

Residential amenity and living conditions

As the Examining Authority have pointed out, there is clearly going to be substantial degree of visual change to our property and a severe impact on our residential amenity. There are only 4 windows in the whole house that will not be affected. The RVAT represented a very high threshold to private views and residual effects will clearly remain at year 15, this has clearly (and intentionally) been underplayed by the Applicant. A full RVAA should have been carried out, as we have mentioned throughout this whole saga. Our position remains unchanged here and we would again refer to the recently consented Botley West Solar Farm which requires a minimum offset of at least 250m from residential curtilages. Our home is situated immediately adjacent to Solar Development Site 6 and will be directly affected by the proposed Light Valley Solar NSIP.

Our concerns remain regarding the cumulative effect of the development upon:

- Our home and residential amenity;
- Our privacy and enjoyment of our property;
- the landscape and setting of our home;
- construction disturbance;
- the proposed use of Common Lane as construction access for Solar Development Sites 6 and 7;
- highway safety;
- pedestrian and equestrian safety; and
- our ability to safely enter and leave my our home.

I ask the Examining Authority and ultimately the Secretary of State to consider these effects expressly in the context of our rights under the Human Rights Act 1998, particularly:

- Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights – respect for private and family life and the home; and
- Article 1 of the First Protocol – peaceful enjoyment of possessions.

My objection is not simply that we dislike the appearance of solar development or additional traffic.

The issue is the exceptionally concentrated burden which the proposed development would place upon our home and the surrounding residential environment.

2. Milford Lodge Cottage is particularly affected by Site 6

The Applicant's own Environmental Statement identifies Milford Lodge and Milford Lodge Cottage as VP46.

The Applicant assesses the susceptibility of the residential receptor to change as high. This is despite there being a very high threshold!

It predicts:

Construction

- Magnitude of impact: HIGH
- Effect: MODERATE ADVERSE (SIGNIFICANT)

Year 1 of operation

- Magnitude of impact: HIGH
- Effect: MODERATE ADVERSE (SIGNIFICANT)

The Applicant therefore accepts that Milford Lodge Cottage will experience a significant adverse effect.

The Applicant further acknowledges that the existing environment contains expansive agricultural fields and retains an open rural character and that, even once proposed mitigation planting has matured, the existing openness will be changed to a more enclosed character.

These findings should form an important part of the Human Rights and residential amenity assessment.

3. Article 8 – respect for our home and private life

Article 8 protects the right to respect for private and family life and the home.

I recognise that Article 8 does not provide an absolute right to prevent development, nor does it provide an absolute right to retain an existing view.

That is not the basis of our objection.

My concern is the cumulative effect upon the environment and enjoyment of our home arising from:

- the proximity of Site 6;
- extensive solar infrastructure immediately adjoining the residential environment;
- the transformation of the existing open agricultural setting;
- the enclosure of the property by development and mitigation planting;
- construction noise;
- construction traffic;
- piling and heavy machinery;
- temporary lighting;
- workers operating close to the property;
- potential effects upon privacy;
- long-term operational infrastructure;
- security infrastructure and maintenance activity;
- and the proposed use of the only access to our home by construction HGVs.

These matters should not be considered independently from one another.

They combine to affect the way in which our home can be safely, privately and peacefully occupied.

4. Common Lane is the only access to our home

Common Lane is the sole vehicular access to Milford Lodge Cottage.

There is no alternative public highway route by which we can enter or leave our property.

This is an important distinction.

The proposed construction traffic arrangements do not merely affect a road which we sometimes use.

They affect the only means by which we can physically access our home.

Any obstruction, queuing, road closure, conflict with HGVs or unsafe conditions on Common Lane therefore directly affects:

- our ability to enter and leave our property;
- access by family and visitors;
- deliveries;
- postal services;
- utility and maintenance vehicles;
- emergency services;
- ambulances;
- fire appliances; and
- normal daily residential life.

I therefore consider the Common Lane issue to be directly relevant to the protection and enjoyment of our home under Article 8, in addition to being a highway-safety issue.

5. Physical characteristics of Common Lane

Common Lane is, in my experience as a resident, a narrow rural single-track lane.

It is under approximately 3 metres wide in most places (estimated to be over 95%) and I attach photos taken at various places along the lane. There are 2 places on the whole lane where two ordinary vehicles can safely pass.

