

**Byers Gill Solar
EN010139**

8.21 Comments on Deadline 4 Submissions

Planning Act 2008

APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms
and Procedure) Regulations 2009

Volume 8

Deadline 5 – November 2024

Revision C01



Table of Contents

Page

1.	Introduction	1
1.1.	Purpose of this document	1
2.	Comments on Deadline 4 Submissions	2
3.	Update on Matters Raised at Earlier Deadlines	11
3.1.	Introduction	11
3.2.	Cumulative effects sensitivity analysis	11

Table of Tables

Table 2-1	Applicant comments on submissions at Deadline 3	2
Table 3-1	Applicant's sensitivity analysis in relation to cumulative effects	13

1. Introduction

1.1. Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1. This document provides comments from RWE (the Applicant) on submissions made by Interested Parties at Deadline 4 (24 October 2024) of the Examination of Byers Gill Solar (the Proposed Development). This includes submissions accepted after the deadline at the discretion of the of the Examining Authority (ExA).
- 1.1.2. This document also provides an update on matters discussed at earlier Deadlines, where there has been progression since the submissions made at that time, and where this falls outside of the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) process.

2. Comments on Deadline 4 Submissions

- 2.1.1. The table below provides the Applicant's comments on submissions made at Deadline 4 (or where submissions were accepted at the discretion of the Examining Authority after that deadline, those available to review before Deadline 5). This sets out the document that was submitted at Deadline 4, the Interested Party that submitted the document, and a summary of the content that the Applicant wishes to comment on, before providing the Applicant comment.
- 2.1.2. The Applicant has sought to summarise only the parts of any submission that it wishes to comment on. As such, elements of any submission to which the Applicant has no response are not included in the below table.

Table 2-1 Applicant comments on submissions at Deadline 3

Examination Library Reference	Interested Party	Summary	RWE Response
REP4-017	Environment Agency	The EA notes that they have no further comments on information submitted at Deadline 3. The EA included a 'Work Package Tracker' under REP4-017 which set out the EA position on matters discussed to date with the Applicant.	The Applicant agrees with the positions as represented in the 'Work Package Tracker' submitted by the EA at Deadline 4, and which reflects the content of the Comments on Deadline 3 Submissions [REP4-011] in respect of the discussions with the EA to date. The EA and the Applicant are intending to submit an updated SoCG at Deadline 7, following the submission of updated management plans, in which it is anticipated that there will be agreement recorded on many of the matters in the EA's Work Package Tracker.
REP4-018	National Grid Energy Transmission (NGET)	NGET state that ongoing discussion has been undertaken with the Applicant regarding protective provisions to be secured in the DCO. The preferred protective provisions are included in an appendix of the submission.	As set out in the Status of Negotiations with Statutory Undertakers submitted at Deadline 4 [REP4-006]. The Applicant continues to engage with NGET on protective provisions. The Applicant provided comments on a draft set of protective provisions to NGET in October 2024 and is awaiting a response.

