percentage, and vice versa. It also does not take into account that the majority of current traffic goes to the Maltings Recycling plant and Network Rail compound, but no further than that – so the actual increase in HGV traffic along Common Lane past this point is 100%.
- **Emergency-access measures are expressed as intentions.** No final passing-place locations and dimensions, forward visibility, swept paths, land-control position, implementation date, maintenance, obstruction protocol or written emergency-service confirmation is supplied.
- **The existing-route condition is not answered by a category label.** Saying the fear-and-intimidation category remains "small" does not address single-track width, dead-end operation, pedestrian/cycle encounters, verge condition, drainage, refuge availability or previous emergency incidents.

- **Plan inconsistency is denied rather than reconciled.** TRA-66 says the Works, Access to Works, Street Plans and Transport Assessment should be read together, but supplies no plan/revision/route comparison, hierarchy or correction table for the specific conflicts alleged.
- **The baseline cannot be checked from the response.** TRA-67 does not provide traffic-count dates, duration, raw data, season, school/holiday conditions, exceptional events or validation against the resident's observations.
- **Outdated PROW mapping is not corrected.** TRA-68 describes data sources and ground-truthing but does not identify the disputed route, confirm the correct alignment, issue a corrected plan or assess whether the change affects closures, diversions or traffic interaction.
- **Cumulative development is asserted, not exposed.** TRA-69 and TRA-70 do not list the committed developments, traffic assumptions, pedestrian/cycle forecasts, construction programmes, overlap scenarios or sensitivity tests used for Gascoigne Wood and other schemes.
- **The footpath-to-Common-Lane issue is not answered directly.** Generic diversion and permissive-path statements do not show the route, duration, width, accessibility, road-crossing or safety audit for any diversion that places additional users on Common Lane.
- **The Hambleton Hough compound question remains outstanding.** The response does not identify what traffic and PROW information was shown during consultation or answer the allegation that an irrelevant map was supplied.

Requested examination action: Require a Common Lane evidence pack with absolute and hourly vehicle/HGV flows; count data and dates; construction phasing; a committed-development and overlap table; route and plan reconciliation; final-or-minimum swept-path and passing-place drawings; emergency-service confirmation; and a pedestrian/cycle/PROW diversion plan and road-safety audit. The final CTMP requirement should contain minimum controls and objective limits, not merely leave all material details to later agreement.

10. Aviation and the Site 6 emergency landing strip

Applicant response references: AVI-02 (p.92), GLI-03 (p.208), together with GLI-07 and relevant ecology responses.

What the Applicant says

The Applicant says the grass emergency strip is aligned under the runway 19 climb-out path at Sherburn-in-Elmet, would not change flight paths, has no buildings under its final approach, and that an AAIB-record search since 2005 found no forced landings in the stated area. It says custom flight-path receptors were used for glint and glare, relies on an empirical study, and has engaged with Sherburn-in-Elmet Airfield.

What remains unanswered or inadequate

- **The safety case is not independently evidenced in the response.** No CAA, aerodrome safeguarding or independent aviation-safety assessment is identified for the strip's dimensions, obstacle environment, adjacent arrays, fencing, glare, emergency access and proximity to homes.
- **The AAIB search is not reproducible.** The response does not give the search terms, geographic boundary, incident categories, source extract or treatment of events not resulting in an AAIB report.
- **Glint, ecology and emergency landing are treated separately.** There is no integrated assessment of reflections on approach/climb-out, turbulence, bird activity, forced-landing options, panel height/tracking and the consequences of an aircraft departing the strip or overshooting toward nearby receptors.
- **Leeds Bradford Airport is not answered.** I could not locate a Part 2 response to the specific RR-1051 point asking whether Leeds Bradford Airport was consulted. Nor does the response provide a full aviation consultee schedule and replies.

Requested examination action: Require the Applicant to provide the aviation consultee schedule and responses, including a direct answer on Leeds Bradford Airport; the Sherburn and CAA/aerodrome-safeguarding position; the AAIB search methodology and output; and an integrated strip, glint, tracking, bird and emergency-risk assessment. Any safety-critical dimensional or operational assumptions should be secured in the DCO.

11. Alternatives, agricultural land, local policy and the planning balance

Applicant response references: AGR-01 to AGR-02 (pp.45-50), ALT-24 to ALT-27 (pp.78-81), DES-49 to DES-55 (pp.317-320).