The road includes:

- very limited passing opportunities;
- narrow bridge sections;
- restricted and blind visibility;
- no conventional pedestrian footway (despite linking PROWs)
- little or no pedestrian refuge;
- drainage infrastructure and verges immediately adjacent to the carriageway;
- use by pedestrians;
- use by horse riders;
- connections with the public rights of way network; and
- residential and agricultural users who rely upon the lane.

These characteristics raise serious concerns regarding the proposed introduction of repeated HGV construction movements.

6. Proposed use for Sites 6 and 7

The Applicant proposes to use Common Lane to provide access to both Solar Development Site 6 and Solar Development Site 7. There was also reference to using it for Solar Development Site 8 at the hearings but this has not been assessed in any of the existing documentation and would have an even more devastating impact on our day to day lives.

This is not therefore an occasional or incidental construction access.

The Applicant's documentation identifies multiple access points serving these development areas.

The suitability of Common Lane should consequently be established through a detailed, route-specific safety assessment.

The question should not merely be whether an HGV can physically travel down the lane.

The proper question is:

Can Common Lane safely accommodate construction HGVs while remaining safely available at all times to residents, pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders, emergency vehicles and other legitimate highway users?

7. Applicant identifies Common Lane as a sensitive receptor

The Applicant's Environmental Statement identifies Common Lane as having high receptor sensitivity to change.

That acknowledgement is important.

The safety and amenity implications cannot properly be assessed merely by reference to total traffic numbers or percentage increases.

An additional HGV on a modern two-lane road is fundamentally different from an additional HGV on a sub-3-metre single-track road with blind locations and vulnerable road users.

Daily traffic averages cannot demonstrate whether individual vehicle encounters will be safe.

8. HGV movements and real-life vehicle encounters

The Applicant's Transport Assessment anticipates construction HGV movements on Common Lane.

The relevant question is what happens in real-life situations when:

- an HGV meets a resident's car;
- two HGVs meet each other;
- an HGV encounters a pedestrian;
- an HGV encounters a cyclist;
- an HGV encounters a horse and rider;
- an HGV approaches one of the restricted bridge locations;
- an emergency vehicle requires access;
- a construction vehicle needs to reverse;
- or several construction movements occur close together.

The Applicant should identify precisely where vehicles can pass safely.

It should also demonstrate what would happen if vehicles meet between those locations.

9. Vulnerable road users

Common Lane is used on foot and on horseback and connects with public rights of way.

The Applicant's own recreational proposals envisage continued and potentially increased pedestrian, cyclist and equestrian use in the area.

This creates a particularly important interaction between:

construction HGVs + vulnerable road users + a narrow single-track highway.

Pedestrians have very limited opportunities to move away from the carriageway.

Horse riders are particularly vulnerable.

Large vehicles, braking noise, reversing alarms, loose materials, air brakes and unexpected vehicle movements can cause horses to react unpredictably.

On a road of approximately 3 metres or less in width, there may be insufficient space for a horse and a large construction

vehicle to safely pass.

I therefore request a specific equestrian and vulnerable-road-user risk assessment for Common Lane.

10. Blind bridge locations and visibility

I have previously raised concerns regarding the bridges and restricted visibility along Common Lane.

The Applicant should provide objective evidence addressing:

1. measured highway width throughout the construction route;
2. the width at each bridge or constrained point;
3. forward visibility in both directions;
4. intervisibility between approaching vehicles;
5. intervisibility between HGV drivers and vulnerable road users;
6. swept-path analysis for the largest proposed construction vehicles;
7. locations where a car and HGV can pass;
8. locations where two HGVs can pass;
9. the distance between passing locations;
10. whether reversing would be required;
11. whether repeated construction HGV loading is appropriate for bridge structures;
12. whether vulnerable road users have a safe refuge at those locations; and
13. whether the proposed Site 6 and Site 7 access points themselves provide adequate visibility.

11. Swept-path analysis alone is insufficient

A swept-path analysis may demonstrate that an HGV is physically capable of moving through a particular section of road.

It does not demonstrate that the route can operate safely when other users are present.

There is an important distinction between:

“An HGV can fit along this road”

and:

“This road can safely function as a construction HGV route while remaining open to existing highway users.”

The second question is the one which matters.

12. Article 8 and access to the home

I ask the Examining Authority specifically to consider the relationship between highway access and Article 8.

The ability to safely enter and leave one's home is part of the practical enjoyment of that home.

The proposed development therefore affects Milford Lodge Cottage not only through visual and environmental change but potentially through the operation of the sole route serving the property.