Examination Library Reference	Interested Party	Summary	RWE Response
REP4-019	Bishopton Villages Action Group (BVAG)	In a written summary of representations intended to be made at hearings on 16 October 2024, BVAG note concerns regarding the cumulative effects of solar energy development in the local area.	The Applicant responded to previous concerns raised regarding cumulative effects in section 2.11 of Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-004] submitted at Deadline 1. This confirms that the Applicant has assessed cumulative effects in ES Chapter 13 Cumulative Effects [APP-036], in which it is concluded there would be no significant adverse effects.
REP4-020	Bishopton Villages Action Group (BVAG)	In response to matters discussed at Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3), BVAG consider the Proposed Development will exacerbate existing flooding of local roads and provide photographic evidence of existing road flooding.	This matter was discussed at ISH3, Please refer to the response provided to Hearing Action Point ISH3-05 in the Response to Hearing Action Points (Document Reference 8.20).
REP4-021 / REP4-032-39	Peter Wood, Bishopton Resident & Chair of Bishopton Village Hall Association	Mr Wood states concerns regarding the impact of the Proposed Development on the existing flooding of local roads, and provides four specific examples of where this is particularly an issue. Mr Wood additionally provided a number of videos and a plan showing the location of the videos, relating to flood events on local roads.	This matter was discussed at ISH3, Please refer to the response provided to Hearing Action Point ISH3-05 in the Response to Hearing Action Points (Document Reference 8.20).
REP4-021 / REP4-032-39	Peter Wood, Bishopton Resident & Chair of Bishopton Village Hall Association	Mr Wood objects to the loss of agricultural land, noting concerns regarding food security.	The Applicant has addressed concerns raised previously regarding use of agricultural land, in section 2.3 of Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-004] submitted at Deadline 1. This confirms that ES Appendix 9.1 Agricultural Land Classifications and Soil Resources [APP-150] provides a summary of the Agricultural Land Classification for each parcel of land which is to be used by the Proposed Development. It confirms that only 6.1% of the total site area includes land considered Best and Most Versatile (BMV), which is Grade 3a and above. The Applicant considers that it was not feasible to avoid agricultural land altogether and that the overall low proportion of BMV land within the Order Limits is justified within the context of the overall benefits presented by the Proposed Development, and its clearly established national

Examination Library Reference	Interested Party	Summary	RWE Response
			need, as set out in Paragraph 5.4.9 of the Planning Statement [APP-163]
REP4-022	Martin Philpott representing Great Stainton Parish Meeting (GSPM)	GSPM note concerns regarding the cumulative effects of solar energy development in the local area.	The Applicant responded to previous concerns raised regarding cumulative effects in section 2.11 of Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-004] submitted at Deadline 1. This confirms that the Applicant has assessed cumulative effects in ES Chapter 13 Cumulative Effects [APP-036], in which it is concluded there would be no significant adverse effects.
REP4-022	Martin Philpott representing Great Stainton Parish Meeting (GSPM)	GSPM raise the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development on Great Stainton, and outline ongoing discussions with the Applicant with regards to the possibility of the removal of some panel areas should there be sufficient technical advancement to allow this.	The Applicant continues to engage with GSPM regarding the Proposed Development, and has updated the Design Approach Document (Document Reference 7.2, Revision 3) to reflect the discussions regarding the potential for improved technology to be considered in respect of detailed design. The Applicant acknowledges that GSPM remain in overall objection and will seek to submit an updated Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) with GSPM, which reflects the latest position, at Deadline 6.
REP4-023	Northumbrian Water Limited (NWL)	<p>NWL has provided the following representation:</p> <p><i>“In respect of ExQ1 GCT 1.9 contrary to what is noted in the Applicant’s summary of the current position in [APP-170] responses are in fact awaited by our client from the applicant. Our client last had contact with the applicant on the 2nd May 2024 with the DCO Project Manager for RWE and the Project Engineer at AFRY Ireland Ltd regarding matters relating to the Byers Gill DCO application and the potential implications of carrying out works near, over or in the vicinity of NWL assets.”</i></p> <p>NWL register their objection to the Proposed Development until agreement is reached on the protective provisions.</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges NWL’s representation but respectfully clarifies that the Project Engineer at AFRY Ireland Ltd (on behalf of the Applicant) responded to NWL’s Design Team on 3rd May 2024 to confirm that appropriate risk assessments to protect NWL’s assets will be undertaken at the detailed design stage and to provide assurance that the Applicant would be happy to have further discussions on the wording of any protective provisions to be included.</p> <p>The Applicant is not aware that NWL responded to this correspondence.</p> <p>As noted in the updated Statutory Undertakers Position Statement submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 5</p>

