YG-DCO-111

Yorkshire Green Energy Enablement (GREEN) Project

Volume 5

Document 5.2.21 Environmental Statement Addendum (Part 2)

Final Issue A

May 2023

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN020024

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 Regulation 5(2)(a)

nationalgrid

Page intentionally blank

Contents

Date	Version	Status	Description/Changes
10/05/2023	A	Final	First Issue

1. Introduction

1.1 Overview

1.1.1 This Addendum (**Document 5.2.21**) has been prepared and submitted at Deadline 3 to provide an update to the following documents forming part of the Environmental Statement (ES) for the Yorkshire Green Energy Enablement (GREEN) Project (referred to as Yorkshire GREEN or the Project).

- **ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity, Document 5.2.8, [APP-080];**
- **ES Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects, Document 5.2.18, [APP-090];**
- **ES Appendix 18A Cumulative Effects Assessment Long List of Other Developments, Document 5.3.18A, [APP-161];** and
- **ES Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects Figures, Document 5.4.18, [APP-194]**.

1.1.2 As noted in the Examining Authority's (ExA) Written Questions (ExQ1) **[PD-007]** this Addendum (**Document 5.2.21**) has been prepared to provide an update of the cumulative effects assessment (CEA) (**ES Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects, Document 5.2.18, [APP-090]**) in response to ExA question ExQ1.2.1. Since the submission of the ES in November 2022 additional potential developments have been identified which need to be considered as part of the CEA. In addition, updated information has been submitted in support of the Lumby Quarry Planning Application (NY/2022/0102/ENV) and this is also considered as part of this Environmental Statement Addendum (Part 2).

1.1.3 Furthermore, additional ecology surveys (bat roost surveys and important hedgerow surveys) have taken place since the ES submission, the results of which were submitted to the ExA at Deadline 2 in line with the ExA's request in Written Questions (ExQ1) **[PD-007]**. The methodology and results of additional preliminary ground level roost assessments (GLRAs) conducted between November 2022 and February 2023 and additional aerial tree-climbing bat roost inspection surveys conducted between February and April 2023, were submitted at Deadline 2 to the ExA as an update to **Appendix 8H Bat Survey Report (Document 5.2.8H(B)) [REP2-029]** and **Figure 8.26(B) (Document 5.4.8(B)) [REP2-033]**.

1.1.4 In addition, the methodology and results of important hedgerow surveys, conducted during April 2022, were submitted to the Examining Authority as an update to **Appendix 8B Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey Report (Document 5.3.8B(C)) [REP2-027]** and **Figure 8.6(B) (Document 5.4.8(B)) [REP2-033]**.

1.1.5 This Addendum provides an update to the baseline and assessment sections of ES Chapter 8 **(Document 5.2.8) [APP-080]** with respect to bats and hedgerows, taking into account the results of the post-submission surveys.

1.1.6 This Addendum has been prepared subsequent to the submission of the application for development consent and should be read in conjunction with the following documents:

- **ES Chapter 3 Description of the Project (Document 5.2.3) [APP-075];**
- **ES Chapter 6 Landscape and Visual (Document 5.2.6) [APP-078];**

- **ES Chapter 7 Historic Environment (Document 5.2.7) [APP-079];**
- **ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Document 5.2.8) [APP-080];**
- **ES Chapter 10 Geology & Hydrogeology (Document 5.2.10) [APP-082];**
- **ES Chapter 16 Socio-Economics (Document 5.2.16) [APP-088];**
- **ES Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects (Document 5.2.18) [APP-090];**
- **Code of Construction Practice (Document 5.3.3B) [APP-095];**
- **Appendix 18A Cumulative Effects Assessment Long List of Other Developments (Document 5.3.18A(B)) [APP-161];**
- **ES Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects Figures (Document 5.4.18(B)) [APP-194];**
- **ES Consolidated Errata (Document 5.2.19(B));**
- **Appendix 8B Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey Report (Document 5.3.8B(C)) [REP2-027];**
- **Appendix 8H Bat Survey Report (Document 5.2.8(B)) [REP2-029];**
- **Figure 8.26(B) (Document 5.4.8(B)) [REP2-033];** and
- **Figure 8.6(B) (Document 5.4.8(B)) [REP2-033]**.

1.1.7 Readers should note that this document (**Document 5.2.21**) only considers the additional potential developments identified in **Section 3**. There have been no changes to the remainder of the potential developments presented in the Long List, all of which have been detailed in **Appendix 18A Cumulative Effects Assessment Long List of Other Developments (Document 5.3.18A(B)) [APP-161]**.

1.1.8 Furthermore, this document (**Document 5.2.21**) only considers the implications of additional bat and hedgerow surveys on the conclusions of the biodiversity assessment within **ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity, (Document 5.2.8) [APP-080]**. No updates in relation to other receptors detailed within ES Chapter 8 are required.

1.1.9 Since the submission of the ES and associated documents to the ExA in November 2022, National Grid has identified a number of minor typographical corrections and clarifications to the ES, all of which are recorded in the **Environmental Statement Consolidated Errata (Document 5.2.19) [REP1-012]** submitted at Deadline 1 and revised at Deadline 3 **(Document 5.2.19(B))**. This Addendum **(Document 5.2.21)**should be read in conjunction with the updated ES Consolidated Errata **(Document 5.2.19(B))**submitted at Deadline 3.

2. Biodiversity Assessment

2.1 Current baseline - Bats

2.1.1 As stated in **Section 1.1** of this Addendum, additional bat roost surveys have taken place since the ES submission. The following sections of this document (**paragraphs 2.1.2 to 2.1.4**) incorporate the results of these surveys and should be read as updates to **paragraphs 8.5.50 and 8.5.58, Section 8.5 Current Baseline - Bats, ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Document 5.2.8) [APP-080]**.

2.1.2 Common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle and noctule were recorded within 30 minutes of sunset/sunrise during activity surveys suggesting roosts for these species may be present within close proximity to the Order Limits. Preliminary GLRAs at trees requiring removal or management as a result of the Project identified 158 trees with moderate to high potential to support roosting bats. During aerial tree-climbing roost inspections (or updated ground level assessments where climbing was not possible), a single confirmed roost was identified. A single pipistrelle bat (*Pipistrellus* sp.) was observed roosting within a south-facing rot hole within a tree on 09 March 2023. The timing of the survey indicates that it was being used as a hibernation roost. In view of the size and location of the roost feature it is likely that the tree may also provide occasional roosting habitat for a small number of bats during the bat active season (generally April to October).

