

---

# **EAST YORKSHIRE SOLAR FARM**

**East Yorkshire Solar Farm  
EN010143**

**Applicant's Additional Responses to Examining Authority's  
First Written Questions and Interested Parties' Submissions to  
First Written Questions at Deadline 1**

**Document Reference: EN010143/APP/8.27**

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

June 2024  
Revision Number: 00

## Table of Contents

1.	Introduction .....	3
1.1	Purpose of the document .....	3
2.	Applicant's additional responses to the Examining Authority's first written questions and Interested Parties' Submissions to First Written Questions at Deadline 1 .....	4

## Tables

Table 2-1.	Applicant's additional responses.....	4
------------	---------------------------------------	---

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose of the document

- 1.1.1 This document provides additional responses to the following:
- a. Matters raised in the Examining Authority's (ExA) first written questions issued on 28 May 2024 **[PD-007]** that required further consideration; and
  - b. Interested Parties' Submissions to the ExA's first written questions submitted at Deadline 1 which include matters that have not been considered previously.
- 1.1.2 The Applicant's responses to the ExA's first written questions were provided at Deadline 1 **[REP1-081]**.
- 1.1.3 The Interested Parties' Submissions to the ExA's first written questions submitted at Deadline 1 which include matters that have not been considered previously include:
- a. **REP1-088**: Deadline 1 Submission - Responses to First Written Questions from North Yorkshire Council; and
  - b. **REP1-111**: Deadline 1 Submission - Responses to First Written Questions from Michael Field.

## 2. Applicant's additional responses to the Examining Authority's first written questions and Interested Parties' Submissions to First Written Questions at Deadline 1

Table 2-1. Applicant's additional responses

ExQ1	Respondent	Question	Response at Deadline 1	Applicant's Response at Deadline 2
Q1.4.2	Michael Field	Statement of Need paragraph 7.6.14. (a) Please expand on why SAT is preferred for the scheme, including consideration of any risks associated with its limited use to date in the UK. (b) If a combination of SAT and FSF were used, please provide further information on any environmental effects and whether any alternative or additional controls would be required.	<p>Q1.4.2(b) Mixed FSF/SAT. This option in the Statement of Need is probably moot. ES-The Scheme [Table 2-1] specifies just SAT, and ES-Alternatives [3.9.6-7] states that FSF was discounted prior to the Statutory Consultation (May 2023). Although the Statement of Need was published in Nov 2023, it was presumably written earlier.</p> <p>Q1.4.2(a) The use of SAT in UK utility-scale solar will be unique. Is this a bold decision or a risky one? Has everyone else in the UK got it wrong? Whereas conventional fixed south-facing (FSF) panels only generate maximum output at midday (when they face directly at the sun, and the sun has maximum irradiance), SAT follows the sun to increase output at lower sun elevations. This is ideal near the equator – the panels face directly at the sun throughout the hours of daylight. But as you move further north or south, this geometrical advantage diminishes – the panels are facing vertically up at midday, but the sun is not directly overhead. It may still be effective in Australia (35°S), but Yorkshire is at 54°N. Surely the minimal advantage at dawn and dusk is cancelled out by the reduced output at midday?</p> <p>BOOM will have used one of the simulator packages created for utility solar designers, in order to compare the power profiles of different configurations. (RatedPower looks like the popular one.) Can they show some print-outs and yields to back up their decision?</p> <p>The free on-line ones suggest no more than 2% energy difference between SAT and FSF at 54°N. The Statement of Need [APP/7.1, 6.5.12a] says that SAT requires more land per MW(p) but has the potential to generate more MWh/MW(p) than FSF. Where's the data?</p> <p>The Scoping Report [ES Appendix 1-1] refers to an Australian solar farm with SAT operated by the applicant's parent company. Which farm? Which parent? Is there any data yet on how this is performing?</p> <p>The overwhelming attraction of solar PV as an energy source is that it has no moving parts, and hence requires virtually nil maintenance for decades, apart from the occasional wash. The overwhelming disadvantage of SAT is that it presumably uses hundreds of motors and sensors, thousands of bearings, miles of additional electrical cables and a central control station, all of which have failure rates. Will BOOM be purchasing a 40-year inventory of spare parts? It is difficult to</p>	<p>Q1.4.2(a) The use of SAT in the UK has historically not been pursued by solar developers due to the increased install costs meaning that SAT projects were not viable. However, more and more developers are now considering SAT configurations for solar projects in the UK especially at NSIP scale. This is because the installation costs associated with SAT schemes have reduced and it is now economically viable to install SAT schemes in the UK.</p> <p>Q1.4.2(b) The Applicant confirms that the reference to mixed FSF/SAT panels in the Statement of Need is an error. The Scheme will use SAT panels. This is secured on page 3 of the Outline Design Principles Statement <b>[REP1-051]</b>, which is secured by Requirement 5 of Schedule 2 of the draft DCO <b>[REP1-006]</b>. The Applicant has submitted an updated Statement of Need to correct this error at Deadline 2.</p>

