



**PINS Document Number:**  
EN010140/APP/5.2.13.1

**Pursuant to:**  
APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)

**Consultation Report:  
Appendix 13.1 - Section 42  
respondents and feedback overview**

June 2024



**Appendix 13.1 - Section 42 respondents and feedback overview**

**Helios Renewable Energy Project – Section 42 Respondents, issues raised and regard had by the Applicant**

	Date	Organisation	Name	Full response or summary of response where relevant	Topics raised	Regard had by the Applicant
S42	25/10/2023	Canal River Trust	Simon Tucker, Canal River Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmation of no comment on the proposals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/a</li> </ul>	Noted.
S42	25/10/2023	Network Rail	Stephen Sprei	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request for information on specific impacts on Network Rail assets.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport &amp; Access</li> </ul>	<p>The Applicant provided the requested Shapefiles and clarified the likely impact on Network Rail assets.</p> <p>No further response received from Network Rail.</p>
S42	26/10/2023	NATS	Sacha Rossi, NATS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmation of no comment on the proposals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/a</li> </ul>	Noted.
S42	30/10/2023	Transmission Investment	Kirsty McGuigan, Development Associate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Required clarification on why they were considered a S42 consultee</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/a</li> </ul>	<p>The Applicant confirmed via telephone conversation with Transmission Investments that they had been identified as a potential consultee under S42 of the Planning Act 2008, under a broad sweep of listed statutory undertakers.</p> <p>No further correspondence was received.</p>
S43	02/11/2023	Durham County Council	Claire Teasedale, Principle Planning Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmation of no comment on the proposals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/a</li> </ul>	Noted.
S42	06/11/2023	National Plant Inquiries, Atkins	Plant Inquiries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advised that the request had been sent to incorrect address and request for the following information:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the site location name (including postcode if possible) within the subject heading</li> <li>send separate emails for each separate site location</li> <li>12-digit grid references within the body of the email</li> <li>a site location plan</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/a</li> </ul>	As requested, the Applicant sent information to the supplied correct address on 23/11/23, confirming they did not have any apparatus within the boundary of the Proposed Development.
S42	13/11/2023	Historic England	Andrew Burn, Development Advice Team Leader - Yorkshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the installation of PV array at this location.</li> <li>Historic England stated that they had no concerns regarding archaeology and would defer to the local authority archaeologist on this matter.</li> <li>The installation of PV's in these locations would likely cause a very small degree of harm to the significance of Camblesforth Hall and Carlton Towers, resulting from a change in their setting.</li> <li>However, Historic England acknowledge that although all efforts should be made to minimise this harm through design, it is such a small degree of harm that it is likely to be outweighed by the clear public benefits of the scheme.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cultural Heritage</li> </ul>	<p>The Applicant has noted the comments from Historic England.</p> <p>Further information on Cultural Heritage assessments can be found in Chapter 6 of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.6).</p>
S42	15/11/2023	North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue	Sam Crossley, Business Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) publication Grid Scale Battery Energy Storage System Planning NFCC BESS (ukfrs.com) should be used as current best</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction &amp; Decommissioning Methodology &amp; Phasing</li> </ul>	<p>The Applicant has noted the comments from North Yorkshire Fire &amp; Rescue.</p> <p>Further information on the safety and operations of the BESS can be found in Appendix 3.1 of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.3.3.1).</p>

	Date	Organisation	Name	Full response or summary of response where relevant	Topics raised	Regard had by the Applicant
				practice guidance in the design and installation of Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) sites.		
S42	22/11/2023	National Highways	Becky Garrett, Planning and Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further discussions are required to develop a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan which should include collision data analysis.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport &amp; Access</li> </ul>	<p>Collision Data analysis is provided in Chapter 10 – Transport and Access of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.10), and a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan has also been provided.</p> <p>This approach has been agreed between the Applicant and National Highways and is documented in the Applicant's Statement of Common Ground with National Highways (Doc Ref Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/7.14).</p>
S43	23/11/2023	Lancashire County Council	Richard Sharples, Principal Planning Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmation of no comment on the proposals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	Noted.
S42	23/11/2023	Fulcrum pipelines	Sue Beesley, Asset Coordinator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmation of no comment on the proposals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	Noted.
S42	29/11/2023	UK Health Security Agency	Carol Richards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request that a fire prevention plan be included within the ES</li> <li>Request that an assessment of air quality impacts from a BESS fire is undertaken and compared to relevant air quality levels</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction &amp; Decommissioning Methodology &amp; Phasing</li> </ul>	<p>A BESS Safety Management Plan (BSMP) has been prepared and is included as Appendix 3.1 to the ES (Doc ref: EN010140/APP/6.3.3.1). A Site Specific Risk Engagement Document (SSRED) has also been prepared (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/7.5).</p> <p>In the event of a BESS fire, several chemicals in gaseous form can be released and the composition and concentration of the plume (also referred to as the vapour cloud). In the event of a BESS fire, amongst the general gases released, are Carbon Monoxide (CO), Hydrogen Fluoride (HF), Oxygen and Hydrogen. The only BESS fire in the UK (Carnegie Road, Liverpool – Sept 2020) was monitored and the resultant composition of the plume was determined as being negligible in toxic gas concentration.</p>
S42	30/11/2023	The Coal Authority		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Despite site falling within the coalfield, it is outside the Development High Risk Area, therefore The Coal Authority have no comments to make on the proposals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	Noted.
S42	01/12/2023	Northern Powergrid	Andrew Savage, Property Surveyor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No further comments to make following plans received from TerraQuest.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	Noted.
S43	05/12/2023	Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council	Adrian Miller	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmation of no comment on the proposals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	Noted.
S42	27/11/2023	HSE	Agata Janicka	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HSE makes a recommendation for the Applicant to approach National Grid Gas PLC to discuss the vicinity of a major pipeline.</li> <li>However, based on the information in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report, it is unlikely that the HSE would advise against these proposals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cumulative schemes</li> <li>Site &amp; Development Description</li> <li>Alternatives &amp; Design Evolution</li> </ul>	The Applicant has noted HSE's recommendation to approach National Grid Gas PLC and can confirm that discussions have taken place to understand any potential impacts and mitigations that may be required to protect the asset.
S42	07/12/2023	National Grid Electric (NGET)	Tiffany Bate, Development Liaison Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request for appropriate safety measures be implemented when designing or working on infrastructure near National Grid Electric (NGET) assets.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comments relating to specific assets</li> </ul>	Noted.
S42	06/12/2023	National Grid Transmission (NGT)	Vicky Cashman, DCO Liaison Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NGT has existing easements for these pipelines which provides rights for ongoing access and prevents the erection of permanent / temporary buildings/structures, change to existing ground levels or storage of materials etc within the easement strip.</li> <li>The Applicant should be aware of NGT's guidance for working in proximity to its</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site &amp; Development Description</li> <li>Alternatives &amp; Design Evolution</li> <li>Comments relating to specific assets</li> </ul>	<p>The Proposed Development has considered the existing National Grid Transmission (NGT) feeder main (FM28: Asselby to Pannal) and ancillary apparatus in its proposed layout. This is shown on Figure 2.1 in Chapter 2 - EIA Methodology of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.2) and in Table 3.1 and on Figure 3.17 in Chapter 3 - Site and Development Description of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.3).</p> <p>As requested, a copy of the Proposed Development Shapefile was provided to NGT on 11/12/23 to assist preparation of an overlay plan.</p>