2.1.3 Of the remaining trees, 49 were assessed as having High suitability to support roosting bats while 54 were assessed as having Moderate suitability to support roosting bats, with the remainder being down-graded to Low or Negligible potential based on the updated survey results.

2.1.4 The results of the bat roost and activity surveys suggest the bat assemblage recorded is typical of the county. The dominant habitat type throughout the Order Limits is arable land which is of low value in terms of the foraging and commuting opportunities. Results indicate treelines, hedgerows and ditches which bound arable fields provide foraging and commuting opportunities for bats within this arable landscape although only a low number of these features recorded higher levels of activity indicating a greater level of importance to local bat populations.

2.2 Assessment of effects- Bats

2.2.1 The following sections of this document (**paragraphs 2.2.2 to 2.2.5**) update the assessment of effects on bats to include the results of the post-submission surveys and should be read as updates to **paragraphs 8.9.95 to 8.9.97, Section 8.9 Assessment of effects: Bats (all species), ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Document 5.2.8) [APP-080]**.

2.2.2 In terms of bat roosting habitat, there is potential for the vegetation management required to facilitate construction activities, including maintenance of safety clearance beneath the existing and proposed overhead lines, to cause damage or destruction to bat roosts and death/injury of individuals in suitable trees. A single confirmed bat roost has been recorded during targeted surveys of trees to be removed or managed within the Order Limits. The roost was occupied by a single hibernating pipistrelle bat and may

provide roosting habitat for small numbers of bats during the active season. As such it is considered to represent a small intermittent roost for relatively common species.

2.2.3 The tree containing the roost was identified for removal in **Annex 3I.3** of the **Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Document 5.3.3I) [APP-104]** at the point of DCO submission in November 2022. Following the identification of the roost, in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy the Project design has been reviewed and updated to ensure the tree is retained. Based on the current condition of the tree, no management works are required and therefore the roost (and any bats using it) would not be subject to direct harm or disturbance[1]. There is a very low chance that minor pruning works may be required at the tree should a branch (which currently overhangs an access route) sag in the intervening period and obstruct access. These works would not directly affect the roost, which is located in the main trunk, but may cause minor temporary disturbance to any bats using the roost at the time. The tree condition (and therefore need for management) would be reviewed pre-construction, and if any works are required, embedded environmental measures: **1 – Pre-construction update surveys** and **16 – Protected species licences**, would ensure the updated status of the roost was assessed and an EPS licence (under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended)) obtained if required prior to any works proceeding, in order for the Project to proceed while avoiding contravening legislation. By default, an EPS licence does not allow for a significant negative effect on the favourable conservation status of those species affected.

2.2.4 Furthermore, embedded environmental measure **7 – Protection of ancient/veteran trees** ensures protection of the most mature trees within the Order Limits which are more likely to have suitable roosting cavities due to their age. In addition, tree removal would be mitigated with a scheme of mitigation planting (replacement planting) which would ensure no net loss in tree cover as detailed in the **Code of Construction Practice (Document 5.3.3B) [APP-095]**.

2.2.5 In order to mitigate the potential loss of available roosting features throughout the Order Limits, embedded environmental measure **17 – Installation of bat boxes** outlines that bat boxes would be erected at suitable locations as close as practicably possible to any trees with roosting potential which are removed. Boxes would be erected at a ratio of 2:1 for each tree removed with high/moderate potential to support roosting bats (but no evidence of confirmed roosting). The number of required boxes would be determined after completion of pre-construction update roost surveys based on the Project detailed design.

2.2.6 Therefore, the outcome of the assessment of effects on bats as stated **in paragraph 8.9.108**, **Section 8.9 Assessment of effects: Bats (all species), ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Document 5.2.8) [APP-080]** remains unchanged, that is:

*Given the low level of temporary negative change during construction and operation, the overall magnitude of change on bats is **low negative**, and the resultant effect on conservation status is **Not Significant** on an ecological feature of County importance.*

2.3 Current baseline - Hedgerows

2.3.1 As stated in **Section 1.1** of this document, important hedgerow surveys have taken place since the ES submission. The following section of this document (**paragraph**

[1] As the roost/bats within would not be subject to any licensable actions, it is not considered necessary to apply for a Letter of No Impediment (LoNI) from Natural England.

2.3.2) incorporates the results of these surveys and should be read as an update to **paragraph 8.5.35, Section 8.5 Current Baseline - Hedgerows, ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Document 5.2.8) [APP-080]**.

2.3.2 Of the nine hedgerows classed as potentially important under the Hedgerow Regulations based on biodiversity criteria, seven were accessible for detailed hedgerow surveys in April 2023, none of which were found to meet the criteria for classification as important. As of 30th April 2023, it had not been possible to access the two remaining hedgerows (due to landowner restrictions). Therefore, of the hedgerows/hedgerow sections that may be removed (105 in total), approximately 81% are considered to be important under the Hedgerow Regulations based on historic environment criteria; 17% are not important based on historic environment or biodiversity criteria; and 2% remain classed as potentially important based on biodiversity criteria due to lack of access to confirm status.

2.4 Assessment of effects - Hedgerows

2.4.1 The following sections of this document (**paragraphs 2.4.2 to 2.4.3**) update the assessment of effects on hedgerows to include the results of the post-submission surveys and should be read as updates to **paragraph 8.1.16, Section 8.1 Limitations and Assumptions; and Section 9, Assessment of effects: Hedgerows, ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Document 5.2.8) [APP-080]**.

2.4.2 For the purpose of the assessment, all hedgerows were assumed to qualify as Habitats of Principal Importance (HPI)[2] regardless of 'important' status. Furthermore, it was assumed that those nine hedgerows identified as 'potentially important' with respect to biodiversity criteria would qualify as 'important' following field-based hedgerow assessments.

2.4.3 Although detailed hedgerow surveys found seven of the potentially important hedgerows did not meet the criteria to be considered important under the Hedgerow Regulations, they remain classed as HPI for the purposes of the assessment.