What the Applicant says

The Applicant provides a substantive generic account of agricultural land grades, temporary use, soil-management measures, the 25 km site-selection search, the need for large-scale ground-mounted solar, consideration of brownfield, rooftops, former power stations, airfields and motorway locations, and the land area typically needed for a 500 MW scheme. It says the multi-site layout reflects landform, environmental sensitivities and grid requirements and that the Rochdale Envelope secures maximum parameters. For local policy, DES-49 cross-refers to the Planning Statement and Policy Compliance Document, while DES-50 to DES-55 give selected responses on countryside policy, the NPS framework and emerging policy.

What remains unanswered or inadequate

- **Some original points are answered, but the comparison is not transparent.** The response does not provide a common matrix showing the alternatives assessed, land availability evidence, output, connection feasibility, environmental harm, BMV take, landscape effects, cost/deliverability and reason for rejection.
- **Specific alternatives are not addressed.** Car-park canopies and the mixed wind-and-solar proposition are not individually evaluated. If they are unreasonable or incapable of meeting project objectives, the Applicant should explain why, rather than only cite the generic alternatives chapter.
- **A more compact or differently distributed layout is not demonstrated.** ALT-25 gives typical hectare-per-MW figures and asserts other parcels were unsuitable, but does not expose the comparative scoring, weighting and trade-offs or show the least-harm iterations considered after Sites 6-8 were added.
- **Fixed-versus-tracking optionality is not compared across topics.** The response does not provide a single worst-case matrix showing which technology drives land take, height, visual effects, glint, noise, ecology, drainage and yield, or how a detailed design can be shown to remain within every assessed envelope.
- **The 60-year effect is understated by the word temporary.** The response identifies reversibility but does not supply objective soil-health baselines and end-state criteria supporting the predicted beneficial effect, or explain the consequences if monitoring does not show improvement.
- **DES-49 is not a policy-by-policy response.** It does not identify each adopted policy raised, the relevant site-specific effect, degree of conflict, mitigation, weight and planning-balance conclusion. The NPS framework does not make local policies irrelevant.
- **The local planning balance is not performed in Part 2.** DES-53 restates national need and critical national priority but does not set out the residual adverse effects specific to Sites 6-8 and the affected community, distinguish mitigated from unmitigated harm, or explain the weight given to each matter.

> **Requested examination action:** Require a concise alternatives and design-iteration comparison table, including car-park canopies, mixed technology, compact/distributed layouts and fixed/tracking options, with common criteria and reasons. Require a policy compliance schedule for every adopted local policy cited in RR-1051 and an explicit planning-balance table identifying the residual local adverse effects, the evidence and controls relied on, and the weight the Applicant asks the Secretary of State to give them.

12. Community benefit, local jobs and claimed public value

Applicant response references: Original RR-1051 section 8; relevant generic discussion appears elsewhere in Part 2, but RR-1051 is not listed against the principal community-benefit response.

What the Applicant says

The Applicant refers elsewhere to national electricity-system benefits, business rates, permissive paths, planting, BNG and a proposed community benefit fund. It also states that the community fund is separate from the planning merits. The main Part 2 response on this theme is not expressly tagged as a response to RR-1051.

What remains unanswered or inadequate

- **The RR point is not answered directly.** There is no clear figure for permanent local jobs, the assumptions and duration behind employment claims, or the local procurement/training commitments relied upon.
- **The fund remains undefined.** The amount, formula, commencement, duration, governance, eligible area, decision-making, indexation, transparency and enforceability are not set out in the response.

- **Local electricity benefit should not be overstated.** I do not suggest a legal entitlement to ring-fenced local electricity. The relevant point is that electricity exported to the national network and a non-material community fund should not be described as a direct mitigation of concentrated local environmental harm.

Requested examination action: Require the Applicant to distinguish material planning benefits from voluntary community benefits; provide the evidence behind construction and operational job claims; and state the proposed community-fund parameters. The planning balance should not attribute mitigation weight to an undefined or non-material fund.

13. Land interests and Book of Reference corrections

Applicant response references: LND-06 and LND-07 (p.442).

What the Applicant says

The Applicant says it conducted diligent inquiry, acknowledges that legal interests or categories may be missing or incorrect, asks the respondent to notify its land agents, and says the next Book of Reference can be corrected. I have spent thousands of pounds and many hours establishing the matters affected, why have Dalcour Maclaren not done the same? Why it is down to me to set out what the issues are, when you have acknowledged that it is incomplete?

What remains unanswered or inadequate

- **The current position is left unresolved.** The response does not state the correct category or interest, the plots and rights affected, whether the land agent has already been notified, or the consequences for notices and the compulsory-acquisition case.
- **There is no correction timetable or confirmation.** A promise to correct a future version does not allow the Interested Party or Examining Authority to verify the present legal-interest position.