The cumulative Article 8 assessment should therefore include:

- safety of access;
- reliability of access;
- emergency access;
- construction traffic;
- delays or obstruction;
- privacy;
- noise;
- visual enclosure;
- construction disturbance;
- and the ability to continue ordinary residential life.

This should not be treated as a series of unrelated technical assessments.

13. Privacy and the environment of the home

My Article 8 concerns also include privacy.

The Examining Authority should consider the effect of:

- construction personnel;
- machinery;
- elevated plant;
- maintenance personnel;
- access routes;
- operational staff;
- security measures;
- CCTV;
- lighting; and
- activity close to private residential areas.

The assessment should consider views towards:

- bedrooms;
- bathrooms;
- first-floor rooms;
- living accommodation;
- gardens; and
- private amenity areas.

A roadside landscape viewpoint cannot necessarily represent the experience of an occupier living within the property.

14. Construction impacts should not be dismissed as temporary

Construction may be temporary in planning terms but can still represent a substantial period of a person's life.

The Applicant already accepts a significant adverse construction effect upon Milford Lodge Cottage.

The assessment should therefore consider the cumulative effect of:

- noise;
- piling;
- HGV traffic;
- machinery;

- dust;
- workers;
- temporary lighting;
- vehicle movements;
- vegetation removal;
- reduced privacy;
- highway safety risk; and
- restrictions upon the ordinary use of Common Lane.

15. Article 1 of the First Protocol

I also rely upon Article 1 of the First Protocol, protecting the peaceful enjoyment of possessions.

Our home is a possession for the purposes of that protection.

I recognise that planning controls and infrastructure development may lawfully interfere with property rights in the public interest.

However, a fair balance must be achieved.

The question is therefore whether it is proportionate for Milford Lodge Cottage to bear such a concentrated combination of impacts for the benefit of the wider development.

Those impacts include:

- significant visual effects;
- loss of openness;
- enclosure;
- construction disturbance;
- loss of privacy;
- operational effects;
- highway-safety risks;
- and construction use of the sole access to the property.

16. Proportionality and alternatives

The existence of a national need for renewable energy does not remove the requirement to consider whether the burden imposed upon individual homes is proportionate.

The decision-maker should therefore ask:

Could the same public objective be achieved with materially less harm to Milford Lodge Cottage?

That should include consideration of:

- increasing the stand-off distance from my home;
- removing panels closest to the property;
- relocating infrastructure;
- improving or relocating construction access;
- avoiding HGV construction traffic on Common Lane;
- identifying an alternative Site 6/Site 7 access strategy;
- reducing panel heights;
- improved screening;
- construction-hour restrictions;
- privacy safeguards;
- lighting restrictions;
- and enforceable traffic-management controls.

17. Alternative construction access

I specifically request evidence identifying what alternative access arrangements have been examined for Sites 6 and 7.

The Applicant should not select Common Lane simply because it represents the shortest or most convenient connection to the strategic road network.

Where an alternative route is longer but materially safer, that must be given appropriate weight.

Highway safety and protection of existing users should take precedence over construction convenience.

18. A future Construction Traffic Management Plan cannot cure a fundamentally unsuitable route

I am also concerned that important matters may be left to a future Construction Traffic Management Plan.

Management measures cannot alter fundamental physical constraints.

For example:

- signage cannot widen the road;
- speed limits cannot create a pedestrian refuge;
- driver training cannot increase forward visibility;
- a booking system cannot guarantee that a resident will never encounter a construction vehicle;
- and traffic marshals cannot necessarily eliminate conflicts throughout the entire length of Common Lane.

The fundamental suitability of the route should therefore be established during Examination.

19. Mitigation if Common Lane remains proposed

If Common Lane nevertheless remains within the access strategy, strict and enforceable controls should be considered, including:

- maximum construction-vehicle dimensions;
- maximum daily HGV movements;
- prohibition on simultaneous opposing HGV movements;
- vehicle booking and release systems;
- off-road holding areas;
- prohibition of construction-vehicle waiting on Common Lane;
- radios or equivalent communication between drivers;
- traffic marshals at constrained locations;
- very low construction-vehicle speeds;
- specific pedestrian and horse-rider safety measures;

- restrictions at times of significant recreational use;
- bridge structural assessments;
- pre- and post-construction road-condition surveys;
- Applicant-funded repair;
- prohibition of road closures affecting access to Milford Lodge Cottage without agreed alternative arrangements;
- guaranteed emergency access;
- guaranteed residential access;
- a dedicated resident liaison contact;
- incident reporting;
- compliance monitoring; and
- the ability to suspend construction traffic if unsafe conditions arise.