ExQ1	Respondent	Question	Response at Deadline 1	Applicant's Response at Deadline 2
			<p>comprehend that a marginal (if any) difference in energy yield can justify the monumental additional complexity.</p> <p>Why is BOOM intending to clean the panels using a tractor with the trackers in the horizontal position [Framework Operational, APP/7.8, 2.6.3]? I occasionally wash my car and I can report that the roof is impossible to wash off without a hose. Surely, tilt them over like the Google pictures of other PV-cleaning tractors show. Has this been thought through?</p> <p>If the ExA is querying content in the Statement of Need, could its author (Humbeat Ltd) be asked for an opinion on the wisdom of solar farms in the UK? He – Humbeat Ltd is Mr Simon Gillett1 – has contributed enthusiastic Statements of Need to numerous (all?) solar NSIP applications, yet his website expresses the opposing view. 2 'Power system fundamentals'3 is a worthwhile introduction to the issues of power generation, but it reports that North-West Europe has "low solar generating potential" (page 9).</p>	
Q3.0.7	Michael Field	ES6.7.30. Please provide a source for the 'typical' yield figure of 922 kilowatt hour per kilowatt-peak per year and explain why a 'typical' yield is appropriate to assess the application scheme.	<p>ES Climate Change quotes 922 kWh/kWp/yr as both the minimum yield [6.4.5] and the typical yield [6.7.30]. A more meaningful expression of the units would have been kWh/yr/kWp, because they are describing annual energy (kWh/yr) per kWp of PV panel. For comparison, the government publishes measured solar PV Load Factors1.</p> <p>The most recent available value is 11.4% for 2022 (excluding PV connected during 2022). The figure is based on Installed Capacity, but includes some estimates so may not be entirely accurate. Many UK solar farms are several years old now, so the newer ones should actually have higher LF figures. All (?) use fixed south-facing panels. 11.4% equates to 999 kWh/yr per kW installed. (24 x 365 x 11.4%).</p>	<p>922 kWh/kWp/yr is a representative yield value assumed for the purposes of the ES based on the conservative modelling case undertaken for the Scheme. Subsequent modelling, not available at the time the ES chapter was drafted, indicates an even higher yield can be achieved. The use of the 922 kWh/kWp/yr yield figure, therefore, represents a worst case scenario in terms of lifetime generation, and understates the net carbon benefits of the Scheme relative to the counterfactual scenario of generating electricity using existing, unabated, combined cycle gas turbines.</p>
Q5.1.4	Michael Field	R 18 Question: What certainty is there that the Applicant or its successor will undertake the decommissioning works? (a) should the dDCO include provision for a bond or other means of funding the decommissioning works; or (b) supply the provisions within the agreements with site land owners which would secure the decommissioning works?	<p>The Framework Decommissioning Management Plan [APP/7.9] is understandably noncommittal: The specific method of decommissioning the Scheme at the end of its operational life is uncertain at present as the engineering approaches to decommissioning will evolve over the operational life of the Scheme. [2.1.3]</p> <p>There is no suggestion as to how this will be funded. We have to assume that in the closing years, profits will be diverted into a Decommissioning Account. Hopefully, BOOM's grandchildren will inherit the commitment to responsible governance. But this is far from certain. Indeed, a subsequent owner might resort to the traditional business model of selling off everything that is not nailed down and filing for insolvency, leaving the council to clean up the mess.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no guarantee that East Yorkshire Solar Farm will remain viable for 40 years. It may be forced into receivership</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that specific security for decommissioning is not standard practice for DCOs and it is usually dealt with in the voluntary land agreements. The voluntary land agreements are substantially complete for the Solar PV site except two which require final signatures and make provision for restoration.</p> <p>As set out in the Explanatory Memorandum [AS-010], this requirement provides that within 12 months of the date the undertaker decides to decommission any part of the authorised development, the undertaker must submit to the relevant planning authority for its approval a decommissioning environmental management plan (substantially in accordance with the framework decommissioning environmental management plan).</p>