Requested examination action: Require written confirmation of the affected plots, the correct interest/category, the change to the Book of Reference and Land Plans if any, the notice position, and the deadline/version in which the correction will appear. The Applicant should not leave the burden solely on the Interested Party where its own Part 2 response acknowledges a potential omission.

14. Points that need not be the main focus of the Deadline 1 reply

To keep this submission proportionate, I do not suggest that every Part 2 answer is wholly absent. The Applicant gives reasonably direct generic responses on dust controls (AIR-01), general agricultural-land quantities and soil plans (AGR-01/02), cultural heritage and archaeology (CUL-01/02/04), storm resilience (MAD-01), general decommissioning controls (CON-02/04), and some general biodiversity matters. Those answers may still be tested through the Examination, but the unresolved items above are the priority because they are property-specific, expose a baseline gap, reveal post-consent deferral, or lack an objective control.

I also do not ask the Examining Authority to determine disputed recollections solely on assertion. The practical solution is production of contemporaneous records and auditable assessment material.

15. Requested actions for the Examining Authority

1. Ask the Applicant for the consultation evidence and correction schedule identified in section 3, including address-level dispatch records and the unresolved question log.
2. Require the Sites 6-8 EIA change-control and survey-completeness matrix, together with later survey results and any resulting update to conclusions or mitigation.
3. Require a property-specific integrated residential amenity assessment covering first-floor and winter visual effects, privacy/activity, glint, tracker/plant noise, lighting and relevant health pathways.
4. Require a mapped and assessed private-water-supply receptor, pre-construction baseline, protective stand-offs, monitoring triggers, stop-work/remediation and alternative potable-water commitments.
5. Require a worst-case BESS design envelope and site-specific plume, firewater, groundwater and emergency-access assessment, supported by objective DCO acceptance criteria.
6. Require closure of the badger baseline and a quantified BNG/habitat delivery, monitoring and remedy schedule.
7. Require the Common Lane traffic, survey, cumulative-development, passing-place, emergency-access, plan-reconciliation and PROW-diversion evidence pack.

8. Require a complete aviation consultation record and integrated assessment of the emergency strip, glint, tracking panels, bird activity and nearby receptors.
9. Require transparent alternatives, technology/design and local-policy compliance schedules, plus an explicit residual-effects planning balance.
10. Require confirmation and correction of the RR-1051 land-interest/Book of Reference position.
11. Where important design or mitigation detail remains post-consent, require the Applicant to identify the exact DCO provision, approving body, consultation requirement, objective acceptance criterion, monitoring and remedy. A commitment to later agreement should not be treated as equivalent to an assessed and enforceable outcome.
12. If the information cannot be supplied through ordinary written questions, issue a Rule 17 request and allow Interested Parties a fair opportunity to comment on the response. The proposed questions in Appendix C may be used for that purpose.

13. Note that I rely on Article 1 of Protocol 1 and Article 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998. The application documents identify Milford Lodge Cottage as a residential receptor affected by SDS6, with Common Lane running through SDS6 and a Site 6 construction compound off Common Lane. The applicant's own LVIA accepts that residents of Milford Lodge and Milford Lodge Cottage will experience direct views, a noticeable change in landscape character and a high magnitude / moderate adverse / significant Year 1 effect. The applicant's Statement of Reasons treats Article 8 as unlikely to be engaged because no dwelling is being acquired, but Article 8 protects the practical enjoyment of the home, not only protection from dispossession. The Examining Authority and Secretary of State should therefore assess whether the cumulative effects on my home, garden, access and day-to-day life are lawful, necessary and proportionate, and whether a fair balance has been struck. If the scheme is to be consented, enforceable property-specific mitigation and construction controls are required.

16. Conclusion

The Applicant has answered the broad subject headings but has not closed the most important factual and assessment gaps. In several places the response itself confirms that decisive information will be obtained only after consent: the selected BESS evidence and plume analysis, some ecological verification, detailed traffic controls, and aspects of baseline monitoring. In other places the response relies on an untested conclusion - for example that a property is not at the residential amenity threshold, that an unlocated borehole is covered by a generic study area, or that inconsistent plans are consistent when read together.

I therefore ask the Examining Authority not to treat Part 2 as a complete answer to RR-1051. The examination should obtain the specified evidence, test it against the actual nearby receptors and secure objective controls before any positive conclusion is reached.

AI assistance statement

I used OpenAI ChatGPT to assist with organising and drafting this response and cross-referencing the Applicant's published response document. I have checked the content against the source documents and accept responsibility for the submission.