Examination Library Reference	Interested Party	Summary	RWE Response
			(Document Reference 7.7, Revision 4), engagement between the parties' legal representatives is now ongoing to negotiate bespoke protective provisions for NWL.
REP4-023	Northumbrian Water Limited (NWL)	NWL has provided the following representation: <i>"In response to EXQ GCT 1.13 we note that the DCO The Norwich to Tilbury Project (EN020027) has not been cited in Appendix 13.2 Long List of Committed Developments or Appendix 13.3 Short List of Committed developments. We request that this project is added to both lists. NWL are an interested party in this DCO and will also be submitting initial holding objection letters in due course."</i>	The Applicant does not consider that the Norwich to Tilbury DCO project is relevant to the consideration of cumulative effects and would not be scoped into the assessment on the basis of the methodology outlined in ES Chapter 13 Cumulative Effects [APP-036]. This sets out that the criteria for inclusion for major schemes such as this is those within 10km of the Proposed Development. The Norwich to Tilbury DCO project is located over 300 kilometres from the Proposed Development, and it is not clear to the Applicant on what basis NWL would like this scheme included in the cumulative assessment.
REP4-023	Northumbrian Water Limited (NWL)	NWL has provided the following representation: <i>"In response to EXQ PPD 1.8 we are instructed that the Applicant has not been in dialogue with our Client in order to assess the likelihood and magnitude of any potential issues."</i>	The Applicant refers to the above explanation of the Applicant's understanding of the latest correspondence between the parties. As noted in the updated Statutory Undertakers Position Statement submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 5 (Document Reference 7.7, Revision 4), engagement between the parties' legal representatives is now ongoing to negotiate bespoke protective provisions for NWL.
REP4-024	Robert Bowes	Mr Bowes notes concerns regarding the cumulative effects of solar energy development in the local area.	The Applicant responded to previous concerns raised regarding cumulative effects in section 2.11 of Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-004] submitted at Deadline 1. This confirms that the Applicant has assessed cumulative effects in ES Chapter 13 Cumulative Effects [APP-036], in which it is concluded there would be no significant adverse effects.

Examination Library Reference	Interested Party	Summary	RWE Response
REP4-025	Stacey Gowing	Ms Gowing raises concerns regarding the impact of the Proposed Development on existing flooding of local roads, and requests confirmation that mitigation will be fully installed prior to the commencement of works.	The Applicant responded to previous concerns raised regarding flood risk in section 2.15 of Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-004] submitted at Deadline 1. The effects of the Proposed Development on the water environment are assessed in ES Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk [APP-033]. It concludes that there would be no significant effects in relation to watercourses, designated sites, groundwater, water supplies and flood risk. In response to the query regarding delivery, a construction surface water management plan (CSWMP) is secured via the Outline CEMP (Document Reference 6.4.2.6, Revision 2) and would be produced and approved prior to commencement of construction. Drainage measures required during operation would be implemented at point of construction.
REP4-025	Stacey Gowing	Ms Gowing notes the visual impact of the Proposed Development, both alone and cumulatively with other solar energy schemes, on the village and the primary school, and associated health and wellbeing impacts.	The Applicant acknowledges the concern raised. The Applicant has responded to concerns regarding landscape and visual impacts in section 2.17 of Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-004] submitted at Deadline 1. This reports that the assessment provided in ES Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual [APP-030] does identify some significant adverse effects. However, as reported in the Planning Statement [APP-163], the limited residual effects of the Proposed Development are considered to be outweighed by the critical national priority (CNP) and overall needs case for the Proposed Development, as well as the wider enhancements it would deliver.
REP4-026	Norman Melaney	Mr Melaney provides information regarding aquifers and groundwater sources, noting that these have not been considered in Appendix 2.1 Phase I Geoenvironmental and	The Applicant directs Mr Melaney to the ES Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk [APP-033] and associated figures and appendices, which is the location within the DCO application