20. Human Rights assessment must be cumulative

I ask that the Human Rights assessment is not fragmented between separate environmental topics.

The relevant question is how the development will actually be experienced by someone living at Milford Lodge Cottage.

The cumulative effect is:

significant visual change + loss of openness + enclosure + construction noise + HGV traffic + highway safety concerns + privacy impacts + lighting + construction activity + operational activity + effects upon the only access to the home.

It is that combined burden which should be tested against Article 8 and Article 1 Protocol 1.

21. Requested action from the Examining Authority

I respectfully request that the Examining Authority:

1. expressly considers Article 8 and Article 1 Protocol 1 in relation to Milford Lodge Cottage;
2. requires a property-specific residential amenity assessment;
3. considers impacts from the dwelling itself, including first-floor rooms and private amenity areas;
4. requires a specific cumulative Human Rights and proportionality assessment;
5. requires a detailed Common Lane Highway Safety Assessment;
6. requires measured carriageway widths throughout the relevant route;
7. requires identification of safe passing locations;
8. requires analysis of the blind/restricted bridge sections;
9. requires swept-path assessments for the largest vehicles;
10. requires assessment of HGV interactions with pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders;
11. requires a specific equestrian-safety assessment;
12. requires confirmation of bridge structural suitability;
13. requires a detailed explanation of how uninterrupted residential and emergency access to Milford Lodge Cottage will be guaranteed;
14. requires the Applicant to identify all alternative construction access arrangements considered;
15. requires the Applicant to explain why Common Lane is preferable to any less harmful alternative;
16. requires any mitigation relied upon to be secured through enforceable DCO provisions;
17. considers increasing residential stand-off distances and modifying Site 6 to reduce impacts upon the property;
18. considers whether the cumulative burden upon Milford Lodge Cottage is proportionate;
19. determines whether a fair balance has been achieved between the public benefits of the development and the impact upon the occupants of this particular property; and
20. if highway safety and uninterrupted access cannot be satisfactorily demonstrated, requires that Common Lane is removed as an HGV construction access route for Sites 6 and 7.
21. Takes into account the fact that Common Lane is already designated as a pedestrian and cycle route as part of planning permission 2021/1531/EIA granted to Harworth Group by North Yorkshire Council on 18th June 2024, with such development works already underway.

22. Conclusion

Milford Lodge Cottage is not simply a distant residential receptor experiencing a change in view.

It is a home immediately adjoining Site 6 which the Applicant itself assesses as experiencing a high magnitude impact and a significant adverse effect during construction and the early operational period.

The same home is dependent upon Common Lane as its only means of access.

That lane is a narrow rural single-track road, under approximately 3 metres wide in places, containing restricted and blind sections, used by pedestrians and horse riders and connected to the public rights of way network.

The Applicant nevertheless proposes to use it to serve construction traffic associated with Sites 6 and 7.

The resulting impacts upon Milford Lodge Cottage therefore extend well beyond landscape and visual effects.

They concern:

the home, privacy, safety, access, residential amenity and peaceful enjoyment of property.

I recognise the national importance attached to renewable energy development.

However, national need does not remove the obligation to properly assess the concentrated impact placed upon an individual household or to demonstrate that such interference is necessary and proportionate.

I therefore respectfully ask the Examining Authority to scrutinise whether the current design and access arrangements achieve a fair balance and whether materially less harmful alternatives are available.

Unless it can be demonstrated that the cumulative effects upon Milford Lodge Cottage have been reduced so far as reasonably practicable, and that safe and uninterrupted access to the property can be guaranteed, I submit that the present Site 6 layout and proposed use of Common Lane should not be accepted in their current form.

Accuracy and completeness of the Book of Reference

My comments regarding the accuracy and completeness of the Applicant's Book of Reference and, more generally, the reliability of the land referencing exercise undertaken for the Light Valley Solar DCO application, stand and that they remain incomplete and inaccurate.

I have undertaken my own review of publicly available HM Land Registry documentation relating to land affected by the proposed development, at significant expense (both in time and financially!).

As a result of that review, I have identified a significant number of legal interests which appear from the registered title

documentation but which, on my review, do not appear to have been identified or appropriately recorded within the Applicant's Book of Reference.