ExQ1	Respondent	Question	Response at Deadline 1	Applicant's Response at Deadline 2
			<p>prematurely. The solicitor observed at ISH1 that laws exist to protect against misuse of funds. True. But if the money's gone – as is often the case – it's gone. Other infrastructure (most notably nuclear power stations) include a decommissioning fund from day one for this purpose. The holding of deposits in landlord–tenant contracts has the same function. A similar plan for solar farms would be appropriate. The capital held in reserve could be reviewed periodically at the Applicant's or SoS's request.</p> <p>The Applicant should compile an itemised list of decommissioning expenses for ExA approval. BOOM's current intention of sending the PV panels for recycling is commendable, but for the purposes of costing, landfill estimates should be permitted. (Recycling of 20,000 tons (?) of PV is probably not currently possible and likely prohibitively expensive.</p>	<p>Requirement 18 of the DCO provides a clear mechanism for ensuring decommissioning takes place. It is not necessary to provide financial arrangements to secure the decommissioning of the Scheme as the enforcement mechanisms in the Planning Act 2008 are rigorous, where criminal liability is a possible consequence for a breach of a requirement. In addition, the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 also allows local authorities to seek to recover the profits accruing to businesses and individuals who breach planning control. It is therefore not practice or considered necessary for DCOs to incorporate financial arrangements for decommissioning.</p>
Q7.0.6	The Applicant	ES7.6.7 deals with the effects on two of the five temporary construction compounds. Please set out the effects on the other three compounds.	<p>The remaining compounds are located within the Grid Connection Corridor. Construction of the compounds in these areas may result in the permanent removal of buried archaeological remains. This impact is therefore the same as the assessment of laying of cables within the Grid Connection Corridor and would likely result in a moderate adverse or major adverse effect, which is significant. The Grid Connection Corridor has not yet been subject to trial trench evaluation, and it has been agreed with the Local Planning Authority's Archaeology Advisor that trial trenching and mitigation, if needed, in the form of a programme of archaeological excavation and recording will be carried out. The successful implementation of the agreed mitigation would result in a residual effect that is not significant. This is detailed in the agreed Overarching Written Scheme of Investigation which will be submitted at Deadline 1. For completeness and clarity, Chapter 7 of the ES [APP-059] will be updated with a separate impact assessment for the temporary construction compounds (rather than as part of the assessment of laying of cables within the Grid Connection Corridor) for submission at Deadline 2.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage has been updated to include an impact assessment for each construction compound that are proposed within the Order limits. This update has been submitted at Deadline 2. This therefore updates the Applicant's response provided for Q7.0.6 at Deadline 1.</p>
Q9.0.1	North Yorkshire Council	ES Table 10-1 page 10-11 and ES 10.3.6-10. Please comment on the selection of representative viewpoints	<p>The Applicant has not provided an additional viewpoint on New Road / Wren Hall Lane to explain potential vegetation loss, which is contrary to our previous request. This would have potential for a corresponding photomontage. Given the wide scope and parameter for work currently set within the Grid Connection Corridor we are not confident that the Applicant is being clear and assessing and illustrating the worst-case scenario. The Applicant has excluded this viewpoint on the basis that no vegetation will be lost, but this seems unlikely to be the case. For example, the LVIA includes statements that no vegetation will be lost as a result of the scheme (e.g. paragraph 10.5.83 of the LVIA). However, trees and hedgerows are shown for removal on the Tree Protection Plans within the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Application Document ref.</p>	<p>An additional viewpoint on New Road/Wren Hall Lane was discussed at a pre application meeting regarding landscape and ecological matters held on 1<sup>st</sup> August 2023 between the Applicant and East Riding of Yorkshire Council and North Yorkshire Council representatives. This was proposed in the context of the potential for existing vegetation loss in this location as a result of the Scheme. Following a review confirming existing vegetation would be retained at this location, it was not considered relevant by the Applicant to include this as an additional viewpoint and prepare a corresponding photomontage as part of the assessment</p>