Examination Library Reference	Interested Party	Summary	RWE Response
		Geotechnical Desk Study [APP-105]. Mr Melaney states that there are aquifers and wells within the vicinity of Bishopton.	<p>that considers groundwater and features such as aquifers and source protection zones (SPZ).As stated in paragraph 10.7.17 of ES Chapter 10, 'The Proposed Development is underlain by a Principal Aquifer associated with the Permian Limestone deposits. Groundwater Vulnerability across the majority of the Proposed Development is Medium, with sporadic pockets of low groundwater vulnerability at Panel Areas A, B, C, D, and F.'</p> <p>ES Figure 10.1 Hydrological Features [APP-084] also shows the spatial extent of the SPZ in relation to the Proposed Development. It shows that there are no SPZ in Bishopton village itself, which are located to the western extent of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>This assessment has been undertaken in consultation with the Environment Agency and the lead local flood authorities (LLFA).</p>
REP4-027	Norman Melaney	Mr Melaney raises fire safety concerns relating to the proposed Battery Energy Storage Sites (BESS) as part of the Proposed Development.	As set out in Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-004] submitted at Deadline 1, the DCO application is supported by ES Appendix 2.13 Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan (oBFSMP) [APP-117], which sets out how the measures for ensuring safety is at the forefront of the Proposed Development. It considers specific risks and concerns raised in the Representations such as thermal runaway, access and water contamination. This plan has been developed with regard to the National Fire Chief's Council (NFCC) Grid Scale Battery Energy Storage System planning – Guidance for Fire and Rescued Services, and in consultation with the local Fire and Rescue service.
REP4-028	Susan Nobbs	Ms Nobbs questions why alternatives are not being pursued instead, such as wind power and roof top solar.	The Applicant has set out the approach to alternatives in ES Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-026] and in

Examination Library Reference	Interested Party	Summary	RWE Response
			Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-004] submitted at Deadline 1.
REP4-028	Susan Nobbs	Ms Nobbs raises concerns regarding the rerouting of footpaths in the Great Stainton area, in particular number 40. The respondent is concerned that the location is not safe, will have minimal separation from the road, and will be flooded during the winter due to its location in flood zone 3.	The Proposed Changes to the FP-GtStn.8 are intended to re-locate the current footpath to the edge of proposed mitigation / panel areas but also run the realigned footpath closer to the beck, which, with associated landscape mitigation (hedgerows and grassland) should provide a nicer environment for users of the PRow. The Applicant acknowledges that there is a localised area of flood risk as the footpath approaches / joins FP-LtStn.3 to the south, associated with Little Stainton Beck. This will be further considered at detailed design in consultation with the Darlington PRow Officer, as per the commitments made in the Outline PRow Management Plan [CR1-017].
REP4-028	Susan Nobbs	Ms Nobbs notes the Darlington Landscape Character Assessment of Great Stanton the residual significant landscape and visual effects as outlined in the Applicant's assessment on this settlement, and questions why the Proposed Development is being proposed in this location.	The Applicant acknowledges the concern raised. The Applicant has responded to concerns regarding landscape and visual impacts in section 2.17 of Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-004] submitted at Deadline 1. This reports that the assessment provided in ES Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual [APP-030] does identify some significant adverse effects. However, as reported in the Planning Statement [APP-163], the limited residual effects of the Proposed Development are considered to be outweighed by the critical national priority (CNP) and overall needs case for the Proposed Development, as well as the wider enhancements it would deliver.
REP4-028	Susan Nobbs	When considering the location of the Proposed Development, Ms Nobbs questions whether good design principles were followed. Ms Nobbs considers the location was based on	The Applicant has set out in ES Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-026] how the site selection for the Proposed Development was undertaken, which took into account grid connection agreement and availability of land in