I do not however see why I should be the party responsible for highlighting all of the interests that I have established when this is such a crucial part of the DCO application and a land referencing company has been employed to deal with these. This is of particular concern because the Applicant has recently indicated, in response to matters raised during the Examination, that the relevant interests have been included in the Book of Reference and that all matters in the public domain are included within. My evidence clearly calls that assertion into question as some simple research (ie trying to locate benefiting land / parties via Land Registry documentation and a review of abutting titles / the use of Google) has found some of those stated as 'unknown' within the Book of Reference. They have clearly stated 'unknown' to many of the interests as it is a time consuming and costly exercise. If a member of the public can ascertain the 'unknown' parties, why can't paid professionals do the same?

Applicant's stated land referencing exercise

This issue should also be considered against the Applicant's own description of the land referencing exercise undertaken for the Application.

The Applicant states in its Consultation Report that:

- a professional land referencing firm was instructed to undertake diligent inquiry;
- HM Land Registry title information and Official Copy Registers and Title Plans were obtained;
- relevant freehold, leasehold, mortgagee, beneficiary, charge and restrictive covenant information was extracted and entered into the land referencing database;
- Land Registry information was updated before preparation of the Book of Reference; and
- further enquiries were undertaken where necessary to address changes, anomalies or gaps.

The fact that legal interests identifiable from the underlying registered title documentation nevertheless appear to be absent from the Book of Reference therefore requires explanation.

Statutory importance of the Book of Reference

The Book of Reference is not simply an administrative document.

It forms part of the statutory documentation accompanying an application for development consent where compulsory acquisition, acquisition of rights, temporary possession and/or interference with existing rights is proposed.

Regulation 7 of the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 requires the Book of Reference to contain prescribed information concerning persons and interests in affected land.

The relevant categories include, amongst other matters:

- owners, lessees, tenants and occupiers;
- persons having other qualifying interests in land;
- persons who may have relevant compensation claims; and
- persons entitled to easements or other private rights where those rights would be extinguished, suspended or interfered with by the proposed DCO.

Sections 56 and 57 of the Planning Act 2008 also place importance upon the Applicant undertaking diligent inquiry to identify persons falling within the relevant categories.

It is therefore important that the Book of Reference provides an accurate account of the interests that are required to be included.

Why the apparent omissions are significant

My concern extends beyond the individual interests I have identified.

If interests which can be identified from publicly available Land Registry documentation have been omitted, I respectfully submit that it is reasonable for the Examining Authority to seek assurance as to whether the omissions are isolated errors or indicate a wider issue with the land referencing exercise.

This is particularly important given the extensive compulsory acquisition and land rights powers sought through the DCO.

The issue potentially affects:

- whether all relevant persons and interests have been identified;
- whether affected persons have been properly notified;
- whether persons whose rights may be acquired, extinguished, suspended or interfered with have been correctly identified;
- whether the Applicant has undertaken the required diligent inquiry;
- the completeness of the Book of Reference;
- the relationship between the Book of Reference, Land Plans and draft DCO;
- the assessment of existing private rights;
- the exercise of proposed compulsory acquisition powers; and
- the ability of the Examining Authority properly to examine the land and rights sought by the Applicant.

I am not suggesting that the identification of one error automatically establishes that the entirety of the Book of Reference is incorrect. However, where several independently verifiable interests appear to have been omitted, I consider that the matter warrants a substantive response and wider verification by the Applicant.

Request to the Examining Authority

I respectfully request that the Examining Authority requires the Applicant to provide a substantive response addressing the interests I have identified.

In particular, I request that the Applicant be required to provide, for each interest identified:

1. the relevant registered title number;
2. the relevant Land Registry entry, transfer, conveyance, deed, easement, covenant or other instrument;
3. the Applicant's interpretation of the legal interest concerned;
4. whether that interest was identified during its land referencing exercise;
5. if it was identified, where that interest and/or the person benefiting from or burdened by it appears within the Book of Reference;
6. if it does not appear in the Book of Reference, the legal and factual basis upon which the Applicant considers that it is not required to be included;
7. whether the proposed DCO would acquire, override, extinguish, suspend, interfere with or otherwise affect that interest;

8. whether the relevant person was identified for the purposes of sections 42, 44, 56 and/or 57 of the Planning Act 2008, where applicable;
9. whether that person was notified or consulted and, if so, when;
10. whether the discovery of the omission requires amendment of the Book of Reference, Land Plans, Statement of Reasons, Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker or any other application document; and
11. what further audit or verification the Applicant has undertaken, or now proposes to undertake, to establish whether comparable omissions exist elsewhere within the Order Limits.