ExQ1	Respondent	Question	Response at Deadline 1	Applicant's Response at Deadline 2
			<p>APP-102, APP-103, APP-104). Additionally, these impacts are not fixed to specific cable route alignment within the Grid Connection Corridor, with impacts to be reassessed and included as part of the detailed CEMP, Table 6 page 73 (CEMP DCO Requirement 11). We are not confident that tree protection will be an active part of the future design development for the main connecting cables, temporary access and compounds within the Grid Connection Corridor and a requirement of the Detailed design approval (Requirement 5 of the DCO).</p>	<p>presented in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES <b>[REP1-014]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has updated the Framework LEMP <b>[REP1-063]</b> as part of the Deadline 1 package of information to make it clear that areas of existing vegetation within the Grid Connection Corridor, specifically in proximity to Drax Power Station, will be retained and protected. The update sets out the measures to be undertaken to minimise impacts upon existing vegetation and hedgerows within the Grid Connection Corridor including, where possible, the reduction in working width to approximately 5 metres when the route passes through vegetation and hedgerows. The Applicant will determine the route of the Grid Connection Cables following trial trenching, as set out in the Overarching Written Scheme of Investigation (submitted to examination at Deadline 1 <b>[REP1-086]</b>), and any ground investigation work is undertaken as described in Table 14 of the Framework CEMP <b>[REP1-053]</b>. The update has also been made to the Landscape Masterplan presented at Appendix A of the Framework LEMP <b>[REP1-063]</b> to illustrate the retention of existing vegetation. These updates have been submitted into the examination at Deadline 1.</p> <p>The protection of trees in relation to the route of the Grid Connection Cables is addressed in detail in Section 4.5 of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment report [APP-102] and this sets out how the design will be amended where possible to avoid cable routes or access routes incurring within the Root Protection Area of retained tree features and where avoidance is not possible how it will be managed in principle. The final extent of incursions and the methodology for any such work will be detailed as part of an Arboricultural Method Statement which will be secured as part of the detailed CEMP. This is described in Table 6 of the Framework CEMP <b>[REP1-053]</b>.</p> <p>The detailed CEMP and a detailed LEMP will need to be approved post consent prior to construction by the relevant local authorities. These detailed management plans must substantially accord with the framework management plans the Applicant has prepared and this is secured by requirements in Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO <b>[REP1-006]</b>.</p> <p>The assessment within Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES <b>[REP1-014]</b> has therefore been undertaken on the assumption that areas of woodland along</p>

ExQ1	Respondent	Question	Response at Deadline 1	Applicant's Response at Deadline 2
Q9.0.2	North Yorkshire Council	ES Table 10-1 page 10-12. Please comment on the Applicant's approach to the tranquillity assessment and its finding of no significant noise effects.	The Applicant has not agreed a methodology for assessment of tranquillity which is contrary to our previous request. We would typically expect tranquillity to be considered within Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity Assessment whether or not it is identified as a significant affect within the Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration, since these consider different parameters and that tranquillity is not solely a measure of noise impacts. Tranquillity is explained as a perceptual aspect within GLVIA3. Given that the scheme is predominantly a rural landscape there is potential for adverse effects to local landscape character and setting during construction, operational and decommissioning phases.	<p>the Grid Connection Corridor such as those close to Drax Power Station will be retained and that the majority of hedgerows and trees, where possible, would be retained or a section of approximately 5m would be removed, in accordance with the reduction of working width through vegetation and hedgerows being committed to by the Applicant. Within Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES <b>[REP1-014]</b>, paragraph 10.5.83 states that the potential viewpoint to the south of Drax, along New Lane would not experience views of the Grid Connection as a result of the retention of the mature vegetation located along Wren Hall Lane and Carr Lane.</p> <p>Appendix 1-3: EIA Scoping Opinion Responses <b>[APP-075]</b> page 82 provides the EIA scoping opinion response from North Yorkshire Council regarding the topic of tranquillity. This identifies that <i>“there is potential for significant adverse noise effects associated with construction, decommissioning and operational noise arising from static plant installations (inverter stations and energy storage containers)”</i> and requests consideration is <i>“given to the assessment of tranquility and effect on local character and setting”</i></p> <p>Table 10-1 in ES Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity <b>[REP1-014]</b> responded to this request from the Scoping Opinion.</p> <p><i>“The Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEI Report) stated that an assessment of tranquillity would be considered at the ES stage if significant adverse noise effects were identified.</i></p> <p><i>The noise assessment is presented in Chapter 11 of this ES and it is assessed that the Scheme would not result in significant effects. Therefore, an assessment of tranquillity has not been undertaken.”</i></p> <p>No comments were received from North Yorkshire Council in response to the statutory consultation about the comment made in the PEI Report regarding the assessment of tranquillity. It should also be noted that there are no static plant installations proposed as part of the Scheme within the administrative area of North Yorkshire Council.</p>