Examination Library Reference	Interested Party	Summary	RWE Response
		proximity to the Norton substation and landowner willingness to lease land.	addition to other factors such as environmental constraints. The use of design principles is set out in the Design Approach Document (Document Reference 7.2, Revision 3) and further detail on design iteration, in respect of specific panel areas, is expanded on further in the Energy Generation and Design Evolution Document [REP2-010].
REP4-028	Susan Nobbs	Ms Nobbs notes concerns regarding the cumulative effects of solar energy development in the local area.	The Applicant has addressed cumulative effects in ES Chapter 13 Cumulative Effects [APP-036], as well as in Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-004] submitted at Deadline 1.
REP4-029	Suzanne Springett	<p>Ms Springett raises a number of objections, as reflected in her Relevant Representation [RR-510] and representation made at ISH4 on 16 October 2024. The matters raised in objection relate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the siting of the proposed on-site substation and a request to relocate it in the proposed design ▪ landscape and visual effects ▪ effects on her dog breeding business ▪ impacts to the Carr House Local Wildlife Site (LWS) and Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI), including flooding 	The Applicant has responded to specific points raised by Ms Springett previously under entries directed at RR-510 in the Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-004] submitted at Deadline 1. The Applicant also directly responded to points raised at ISH4 as reflected in Post-hearing submissions including written submissions of oral cases as heard at ISH2, ISH3, ISH4 and CAH1 [REP4-010] at Deadline 4. Furthermore, the Applicant has responded to related hearing action points in Response to Hearing Action Points (Document Reference 8.20), namely ISH4-09 and ISH4-10. The Applicant refers to those previous submissions in response to REP4-029. The Applicant acknowledges the ongoing objection to the scheme from this Interested Party.
REP4-030	Alex Swainston	Mrs Swainston raises concern regarding a recent correspondence from the Applicant relating to landowner consent for subsoil land interests. Mrs Swainston states that the letter is confusing and having contacted the Applicant to discuss further, has not had a response. Mrs Swainston	The Applicant sent letters on 26 September 2024 to persons with an interest in the land affected by a proposed change to the DCO application. This is set out in the Change Application Summary Report [CR1-012], and relates to Change 1, in which the Applicant is seeking to include rights over highways subsoil

Examination Library Reference	Interested Party	Summary	RWE Response
		confirms that she does not consent to the acquisition of subsoil rights.	land in the compulsory acquisition sought under the DCO. The Applicant is aware of the response from Mrs Swainston.
REP4-031	Melanie Turner	<p>Ms Turner raises a number of objections, as reflected in her Relevant Representation [RR-348] and Deadline 1 submission [REP1-039], and makes several observations in relation to the hearings held on 15 and 16 October 2024. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ observations on the discussion regarding ‘overplanting’ of panels ▪ observations on the discussion regarding the transport for construction staff to the site and the current state of local roads ▪ observations on the discussion regarding ecological and flooding effects ▪ the location of the on-site substation ▪ impacts to the Carr House Local Wildlife Site (LWS) and Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI), including flooding ▪ impacts of construction on the community alongside other schemes ▪ the potential use of pylons instead of cables. 	<p>The Applicant has responded to specific points raised by Ms Turner previously under entries directed at RR-348 in the Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-004] submitted at Deadline 1, and in respect of REP1-039 in the Comments on Deadline 1 Submissions document [REP2-009]. The Applicant also directly responded to points raised at hearings as reflected in Post-hearing submissions including written submissions of oral cases as heard at ISH2, ISH3, ISH4 and CAH1 [REP4-010] at Deadline 4.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Applicant has responded to related hearing action points in Response to Hearing Action Points (Document Reference 8.20), namely ISH2-02, ISH3-01, ISH4-09 and ISH4-10. The Applicant therefore refers to those previous submissions in response to REP4-031. The Applicant acknowledges the ongoing objection to the scheme from this Interested Party.</p> <p>In relation to the query on pylons, which was not discussed at the hearings or in previous representations, the Applicant confirms that it is not proposed to use pylons within the Proposed Development and it would not be possible to do so within the parameters of the consent being sought.</p>

3. Update on Matters Raised at Earlier Deadlines

3.1. Introduction

3.1.1. This section provides an update on matters raised in submissions at earlier Deadlines, including where the Applicant has committed to providing further information or clarification.