	Date	Organisation	Name	Full response or summary of response where relevant	Topics raised	Regard had by the Applicant
				assets, further guidance and links are available as follows.		No further correspondence was received.
S42	08/12/2023	Trans Pennine Trail and Sustrans	Mandy Loach (TPT Team Leader) and Josh Molyneux (Sustrans)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Trans Pennine Trail Partnership (TPT) and Sustrans welcomes the opportunity to consult on this planning application.</li> <li>The application relates to a solar farm and battery storage system that will be connect to the National Grid at Drax Power Station.</li> <li>The term pedestrian is used throughout the documentation to represent pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians. It is recommended that this is changed as legally all have different legal status where public rights of way are concerned. Please change to either a more inclusive term or specify pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians.</li> <li>There is no mention of the eastern spur of the TPT from Selby to Hornsea that passes to the north of the River Ouse to the north of the development.</li> <li>The application provides an opportunity to enhance off-road options as well as the Trans Pennine Trail / National Cycle Network itself.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport &amp; Access</li> <li>Socio Economics</li> <li>Landscape &amp; Views</li> <li>Comments relating to specific assets</li> </ul>	<p>The Applicant can clarify that the proposed development relates to a solar farm and battery energy storage system which will connect to the National Grid at Drax Power Station.</p> <p>The former Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) guidance, which the PEIR was prepared in accordance with, used the umbrella term pedestrians when describing aspects such as pedestrian delay, pedestrian amenity etc. This has recently been updated and now refers to 'non-motorised users' (NMUs) to cover pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians. Accordingly, the ES chapter has been prepared to reflect language used in the guidance.</p> <p>While the Applicant has provided for a permissive footpath, linking Public Rights of Way (PRoW) and other public footpaths, the enhancement of off road options as well as the TPT and the broader National Cycle Network itself, is beyond the scope of the Proposed Development.</p>
S42	11/12/2023	Yorkshire Water	Jim McGlade, Development Control Agent	<p><u>Surface water Management</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chapter 9: Water Environment of The Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) dated October 2023 advises that the drainage characteristics of the site will not be materially changed as a result of the development. Surface water runoff will continue to drain via overland flow to watercourses and via infiltration. Vegetation will be maintained throughout the lifetime of the development and appropriate seed mix being sown upon construction.</li> <li>The structures on site including the BESS and substation will manage surface water disposal via detention basins and discharged to on-site drainage ditches at rate of 1l/s. This will mimic surface water flows from the site prior to development. Yorkshire Water welcome this approach to surface water management of the development.</li> </ul> <p><u>Pollution control</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chapter 9: Water Environment of the PEIR advises that protective earth flood defence bunds will surround ancillary equipment, the BESS facility and substations in areas of elevated flood risk. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) dated September 2023 notes further</li> <li>that all fuel and oil will be stored within a specified area of the construction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water Environment</li> <li>Soils &amp; Agricultural Land</li> <li>Comments relating to specific assets</li> </ul>	<p>The Proposed Development has considered the existing Yorkshire Water assets (Ductile Iron 600mm Live Treated Water Main and (AB) Cement 150mm Foul rising main) in its proposed layout. This is shown on Figure 2.1 in Chapter 2 - EIA Methodology of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.2) and in Table 3.1 and on Figure 3.17 in Chapter 3 - Site and Development Description of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.3).</p>

	Date	Organisation	Name	Full response or summary of response where relevant	Topics raised	Regard had by the Applicant
				<p>compound. The storage area will be either be internally or externally bunded. Any contaminated surface water within the bund will be disposed of at a waste management facility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is noted that vehicle washing will be carried out on designated areas at least 10m from any watercourse or surface water body. Yorkshire water require that additional safeguards are considered to ensure that contaminated water from vehicle water does not infiltrate and pollute groundwater resources.</li> <li>No welfare facilities requiring foul water drainage, other than the primary construction compound, located close to the site entrance at the A4141, will be located on the development site. The construction compound will be temporary and foul water drainage during the operational phase of the development is not proposed.</li> </ul> <p><u>Yorkshire Water Assets</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The below assets are recorded on our statutory mapping record as passing through the development site:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ductile Iron 600mm Live Treated Water Main</li> <li>(AB) Cement 150mm Foul rising main</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Both assets are located to the west of Camblesforth and must be taken into consideration during the detailed design stage of the development. No apparatus should be constructed over or construction so as to restrict access to either of these assets.</p>		
S42	11/12/2023	Selby Area Internal Drainage Boards	Mark Joynes, Financial Officer	<p>If you propose to <b>work in, on, under or near ordinary watercourses</b> (including piped ordinary watercourses), or create or alter <b>surface water discharge</b> into a watercourse then the following Consents would be required from the IDB:</p> <p><b>Section 23 Consent</b>                      Section 23 LDA prohibits obstructions etc. in watercourses and states <i>“no person shall erect any mill dam, weir or other like obstruction [or] erect any culvert that would be likely to affect the flow of any watercourse ... without the consent in writing of the drainage board concerned.”</i></p> <p><b>Section 66 (Byelaw) Consent</b>                      Section 66 LDA provides the power to make byelaws which state that <i>“no person shall ... introduce any water into any watercourse in the District so as to</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water Environment</li> <li>Soils &amp; Agricultural Land</li> <li>Comments relating to specific assets</li> </ul>	<p>Details regarding the proposed drainage design are discussed in Chapter 9 - Water Environment of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.9). Drainage corridors in relation to landscaping are discussed in Chapter 7 - Landscape and Views of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.7)</p> <p>Consent will be acquired from the Selby IDP for any surface water discharge to an ordinary watercourse or any obstructions within seven metres of the edge of an ordinary watercourse.</p>

	Date	Organisation	Name	Full response or summary of response where relevant	Topics raised	Regard had by the Applicant
				<p><i>directly or indirectly increase the flow or volume of water ... without the previous consent of the Board [and] no person ... shall erect any building or structure whether temporary or permanent, or plant any tree, shrub, willow ... without the previous consent of the Board, amongst other byelaws specific to Selby Area IDB.</i></p> <p>Every person who acts in contravention of, or fails to comply with, any notice served under Section 24 LDA or Byelaws under Section 66 LDA shall be guilty of an offence and liable, on summary conviction to such fines as prescribed within Section 24(3) and/or Section 66(6) LDA.</p> <p><b>Consent applications forms</b> can be found on the website <a href="https://www.shiregroup-idbs.gov.uk/planning-consents/">https://www.shiregroup-idbs.gov.uk/planning-consents/</a> and sent to <a href="mailto:consents@shiregroup-idbs.gov.uk">consents@shiregroup-idbs.gov.uk</a></p> <p>The IDB standard planning advice to developers is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· <b>If the surface water were to be disposed of via a soakaway system</b>, the IDB would have no objection in principle but would advise that the ground conditions in this area may not be suitable for soakaway drainage. It is therefore essential that percolation tests are undertaken to establish if the ground conditions are suitable for soakaway drainage throughout the year.</li> <li>· <b>If surface water is to be directed to a mains sewer system</b> the IDB would again have no objection in principle, providing that the Water Authority are satisfied that the existing system will accept this additional flow.</li> <li>· <b>If the surface water is to be discharged to any ordinary watercourse</b> within the Drainage District, Consent from the IDB would be required in addition to Planning Permission, and would be restricted to 1.4 litres per second per hectare or greenfield runoff and no increase in volume.</li> <li>· <b>No obstructions within 7 metres</b> of the edge of an ordinary watercourse are permitted without Consent from the IDB.</li> </ul>		
S42	13/12/2023	Burn Gliding Club	Neil Bale, Secretary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BGC raised concerns over the potential for glint and glare from the proposed solar panels and the safety aspects of flying operations should there be a situation where they are forced to land out, particularly at the end of runways 07 and 19 on aerotow.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction &amp; Decommissioning Methodology &amp; Phasing</li> </ul>	The Applicant has prepared a High Level Investigative Report assessing the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on the Burn Gliding Club. This assessment predicts that there will be no significant impacts upon aviation activity on the operations of the airfield as a result of the Proposed Development.

	Date	Organisation	Name	Full response or summary of response where relevant	Topics raised	Regard had by the Applicant
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BGC would like to understand any likely hazards during the construction phase - such as the use of cranes.</li> <li>We understand you will be commissioning an appraisal and report encompassing all of these aspects. They would welcome the opportunity to be involved in the appraisal and report to encompass all of the above aspect and stand ready to assist.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comments relating to specific assets</li> </ul>	
S42	06/12/2023	The British Horse Society	Mark Corrigan, Access Field Officer	<p>The British Horse Society states an objection to the proposals and failure to accommodate the needs of these users would be contrary to National and Local Planning Policies such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>NPPF policy 58 Requiring Good design.</b> Create safe and accessible environments.</li> <li><b>Paragraphs 73 and 81 of the NPPF</b> require Local Authorities to plan positively for access to high quality open spaces for sport and recreation which can make important contributions to the health and wellbeing of communities and to plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation.</li> <li><b>NPPF Section 8</b> Promoting healthy communities Policy 73 access to high quality open spaces for sport and recreation and can make important contribution to the health and wellbeing of communities. Policy 75 Planning policies should protect and enhance public rights of way and access. Local authorities should seek opportunities to provide better facilities for users. For example, by adding links to existing rights of way networks. Policy 81 local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation.</li> <li><b>NPPF Para 100: Planning policies and decisions</b> should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks including National Trails.</li> <li><b>NPPF Para 92:</b> Planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy inclusive lifestyles, especially where this would address identified local health and well-being needs-for example through the provision of safe and accessible green</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport &amp; Access</li> <li>Socio Economics</li> <li>Landscape &amp; Views</li> </ul>	<p>The British Horse Society's comments are noted. The predicted impacts of the Proposed Development are set out in Chapter 13 – Socio-Economics of the ES (in Chapter 13 – Socio-Economics of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.13).</p> <p>No significant adverse socio-economic effects have been identified during the construction, operational or decommissioning phases and therefore no further mitigation beyond the mitigation identified in the ES chapters on noise and vibration, landscape and transport and access is required.</p> <p>Comments in relation to promoting healthy communities and access to green spaces for outdoor sport and recreation are understood, however this application does not restrict this access.</p> <p>The site is not within the Greenbelt, and is situated on private land, which did not previously represent an opportunity for local community access for sports or recreation provision.</p> <p>Public rights of way and access will be unaffected throughout construction and operation, with temporary diversions put in place during construction only wherever absolutely necessary.</p> <p>The proposals on the whole represent a net improvement to local access and pedestrian linkages through the site and between the local villages. Through the inclusion of new permissive footpaths pedestrian links have been added to connect existing rights of way, which improves access across the site.</p>