ExQ1	Respondent	Question	Response at Deadline 1	Applicant's Response at Deadline 2
Q9.0.3	North Yorkshire Council	ES Table 10-1 page 10-13. Please comment on the content of the LEMP, including whether it gives adequate consideration to wider landscape character opportunities to enhance green infrastructure and the provisions for long term maintenance.	We are not confident that the Application sufficiently considers provision of Green Infrastructure within the Grid Connection Corridor, as set out and explained within the content of the LEMP. All existing vegetation and trees to be retained within the Grid Connection Corridor should be clearly shown on Framework Landscape Masterplan Drawings in the LEMP. Where tree loss may be unavoidable within the Grid Connection Corridor, the provision for reinstatement, tree replacement and compensatory mitigation is insufficiently explained or allowed for in the Framework Landscape Masterplan, or how this might be linked to the wider requirements and provision of green infrastructure within the Grid Connection Corridor. For a development of this scale we would also expect to see clear provision of green infrastructure actively applied within the whole of the application area, in accordance with principles of Natural England's GI Framework. Specific areas for this should be identified on a plan within the Grid Connection Corridor and secured through the DCO. This would also give confidence that further landscape and arboricultural impacts could be sufficiently mitigated at detailed design stage.	<p>The Applicant has updated the Framework LEMP <b>[REP1-063]</b> as part of the Deadline 1 package of information to make it clear that areas of existing vegetation within the Grid Connection Corridor, specifically in proximity to Drax Power Station, will be retained and protected. The update sets out the measures to be undertaken to minimise impacts upon existing vegetation and hedgerows within the Grid Connection Corridor including, where possible, the reduction in working width to approximately 5 metres when the route passes through vegetation and hedgerows. The Applicant will determine the route of the Grid Connection Cables following trial trenching, as set out in the Overarching Written Scheme of Investigation (submitted to examination at Deadline 1 <b>[REP1-086]</b>), and any ground investigation work is undertaken as described in Table 14 of the Framework CEMP <b>[REP1-053]</b>. The update has also been made to the Landscape Masterplan presented at Appendix A of the Framework LEMP <b>[REP1-063]</b> to illustrate the retention of existing vegetation. These updates have been submitted into the examination at Deadline 1.</p> <p>The protection of trees in relation to the route of the Grid Connection Cables is addressed in detail in Section 4.5 of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment report <b>[APP-102]</b> and this sets out how the design will be amended where possible to avoid cable routes or access routes incurring within the Root Protection Area of retained tree features and where avoidance is not possible how it will be managed in principle. The final extent of incursions and the methodology for any such work will be detailed as part of an Arboricultural Method Statement which will be secured as part of the detailed CEMP. This is described in Table 6 of the Framework CEMP <b>[REP1-053]</b>.</p> <p>The detailed CEMP and a detailed LEMP will need to be approved post consent prior to construction by the relevant local authorities. These detailed management plans must substantially accord with the framework management plans the Applicant has prepared and this is secured by requirements in Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO <b>[REP1-006]</b>.</p>
Q10.0.24	The Applicant	ES11.10.12 and ES11.10.13. These findings assume that the identified cumulative developments would not give rise to significant noise effects after	As discussed in section 11.10 of ES Chapter 11 <b>[APP-063]</b> , based on identified separation distances and requirements to implement Best Practicable Measures, it is considered that any overlapping of construction phases between the Scheme and the other nearby development schemes during construction would not result in any in-	A review of residual adverse noise and vibration effects identified at the shortlisted cumulative schemes identified in ES Appendix 17-1 has been undertaken.