2.4.4 Therefore, the outcome of the assessment of effects on hedgerows in biodiversity terms as stated in **paragraph 8.9.47, Section 8.9 Assessment of effects: Hedgerows, ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Document 5.2.8) [APP-080]** remains unchanged, that is:

*Given the low level of permanent negative change during construction and the low level of temporary negative change during operation, the overall magnitude of change on hedgerows is **low negative**, and the resultant effect on conservation status is **Not Significant** on an ecological feature of County importance.*

2.5 Significance conclusions

2.5.1 **Table 2.1** confirms that the assessment of effects on bats and hedgerows, taking into account the results of the additional post-submission surveys, remains unchanged from that within **Table 8.15 of ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Document 5.2.8) [APP-080]**.

[2] JNCC (2016). UK Biodiversity Action Plan; Priority Habitat Descriptions: Hedgerows. (Online) Available at: https://data.jncc.gov.uk/data/ca179c55-3e9d-4e95-abd9-4edb2347c3b6/UKBAP-BAPHabitats-17-Hedgerows.pdf (Accessed 02 May 2023).

Table 2.1 Summary of significance of effects – Bats and Hedgerows

Ecological feature and summary of predicted effects	Importance of ecological feature at Project level[1]	Magnitude of change[2]	Significance	Summary rationale
Ecological feature: Bats **Predicted effects:** Effects resulting from: land take/land use change; fragmentation of habitat; increased noise, vibration, light and movement levels	County	Low	Not Significant	Embedded environmental measures and habitat/species-specific measures would render effects to a level which would not affect the feature's Favourable Conservation Status.
Ecological feature: Hedgerows **Predicted effects:** Effects resulting from: land take/land use change; fragmentation of habitat	County	Low	Not Significant	Embedded environmental measures and habitat/species-specific measures would render effects to a level which would not affect the feature's Favourable Conservation Status.

3. Cumulative Effects Assessment

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 This Addendum (**Document 5.2.21**) presents the assessment of the likely significant effects of the Yorkshire Green Energy Enablement (GREEN) Project (referred to as the Project or Yorkshire GREEN throughout the ES) with respect to Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA).

3.1.2 The CEA assessment methodology which has been followed as part of this Addendum (**Document 5.2.21**) has remained unchanged from that presented within the **Section 18.4 of ES Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects (Document 5.2.18) [APP-090]**. In addition, the relevant legislation, planning policy and technical guidance identified in **Section 18.2** and consultation and engagement in **Section 18.3** are also unchanged.

3.1.3 This Addendum (**Document 5.2.21**) only provides an update to the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects. These are effects resulting from the Project combined with the same aspect-related effects generated by other developments to affect a common Receptor. The assessment should be read in conjunction with the Project description provided in **ES Chapter 3 Description of the Project (Document 5.2.3) [APP-075]**.

3.2 Assessment: Inter-project cumulative effects

Stage 1 Long List

3.2.1 In accordance with the cumulative effects methodology outlined in **Section 18.4** (**ES Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects (Document 5.2.18) [APP-090]**), additional proposed developments have been identified since the submission of the ES in November 2022 and included in the Cumulative effects long list. The additional proposed developments are provided in the matrix format suggested by the Planning Inspectorate in Advice Note Seventeen[3] in **Appendix 18A(B) Cumulative Effects Assessment Long List of Other Developments (Document 5.3.18A(B))** . The updated long list includes the additional potential developments identified between 01 September 2022 and 28 April 2023, presented as ID132 to ID137. **Appendix 18A(B)** also includes all other potential developments considered as part of the CEA submitted in November 2022.

Stage 2: Short List

3.2.2 The additional six potential developments added to the long list have been evaluated using the methodology outlined in **Section 18.4** (**ES Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects (Document 5.2.18) [APP-090]**). Of these six developments (see **Appendix 18A - Cumulative Effects Long List (Document 5.3.18A(B)=**), two have been added to the short list of other developments and assessed within the CEA, in accordance with the approach set out in **paragraphs 18.4.25 to 18.4.28** of **ES Chapter 18 Cumulative**

[3] Planning Inspectorate (2019). Advice note seventeen: Cumulative effects assessment relevant to nationally significant infrastructure projects, Version 2 (online). Available at: https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Advice-note17V4.pdf (Accessed October 2022)

Effects (Document 5.2.18) [APP-090]. The reasons for not including the other four developments have been provided in **Appendix 18A - Cumulative Effects Long List (Document 5.3.18A(B).**

3.2.3 The additional potential developments added to the short list are provided in **Table 3.1** and the location of these and other previously assessed developments on the short list are shown on **Figure 18.1(B), Document 5.4.18(B)**. Details of developments previously assessed as part of the short list can be found in **Table 18.9**, **ES Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects (Document 5.2.18) [APP-090]**.

Table 3.1 Additional developments added to Cumulative Effects Assessment short list

ID	Development, Tier and status of consent	Local Authority	Location, Distance and Direction from Order Limits	Aspects with Potential for Significant Cumulative Effects
135	2022/1295/SCP, EIA Scoping request for proposed development comprising 500 dwellings and public open space, Tier 2	North Yorkshire Council	Kelcbar Hill Tadcaster, within Order Limits	All aspects
136	22/01895/EIASN, Screening opinion in respect of ground mounted solar photovoltaic (PV) and battery storage development, including underground cable route, substation and ancillary equipment, Tier 2	City of York Council	Nether Poppleton, within Order Limits	All aspects

3.2.4 The following assumptions have been made in the assessment of cumulative effects:

- It is anticipated, as for the Project, that other developments will implement best practice measures during their respective construction phases which will help to mitigate adverse effects during construction and avoid potential cumulative effects should construction periods overlap with that of the Project.
- The assessment has been completed based on information relating to the other developments which is available within the public domain.
- It is assumed for the purposes of this assessment that the other developments will be at least partly operational by the time the Project is fully operational.
- Measures required to mitigate likely significant negative environmental effects arising from the other developments alone will be adopted as part of the implementation of those schemes.