3.2. Cumulative effects sensitivity analysis

3.2.1. In its response to ExQ1 GCT1.13 [REP2-031], Darlington Borough Council (DBC) identified a number of updates to projects in respect of those scoped into the cumulative effects assessment. DBC noted that while 'generally happy with the list of developments and allocations within DBC's area', the long and short lists of committed development [APP-102/103] should be updated, alongside the assessment itself as reported in ES Chapter 13 Cumulative Effects [APP-026].

3.2.2. The Applicant provided an initial comment on DBC's response to ExQ1 GCT1.13 at Deadline 3 [REP3-004] which stated the below and committed to undertaking a further sensitivity analysis for submission at a later deadline:

ID15, 57 and 65 have all been included in the cumulative assessment presented in 6.2.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 Cumulative Effects [APP-036]. The long list was frozen in January 2024 and was considered correct at the time of assessment for submission. The change in status of these projects is not considered likely to impact the assessment already presented. It is further noted that these projects, given their timing in the planning process behind the Proposed Development, should themselves cumulatively assess the Proposed Development and present their findings upon this.

Application 17/00636/OUTE is not currently included in 6.2.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 Cumulative Effects [APP-036] however the conclusions made in relation to ID57 (17/00632/OUTE), which also make up part of local plan site allocation ID A6, are considered relevant to this application, and the overall conclusion made for biodiversity under the cumulative assessment remains.

Application 24/00772/FULE – This application was received by Darlington Borough Council in August 2024. This is outside of the cut-off date for data collection for the cumulative assessment for the Proposed Development. Given this project's timing in the planning process, and when the application was made, this scheme should themselves cumulatively assess the Proposed Development and present their findings upon this.

Application 21/00529/FUL is not currently included in 6.2.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 Cumulative Effects [APP-036]. This application sits within the zone of influence for biodiversity for which the overall conclusions are expected to remain.

The Applicant acknowledges and welcomes the update from DBC on these applications and will undertake a further sensitivity analysis to understand the implications for the cumulative

assessment; this will be presented in an updated ES Errata and Management Plans Proposed Updates [REP2-012] at a future deadline.

- 3.2.3. The Applicant has now undertaken a further sensitivity analysis, which is provided in the table overleaf. This is not included in the ES Errata and Management Plans Proposed Updates (Document Reference 8.11, Revision 3) as previously stated, due to its length and the fact that it is a further update to, rather than correction of, the original cumulative assessment.

Table 3-1 Applicant's sensitivity analysis in relation to cumulative effects

Proposed Development cumulative assessment ID	Darlington Borough Council comments	Sensitivity analysis
ID15 – Burtree Garden Village (22/01342/FULE)	Darlington Borough Council noted a change in status of this project and that this application is likely to be approved.	As per response at Deadline 2, each of these developments were already included in the short list and therefore the cumulative assessment presented in 6.2.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 Cumulative Effects [APP-036]. As noted in the Applicant's previous response, the change in status of these projects would not impact the assessment already presented. As such, even though they were awaiting determination at the time of the Applicant's assessment, they were still assessed as if they may interact with the Proposed Development from a cumulative perspective.
ID57 – Land north of Coniscliffe Road (17/00632/OUTE)	Darlington Borough Council noted a change in status of this project and that this application is now approved.	
ID65 – NWL Water Main, Ketton Lane	Darlington Borough Council noted a change in status of this project and that a full planning application will be submitted by the applicant.	
A6 – Site 249 Coniscliffe Park North	Darlington Borough Council noted application 17/00636/OUTE granted as part of this local plan allocation.	<p>Local plan allocation A6 – Site 249 17/00632/OUTE, ID57, was previously screened into the short list, and therefore an assessment was included in 6.2.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 Cumulative Effects [APP-036].</p> <p>17/00636/OUTE, noted by Darlington Borough Council, which adjoins 17/00632/OUTE directly to the north, has now additionally been considered as part of a sensitivity analysis presented below.</p> <p>17/00636/OUT directly adjoins 17/00632/OUTE to the north, as part of the A6 – Site 249 local plan allocation site. The cumulative assessment for both projects (viewed on the Darlington Borough Council for each application respectively) identified that the addition of each would not give rise to any significant cumulative effects.</p> <p>Further, 17/00636/OUT only affects the Zol for biodiversity for the Proposed Development. The conclusions for biodiversity presented in 6.2.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 Cumulative Effects [APP-036]</p>