Wider verification of the Book of Reference

Given that I have been able to identify these matters through publicly available Land Registry documents and Google, I also ask the Examining Authority to consider requiring the Applicant to undertake a further systematic reconciliation between:

HM Land Registry title documentation! the Applicant's land referencing database
Plans! the powers contained within the draft DCO.

That exercise should not be limited solely to the individual examples that I have identified. If errors are established, the Applicant should explain what steps have been undertaken to determine whether the same methodology has resulted in other interests being omitted elsewhere across the very substantial Order Land.

Requested action

I therefore respectfully ask the Examining Authority to:

- A. require the Applicant to respond individually to each of the interests identified in my accompanying schedule;
- B. require the Applicant to confirm whether each interest was known at the date of the original land referencing exercise;
- C. require the Applicant to explain why any qualifying interest was omitted from the Book of Reference;
- D. require confirmation of whether every affected person associated with those interests received the statutory notices to which they were entitled;
- E. require the Applicant to undertake a wider audit of ALL Land Registry interests against the Book of Reference;
- F. require any necessary corrections to the Book of Reference and consequential application documents;
- G. require the Applicant to identify any additional affected persons discovered as a result of that exercise and explain what procedural steps will be taken in respect of them; and
- H. take the results of that exercise into account when considering whether the statutory and policy tests for the grant of compulsory acquisition powers have been satisfied.

Conclusion

This submission is based upon identifiable legal interests contained within publicly available HM Land Registry documentation.

The evidence is therefore capable of straightforward independent verification.

The issue is not merely whether an individual entry has been transcribed incorrectly. The more important issue is whether apparent omissions reveal deficiencies in the underlying land referencing exercise and whether the Examining Authority can safely rely upon the Applicant's assertion that the relevant interests have been identified.

Given the importance of the Book of Reference to notification, affected-person status, existing private rights and compulsory acquisition, I respectfully ask that this matter is resolved transparently and comprehensively before the Examination closes.

Connection offer

The BESS is described as an integral component of the proposed development and is intended to store both surplus electricity generation and/or electricity imported from the grid. The BESS has only received Gate 1 status whilst the solar generation component has a Gate 2 firm connection position, which clearly weakens the certainty that the BESS described in the DCO application can actually operate as proposed.

NESO is explicit that Gate 1 does not reserve capacity, does not give a protected queue position and does not guarantee a connection. NESO state that transmission works for a Gate 1 project will cease to be progressed, a Gate 1 project cannot currently progress into delivery through the reformed connections pipeline and has to apply successfully for a Gate 2 connection in a future application window.

Earlier Light Valley documentation was explicit about the grid arrangements. The Site Selection Report stated that National Grid had confirmed 500 MW capacity with a 500 MW import for BESS at Monk Fryston. As the 500 MW BESS import capacity is Gate 1, the position is materially different from simply saying that Light Valley has "secured a 500 MW grid connection." As such, the Applicant does not have Gate 2 status for the whole solar and BESS development.

Please confirm:

1. What Gate status has been awarded separately to the 500 MW solar generation/export element and the BESS import/export element?
2. Precisely how many MW of Light Valley's connection agreement are Gate 1 and how many are Gate 2?
3. If the BESS remains Gate 1, can it operate solely using electricity generated by Light Valley Solar without requiring the Gate 1 import capacity?
4. If the BESS cannot obtain Gate 2, can the DCO scheme still be constructed and operated substantially as assessed in the ES, and if so, why is the full BESS land take and infrastructure still required?

Change recorded in the NESO TEC Register

Following the recent change recorded in the NESO TEC Register from Monk Fryston 275 kV Substation to Monk Fryston 400 kV Substation, the Applicant is requested to explain whether its current Gate 2 connection offer differs from the connection assumptions assessed in the submitted Environmental Statement and DCO application, including the connection voltage, connection point, electrical infrastructure, works at Monk Fryston, cable specification and route, and whether any consequential environmental effects require further assessment. Please provide a copy of the Gate 2 connection offer / BCA (appropriately redacted if necessary).

Please note that as has been the case throughout this dreadful experience, that my comments are on behalf of not only my family, but our neighbour () but is equally as impacted by this horrendous application.



2.27 m



2.46 m



2.66 m



2.5 m





2.72 m



2.69 m



2.92 m



2.5m



3.34 m