ExQ1	Respondent	Question	Response at Deadline 1	Applicant's Response at Deadline 2
		<p>mitigation at the construction and operational phases. However, it is possible that decision makers could find that the benefits of the scheme would outweigh any such effects. Please comment on this eventuality.</p>	<p>combination cumulative effects at common noise sensitive receptors. The assessment of cumulative noise and vibration operational effects has been undertaken based on the reasonable assumption that cumulative developments would be subject to planning restrictions requiring new developments to achieve operational noise standards. Given this and the relative distance between cumulative developments and the Scheme there would be no significant adverse effects from those developments. The cumulative schemes (where available and relevant) will be reviewed, and confirmation regarding whether any additional information pertinent to the cumulative noise and vibration impact assessment is required will be provided at Deadline 2</p>	<p>The only cumulative scheme which identifies significant residual adverse noise effects is the Eastern Green Link 2 (EGL2, formerly Scotland to England Green Link 2) during the construction phase. The EGL2 Environmental Statement (ES) Noise Chapter identifies significant adverse construction noise effects at three receptors; Rec23, Rec60 and Rec62. Appendix 13-C of the EGL2 ES identifies the locations of these receptors All of these receptors are located outside the Applicant's construction noise study area of 300m (paragraph 11.4.15 [REP1-016]) and would be unaffected by noise generated by cable laying activities or any other part of the Scheme. As such significant adverse cumulative effects of the Scheme with EGL2 are not anticipated.</p>
Q14.0.5	The Applicant	<p>ES16.2.77. Please review the approach to the availability of information available for cumulative schemes. For example, both the consented Drax Carbon Capture with Storage DCO and the Drax Re-power DCO ESs include a quantitative Air Quality assessment and identify construction traffic routes. Please update the availability of information on other cumulative scheme currently in the planning approval process.</p>	<p>Traffic Flows on road links potentially affected by the Scheme and developments at the Drax site are considered in ES13.10.6, Data on traffic flows of cumulative schemes (where available and relevant) will be reviewed, and confirmation regarding whether any additional information pertinent to the cumulative air quality impact assessment is required will be provided at Deadline 2.</p>	<p>A review of the traffic flows of cumulative schemes identified in Appendix 17-1 Shortlist of cumulative schemes has been undertaken.</p> <p>The impacts of the cumulative traffic from the identified schemes have been assessed in the ES Chapter 13: Transport and Access, Section 13.10 [APP-065]. The assessment concluded the impacts of cumulative schemes were considered to be minimal in regards to the 24-hour flows (ES13.10.16 [APP-065]).</p> <p>The traffic flow contribution from the Scheme has been considered with regard to the likelihood of significant cumulative effects upon air quality and has been screened out as unlikely to give rise to significant effects based on the IAQM screening criteria (&lt;100 HDVs, &lt;500 LDVs) for all roads except one road link, Road Link 14. The EGL2 cumulative scheme has been identified from the shortlist of cumulative schemes provided in ES Appendix 17-1 [add ref] as contributing construction traffic to the same road link (Road link 14 (A614) [ES13.10.16 Table 13-5]) within the road network proposed to be used by the Scheme.</p> <p>The total cumulative construction traffic from both the Scheme and EGL2 contributes up to 147 Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) and 140 Light Goods Vehicles (LGV) as 2-way annual average daily traffic flows on any road. The traffic-generated cumulative emission contributions are 0.0006 g/km/s for the additional HGVs and 0.0016 g/km/s for the additional LGVs. The potential increase in annual mean nitrogen dioxide concentrations as a result of these emissions would be &lt;0.5 µg/m<sup>3</sup> at 5m from the roadside</p>