	Date	Organisation	Name	Full response or summary of response where relevant	Topics raised	Regard had by the Applicant
				<p>infrastructure, sports facilities, local shops, access to healthier food, allotments and layouts that encourage walking and cycling.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The British Horse Society's report Making Ways for Horses</b> – off-road Equestrian Access in England – Equestrian Access Forum August 2012, highlights the importance of horse riding for health and well-being. Access for horse riders, which inevitably involves crossing roads, is central to riding activities without which the level of participation is likely to decline which will have a negative impact on the local economy (Making Ways for Horses – off-road Equestrian Access in England – Equestrian Access Forum August 2012).</li> </ul>		
S43	28/11/2023	Yorkshire Dales	Lindsey Lightowler, Planning Technician	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmation of no comment on the proposals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>	Noted.
S43	23/11/2023	North York Moors National Park Authority	Wendy Strangeway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmation of no comment on the proposals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>	Noted.
S42	19/12/2023	Openreach	Carly Simmons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At this stage, plans are at too high a level to determine if OpenReach apparatus will be affected or not. Specific locations need to be identified as needing alteration work and the earthing report.</li> <li>• OpenReach would need construction plans for the new access roads/footpaths and the earthing report to be able to access if there is any alteration work required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternatives &amp; Design Evolution</li> <li>• Construction &amp; Decommissioning Methodology &amp; Phasing</li> </ul>	<p>Upon receipt of further plans from the Applicant, OpenReach confirmed that they remained too high level and OpenReach require construction plans for new access roads and footpaths as well as an earthing report, to be able to confirm if alteration works to their assets would be required.</p> <p>As such, future engagement with OpenReach as part of the Detailed Design process will be required.</p>
S43	15/12/2023	North Yorkshire Council	Michael Reynolds	<p><u>The Principle of the Development</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While national and local policies are broadly supportive of low carbon and renewable energy proposals in principle, the local environmental impacts of the proposals need to be given full and careful consideration.</li> </ul> <p><u>Cumulative Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are likely to be cumulative impacts in conjunction with other developments. A final review should be done to update the cumulative impacts of plans and projects.</li> <li>• The Authorities would welcome early and ongoing discussions on the cumulative impact assessment, given the number of projects which are coming forward in and around Drax power station and the location of the proposed development concurrently.</li> </ul> <p><u>Landscape and Visual Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The comments from the Landscape consultant should be taken into consideration in assessing the projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternatives &amp; Design Evolution</li> <li>• Site &amp; Development Description</li> <li>• Construction &amp; Decommissioning Methodology &amp; Phasing</li> <li>• Cumulative Schemes</li> <li>• Landscape &amp; Views</li> <li>• Soils &amp; Agricultural Land</li> <li>• Biodiversity</li> <li>• Cultural Heritage</li> <li>• Water Environment</li> <li>• Transport &amp; Access</li> <li>• Noise &amp; Vibration</li> <li>• Climate Change</li> <li>• Socio-Economics</li> </ul>	<p>Given the clear need for the Proposed Development and in the absence of any policies which would dictate otherwise, the Applicant considers the principle of the Proposed Development is acceptable.</p> <p>The consideration of alternatives to the Proposed Development is set out in the Chapter 4 - Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.4). This is considered to be in accordance with the requirements of the EIA Regulations and relevant policy.</p> <p>Local planning policies from the relevant authorities can be 'important and relevant' considerations for the Secretary of State (SoS) in determining the DCO Application. The current adopted Development Plan of relevance to the proposals comprises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan (2013) (SDCSLP);</li> <li>• Saved Policies of the Selby District Local Plan (2005) (SDLP); and</li> <li>• The North Yorkshire Minerals and Waste Joint Plan (2022) (NYMWJP).</li> </ul> <p>North Yorkshire Council are in the process of preparing a new Local Plan and given the stage of preparation the following draft document is a material consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft Selby Local Plan – Publication Version Consultation (2022)</li> </ul> <p>The policies of relevance to the Application are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selby District Local Plan (2005)                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ENV1: Control of Development</li> <li>○ ENV2: Environmental Pollution and Contaminated Land</li> <li>○ ENV3: Light Pollution</li> <li>○ ENV4: Hazardous Substances</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



	Date	Organisation	Name	Full response or summary of response where relevant	Topics raised	Regard had by the Applicant
				<p>Landscape and Visual Impacts and a Landscape and Visual Impact assessment and report should be included in the ES including Cumulative effects.</p> <p><u>Statement of Community Consultation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is advised a press notice should be put in the Pontefract and Castleford Express, in addition to the others listed and the Statement of Community Consultation should be updated to reflect this so it is clear whether this has been done.</li> </ul> <p><u>Air Quality</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall, taking into account the measures set out in the oCEMP, there are no objections relating to construction air quality impacts so far as this department's interests are concerned.</li> </ul> <p><u>Land Contamination</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst plausible linkages have been identified to construction workers and potentially represent an 'unacceptable risk' it is considered that mitigation through the adoption of good working practices will reduce the risk to an acceptable level. The mitigation measures will be defined in activity specific risk assessments and method statements (RAMS).</li> <li>Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment identifies potential risks associated with possible contamination on limited areas of the site. I would agree that an intrusive ground investigation and a detailed UXO desk-based threat assessment are needed to characterise the conditions at the site and inform the need for mitigation. Following the implementation of appropriate mitigation/remediation measures, I would agree that significant risks to receptors are unlikely to remain and therefore likely significant effects on land contamination from the proposed development are not anticipated.</li> </ul> <p><u>Landscape and Visual Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LVIA lacks clarity and transparency to communicate a thoroughness and how individual receptors are assessed, the overall geographic scale of those effects, then how this follows through to inform decisions on design and mitigation. The reader is currently left to try and work this out by comparing incomplete assessment tables with mitigation plans rather than being guided by the assessment. There is no</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ENV15: Conservation and Enhancement of Locally Important Landscape Areas</li> <li>ENV28: Other Archaeological Remains</li> <li>T1: Development in Relation to the Highway Network</li> <li>T2: Access to Roads</li> <li>T8: Public Rights of Way</li> <li>RT5: The Trans-Pennine Trail</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan (2013)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SP1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development</li> <li>SP13: Scale and Distribution of Economic Growth – C. Rural Economy</li> <li>SP13: Scale and Distribution of Economic Growth – D.</li> <li>SP15: Sustainable Development and Climate Change – A. Promoting Sustainable Development</li> <li>SP15: Sustainable Development and Climate Change – B. Design and Layout of Development</li> <li>SP17: Low-Carbon and Renewable Energy – A</li> <li>SP17: Low-Carbon and Renewable Energy – B</li> <li>SP17: Low-Carbon and Renewable Energy – C</li> <li>SP17: Low-Carbon and Renewable Energy – D</li> <li>SP18: Protecting and Enhancing the Environment</li> </ul> </li> <li>North Yorkshire Minerals and Waste Joint Plan                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>M01: Broad geographical approach to supply of aggregates</li> <li>M02: Provision of sand and gravel</li> <li>D07: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</li> </ul> </li> <li>Draft Local Plan:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SG1 Achieving Sustainable Development (Strategic Policy)</li> <li>SG10: Low Carbon and Renewable Energy – A</li> <li>SG11: Flood Risk – A</li> <li>SG11: Flood Risk – B</li> <li>SG11: Flood Risk – C</li> <li>SG11: Flood Risk – D</li> <li>SG13: Planning Applications and the Historic Environment</li> <li>IC7: Public Rights of Way</li> <li>NE1: Protecting Designated Sites and Species</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><u>Cumulative effects</u></p> <p>Table 15.1 of Chapter 15 – Cumulative Impacts of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.15) details the projects that have been identified for the assessment of likely significant cumulative effects. No significant (beneficial or adverse) cumulative effects were identified for the following technical disciplines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cultural Heritage;</li> <li>Landscape and Views;</li> <li>Water Environment;</li> <li>Transport and Access;</li> <li>Noise and Vibration;</li> <li>Socio-Economics; and</li> <li>Solis and Agricultural Land.</li> </ul> <p>The solar developments identified from the list of cumulative developments for assessment make clear commitments to achieve measurable biodiversity gains; therefore, a major beneficial (significant) cumulative effect to habitats has been identified at the local level.</p>