Assessment by aspect

Landscape and visual

3.2.5 The residential development at Kelcbar Hill, Tadcaster (ID 135) has been scoped out of the cumulative LVIA because it is assessed that there would be no potential for significant cumulative landscape and visual effects with the Project. This conclusion is reached following review of the 2.3km separation distance between the proposed development and the infrastructure elements of the Project that have the potential for significant landscape and visual effects between the A64, Garnet Lane and the A659. The Visual Appraisal plan[4] of the residential development submitted with the scoping request includes a ZTV which indicates that intervening landform and woodland blocks would largely prevent visibility from receptors where there would also be views of the Project. Where minimal theoretical visibility of the upper parts of housing is indicated from receptors including parts of Garnet Lane, this would be largely prevented by roadside hedgerows restricting opportunities for sequential or successive cumulative visibility.

3.2.6 The ground mounted solar photovoltaic (PV) and battery storage development (ID 136) has the potential for significant cumulative landscape and visual effects with the Project and a detailed assessment is set out in **Table 3.2** below.

Table 3.2 Assessment of likely cumulative landscape and visual effects arising from the solar photovoltaic and battery storage development (ID 136)

Criteria	Description
Description of scheme ID 136 and landscape context	The scheme is split into two parcels (A to the south of Lords Lane and B to the north) and has a combined area of approximately 51 hectares with levels generally flat and varying between 14m to 17m AOD. Boundary hedgerows and woodland blocks would be retained. Panels would be up to a maximum of 3m above ground level.
Likely landscape effects arising from scheme ID136 only	Parcel B is located in the regional River Floodplain Landscape Character Type (LCT) and Parcel A is located within the Vale Farmland with Plantation Woodland and Heathland LCT illustrated in **Figure 6.12 (Document 5.4.6) [APP-167]**. There is the potential for adverse effects upon landscape character in these LCT, particularly from the development on the larger Parcel B closer to the River Ouse, however this is predicted to be largely contained within the site boundary with boundary hedgerows and woodland blocks retained and potentially reinforced. The likely landscape mitigation strategy in combination with the essentially flat topography would limit the potential for significant effects on landscape character.

4 Barton Willmore (2023). Visual Appraisal Plan (online) available at: https://publicaccess1.selby.gov.uk/PublicAccess_LIVE/Document/ViewDocument?id=CE4DA88D771B4BDE84140075F4C0309C (Accessed May 2023)

Criteria	Description
Likely visual effects arising from scheme ID136 only	A public footpath flanked by a clipped hedgerow follows the southern boundary of parcel B and the public rights of way (PRoW) network along the River Ouse corridor is located approximately 200m to the north where occasional glimpses, restricted by intervening vegetation, may result in localised adverse visual effects with reference to Viewpoint 4 in **Figure 6.28 (Document 5.4.6) [APP-168]**. Views of the proposals from scattered residential properties in the locality including dwellings on Scagglethorpe Moor (New Farm, Woodhouse Farm, Thickpenny Farm) and dwellings on the edge of Upper Poppleton and Nether Poppleton, would likely be predominantly screened at ground floor level by intervening buildings and vegetation.
Likely cumulative landscape effects arising from the addition of the Project to a baseline that includes scheme ID136	Assuming the prior presence of the construction and/or operation of the proposed development (ID136) which is unlikely to result in significant landscape character effects, the addition of the Project would itself result in significant localised effects during the construction phase on the River Floodplain Landscape Character Type (LCT). These significant effects would overlap with the northern edge of the proposed development (ID136) resulting in **potentially significant cumulative effects** on landscape character, that would be temporary in nature (up to 2 years).
Likely cumulative visual effects arising from the addition of the Project to a baseline that includes scheme ID136	Assuming the prior presence of the construction and/or operation of the proposed development (ID136) which is unlikely to result in significant visual amenity effects on users of nearby PRoW or ground floor views from scattered dwellings on Scagglethorpe Moor, the addition of the Project would result in significant localised visual effects during the construction phase only. There is the potential for limited combined, successive and/or sequential visibility of the Project and the proposed development (ID136) from localised sections of PRoW on Scagglethorpe Moor and from PRoW along the River Ouse corridor including four long distance footpaths. The greatest contribution to the **potentially significant cumulative visual effects** would be views of the Project comprising decommissioning and realignment of the 275kV XC/XCP overhead line, with additional temporary structures including scaffolding at two locations close to the river and six temporary pylons. Visual clutter would occur due to the simultaneous presence for up to 2 years of the existing, temporary and replacement pylons in this relatively open landscape.

Historic environment

3.2.7 Cumulative effects on heritage assets can arise either because of:

- loss of or disturbance to heritage assets or areas of heritage interest arising from construction or other activities related to more than one development; or
- increased harm to the setting of a heritage asset as a result of more than one development.

3.2.8 The following two developments were identified as presenting potential for cumulative effects in terms of historic environment receptors: a housing development for 500 dwellings at Kelcbar Hill Tadcaster (ID135); and a ground mounted solar photovoltaic (PV) and battery storage development west of Nether Poppleton (ID136), both of which intersect the Order Limits.

3.2.9 Elements of the Project close to ID135 include the refurbishment of pylons XC473 and XC472. No effects to the significance of historic environment receptors in this area were identified. For this reason, no cumulative effects to historic environment receptors are expected regarding ID135.

3.2.10 **Section 7.14** of **ES Chapter 7 Historic Environment (Document 5.2.7) [APP-079]** identified a low magnitude of change to the setting of Overton Grange, a non-designated asset of low heritage significance, resulting from a change to views to the southwest. There is therefore a potential for some cumulative effect arising from ID136 and the Project being visible in the same view but given that the assessment resulted in a low magnitude change to an asset of low heritage significance, it is considered that the inclusion of ID136 will not give rise to a significant cumulative effect.

Biodiversity

3.2.11 An approximate 0.04ha area of poor semi-improved grassland is within both the proposed development ID135 and the Order Limits of the Project. At this location, the Project comprises a trackway access route and a temporary bridge to existing pylon XC472 on the existing 275kV Monk Fryston to Poppleton XC overhead line, trackway access route from pylon XC472 to scaffold immediately south of the River Wharfe, and there is an additional scaffold along the A659. Project works would comprise reconductoring of the existing overhead line.