Documents reviewed

- Relevant Representation RR-1051 supporting attachment: Nick and Louise Billingham, published by the Planning Inspectorate (document reference EN0110012-000252).
- The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 2, published by the Planning Inspectorate (document reference EN0110012-000368).
- Planning Inspectorate Rule 8 letter and examination timetable for Light Valley Solar, including Deadline 1.
- Planning Inspectorate guidance on Environmental Impact Assessment for NSIPs, updated 27 July 2026. This postdates the pre-application work and is used only as a current statement of good EIA practice on scoping assumptions, project changes, baselines, uncertainty and interrelationships.
- Planning Act 2008, section 104, and the relevant energy National Policy Statements, for the decision-making framework.

Appendix A - RR-1051 response-gap audit

Status legend: **Unanswered** means the specific issue is not addressed; **Partial / evidence missing** means the topic is addressed but the necessary record or receptor-specific analysis is not supplied; **Generic / control missing** means the answer relies on a general ES cross-reference or future plan without an objective control.

No.	Applicant reference(s) / PDF page	Assessment	Unresolved point and information required
1	ENG-02 p.182; ENG-09 p.186	Partial / inconsistent	ENG-02 acknowledges addresses omitted at Phase One because the zone changed; ENG-09 says addresses near Sites 6-8 will have received a postcard. Provide address-level dispatch evidence, returned-mail data and explanation of the inconsistency.
2	ENG-02 p.182	Unanswered	Reconcile the 14,000-postcard figure challenged in the supporting correspondence with the more-than-12,500 figure in Part 2; identify phases, duplicates, returns and delivery evidence.
3	ENG-02; ENG-08; ENG-09	Partial / evidence missing	Answer the three-day notice allegation, incorrect event details, absence of a South Milford event and the additional accessibility steps taken for the newly affected community.
4	ENG-02; ENG-15	Unanswered	Provide direct responses on Leeds City Council Phase One consultation, Gateforth and Thorpe Willoughby parish councils, Gateforth distance/mapping, local-authority requested information and the correction/version log.
5	ENG-03 p.184	Partial / evidence missing	Provide the consultation question log, written answers, dates, contradictions and response times; identify the unanswered Hambleton Hough traffic/PROW request.
6	ENG-09 p.186; DES-34 p.308	Partial / evidence missing	Provide a Sites 6-8 EIA change-control matrix: scoping assumption, change, new receptor/baseline, survey, scoped-out matter re-test, ES consequence, consultee agreement and DCO control.
7	DES-46 p.315	Partial / evidence missing	Publish the later pond/tree/geophysical survey results, identify any changed conclusion/mitigation, and define the update mechanism if precautionary assumptions prove wrong.
8	BIO-43 p.143; ORN-21 p.289	Partial / evidence missing	Provide dates, visits, weather, coverage and access limits for Sites 6-8, plus the scope/date of Natural England agreement and cumulative functional-land assessment.
9	DES-47-48 p.316	Generic / control missing	List assessment-critical matters deferred to detailed design, the worst case used, exact DCO provision, approving body, objective acceptance test and no-worse-than demonstration.
10	HUM-06-08 pp.214-215; LAN-35-41 pp.246-251	Partial / methodology gap	Provide a property-specific integrated amenity assessment; first-floor winter/leaf-off visuals and sections; actual infrastructure and tracking parameters; construction/activity/privacy; mitigation performance; and combined health pathways.
11	GLI-07 p.209	Partial / evidence missing	Provide property coordinates/heights, room orientations, contributing panels, predicted dates/times/duration, screening assumptions and upper-storey sensitivity rationale.
12	NOI-11 p.273	Partial / methodology gap	Model multiple/synchronised trackers and other plant at the property, including sound character, low background, facade/upper-floor levels and fixed/tracking optionality; secure verification and a limit.