	Date	Organisation	Name	Full response or summary of response where relevant	Topics raised	Regard had by the Applicant
				<p>explanation or analysis within the landscape strategy plans or text to explain how adverse effects on specific receptors have been considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additionally, the Landscape and Visual Assessment seems to consistently understate the significance of adverse effects and then overstates the benefits of the proposed mitigation.</li> <li>• While the viewpoint locations for the visual assessment are agreed, the photomontage locations and method for producing these is not agreed.</li> <li>• The landscape strategy relies heavily on provision of new boundary hedgerows and improving existing hedgerows in order to screen the proposed development, but this would be a radical shift in current landscape management. It's unclear that the method of landscape screening stated could be achieved within a reasonable timescale, or that this alone would be sufficient to reduce adverse effects.</li> <li>• The long-term maintenance and management of all landscape mitigation and how this is secured is a concern.</li> </ul> <p><u>Ecology</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No formal assessment of BNG has been made within the PEIR, however there is a continued commitment to providing biodiversity net gain which is welcomed and the general information submitted in relation to habitat creation and enhancement suggests that BNG can be achieved at this strategic stage. For the ES submission, I would encourage use of the most up to date version of the Defra Biodiversity Metric in presenting data on biodiversity losses and gains. I would also expect to see details in relation to securing the long term monitoring and management through the LEMP. In addition to habitat monitoring for BNG, I would be keen to secure some species monitoring surveys at intervals across the site. I would be particularly keen to have data on the effectiveness of the ground nesting farmland bird measures if this could be included within the oLEMP.</li> </ul> <p><u>Archaeology / Cultural Heritage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Archaeological Mitigation Strategy sets out a number of areas based around the more complex areas of geophysical survey anomalies where a 'no-dig' solution to construction is proposed. I support this aspect of the strategy.</li> </ul>		<p>Moderate beneficial (significant) effect at the local level identified to a reduction in carbon emissions associated with the cumulative operation of several schemes related to the generation or storage of renewable energy.</p> <p><u>Air Quality</u></p> <p>Comments on Air Quality are noted.</p> <p><u>Land Contamination</u></p> <p>The Phase 1 Ground Conditions assessment concludes that there are potential risks associated with possible contamination in limited areas of the site. An intrusive investigation is recommended to characterise the conditions at the site and to confirm the anticipated absence of contamination across the majority of the Site.</p> <p>A detailed UXO desk based threat assessment will be undertaken post-consent to inform the need for mitigation during in-ground works including intrusive investigation.</p> <p><u>Landscape and Visual Effects</u></p> <p>The LVIA initial study area, for the purposes of desk studies and field surveys, was set at 5km. Following the initial assessment, an updated Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) was prepared based on the parameters of the proposed development and the screen effect of existing vegetation and settlements. The updated ZTV is presented in Figure 7.1 of Chapter 7 - Landscape and Views of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.7).</p> <p>The visual assessment viewpoints and visualisations are based on those shown on Figure 7.7 of Chapter 7 - Landscape and Views of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.7).</p> <p>The Applicant confirms that the LVIA will follow guidance stipulated in the EIA Scoping Report covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GLVIA Third Edition (LI and IEMA, 2013); and</li> <li>• Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 2/21: Assessing landscape value outside national designations</li> </ul> <p>The baseline conditions are set out in Section 7.4 of Chapter 7 - Landscape and Views of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.7). The descriptions are based on a timeframe of winter (2023/2024) and therefore considers a maximum visibility scenario.</p> <p>The Site is not designated in landscape terms, and there are no national designations for landscape or scenic beauty within the study area.</p> <p>Careful consideration was given to how landscape and visual impacts can be reduced, whilst being mindful that some visual effects are likely to remain. The Applicant has provided reasonable and appropriate mitigation, proportionate to the level of effects predicted to result from the Proposed Scheme, and as a result has minimised harm to the landscape resulting from the Proposed Scheme (in accordance with paragraph 5.9.8 of NPS EN-1).</p> <p>The Applicant has sought to follow guidance made available by NYC in forming its Landscape Strategy, particularly the use of hedgerows for screening.</p> <p>The Applicant confirms that an outline Landscape Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) is being prepared and will be submitted with the DCO application.</p>

	Date	Organisation	Name	Full response or summary of response where relevant	Topics raised	Regard had by the Applicant
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Archaeological Mitigation Strategy also proposes archaeological monitoring during installation of underground cabling. Again, I support this strategy which is proportionate to the expected significance of the remains.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conservation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Having looked at the information provided the above heritage assets identified appear to be correct and therefore the search is considered satisfactory. There were a number of heritage assets which can be ruled out of an assessment because they are deemed to be too far from the sites submitted. The below information shall focus on the assets which are close to the sites and are therefore required to undertake a balance of harm exercise.</li> <li>In this instance the balance of whether the proposed scheme shall affect the setting and therefore the significance of the below heritage assets shall be assessed. Guidance from Historic England The Setting of Heritage Assets GPAP 3 is used for this assessment. With respect to land which surrounds these assets the only site which has a park and garden associated with it is Carlton Towers. The other sites are assessed on whether the sites fall on land which may not form part the assets but may be adjacent, or associated with the heritage assets because it forms an important contribution to the historic character of the site in some other way.</li> </ul> <p><u>Highways</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The developer should be aware that any work on the highway will need consultation with the authority on such matters as informing the public and street work approval in connection with implementing the two access points. which will need to be prepared by the developer. The Authority sees this being included in the DCO.</li> </ul> <p><u>Lead Local Flood Authority</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In general terms the design of photovoltaic (PV) panels means that the area represented by the proposed panels is not considered impermeable, as the ground beneath all panels will be grassed and as such remains permeable.</li> <li>In most circumstances rainfall will drain freely off the panels onto the ground beneath the panels where the surface remains permeable. Thus, the total surface area of the photovoltaic array is not</li> </ul>		<p>Current assessment shows there will be no long term significant adverse effects – therefore, there will be no residual effects.</p> <p><u>Ecology</u></p> <p>A BNG assessment has been undertaken and submitted as part of the ES. Primary design measures (i.e. embedded measures) are set out Chapter 8 – Biodiversity of the ES Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.8), including specific detailed measures that will be contained within the CEMP.</p> <p><u>Archaeology and Cultural Heritage</u></p> <p>The Applicant sets out a description of the Study Area and Methodology for assessment of heritage matters in Section 6.3 of Chapter 6 - Cultural Heritage of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.6).</p> <p>Measures to be adopted by the project in the form of an AMS have been established through consultation with the Principal Archaeologist for HYC.</p> <p>The impacts of the Proposed Development on Grade 1 Listed Camblesforth Hall, Grade I Listed Carlton Towers and Grade II Listed Manor Farmhouse at the construction and operational phases are not significant.</p> <p>The Applicant confirms that mitigation measures will be developed as part of the design process and informed by the assessment. Measures are set out in Section 6.6 of the PEIR Volume 2 Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage. Measures identified include an Archaeological Watch Brief during the implementation of the underground cable corridor.</p> <p>The Applicant sets out the residual effects on below ground archaeological deposits and on the identified heritage assets in Section 6.7 of of Chapter 6 - Cultural Heritage of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.6). The identified effects are not considered to be significant.</p> <p><u>Noise and Vibration</u></p> <p>The study area and methodology are set out in Chapter 11 - Noise and Vibration of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.11).</p> <p>The baseline is described in Section 11.4 of Chapter 11 - Noise and Vibration of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.11) taking into account monitoring undertaken at locations agreed with NYC.</p> <p>Section 11.5 of Chapter 11 - Noise and Vibration of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.11) sets out the results of the noise and vibration predictions. Construction and operational noise and vibration are identified as being not significant.</p> <p>The mitigation measures proposed are set out in the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.3.5.1).</p> <p>No residual effects are predicted for Noise and Vibration.</p> <p><u>Transport</u></p> <p>As detailed in the ES, it is considered that there will be no significant residual effects on the highway network within North Yorkshire. Any works on the highway will be undertaken in consultation with the relevant highways body.</p>