3.2.12 Proposed development ID135 is at the scoping stage with an EIA to follow, therefore there is no detailed information available on the likely effects at this stage. As such, the assessment below is based on the information within the scoping report[5] which has identified a number of potentially significant effects which may result from the development, and the scoping response provided by Natural England. The potential for these effects to act in-combination with effects arising from the Project is addressed below.

3.2.13 ID135 would lead to loss of low value habitats within the site, principally arable and grassland habitat. It is assumed that habitat loss may include a small area (up to 0.04ha) of poor semi-improved grassland which overlaps with the Project Order Limits. As habitats are of low value, and losses arising from the Project in the vicinity of ID135 would be minimal and temporary, no significant adverse cumulative effects relating to habitat loss or the effects of habitat loss on protected and priority species are likely. Significant cumulative adverse effects on protected and priority species resulting from disturbance during construction are unlikely in view of the embedded environmental measures as described for each species scoped into the assessment in **Section 8.9, ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Document 5.2.8) [APP-080])** which would minimise disturbance effects.

3.2.14 The potential for effects on biodiversity features resulting from dust generation and pollution as a result of the Project have been scoped out of the assessment **(paragraph 8.7.16, ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Document 5.2.8) [APP-080])**. Therefore, there is

[5] Terence O Rouke (2022) EIA Scoping report: Kelcbar Hill, Tadcaster. Accessed May 2023: Kelcbar Hill Tadcaster scoping report (selby.gov.uk)

no risk of significant cumulative adverse effects on habitats (including the River Wharfe) from dust generation and pollution during the construction phase of ID135. There is also no risk of significant long-term cumulative adverse effects on retained habitats or protected and priority species resulting from increased recreational use and associated disturbance attributed to the housing development post-construction, as any disturbance arising from the Project would be short-term and temporary.

3.2.15 Although the risk of cumulative adverse effects on internationally important nature conservation sites from increased wastewater discharge to the River Wharfe has been referred to in the scoping report for ID135, there is no risk of the Project contributing to this effect as there is no release of wastewater to the River Wharfe. In addition, there is no risk of cumulative adverse effects on nationally designated biodiversity sites (scoped out of the Project assessment) or locally designated SINCs (those within 2km of ID135 are scoped out of the Project assessment) (see **Appendix 8A Scoping of Assessment Summary (Document 5.3.8A) [APP-126]**).

3.2.16 In summary, although the scoping report for ID135 lists a number of potentially significant effects (including the potential for cumulative effects) on biodiversity features, there are no likely significant adverse cumulative effects resulting from ID135 and the Project.

3.2.17 An approximate 3.5ha area of arable field and its hedgerow boundaries lie within both the proposed development ID136 and the Order Limits of the Project. At this location, the Project comprises scaffold and trackway access routes, dismantling of pylon XCP007, construction of a new build pylon XC422 and a temporary pylon XCP006BT within the same field as the proposed development ID136. As ID136 is currently at the screening stage there is no detailed information available on the likely effects at this stage. As such, the assessment below is based on the information within the screening report[6] which concludes that there is no potential for adverse significant effects on biodiversity features, or any likely cumulative effects.

3.2.18 In consideration of the low value habitat affected and limited potential for effects on protected and notable species, both projects alone would not have any significant effects on biodiversity features. As a reasonable worst case, should the construction phases for ID136 and the Project occur at the same time, both could affect the same features, however given the embedded environmental measures that would be implemented for both, significant cumulative adverse effects are considered unlikely.

Hydrology

3.2.19 The CEA assesses the combined effects of the Project with other developments on the same hydrology or flood risk Receptor and the contribution of the Project to those impacts. For all developments assessed it is assumed that good industry practice measures for runoff and silt management and pollution prevention would be successfully implemented during construction such as those set out in Pollution Prevention Guidance notes[7] and CIRIA's Environmental Good Practice on Site[8].

---

[6] ARCUS (2022) EIA screening report: Poppleton Solar Farm Accessed May 2023: 22_01895_EIASN-EIA_SCREENING_REPORT-2516664.pdf (york.gov.uk)

7 NetRegs (2021). Guidance for Pollution Prevention (GPPs) - Full list. 2021. (Online) (Accessed 12 July 2022).

8 56 Charles, P. and Connely, S. (2005) Environmental Good Practice Site Guide (second edition). C650. London: CIRIA.

3.2.20 For both of the additional proposed developments, the scope for potential hydrological cumulative effects is considered to be restricted to the construction phase. This is because the works associated with the Project at both locations are restricted to works associated with overhead lines. Once works are completed the overhead lines would have minimal impact on hydrology in their locality, either because pylons already exist (as in the vicinity of ID135) or because new pylons would have a minimal surface footprint (as with the new pylons in the vicinity of ID136).

3.2.21 Cumulative effects during construction could only arise if the construction activities associated with the Project and the additional proposed developments were coincident. Even if this were the case, the implementation of good industry practice in runoff management for both the Project and the additional proposed developments would be sufficient to avoid potentially significant cumulative effects on hydrology receptors.

Geology and Hydrogeology

3.2.22 The two developments listed in **Table 3.1** fall within the Geology and Hydrogeology Zone of Influence (ZoI) for the consideration of cumulative effects, which is 1km from the Order Limits (as defined in **ES Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects (Document 5.2.18) [APP-090]**).

3.2.23 UK legislation and planning policy requires risks to human health and Controlled Waters from land contamination (and also risks from geohazards) to be appropriately managed such that a development site is suitable for its proposed use. It is therefore assumed that the developments within the geology ZoI comply with legislation and planning policy regarding the management and control of ground contamination. On this basis significant cumulative effects in relation to the mobilisation of pre-existing contamination are considered very unlikely. This is verified by consideration of the available information regarding the two proposed developments, as described below.

3.2.24 The EIA Scoping Report for Development ID135[5] identifies that no significant effects are predicted on human health or the water environment from the mobilisation of, or contact with, existing contamination during or post-construction. The EIA Scoping Report also states that no significant geotechnical effects are predicted during or post-construction. The EIA Scoping Report for Development ID135 does, however, identify the potential for significant effects on groundwater in the Principal Aquifer (limestone) that underlies this proposed development site. These effects may be chemical (i.e. deterioration in groundwater quality due to contamination caused by construction activities), or physical (i.e. change in aquifer recharge due to impermeable surfacing on currently vegetated land). The EIA Scoping Report states that, with the implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan and a suitable SuDS strategy, the effects on groundwater would be expected to be "negligible or low". The corresponding effects for the Project are assessed as negligible or minor (as described in **ES Chapter 10 Geology & Hydrogeology (Document 5.2.10) [APP-082]**) and it is not considered that any cumulative effect would exceed this.