No.	Applicant reference(s) / PDF page	Assessment	Unresolved point and information required
13	WAT-19 p.431	Partial / baseline missing	Map the private borehole as a named receptor; provide depth/aquifer/baseline/pathway assessment, verified stand-offs, monitoring triggers, stop-work/remediation and alternative supply.
14	WAT-01-04; WAT-20	Generic / evidence missing	Provide the South Milford-focused flood/drainage and cumulative-construction analysis, including local defences, compaction/runoff and actual schemes/timelines.
15	BAT-01 p.95	Partial / post-consent deferral	Provide consent-stage BESS envelope, selected-system test criteria, site-specific plume and firewater/groundwater assessment, emergency-access plan, warning arrangements and objective DCO limits.
16	BIO-45 p.144	Partial / post-consent deferral	Resolve resident badger evidence and garden access; quantify buffers and routes; show design flexibility, survey/reporting/licensing/stop-work controls.
17	BIO-04/06/07	Generic / control missing	Provide BNG/habitat targets, location, timing, condition milestones, monitoring, failure thresholds, remedies, responsibility, funding and DCO hooks.
18	TRA-26 p.376; TRA-64-70 pp.397-400	Partial / evidence missing	Provide absolute/hourly flows, count data, construction phasing, cumulative scheme table, passing-place/swept-path evidence, emergency-service confirmation and CTMP minimum controls.
19	TRA-66-68; SOC-23/35	Unanswered / partial	Reconcile access/street/works plans by revision and hierarchy; correct PROW mapping; provide the actual diversion route, duration, accessibility and Common Lane road-safety audit.
20	AVI-02 p.92; GLI-03 p.208	Partial / evidence missing	Provide aviation consultee record, direct answer on Leeds Bradford Airport, CAA/aerodrome-safeguarding view, AAIB search method and integrated strip/glint/tracking/bird/emergency assessment.
21	AGR-01/02; ALT-24-27	Substantial generic answer; comparison missing	Provide common-criteria alternatives matrix including car-park canopies, mixed wind/solar, compact/distributed layouts and fixed/tracking options; disclose scoring, trade-offs and reasons.
22	DES-49-55 pp.317-320	Generic / policy analysis missing	Provide a policy-by-policy schedule for the adopted local policies cited, with effect, conflict, mitigation, weight and planning-balance conclusion.
23	Community-benefit issue	Unanswered directly	Distinguish material planning benefits from voluntary benefits; provide local job assumptions and community-fund parameters; do not use an undefined fund as mitigation.
24	LND-06/07 p.442	Unresolved	Confirm affected plots, correct legal interest/category, notice implications and the exact Book of Reference/Land Plan correction and version/date.

Appendix B - Applicant Part 2 entries tagged RR-1051

The following 80 issue rows were reviewed. Grouping is for navigation only; the audit above identifies the material gaps.

Topic	Part 2 references tagged RR-1051
Agricultural land / alternatives	AGR-01, AGR-02, ALT-06, ALT-24, ALT-25, ALT-26, ALT-27
Air, aviation and BESS	AIR-01, AVI-02, BAT-01
Biodiversity / birds	BIO-01, BIO-04, BIO-06, BIO-07, BIO-37, BIO-43, BIO-44, BIO-45, ORN-21
Construction / consultation	CON-01, CON-02, CON-04, ENG-02, ENG-03, ENG-09, ENG-15
Cultural heritage	CUL-01, CUL-02, CUL-04
Glint and glare	GLI-02, GLI-03, GLI-07
Human health / residential amenity	HUM-02, HUM-06, HUM-07, HUM-08
Landscape and visual	LAN-35, LAN-36, LAN-37, LAN-38, LAN-39, LAN-40, LAN-41, LAN-42, LAN-43, LAN-44
Major accidents / noise	MAD-01, NOI-01, NOI-11
Design / EIA / policy	DES-34, DES-46, DES-47, DES-48, DES-49, DES-50, DES-51, DES-52, DES-53, DES-54, DES-55
Socioeconomics / property / routes	SOC-02, SOC-07, SOC-23, SOC-35
Transport	TRA-23, TRA-26, TRA-64, TRA-65, TRA-66, TRA-67, TRA-68, TRA-69, TRA-70
Water and flood risk	WAT-01, WAT-02, WAT-04, WAT-19, WAT-20
Land interests	LND-06, LND-07

Appendix C - Proposed written questions for the Applicant

The following questions are submitted as proposed written questions for the Applicant. They supplement the priority evidence requests in section 15 and should be answered by reference to the relevant application document, assessment result, drawing, DCO provision and responsible approving or enforcing body. Where a matter remains to be fixed after consent, the response should identify the reasonable worst case assessed and the objective control that prevents materially worse effects or materially weaker mitigation.

1. Scheme maturity and design flexibility

- Please provide a consolidated schedule identifying which elements of the development are fixed and which remain to be determined after consent, including panel technology, panel height, array layout, BESS technology, conversion units, substations, access tracks, fencing, drainage and mitigation planting.
- Has the Environmental Statement assessed the full reasonable worst-case design permitted by the DCO, or has it principally assessed an illustrative or preferred layout?
- Please demonstrate that the assessments remain valid for the worst-case positioning of panels, BESS, inverters, transformers, access tracks, lighting and fencing relative to homes, Public Rights of Way, sensitive habitats and landscape receptors.
- What binding controls prevent higher-impact infrastructure from being moved at detailed-design stage into a location that has not been specifically assessed?
- Will the Applicant accept a DCO requirement that the final scheme must result in no materially greater environmental effects, and no materially less effective mitigation, than assessed in the Environmental Statement?