	Date	Organisation	Name	Full response or summary of response where relevant	Topics raised	Regard had by the Applicant
				<p>considered to act as an impermeable area and the impact is assumed to be nil. However, the nature of the underlying groundcover and antecedent conditions can have a demonstrable influence on the surface water run-off characteristics of a site, i.e. if the ground cover beneath panels is proposed as bare earth which is susceptible to hardening in summer months, then peak discharges can increase significantly. As such, it should be ensured as part of any proposed scheme that grass or wildflower cover will be well-maintained across the site to ensure that such proposed schemes will not increase the surface water run-off rate, volume or time to peak compared to the pre-development situation. For example, This will also help provide net biodiversity gain.</p> <p><u>Public Health</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the general health of the population there is a general lack of accurate baseline health information, including consideration of mental Health and wellbeing. To this end I wish to suggest there is a longitudinal study to consider the health issues of those living within an agreed radius of the Solar Farm development. This needs to be undertaken at the earliest opportunity, by an independently appointment appropriately qualified professional and agreed by North Yorkshire Council Director of Public Health, the study should be repeated at regular intervals to gather evidence over a number of years of the long and short term impact of these large scale environmental developments on people's health and wellbeing.</li> </ul> <p><u>Socio-Economic data</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The socio-economic chapter talks about Job creation- direct job- displacement and identifies that no loss of jobs from the existing agricultural use will occur. This is welcomed. However, the chapter goes on to talk about 'leakage' - the number of external workers who will be brought into the site and that a 100% leakage rate has been applied to the methodology. This would not be considered acceptable for a development of this scale and the potential benefit it can bring in upskilling the local workforce or providing work for those that are unemployed. We would therefore insist that minimum threshold be applied to a local labour force, for example where by 30-40%</li> </ul>		<p><u>Flood Risk and Drainage</u></p> <p>The ES Study Area and Methodology are set out in Chapter 9 - Water Environment of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.9). The methodology in the ES has drawn from the more detailed FRA and considers flood risk to and from the Site, and from all sources including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tidal (flooding from the sea);</li> <li>Fluvial (flooding from watercourses);</li> <li>Pluvial (direct rainfall and surface water flooding);</li> <li>Groundwater;</li> <li>Overwhelmed Sewers and Drainage Systems; and</li> <li>Artificial Sources</li> </ul> <p>The Applicant considers the methodology described therein remains appropriate.</p> <p>The scope of the baseline data gathering is set out in Section 9.4 of Chapter 9 - Water Environment of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.9). The Applicant considers that the scope of FRA is commensurate with the scale and scope of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The Proposed Development has been informed by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), ensuring the Proposed Development does not increase flood risk elsewhere and incorporates sustainable drainage systems.</p> <p>The Applicant has set out their assessment of impacts on flood risk in Section 9.5 of Chapter 9 - Water Environment of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.9).</p> <p>Primary design measures (i.e. embedded measures) are set out in Chapter 9 - Water Environment of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.9), including permanent design measures as well as specific detailed measures that will be contained within the CEMP.</p> <p>The assessment of cumulative effects is presented in Section 9.8 of Chapter 9 - Water Environment of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.9). The Proposed Development is not likely to have any discernible cumulative or in-combination effects. In addition there are no cumulative direct effects on statutory or non-statutory designated sites or their associated qualifying interest species.</p> <p>The Applicants assessment of residual effects is set out in Chapter 9 - Water Environment of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.9). There will be no significant adverse residual effects.</p> <p>The Applicant has disapplied the IDB byelaws as defined under section 66 of the Land Drainage Act 1991 and the need for IDB consent under section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991, pursuant to section 150 of the Planning Act 2008 and The Infrastructure Planning (Interested Parties and Miscellaneous Prescribed Provisions) Regulations 2015.</p> <p><u>Socio-Economics and Public Health</u></p> <p>The scope and methodology for this topic are set out in the Chapter 13 – Socio-Economics of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.13). The chapter identifies a Local Study Area comprising the three electoral wards of Camblesforth and Carlton; Brayton and Barlow; and Thorpe Willoughby and Hambleton.</p> <p>The baseline Data Sources are detailed in Table 13.2 in Chapter 13 – Socio-Economics of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.13).</p>

	Date	Organisation	Name	Full response or summary of response where relevant	Topics raised	Regard had by the Applicant
				<p>be provided by local people within the local and study area.</p> <p><u>Construction Noise/Vibration</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We would consider anxiety and worries about the local environment to be a potential impact on health (mental wellbeing). Meaningful community engagement may alleviate concerns, help to improve community understanding of the project, and alleviate potential impacts upon mental health by providing a sense of control, inclusion and participation.</li> <li>We would like assurance that communication and methods of engagement with neighbouring residents referred to in Appendix 5 (4.9) will be accessible and effective. It should take into consideration:                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there any identified groups who may be impacted more than others e.g. older members of the local population who may be more sensitive to effects of vibration and noise.</li> <li>Impact on mental health - some people are more sensitive to noise levels than others, can cause stress, interfere with concentration and ability to focus.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><u>Construction Air Quality</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We would like see assurances that the cumulative effects of any dust creation during construction phase combined with other relevant developments in the area has been taken into account.</li> </ul> <p><u>Fire Safety</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fire Safety is a topic we wish to raise as a query, and give the applicant the opportunity to address either in written response or through meetings with the Council, What is the potential for the battery storage facility catching fire and how will the emergency response team will react? Prevailing winds will blow the fumes over Camblesforth and there is a concern that that the fire brigade will let it burn itself out.</li> </ul> <p><u>Community Benefit Contribution</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are a number of places throughout this response in which a community Benefit Contribution could help mitigate the effects, not least the effects identified in the public health chapters. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss the process further as we note at this point that the contribution is being considered.</li> </ul>		<p>The predicted impacts of the Proposed Development are set out in Chapter 13 – Socio-Economics of the ES (in Chapter 13 – Socio-Economics of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.13).</p> <p>No significant adverse socio-economic effects have been identified during the construction, operational or decommissioning phases and therefore no further mitigation beyond the mitigation identified in the ES chapters on noise and vibration, landscape and transport and access is required.</p> <p>Chapter 13 – Socio-Economics of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.13) reports that there would no significant residual effects relating to job creation, economic output, workforce expenditure and local amenity during the Construction, Operation and decommissioning phases.</p> <p>Human Health impacts have been descoped from the PEIR and subsequent ES, as per the adopted scoping opinion from July 2022. Impacts to human health arising from the Proposed Development have however been considered in the PEIR (and subsequent ES), throughout various independent chapters. As such the Applicant has prepared a Population and Human Health Technical note, which is be appended to Chapter 2 - EIA Methodology of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.9).</p> <p><u>BESS</u></p> <p>The BESS compound has been subject to a thorough design process, taking into account feedback received from a number of parties, including North Yorkshire Council, North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service and the EA. The BESS compound would be lined, including areas under the detention basins, so as to ensure infiltration of any contaminants, such as those in firefighting foam, does not occur. This containment system would be partnered with a penstock drainage system, limiting discharge to any sensitive receptors. Further details of the proposed BESS containment and drainage system is discussed in Chapter 3 -Site and Development Description (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.3) and Chapter 9 - Water Environment of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.9).</p> <p><u>BMV</u></p> <p>The Applicant sets out the Baseline Conditions in Section 14.4 of Chapter 14 - Soils and Agriculture of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.14). The ALC Survey confirms that the Site is made up of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grade 1 – 15ha (3.7%)</li> <li>Grade 2 – 162ha (40.5%)</li> <li>Grade 3a – 207ha (51.8%)</li> <li>Grade 3b – 11ha (2.8%)</li> <li>Non-agricultural land – 5ha (1.2%)</li> </ul> <p>The likely effects of the Proposed Development are set out in Chapter 14 - Soils and Agriculture of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.14). Approximately 7.4ha of land will be affected by fixed equipment and will be restored at decommissioning. This is not considered to be significant. The underground cable will have no effect on agricultural land quality or activity during construction.</p> <p>There will be no significant effects during operation on soils or agricultural land quality.</p> <p>Design, Mitigation and Enhancement measures are set out in the Outline Soils Management Plan at Appendix 14.3 of the ES Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/ 6.3.14.3). The OSMP identifies the importance and sensitivity of the soil resource and provides specific guidance to ensure that</p>