3.2.25 The EIA Screening Report for development ID136[6] states that the proposed development site is greenfield land and that there is negligible risk of encountering contaminated soils. It concludes that there is no potential for significant effects in relation to land contamination or water quality, with the development work to be controlled under a Construction Environmental Management Plan. Given the negligible risk identified by the EIA Screening Report, it is considered that there is no potential for significant cumulative effects in relation to contamination or water quality when considering this proposed development along with the Project.

3.2.26 It is also considered that there is no potential for significant cumulative hydrogeological effects in relation to development ID136, as that site is located on Unproductive Strata (Alne Glaciolacustrine Formation) and the nature of the development (solar farm) would not be expected to require or cause any interaction with deeper groundwater receptors beneath the Alne Glaciolacustrine Formation deposits (as would also be the case for the Project, in accordance with the assessments provided in **ES Chapter 10 Geology & Hydrogeology (Document 5.2.10) [APP-082]**).

3.2.27 Therefore, it is concluded that the potential for significant cumulative effects between the Project and either development ID135 or development ID136 in relation to Geology and Hydrogeology is negligible, based on the information currently available regarding development IDs135 and 136.

Agriculture and soils

3.2.28 Those developments which fall within the Agriculture and Soil Zone of Influence (**Table 18.7, ES Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects (Document 5.2.18) [APP-090]**) have the potential to result in cumulative effects with the Project as a result of the total loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land and also as a result of disturbance and loss of soils. **Table 3.3** below provides an update of this assessment to include developments ID135 and ID136.

3.2.29 Paragraph 11.4.9 of ES Chapter 11 Agriculture and Soils **(Document 5.2.11) [APP-083]** outlines that where detailed ALC survey information is not available and where the land is provisionally mapped as Grade 3 and mapped as High Likelihood of BMV land, it has been considered as Subgrade 3a, whereas land which is Provisionally mapped as Grade 3 and mapped as Moderate Likelihood of BMV has been split 50/50 between Subgrades 3a and Subgrade 3b. This approach provides a reasonable worst-case approach to the assessment where detailed ALC survey information is not available.

3.2.30 Based on the above approach, the likelihood of BMV land (from Natural England's 2017 Likelihood of Best and Most Versatile Land Map) was used to determine the ALC breakdown of Grade 3 agricultural land in Table 3.3. Proposed development ID135 is located on an area of High BMV likelihood so the assumption has been made that the land is subgrade 3a. Proposed development ID136 is located on an area of Moderate BMV likelihood so the assumption has been made that there is a 50/50 split between Subgrade 3a and Subgrade 3b.

Table 3.3 Addendum to Table 18.11 Chapter 18, (Document 5.2.18) [APP-090]

ID	Development, Tier and status of consent	Local Authority	Location, Distance and Direction from Order Limits	Aspects with Potential for Significant Cumulative Effects	ALC Breakdown	Permanent and Temporary land loss or soil disturbance
135	2022/1295/SCP, EIA Scoping request for proposed development comprising 500	North Yorkshire Council	Kelcbar Hill Tadcaster, within	All aspects	Grade 2-14.7 ha Grade 3-10.73 (unclear as to	Permanent loss

ID	Development, Tier and status of consent	Local Authority	Location, Distance and Direction from Order Limits	Aspects with Potential for Significant Cumulative Effects	ALC Breakdown	Permanent and Temporary land loss or soil disturbance
	dwellings and public open space, Tier 2		Order Limits		how the grades have been broken down so an assumption has been made that Grade 3 land is Subgrade 3a) Subgrade 3a-2.08 ha Subgrade 3b-1.5 ha	
136	22/01895/EIASN, Screening opinion in respect of ground mounted solar photovoltaic (PV) and battery storage development, including underground cable route, substation and ancillary equipment, Tier 2	City of York Council	Nether Poppleton, within Order Limits	All aspects	Grade 3 and Grade 4 (areas undefined) and will be subject to site-specific survey to confirm ALC grades. Total proposed area for development is 51 ha which are mapped as a moderate BMV likelihood, so a 50/50 split has been assumed. 25.5 ha of Subgrade 3a and 25.5 ha	Long term temporary, may also be used for grazing during operational phase.

ID	Development, Tier and status of consent	Local Authority	Location, Distance and Direction from Order Limits	Aspects with Potential for Significant Cumulative Effects	ALC Breakdown	Permanent and Temporary land loss or soil disturbance
					of Subgrade 3b	

3.2.31 The proposed development ID135 of 500 dwellings and public open space at Kelcbar Hill, Tadcaster falls within the Order Limits of the Project. The proposed development would overlap with the Project's Order Limits where the reconductoring works are proposed to the existing XC 275KV overhead line west of Tadcaster. The Scoping Report for ID135 details that the site is made up of 35.82 hectares (comprised of a northern parcel of 31.39 ha and a smaller southern parcel of land of 4.43 ha). Given that development ID135 is still at the scoping stage, there is insufficient detailed information at this stage to entirely assess cumulative effects and their significance.

3.2.32 The Scoping Report however does detail the following:

- "*The proposed development will lead to the loss of approximately 29 ha of land from agricultural production and the associated loss of soils within the area proposed for built development, although these will be retained within the green space*".
- The Scoping Report also states that *"given the relatively small area of land to be lost in relation to the total area of agricultural land in Selby district (47,488 ha in 2021), and the fact that no grade 1 land will be lost, it is considered that this is a negligible effect that will not be significant*".
- The Scoping Report also details the loss of agricultural land and soils on the site as of 'medium to high' receptor importance sensitivity and of a 'negligible' and 'long term' magnitude.

3.2.33 As visible in the ALC breakdown (**Table 3.2**) there is the potential loss of 27.51 ha of BMV land (including Grade 2, Grade 3, Subgrade 3a).