2. Preliminary works

- Please identify precisely which works may be undertaken as "permitted preliminary works" before formal commencement of the development.
- Could vegetation clearance, access-point construction, haul-road preparation, land remediation, groundworks or Public Rights of Way works take place before the principal Construction Environmental Management Plan and Construction Traffic Management Plan have been approved?
- Where preliminary works involve heavy plant, HGV movements, vegetation removal or substantial ground disturbance, why should they not be subject to the same controls over working hours, traffic routes, noise, dust, drainage and ecology as the main construction works?
- Will the Applicant amend the DCO to require an approved Preliminary Works Environmental Management Plan and Preliminary Works Traffic Management Plan before any substantial preliminary activity begins?
- Will early landscape planting be expressly permitted and encouraged as a preliminary work, subject to an approved planting programme, establishment monitoring, watering and replacement obligations?

3. Maintenance and replacement works

- What major replacement campaigns are currently anticipated during the 60-year operational period for solar panels, BESS cells, inverters, transformers and associated electrical infrastructure?
- What assumptions have been made about the frequency, duration, HGV movements, waste generation and local effects of those replacement works?
- Will major maintenance and replacement campaigns be subject to the same controls over traffic, working hours, noise, dust, lighting, Public Rights of Way, drainage and ecology as the original construction works?
- How will the DCO ensure that replacement panels or equipment are not taller, larger, noisier, more prominently illuminated or more visually harmful than the infrastructure and effects originally assessed?
- Will a Major Maintenance and Replacement Plan be required before each substantial replacement campaign, including arrangements for recycling and disposal of replaced panels, batteries and electrical equipment?

4. Carbon strategy

Design optimisation

- What quantified whole-life carbon savings were achieved during design optimisation, and against what baseline were those savings measured?
- Which decisions taken in accordance with PAS 2080 resulted in measurable carbon reductions?
- Were alternative panel technologies, BESS configurations, equipment locations, cable routes, access-track designs and construction methods assessed to minimise embodied carbon?

Biodiversity and land use

- What increase in soil carbon stocks is expected from the change from arable land to grassland?
- What reduction in agricultural emissions is expected from the cessation or reduction of existing farming activities?

- Why are the carbon effects of biodiversity gains, grassland establishment, hedgerow creation and woodland planting not more explicitly quantified within the carbon assessment?

Design flexibility

- Does the carbon assessment represent the reasonable worst-case design permitted by the DCO?
- How sensitive are the carbon results to changes in equipment selection, panel technology, steel quantities, battery specification, cable lengths, transformer locations and site layout?

Electrical infrastructure

- Will any SF_6-containing switchgear or other SF_6-containing equipment be used?
- If so, why have lifecycle emissions, including expected leakage, maintenance losses and end-of-life losses, not been quantified?

Monitoring and controls

- Why is no project carbon monitoring proposed during detailed design, procurement, construction, operation, replacement and decommissioning?
- Why are no embodied-carbon performance targets, reporting obligations or carbon-reduction commitments secured through the DCO?

5. Agricultural land and Best and Most Versatile land

- How did the Applicant apply the avoidance of Grades 1, 2 and 3a Best and Most Versatile agricultural land when selecting the site and developing the layout?
- What alternative configurations were considered that would have reduced the amount of BMV land occupied by BESS, substations, conversion units, tracks and other built infrastructure?
- Please confirm the final or worst-case area of agricultural land that would be occupied by built infrastructure, broken down by agricultural land grade.
- Please confirm whether the approximately 19.1 hectares identified for BESS and other built structures is treated as a permanent or long-term loss for the full 60-year operational period.
- How much agricultural land would be used for landscape planting, woodland, hedgerows and bird-mitigation areas, and how has that land been treated in the agricultural assessment?
- What sensitivity analysis has been undertaken of the ecological, landscape and carbon consequences of removing mature hedgerows, woodland and other mitigation at decommissioning?
- Why should the DCO assume that all mature landscape and ecological mitigation will be removed after 60 years, rather than requiring an assessment at that time of whether retention would be environmentally preferable?