	Date	Organisation	Name	Full response or summary of response where relevant	Topics raised	Regard had by the Applicant
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The council has had sight of the response by the York and North Yorkshire LEP and endorse their points made in this regard.</li> </ul> <p><u>Best Most Versatile Land</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both in this response and at scoping there has been significant concern about the use of BMV land for this project and the Council would encourage further discussion to better understand the choices for land take including options appraisals and mechanisms used.</li> <li>The Council endorses the response put forward by the LEP on this topic and would like to join discussions on the use of the routemap to carbon negative that has been produced.</li> </ul>		<p>there is no significant adverse effects on the soil resource as a result of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Residual effects are set out Section 14.7 of Chapter 14 - Soils and Agriculture of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.14).</p>
S42	19/12/2023	Natural England	Laura Tyndall, Lead Advisor Sustainable Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural England considers that the PEIR does not provide adequate information regarding statutory designated sites, particularly in relation to air quality (see section 1.1), functionally linked land for SPA / Ramsar birds (see section 2.1), and in-combination assessment (see section 2.4).</li> <li>Section 8.9.7 states that as the proposal will not negatively affect any statutory designated sites, however, Natural England does not agree that effects can be ruled out at this stage, as further information is required to determine this.</li> <li>Natural England provided detailed advice through our Discretionary Advice Service (DAS), which does not appear to have been considered in the PEIR. We advise that this advice is taken into account in the next iteration of the relevant assessments.</li> <li>Further advice on initial information / assessment provided in the PEIR is included below. Natural England considers that the Applicant should seek to address these issues prior to Examination, where possible.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site &amp; Development description</li> <li>Alternatives &amp; Design Evolution</li> <li>Biodiversity</li> <li>Soils &amp; Agricultural Land</li> </ul>	<p>The ES Study Area and Methodology are set out the ES Volume 2 Chapter 8: Biodiversity. The Applicant considers the methodology described therein remains appropriate. The scope of the baseline data gathering is set out in Section 8.3 of Chapter 8 – Biodiversity of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.8). The Applicant considers that the scope of ecological surveys is commensurate with the scale and scope of the Proposed Development. A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Report will be included in the ES. This HRA considers the following European designated sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lower Derwent Valley SPA/Ramsar; and</li> <li>Humber Estuary SPA/Ramsar.</li> </ul> <p>The draft HRA concludes that the Proposed Scheme would not lead to adverse effects on the integrity of any European Site, subject to the securing of the mitigation measures identified in the HRA Report.</p> <p>The Applicant has set out their assessment of impacts on ecological receptors in Section 8.5 of Chapter 8 – Biodiversity of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.8).</p> <p>Primary design measures (i.e. embedded measures) are set out in Chapter 8 – Biodiversity of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.8), including specific detailed measures that will be contained within the CEMP.</p> <p>The ecological assessment of cumulative effects is presented in Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 – Biodiversity of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.8).</p> <p>The proposed development is not likely to have any discernible cumulative or in-combination effects. In addition there are no cumulative direct effects on statutory or non-statutory designated sites or their associated qualifying interest species.</p>
S42	22/12/2023	Environment Agency	Neil Wallace, Planning Specialist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR fails to reference flooding from all sources and appears focused exclusively on flood risk change resulting from the impacts on drainage and the proposed watercourse crossings.</li> </ul> <p><u>Flood Risk Assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EA supports the production of a standalone Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) to inform the Environmental Statement (ES)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water Environment</li> <li>Construction &amp; Decommissioning Methodology &amp; Phasing</li> </ul>	<p>The ES Non-Technical Summary (NTS) has been prepared to reflect the findings of Chapter 9: Water Environment, which in turn reflects the methodological approach agreed with the EA.</p> <p>Regarding preparation of the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP7.7) without the site specific modelling, the Applicant has provided the flood model to the Environment Agency (EA) for review, alongside the PEIR. To date, no response on the flood modelling has been provided by the EA. As such the FRA has been prepared on a precautionary 'credible maximum scenario' basis.</p> <p>Regarding the assessment of flood risk without river defences, it is the Applicant's view that the policy ambition set out in the CFMP should be adhered to, and assessment should be based</p>

	Date	Organisation	Name	Full response or summary of response where relevant	Topics raised	Regard had by the Applicant
				<p>and note that this is to be supported by site specific modelling. Until this assessment of flood risk is complete, it will be difficult to accept the conclusions of the FRA regarding acceptable design and mitigations offered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EA notes that the applicant will not be assessing flood risk without the influence of flood defences and cites the River Ouse CFMP (2010) in support of this approach. The CFMP is a policy ambition and not a commitment to maintaining or improving local flood defences or standard of protection. Hence, mitigation and adaptation measures proposed as part of this development should be as independent of the effectiveness of flood defences as possible.</li> <li>The assessment of flood risk at this site should take the following into account:                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Joint probability of tidal and fluvial risk</li> <li>Impact of climate change on both peak river flow and sea level rise including an assessment of credible maximum scenario</li> <li>Residual risk from breach and overtopping of existing defences.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The development of flood risk mitigation and future adaptive approaches is dependent on the site-specific flood modelling providing a robust assessment of the flood risk. The EA is in ongoing discussion with the Applicant with respect to the proposed modelling to ensure that the FRA is based on the best available and most appropriate information.</li> </ul> <p><u>Groundwater Protection</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A sensitive location with respect to groundwater would depend on the hazard from the proposed activity and importance of the receptor. In this case, the developers have acknowledged that parts of the proposed sites are located upon a sensitive Principal Aquifer bedrock (The Sherwood Sandstone) and Secondary A Aquifer drifts (Breighton Sand Formation and Alluvium). Principal aquifers provide significant quantities of drinking water, and water for business needs whilst secondary aquifers potentially provide water supplies at a local level. The developer has also acknowledged that Parcel A and B sit in source protection zone 3 and part of Parcel A sits in source protection zone 1.</li> <li>The EA designate source protection zones to identify the catchment areas of sources of potable water (that is high quality water supplies usable for human consumption).</li> </ul>		<p>on that scenario. An undefended scenario is unrealistic for the 40-year timespan of the proposal. The EA agreed to this approach in their May 2023 'Method Statement Review' produced by JBA, highlighting that it is exceptionally unlikely that all flood defences along the subject rivers would fail simultaneously.</p> <p>Assessment of flood risk takes into account joint probability of tidal and fluvial risk and the impact of climate change on both peak river flow and sea level rise, including an assessment of credible maximum scenario. At present the assessment does not take into account residual risk from breach and overtopping of existing defences. There is opportunity for this to be added, however it would need to be agreed with the EA.</p> <p>The Proposed Development's approach to groundwater protection, including application of the groundwater protection hierarchy, is discussed in Chapter 9 - Water Environment of the ES Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.9).</p> <p>An outline Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) and Decommissioning Environment Management Plan (DEMP) are to be provided alongside the ES. The detailed CEMP and DEMP will be secured via planning condition. Other relevant permissions will be obtained prior to the commencement of works with other assessments, such as Hydrological Risk Assessment or Piling Risk Assessment to be discussed with the EA at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>Broad pollution prevention and control measures are addressed in the oCEMP, included as Appendix 5.1 of the ES.</p> <p>The BESS compound has been subject to a thorough design process, taking into account feedback received from a number of parties, including North Yorkshire Council, North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service and the EA. The BESS compound would be lined, including areas under the detention basins, so as to ensure infiltration of any contaminants, such as those in firefighting foam, does not occur. This containment system would be partnered with a penstock drainage system, limiting discharge to any sensitive receptors.</p> <p>Further details of the proposed BESS containment and drainage system is discussed in Chapter 3 - Site and Development Description (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.8 6.3) and Chapter 9 - Water Environment of the (ES Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.9)</p>