3.2.34 Consideration of the proposed development ID135 places it in the category of a development where more than 20 ha of land would be permanently lost from agricultural use and would constitute a major magnitude of change.

3.2.35 However, as discussed in **Paragraph 18.6.61** of **ES Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects (Document 5.2.18) [APP-090])**, assuming that the proposed development follows the best practice mitigation measures that are industry standard it is expected that the damage to soil resources would be similar to that of the Project and the risk of damage reduced.

3.2.36 The proposed development ID136 for a mounted solar photovoltaic (PV) and battery storage development, including underground cable route, substation and ancillary equipment near Nether Poppleton overlaps with the Project's Order Limits where the removal of the existing XC overhead line is proposed near Nether Poppleton. Given that development ID136 is still at the screening stage, there is insufficient information at this stage to assess cumulative effects and their significance.

3.2.37 However, the Screening Report has identified that from publicly available information the majority of the proposed development site is of Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3 and the surrounding area is a mix of Grade 3 and Grade 4. The site is made up of two parcels of land, an area of 22 ha and an area of 29 ha (total 51 ha). Using the approach detailed in Paragraph 3.5.25 and 3.5.26, an assumption has been made in **Table 3.2** that there is a 50/50 split of Grade 3 agricultural land (so the site encompasses 25.5 ha of Subgrade 3a and 25.5 ha of Subgrade 3b) to assess the potential effects of the development at this stage.

3.2.38 The Screening Report states:

- A site-specific ALC Survey will be carried out to confirm specific grades.
- If the land is classified as BMV land a 'sequential test' will be submitted alongside the application thus determining whether or not there is potential to locate the proposed development on lower quality agricultural land. The Screening Report does also state that there is "*no prohibition on the use of good quality agricultural land for solar outlined in the NPPF and PPG*".

3.2.39 Regarding the potential effects of the proposed development and the future agricultural use of the site, the Screening Report states:

- "…*the temporary nature of the Proposed Development (which would not lead to an irreversible loss of the land which would be reinstated after the Proposed Development is decommissioned) means that the land use at the Site is not considered to be sensitive to the type of development proposed and there is no potential for significant effects*".
- "…*there is the potential for agricultural land use to continue in conjunction with the Development once it is operational, in the form of sheep grazing amongst the solar panels*".

3.2.40 Consideration of the proposed development ID136 places it in the category of a development where the land can be reinstated to agriculture and would constitute a minor magnitude of change as highlighted in **Paragraph 18.6.57** of **ES Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects (Document 5.2.18) [APP-090]**.

3.2.41 As discussed in **Section 18.6.61** of **ES Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects (Document 5.2.18) [APP-090]**, assuming that the proposed development follows the best practice mitigation measures that are industry standard it is expected that the damage to soil resources would be similar to that of the Project and the risk of damage reduced.

3.2.42 The cumulative developments listed in **Table 18.11** of **ES Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects (Document 5.2.18) [APP-090]** comprise a total of 135.2 ha on BMV agricultural land (ALC Grades 1, 2 and 3a) and 83.9 ha on non-BMV land (Grades 3b, 4 and 5). The addition of the two proposed developments (ID135 and ID136) has the potential to increase the cumulative total BMV detailed in **Paragraph 18.6.57** of **ES Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects (Document 5.2.18) [APP-090]** to a figure of 188.21 ha and non BMV land of a cumulative area of 110.9 ha.

3.2.43 Proposed development ID135 would fall into the category "more than 20 ha where land would be lost permanently from agricultural use would constitute a major magnitude of change" of **Paragraph 18.6.57** of **ES Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects (Document 5.2.18) [APP-090]**.

3.2.44 Proposed development ID136 would fall into the category "less than 5.0 ha in size or where land may be reinstated to agricultural use in the future would constitute a minor

magnitude of change" of **Paragraph 18.6.57** of **ES Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects (Document 5.2.18) [APP-090]**.

3.2.45 Assuming that all proposed developments follow the best practice mitigation measures that are industry standard it is expected that the damage to soil resources would be similar to that of the Project, (i.e. the risk of damage would be reduced to a level where there is no change in soil resource quality, or there would be a temporary/reversible change to soil resources). **Paragraph 18.6.59** of **ES Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects (Document 5.2.18) [APP-090]** concluded that there would be a significant adverse cumulative effect on BMV land after taking into account the scale and magnitude of effects on BMV land from the other proposed developments considered in the CEA and the sensitivity of the soils in the region. The additional two proposed developments (ID135 and ID136) would not change the assessment of **Paragraph 18.6.59** of **Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects (Document 5.2.18) [APP-090].**

3.2.46 **Paragraph 18.6.60** of **ES Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects (Document 5.2.18) [APP-090]** concluded that the impact on soil resources is therefore likely to also be a cumulative significant effect with less than 25% of soil resources retained on sites as the nature of the proposed developments are predominantly of a type which would result in large volumes of surplus soils being produced, leading to the loss of soil resource which cannot be confirmed to be re-used sustainably within the region. The additional two proposed developments (ID135 and ID136) would not change the assessment of **Paragraph 18.6.60** of **Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects (Document 5.2.18) [APP-090]**.

3.2.47 **Paragraph 18.6.61 of ES Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects (Document 5.2.18) [APP-090]** concluded that there would be no significant cumulative adverse effects in terms of damage to soil resources and this is assuming that all proposed developments follow the best practice mitigation measures that are industry standard. It is expected that the damage to soil resources would be similar to that of the Project, (i.e. the risk of damage would be reduced to a level where there is no change in soil resource quality, or there would be a temporary/reversible change to less than 25% of soil resources, (equivalent to damage done by typical farm machinery traffic)). The additional two proposed developments (ID135 and ID136) would not change the assessment of **Paragraph 18.6.61** of **Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects (Document 5.2.18) [APP-090]**.

Air Quality

3.2.48 The developments in **Table 3.1** have the potential to result in cumulative effects with the Project due to construction dust effects. Air quality effects from construction traffic emissions are accounted for in the future traffic growth predictions factored into the traffic modelling.