6. Traffic and transport

- Please provide the agreed present-day and future-year capacity assessment for the A63/A162 roundabout, including traffic from existing development, committed development, the proposed highway upgrades and Light Valley Solar.
- Does the proposed Phase 1 improvement fully mitigate the traffic generated by the developments that funded it? If not, how has the remaining capacity problem been reflected in the Light Valley Solar assessment?
- What is the design, funding and delivery status of any Phase 2 improvement, and what financial or physical contribution is the Applicant proposing to make?
- What evidence demonstrates that scheduling deliveries outside peak periods would be sufficient to prevent unacceptable capacity, safety and amenity effects?
- What is the current status of the assessment of the route to Site 4 through West Haddlesley, the use of minor roads through South Milford and any alternative construction routes?
- Have all abnormal-indivisible-load routes, structures, junctions, turning movements and site accesses been fully surveyed and agreed with the highway authority?
- What highway matters remain unresolved with North Yorkshire Council, and when will the complete evidence and the Council's concluded position be available to the Examination?
- Will traffic controls apply to preliminary works, main construction, major replacement campaigns and decommissioning, rather than only the initial construction period?
- What monitoring and enforcement measures will prevent HGVs from using unauthorised routes or travelling outside approved hours?
- Why has the traffic assessment not stated that there are no HGVs that currently pass the Network Rail Compound on Common Lane and therefore increasing HGV traffic by 100%?

7. Noise and vibration

- Please provide technology-specific noise modelling for the final proposed panel-tracking motors, BESS units, inverters, transformers and other electrical equipment.
- Has the cumulative noise from multiple tracking motors operating together or sequentially been assessed at the nearest homes and Public Rights of Way?
- Please identify the predicted receptor-level noise from the BESS, rather than only the source sound-power level, and explain how tonality, intermittency, low-frequency sound and other acoustic characteristics have been addressed.
- How will the Applicant ensure that future equipment selected after consent is no noisier than the equipment and effects assessed?
- What binding operational noise limits, commissioning tests, complaint-investigation procedures and remedial measures will be secured?
- Does the previous decision to scope out vibration remain valid for preliminary land remediation, heavy plant activity, access construction and future major replacement campaigns?

8. Flood risk and drainage

- Please identify the most recent flood-risk and surface-water datasets used in the assessment and provide clear plans distinguishing Flood Zones 3a and 3b.
- Has the Lead Local Flood Authority reviewed and agreed the Applicant's latest flood-risk and drainage evidence?
- Please provide plans identifying every panel, conversion unit, transformer, BESS component and other item of infrastructure located within or close to an area of fluvial or surface-water flood risk.
- For each item in a flood-risk area, please show the existing ground level, finished ground level, foundation or plinth height, flood-related elevation, required freeboard and total height above ground.
- Can the Applicant confirm that the total height of all panels and equipment, including foundations, plinths and flood-related elevation, will remain within the stated 4.5-metre maximum?
- How have changes to floodplain roughness, conveyance, flow paths, velocities, debris trapping and upstream and downstream flood risk been assessed across the full DCO design envelope?
- How has the potential interaction between main-river flooding and the local Internal Drainage Board network been assessed?

9. Water supply and BESS firefighting

- Please provide a site-by-site assessment of water-supply capacity, rather than relying only on an overall network-level conclusion.
- For each BESS compound, what firefighting-water flow rate, volume and duration would be required for the maximum credible incident involving the selected technology?
- What is the maximum credible volume of contaminated firefighting water, and what on-site containment capacity will be provided?
- How will drainage be isolated during an incident to prevent contaminated water reaching watercourses, drains, groundwater or neighbouring land?
- What arrangements will apply to the testing, removal, treatment and safe disposal of contaminated water after an incident?
- If the final BESS technology is selected after consent, what process will ensure that fire-water demand, containment capacity and environmental risks are reassessed before installation?

10. Landscape and cumulative character effects

- Which existing, consented, under-construction and reasonably foreseeable developments have been included in the cumulative landscape and visual assessment?
- Why should the cumulative landscape assessment be confined principally to effects around selected sites if receptors may experience successive views of solar arrays, substations, BESS, tracks, fencing and grid infrastructure across the wider area?
- Will the Applicant provide additional photomontages for the most sensitive homes, settlements and Public Rights of Way showing winter conditions and years 1, 5, 15 and 30?
- What size and maturity of trees and hedgerows will be planted, and what evidence supports the assumed growth rates, survival rates and date at which effective screening will be achieved?
- Where reliance is placed on larger or semi-mature planting to address early effects, has that planting been designed, costed, funded and secured through the DCO?
- What happens if planting fails, grows more slowly than predicted or does not provide the screening relied upon in the Environmental Statement?
- For how long will landscape mitigation be monitored, and what replacement or additional planting will be required where visual effects are worse than assessed?

11. Residential amenity and separation distances

- What evidence supports the use of a standard 30-metre separation from residential curtilages for a development of this scale?