	Date	Organisation	Name	Full response or summary of response where relevant	Topics raised	Regard had by the Applicant
				<p>Within SPZ1 there is a presumption against development that involves activities posing an inherent hazard to groundwater; where appropriate, the EA will oppose such new developments via the development planning system or refuse a permit application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developers and operators should assess the area of influence of their activities and to take account of all current and future groundwater uses and dependent ecosystems. Developers and operators are expected to assess and mitigate the potential impact on groundwater, throughout planning, construction, operation, and decommissioning phases of the development or operation.</li> <li>• Developers and operators should provide adequate information to statutory bodies, including the Environment Agency, when submitting their proposals. This is so that the potential impact on groundwater resources and quality can be adequately assessed. In particular, where new techniques, operations, products or substances are involved, developers or operators should be prepared to supply specific relevant data to allow the risk to groundwater to be assessed.</li> </ul> <p><u>Piling</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area around Camblesforth is the Brighton Sand Formation which acts as a Secondary A aquifer. BGS logs in the area have shown groundwater to be found at levels of around 2 metres below ground level which runs the risk of being penetrated by piling as described. As such the EA require a Piling Risk Assessment to be undertaken to assure that no physical disturbance of the Aquifer or SPZ1 will occur due to piling. Without this document the EA may object to the works as part NGW O 02 and will submit condition NGW C 03.</li> </ul> <p><u>Construction and Decommissioning</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In line with Position statement N7 of 'The Environment Agency's approach to groundwater protection' - Developers proposing schemes that present a hazard to groundwater resources, quality or abstractions must provide an acceptable hydrogeological risk assessment (HRA) to the Environment Agency and the planning authority.</li> <li>• Any activities that can adversely affect groundwater must be considered, including physical disturbance of the aquifer. If the</li> </ul>		



	Date	Organisation	Name	Full response or summary of response where relevant	Topics raised	Regard had by the Applicant
				<p>HRA identifies unacceptable risks, then the developer must provide appropriate mitigation. If this is not done or is not possible, we will recommend that the planning permission is conditioned, or we will object to the proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EA is likely object to the works as part of NGW O 02 due to the risks these activities could pose to the aquifer. We strongly recommend that as part of this HRA any potential risks to groundwater and mitigation strategies are detailed in any part of the works where there is a risk to the aquifer.</li> <li>The EA is broadly satisfied with the current CEMP and DEMP that has been drafted although a more detailed CEMP and DEMP will be required before works take place.</li> </ul> <p><u>Pollution Control</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EA is broadly satisfied with the mitigation strategies suggested in Chapter 9 in regard to pollution control. We note in Chapter 9 section 9.5.58:</li> <li>“The construction activities are unlikely to create new pathways which could pose a risk to groundwater bodies. The risk of groundwater pollution would be as a result of a pollution incident at the surface contaminating the underlying ground and infiltrating/ leaching into the underlying geological deposits which may be a source of groundwater”</li> <li>and in 9.5.44:                      “Taking into account the measures outlined above, adopting best practice construction site management with adequate contingency planning, and following the principles of pollution prevention, which will be formalised and incorporated into a Construction Environmental Management Plan ( ‘CEMP’) secured through a DCO requirement, will reduce the risk of a pollution event occurring. The Outline CEMP (‘oCEMP’) is provided at Appendix 5.1 of the PEIR.”</li> <li>Before works are undertaken, The EA will require a detailed CEMP and DEMP to be submitted. Without these documents we may object to the works as part of NGW O 02</li> </ul> <p><u>Pollution Prevention</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Materials and chemicals likely to cause pollution should be stored in appropriate containers and adhere to guidance for the</li> </ul>		

	Date	Organisation	Name	Full response or summary of response where relevant	Topics raised	Regard had by the Applicant
				<p>storage of drums and intermediate bulk containers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any facilities, above ground, for the storage of oils, fuels or chemicals shall be sited on impervious bases and surrounded by impervious bund walls. The volume of the bunded compound should be at least equivalent to the capacity of the tank plus 10%. All filling points, vents, gauges, and sight glasses must be located within the bund. The drainage system of the bund shall be sealed with no discharge to any watercourse, land or underground strata. Associated pipework should be located above ground and protected from accidental damage. All filling points and tank overflow pipe outlets should be detailed to discharge downwards into the bund.</li> <li>Appropriate procedures, training and equipment should be provided for the site to adequately control and respond to any emergencies including the cleanup of spillages, to prevent environmental pollution from the site operations.</li> <li>Polluting materials and chemicals should be stored in an area with sealed drainage.</li> </ul> <p><u>Battery Energy Storage Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) have the potential to pollute the environment. Applicants should consider the impact to all environmental receptors during each phase of development. Particular attention should be applied in advance to the impacts on groundwater and surface water from the escape of firewater/foam and any contaminants that it may contain. Suitable environmental protection measures should be provided including systems for containing and managing water run-off. The applicant should ensure that there are multiple 'layers of protection' to prevent the source-pathway-receptor pollution route occurring. Appropriate procedures should be provided that clearly illustrate how firewater will be managed, including sufficient details for safe and permitted off-site disposal.</li> </ul>		
S47	01/12/2023	Long Drax Parish Council	Cllr Roger Turnbull	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmed that with the exception of some work relating to the cable route, all development is outside the Parish. Therefore Long Drax Parish has no comments to make on parish issues.</li> <li>From a local perspective, road works and construction needs to be managed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport &amp; Access</li> <li>Site &amp; Development Description</li> </ul>	<p><b>Construction traffic:</b> Traffic assessments show that there is likely to be very little impact on the local road network. However, a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) will be prepared to outline specific points, such as delivery times, restrictions, and routes to ensure that construction traffic does not have a detrimental impact to the local road network. An Outline CTMP is available in Appendix 5.4 of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.3.5.2).</p> <p><b>Soils and Agricultural land (including food security)</b> One of the benefits of solar development is the protection and improvement of soil quality as it will no longer be subjected</p>

	Date	Organisation	Name	Full response or summary of response where relevant	Topics raised	Regard had by the Applicant
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On national issues the use of arable land for solar farms is a concern, but the Parish Council do appreciate that access to the grid pushes the Applicant to this area and this issue will be considered on a national level.</li> </ul>		<p>to intensive farming or use of pesticides and herbicides. At the end of its operational life the solar panels will be removed and the land returned to agricultural use.</p> <p>The Applicant intends to use the land for grazing as part of the management of the grass within the solar farm, and the construction and decommissioning of the infrastructure will have little impact on the land quality due to the nature of the proposals and construction methods utilised.</p> <p>Once the solar farm reaches the end of its operational life, the land designation does not change, meaning that it will return to agricultural land when the site is decommissioned.</p> <p>There is no current policy regarding food production, however, there is current policy regarding the need for renewable energy to tackle climate change, increase energy security and increase biodiversity, and food production is one consideration alongside those others.</p> <p>Further detailed information about this topic is included within Chapter 14 – Soils and Agricultural Land of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.14).</p>
S47		Sir Keir Mather MP	Selby and Ainsty	<p>I am writing to pass on a number of concerns from my constituents about the proposed Helios Renewable Energy Project, to the west of Camblesforth in my constituency. As you will be aware, Members of Parliament have no formal role in the planning process, but I have received numerous pieces of correspondence from constituents who have requested my assistance in sharing their views on the matter. I am sending this email to make you aware of these views, and I have also encouraged my constituents to comment on the statutory consultation. I will of course ask that they continue to engage with the process in the new year.</p> <p>My constituents tell me that their main concerns are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That the solar farm is to be built on high quality agricultural land that produces high quality food and grain.</li> <li>That there is a risk of undermining our country's self-sufficiency if all of the planned solar farms are granted planning permission.</li> <li>That there will be a significant impact on the natural biodiversity in the local area due to the scale of the proposed solar farm.</li> <li>A perceived risk of fire, flooding, contamination of local water supplies and high voltage particularly from the lithium within the batteries.</li> <li>An apparent lack of communication between the local Parish council and the developers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Soils and Agricultural land</li> <li>Food security</li> <li>Impact on biodiversity</li> <li>Health &amp; Safety of the BESS operations</li> <li>Engagement with the community</li> <li>Property</li> <li>Traffic and construction</li> </ul>	<p><u>Soils and Agricultural land (including food security)</u></p> <p>One of the benefits of solar development is the protection and improvement of soil quality as it will no longer be subjected to intensive farming or use of pesticides and herbicides. At the end of its operational life the solar panels will be removed and the land returned to agricultural use.</p> <p>The Applicant intends to use the land for grazing as part of the management of the grass within the solar farm, and the construction and decommissioning of the infrastructure will have little impact on the land quality due to the nature of the proposals and construction methods utilised.</p> <p>Once the solar farm reaches the end of its operational life, the land designation does not change, meaning that it will return to agricultural land when the site is decommissioned.</p> <p>There is no current policy regarding food production, however, there is current policy regarding the need for renewable energy to tackle climate change, increase energy security and increase biodiversity, and food production is one consideration alongside those others.</p> <p>Further detailed information about this topic is included within Chapter 14 – Soils and Agricultural Land of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.14).</p> <p><u>Biodiversity</u></p> <p>Biodiversity improvements have been central to the development of the proposals. A well-designed solar farm provides many opportunities for local ecological and biodiversity improvements. The project would represent a 40-year period in which the intensively farmed land can 'rest' while the boundary vegetation is improved and maintained to improve biodiversity.</p> <p>Further detailed information about this topic is included within Chapter 8 – Biodiversity of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.8).</p> <p>As part of the application, the Applicant is required to assess drainage and flood risk and put in place appropriate drainage and other mitigation measures to ensure that there is no net increase in water run off from the site taking climate change into account. The assessments that have been carried out so far on the indicative design, show that there are no significant identified impacts to watercourses, surface water runoff rate, water quality and flood risk during operation of the solar farm. Flood resilience and resistance measures, including refinement of the site design and a sequential approach to layout, avoids placement of equipment in areas of elevated flood risk to minimise wider potential impacts.</p>