ExQ1	Respondent	Question	Response at Deadline 1	Applicant's Response at Deadline 2
				edge and <0.05µg/m <sup>3</sup> at 100m from the road. The Scheme is predicted to contribute 18% of cumulative additional traffic flows (25 HDV and 25 LDV) and 18% of the magnitude of associated change in annual mean nitrogen dioxide concentrations. A change of this scale is so small as to be imperceptible and would not be able to give rise to a significant effect at any sensitive receptor. The conclusions in the ES Chapter 16 [AS-016] related to cumulative air quality effects are therefore unaffected and remain valid.
Q15.10.4	North Yorkshire Council	ES Appendix 17-1. Please provide an update on the status of the identified shortlisted schemes within your area.	<p>ID3 - The status of this application has evolved since the document was prepared. Planning permission was granted for both parts of the hybrid planning application on 11.08.2023. A reserved matters application for the construction of the converter station has since been submitted and is pending consideration – reference ZG2024/0241/REMM.</p> <p>ID4 – The Secretary of State issued a decision letter on 16th January 2024 granting the Development Consent Order.</p> <p>ID5 – This application has been withdrawn.</p> <p>ID64 – it is correct that this application was refused, however a resubmission has been made, planning reference ZG2023/0720/FULM, which should be included within the short list.</p> <p>ID74 – The status of this application has evolved since the document was prepared. Planning permission was granted on 17.04.2024</p>	<p>The Applicant notes North Yorkshire Council's response to Q15.10.4 and has undertaken a further review of the shortlist presented in Appendix 17-1, ES Volume 2 [APP-125] and the cumulative effects assessment of the Scheme which is set out in chapters 6–16 of the ES [APP-058 to APP-061, AS-014, APP-064 to APP-067, and AS-016] and is summarised in Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects and Interactions, ES Volume 1 [APP-069].</p> <p>A response to each of the points raised is addressed below:</p> <p>ID3- The Applicant notes that permission of this application (Reference 2022/0711/EIA) has now been granted and a reserved matters application for the converter Station has been submitted. The Converter Station was considered within the original planning application (Reference 2022/0711/EIA) which was considered by the Applicant as part of its cumulative effects assessment presented in its ES and as such it is not considered that there would be a change to the cumulative effects assessments as a result. However, for clarity application reference ZG2024/0241/REMM has now been included within the Shortlist.</p> <p>ID4- The Applicant notes that this application has now been granted consent. It is not considered that there would be a change to the cumulative effects assessments as a result.</p> <p>ID5- The Applicant notes that this application has now been withdrawn. It is not considered that there would be a change to the cumulative effects assessments as a result.</p>
Q15.0.5	The Applicant	Please update the shortlist based on the updated information provided by ERYC and NYC (contained in their RRs and, if possible, the responses to Q15.0.4). Please update the relevant sections of the ES topic chapters accordingly	<p>The assessment of cumulative impacts of the Scheme with other existing and proposed developments in the locality is set out in chapters 6 – 16 of the Environmental Statement [APP-058 to APP-061, AS-014, APP-064 to APP-067, and AS016] and is summarised in Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the Environmental Statement [APP-069].</p> <p>The Relevant Representation submitted by East Riding of Yorkshire Council [RR-089] refers to 'other nearby solar farm applications' (in the general vicinity, whether this is within or beyond the study area for cumulative effects). The shortlist presented in Appendix 17-1, ES Volume 2 [APP-125] already considers nearby solar farms within the 5km study area for cumulative effects. The Relevant Representation does not change the shortlist and therefore no updates have been made to the short list as a result.</p> <p>The Relevant Representation [RR-282] submitted by North Yorkshire Council refers to two applications which have been updated since the shortlist was prepared. The Applicant notes the change in status of these two applications referenced and confirms that there is no change to the cumulative effects assessments as a result. The short list will be</p>	

ExQ1	Respondent	Question	Response at Deadline 1	Applicant's Response at Deadline 2
			<p>reviewed again following the LPA response to Q15.0.4 and updated if required and submitted at Deadline 2 into Examination.</p>	<p>ID64- The Applicant notes that this application has been refused and that application reference ZG2023/0720/FULM has been resubmitted. The developments appear to be similar in nature and as such it is considered that the effects have been considered within the existing cumulative effects assessments. However, for clarity application reference ZG2023/0720/FULM has now been included within the Shortlist.</p> <p>ID74 – The Applicant notes that this application has now been granted consent. It is not considered that there would be a change to the cumulative effects assessments as a result.</p> <p>Given the above, the Applicant notes the change in status of these applications referenced and confirms that there is no change to the cumulative effects assessments as a result. The Shortlist of Cumulative Schemes presented in Appendix 17-1, ES Volume 2 has been updated and submitted at Deadline 2 to include these updates noted by North Yorkshire Council.</p>