		<p>are considered to remain the same with the additional consideration of 17/00636/OUT.</p> <p>Ecology was scoped out of the EIA for 17/00636/OUT as no significant effects were expected, and instead an ecological appraisal undertaken. Through this ecological appraisal it is clear that 17/00636/OUT has adequately mitigated for their direct impacts and whilst cumulative effects could occur in relation to habitat loss of a similar type these would not be at a scale that are significant in EIA terms given the mitigation measures that are required to be in place to manage such impacts. There is also considered to be sufficient intervening distance between the Proposed Development and 17/00636/OUT to ensure cumulative effects are limited.</p> <p>The Applicant concludes that the inclusion of 17/00636/OUT does not change the assessment or conclusions as presented in 6.2.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 Cumulative Effects [APP-036].</p>
<p>A7 – Site 251 - Skerningham. Application</p>	<p>Darlington Borough Council advised application 24/00772/FULE made in August 2024.</p>	<p>This project was submitted in August 2024 and is awaiting a decision. The cumulative assessment for 24/00772/FULE did not identify any significant cumulative effects with the Proposed Development. 24/00772/FULE is located just over 1km at its closest location (noting the closest location being existing woodland within the red line boundary for 24/00772/FULE). This puts in in the ZoI for biodiversity, landscape and visual, cultural heritage and archaeology, for which a sensitivity analysis is presented below:</p> <p>Biodiversity – Residual effects for 24/00772/FULE are all reported as not-significant on the basis that the embedded mitigation and scheme designs will be implemented. Whilst cumulative effects could occur with the Proposed Development in relation to habitat loss of a similar type it is not expected that these would at a scale that are significant in EIA terms given the mitigation measures that are required across both developments to be in place to manage such impacts. It is therefore considered that the</p>

		<p>conclusions presented in 6.2.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 Cumulative Effects [APP-036] for biodiversity remain accurate.</p> <p>Cultural heritage and archaeology - Will not have a direct impact on any archaeological remains, standing earthworks or buildings that lie within the Order Limits. No change to the heritage significance of any archaeological remains, standing earthworks or buildings outside of the Order Limits which may be related to those within the Order Limits. Further, the development does not lie within the setting of Asset Group 3: Bishopton or the Bishopton Conservation Area, and does not impact upon Scheduled monument motte and bailey castle 400 m south east of Bishopton. No cumulative effects anticipated.</p> <p>Landscape and visual – The proposed housing which forms part of 24/00772/FULE (Phase 1) would be around 2.5km south of the nearest part of the Proposed Development (with proposed landscaping within about 1km). Non-negligible effects arising from the Proposed Development would extend no more than 0.3km in relation to effects on landscape character and 1km in relation to effects on visual receptors. The ZTV study for 24/00772/FULE indicates limited visibility to the north and northeast of that site, and overlaps in visibility with the Proposed Development would be largely limited to areas in which the effects arising from the Proposed Development would be Negligible.</p>
<p>A16 – Maxgate Farm, Middleton St George (21/00529/FUL)</p>	<p>Darlington Borough Council advised of application 21/00529/FUL, which was not included in 6.2.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 Cumulative Effects [APP-036]</p>	<p>This project was submitted in May 2021 and has been granted consent. It is located approximately 5.5km at its closest location. This puts in in the Zol for biodiversity (international and national statutory designated sites), only, for which a sensitivity analysis is presented below: Biodiversity - 21/00529/FUL does not share any international and national statutory designated sites with the Proposed Development as receptors (21/00529/FUL has set its Zol for assessment at 2km, which the Proposed Development is situated outside of) in the impact assessment. As such there are no potential cumulative effects to assess.</p>