	Date	Organisation	Name	Full response or summary of response where relevant	Topics raised	Regard had by the Applicant
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A risk of a decrease in property value.</li> <li>Increased traffic on already busy roads and pollution during construction of the solar farm.</li> </ul> <p>Whilst I fully appreciate that there is a need for renewable energy projects across the country, I feel duty bound to ensure that the views of my constituents are taken into consideration as this application progresses to the next stage. I intend to continue to engage constructively on this matter, mindful of the limitations of my formal role in the process, but with the aim of ensuring that the voices of those who will be most impacted by this particular project are heard clearly throughout the process.</p>		<p>Some potential risks have been identified during construction should there be spillage or pollution as a result of an accident, however these are considered manageable and temporary with good construction practices, and we have carefully considered how to minimise the potential for these impacts.</p> <p><u>Fire safety</u></p> <p>The Government supports the rapid rollout of BESS as a crucial part of the transition to a low carbon energy system powered by renewables, and there is no national guidance or policy to support the case that the technology is inherently unsafe. In understanding the safety concerns raised, it is therefore important to keep in mind that Li-Ion batteries are not a novel technology: they are used in our phones, laptops, and cars every day.</p> <p>The design, development and manufacture of the BESS requires the development and maintenance of high standards in respect of safety and operation. As is standard practice, the design of the BESS is being informed by a Battery Safety Management Plan (SMP) which will be prepared in line with the requirements of the North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service, in accordance with the National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) BESS guidance.</p> <p><u>Community engagement</u></p> <p>The Applicant has provided regular updates via email through the statutory consultation period and have offered additional information to Parish Councils where requested to assist with answering their specific queries. The Applicant is open to further dialogue and would welcome ongoing discussions with the Parishes. All feedback has been considered and included as part of the assessments.</p> <p><u>Property</u></p> <p>There is no accepted evidence to suggest that solar farms negatively affect property prices.</p> <p><u>Construction traffic</u></p> <p>Traffic assessments show that there is likely to be very little impact on the local road network. However, a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) will be prepared to outline specific points, such as delivery times, restrictions, and routes to ensure that construction traffic does not have a detrimental impact to the local road network. An Outline CTMP is available within Appendix 5.2 of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.3.5.1).</p>
S47	07/12/2023	Hirst Courtney & West Bank Parish Council	Cllr James Barrett	<p>The Hirst Courtney and West Bank Parish Council strongly objected to the proposed Helios Solar Farm and Battery Storage facility based on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of good quality agricultural land</li> <li>Detrimental change to the character of open fields and farmland</li> <li>Health &amp; Safety risks posed by the battery storage and long term as a result of noise and visual impact</li> <li>Cumulative impact alongside the 2 other solar farms proposed</li> <li>Risk of encouraging further crime in the area</li> <li>Potential negative effect on house prices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Soils &amp; Agricultural Land</li> <li>Landscape &amp; Views</li> <li>Socio-Economics</li> <li>Cumulative Schemes</li> <li>Noise &amp; Vibration</li> <li>Transport &amp; Access</li> <li>Biodiversity</li> <li>Water Environment</li> <li>Construction &amp; Decommissioning</li> </ul>	<p><u>Soils and Agricultural land (including food security)</u></p> <p>One of the benefits of solar development is the protection and improvement of soil quality as it will no longer be subjected to intensive farming or use of pesticides and herbicides. At the end of its operational life the solar panels will be removed and the land returned to agricultural use.</p> <p>The Applicant intends to use the land for grazing as part of the management of the grass within the solar farm, and the construction and decommissioning of the infrastructure will have little impact on the land quality due to the nature of the proposals and construction methods utilised.</p> <p>Once the solar farm reaches the end of its operational life, the land designation does not change, meaning that it will return to agricultural land when the site is decommissioned.</p> <p>There is no current policy regarding food production, however, there is current policy regarding the need for renewable energy to tackle climate change, increase energy security and increase biodiversity, and food production is one consideration alongside those others.</p>

	Date	Organisation	Name	Full response or summary of response where relevant	Topics raised	Regard had by the Applicant
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alongside various projects locally expected around the same time, there will be a huge impact in terms of traffic</li> <li>• Negative impact on natural biodiversity and habitats</li> <li>• Better alternatives in terms of location and more efficient energy production</li> <li>• Increased risk of flooding to an already high risk flood area</li> <li>• Loss of public access routes</li> </ul>	Methodology & Phasing	<p>Further detailed information about this topic is included within Chapter 14 - Soils and Agricultural Land of the ES (ES Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.14).</p> <p><u>Landscape and Visual Impacts</u></p> <p>The LVIA initial study area, for the purposes of desk studies and field surveys, was set at 5km. Following the initial assessment, an updated Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) was prepared based on the parameters of the proposed development and the screen effect of existing vegetation and settlements. The updated ZTV is presented in Figure 7.1 of Chapter 7 - Landscape and Views of the ES (ES Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.7).</p> <p>The visual assessment viewpoints and visualisations are based on those shown on Figure 7.7 of Chapter 7 - Landscape and Views of the ES (ES Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.1.7).</p> <p><u>BESS</u></p> <p>The BESS compound has been subject to a thorough design process, taking into account feedback received from a number of parties, including North Yorkshire Council, North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service and the EA.</p> <p>Further information on the safety and operations of the BESS can be found in Appendix 3.1 of the (ES Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/ 6.3.3.1).</p> <p><u>Cumulative effects</u></p> <p>Table 15.1 of the Chapter 15 – Cumulative Effects (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.2.15) details the projects that have been identified for the assessment of likely significant cumulative effects. No significant (beneficial or adverse) cumulative effects were identified for the following technical disciplines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cultural Heritage;</li> <li>• Landscape and Views;</li> <li>• Water Environment;</li> <li>• Transport and Access;</li> <li>• Noise and Vibration;</li> <li>• Socio-Economics; and</li> <li>• Solis and Agricultural Land.</li> </ul> <p>The solar developments identified from the list of cumulative developments for assessment make clear commitments to achieve measurable biodiversity gains; therefore, a major beneficial (significant) cumulative effect to habitats has been identified at the local level.</p> <p>Moderate beneficial (significant) effect at the local level identified to a reduction in carbon emissions associated with the cumulative operation of several schemes related to the generation or storage of renewable energy.</p> <p><u>Property</u></p> <p>There is no accepted evidence to suggest that solar farms negatively affect property prices.</p> <p><u>Alternative and site selection</u></p> <p>The consideration of alternatives to the Proposed Development is set out in the Chapter 4 - Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.2.4). This is</p>

	Date	Organisation	Name	Full response or summary of response where relevant	Topics raised	Regard had by the Applicant
						<p>considered to be in accordance with the requirements of the EIA Regulations and relevant policy.</p> <p>Local planning policies from the relevant authorities can be 'important and relevant' considerations for the Secretary of State (SoS) in determining the DCO Application.</p> <p><u>Flood risk</u></p> <p>The Proposed Development has been informed by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), ensuring the Proposed Development does not increase flood risk elsewhere and incorporates sustainable drainage systems.</p> <p>The Applicant has set out their assessment of impacts on flood risk in Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES (Doc Ref: EN010140/APP/6.2.9).</p>
S47	19/12/23	Carlton Parish Council	Helen Philips, Clerk	The Councillors voted at their last meeting and there was no unanimous opinion therefore it was felt that the Parish Council did not need to comment or react to the Helios project. Ultimately it was felt that the project did not directly impact on the village of Carlton.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	Noted.