- Has the worst-case combination of 4.5-metre-high tracking panels and a 30-metre residential separation been assessed together at each affected property?
- Have the effects of nearby inverters, transformers, BESS, access routes, fencing, lighting and construction activity also been considered when determining whether 30 metres is sufficient?
- What larger buffers or equipment-exclusion zones were considered, particularly for properties affected by development from more than one direction?
- Has the Applicant undertaken a cumulative residential-amenity assessment of what it would be like to live at the affected properties, combining visual change, noise, construction activity, HGV traffic, lighting, fencing, loss of outlook and the time required for planting to mature?
- Where the Applicant relies on the existing landscape being of “low value”, how has the value of an open outlook to the residents who experience it been assessed?

The supporting notes identify the cumulative lived experience of residents, rather than separate discipline-by-discipline conclusions, as a central issue.

12. Public Rights of Way

- For each affected or diverted Public Right of Way, please compare the existing and proposed route length, gradient, accessibility, views, tranquillity, screening and proximity to infrastructure.
- What measurable criteria have been used to conclude that each altered or diverted route would provide an equivalent or better recreational experience?
- Has the Applicant assessed the cumulative experience of users who may encounter several parts of Light Valley Solar, or several solar developments, during one journey?
- Will user numbers and route experience be monitored after construction?
- What corrective measures will be available if monitoring demonstrates reduced use, accessibility, tranquillity or recreational quality?
- Why does it still show a public footpath off Common Lane when it was stopped up in November 2025?

13. Biodiversity and ecological connectivity

- How has the Applicant demonstrated that retained hedgerows, ditches, ponds, woodland edges and field margins will remain ecologically functional during construction, rather than merely remaining physically present?
- How will species movement be maintained where construction compounds, trenching, access routes, traffic, fencing, lighting and noise affect existing ecological corridors?
- What monitoring will be undertaken to establish whether bats, amphibians, hedgehogs, badgers and other species continue to use retained movement corridors?
- What measurable ecological indicators and intervention thresholds will apply if monitoring identifies fragmentation or reduced use of retained corridors?
- How will the practical effectiveness of wildlife-permeable fencing, crossing points and habitat connections be verified?
- How frequently will BNG and habitat-condition targets be reviewed over the 60-year operational period, and what corrective measures will apply where habitats fall below target?
- What evidence demonstrates that the proposed grassland, hedgerows and woodland will establish and persist under projected drought, temperature and other climate conditions?

The key distinction is between physical habitat retention and maintaining ecological connectivity and function throughout construction and operation.

14. Glint, glare and aviation

- Has the glint-and-glare assessment considered the maximum permitted panel height and the worst-case use and orientation of tracking panels?
- Have effects been assessed during the early operational years and in winter, before mitigation planting provides effective screening?
- Please identify the property-specific, Public Right of Way and aviation receptors assessed, including the duration and timing of any predicted effects.
- What consultation has taken place with Sherburn Aero Club, the relevant airfield operator and aviation-safeguarding bodies?
- What technical assessment informed the location and design of any emergency landing area, and what alternative locations were considered?
- What monitoring and corrective measures would apply if operational glint or glare is more extensive or prolonged than predicted?

15. Wider cumulative and inter-project effects

- Please identify every existing, consented, under-construction and reasonably foreseeable project included in the cumulative assessment.
- How have combined construction phasing, HGV traffic, abnormal loads, drainage, Public Rights of Way disruption, landscape change, ecological connectivity, grid infrastructure and mitigation delivery been assessed?
- Could works or mitigation associated with another project prevent Light Valley Solar's mitigation from being delivered as assessed, and if so, how will that risk be controlled?
- Has a receptor-by-receptor cumulative assessment been undertaken for communities and routes affected by more than one project?

16. Green Belt and Grey Belt - lower-priority question

- Please provide the Applicant's parcel-by-parcel assessment of whether the affected Green Belt land constitutes Grey Belt, including the effect of the development on openness and on the purposes of preventing settlements from merging.

17. Securing and monitoring the promised outcomes

- Please provide a single schedule cross-referencing every mitigation measure relied upon in the Environmental Statement to the relevant DCO requirement, parameter plan, management plan or certified document.
- Which mitigation measures are fixed minimum commitments, and which may be reduced, relocated or altered at detailed-design stage?
- Who will independently monitor compliance during preliminary works, construction, operation, replacement and decommissioning?
- Will monitoring reports be made publicly available to the relevant local authorities, parish councils and affected communities?
- What intervention thresholds, timescales and enforcement mechanisms will apply where noise, landscape, biodiversity, traffic, drainage, residential-amenity or other effects are worse than assessed?
- Will the Applicant accept the following overarching principle:

> **The final design may differ from the illustrative design, but the environmental outcomes delivered must be equivalent to or better than those assessed in the Environmental Statement.**