3.2.49 Significant cumulative dust effects from the residential development (ID35) are not likely. The proposed residential development will be required to undertake a dust assessment and develop appropriate dust measures. This will ensure that their impacts are negligible. The Project's **CoCP** (**Document 5.3.3B [APP-095]**) includes the dust measures that will also ensure no significant impacts. Therefore, standard construction management measures would mitigate potential cumulative dust effects should the construction phase for this development overlap with the construction of the Project.

3.2.50 Regarding the solar farm project (ID136), dust impacts would again be mainly associated with the construction phase; standard construction management measures would mitigate potential cumulative dust effects should the construction phase for this development overlap with the construction of the Project.

3.2.51 Therefore, for both of the additional proposed developments ID135 or ID136, no additional cumulative effects relating to air quality have been identified.

Noise and Vibration

3.2.52 The proposed development boundaries shown in the Scoping Report for Development ID135 and the Screening Request for Development ID136 overlap with the Project Order Limits but only along a short section of access land and a small section along the XC overhead line route.

ID135 – North Yorkshire Council - 2022/1295/SCP – Tadcaster residential development

3.2.53 Although ID135 is located near to the XC 275kV overhead line, this will be a like for like replacement of overhead line so the baseline noise climate is unlikely to be affected by the operation of the Project at the location of the proposed housing. Transient noise effects at nearby receptors may occur if works to pylons XC472 and XC473 coincide with the ID135 construction phase, however these would be of a short duration and would likely be dominated by the ID135 works which are proposed to be much closer to residential areas of Tadcaster than the XC 275kV overhead lines.

ID136 – City of York Council - 22/01895/EIASN – Nether Poppleton Solar Farm

3.2.54 The screening assessment for ID136 identifies that construction would take place over a short duration, as minimal excavations are required. The potential adverse effects of noise and vibration during construction are considered to be limited to specific locations within the ID136 construction site, and only for short periods.

3.2.55 It is considered that cumulative noise effects (i.e between Yorkshire GREEN and ID136) are unlikely, but are possible at the nearest sensitive receptors, New Farm, and Woodhouse Farm, Receptor ID YOR08 in the ES (**Noise and Vibration Chapter 14 Document 5.2.14) [APP-086]**. These receptors are **not significant** due to the short duration of the works being below the temporal threshold.

3.2.56 National Grid will continue to follow the progress of the proposed development and determine if there will be programme overlaps. Where significant cumulative impact is determined at any sensitive receptor from the accumulated developments, the National Grid will provide the Nether Poppleton Solar Farm developer an updated programme to allow the Solar Farm developer to inform their mitigation plan and minimise impact upon the nearest receptors.

Health and Wellbeing

3.2.57 The health and wellbeing assessment inherently considers cumulative effects as its findings are based on the conclusions of other assessment disciplines, Landscape and Visual Amenity, Air Quality, Noise and Vibration, and Socio-economics.

3.2.58 In relation to ID135, the findings of the topic assessments presented in this Addendum indicate that there would be no cumulative effects and as such there would be no cumulative effects on health and wellbeing relating to this development.

3.2.59 For development ID136 the Landscape and Visual assessment concludes that there is potential for adverse cumulative visual effects on users of nearby PRoWs including Footpath 10.115/2/3 and the Yorkshire Ouse Walk, for a two year period during construction. The Air Quality assessment (see **paragraphs 3.5.44 to 3.5.47**) and Noise and Vibration assessment (see **paragraphs 3.5.48 to 3.5.52**) both find that there would

be no significant cumulative effects likely to arise on any of the identified receptors, including PRoW users. The Socio-economics assessment (see **paragraphs 3.5.56 to 3.5.58**) concludes that there would be no significant cumulative effects arising in relation to amenity of PRoW users. When taking account of these findings overall in consideration of effects on PRoW users, it is assessed that there would be no cumulative effect on health and wellbeing relating to development ID136.

Socio-economics

3.2.60 The proposed development boundaries shown in the Scoping Request for Development ID135 and Screening Request for Developments ID136 overlap with the Order Limits but only along a short section of land required for access to the Project, and a small section along the XC overhead line route. There are no identified receptors in these locations and therefore no cumulative direct effects can occur.

3.2.61 For amenity effects, the Air Quality (see **paragraphs 3.5.44 to 3.5.47**) and Noise and Vibration sections (see **paragraphs 3.5.48 to 3.5.52**) of this Addendum find that there would be no significant cumulative effects likely to arise on any of the identified receptors. The Landscape and Visual section concludes that there is potential for adverse cumulative visual effects with Development ID136 on users of nearby PRoWs including Footpath 10.115/2/3 and the Yorkshire Ouse Walk, for a two year period during construction. **ES Chapter 16: Socio-Economics (Document 5.2.16) [APP-088]** identifies that significant effects can occur for amenity impacts where two significant effects are identified, with at least one being major in nature (**Paragraphs 16.7.10 to 16.7.13**) and that neither Footpath 10.115/2/3 or the Yorkshire Ouse Walk would experience a significant socio-economic amenity effect. As only one significant cumulative effect is identified for the receptor, no significant cumulative amenity effects can occur on these receptors.

3.2.62 Neither Development ID135 or ID136 consider that employment generation or other economic activity should be scoped into the EIA (and ID136 has been confirmed as non-EIA development by City of York Council). Therefore no cumulative economic effects are predicted.

3.3 Lumby Quarry planning application

3.3.1 Further information has recently been submitted in support of the Lumby Quarry planning application (NY/2022/0102/ENV, ID109) located north-west of Monk Fryston Substation and east of the A1(M). This information has been reviewed in order to identify if there are changes to the significance of cumulative effects conclusions set out in **ES Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects (Document 5.2.18) [APP-090]**.

3.3.2 Following review of the LVIA Supplementary Information dated March 2023[9] that includes an updated cumulative assessment, photomontages, detailed cross sections and clarification on the landscape strategy it is assessed that the significance of cumulative landscape and visual effects in the original **ES Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects (Document 5.2.18) [APP-090]** remain unchanged. The overall cumulative landscape effects from the presence of both Lumby Quarry and the Project would be minor adverse and Not Significant. No significant cumulative visual effects would be

9 David Jarvis Associates (2023). LVIA Supplementary Environmental Information (online) available at: https://onlineplanningregister.northyorks.gov.uk/Register/PlanAppDisp.aspx?recno=11568 https://publicaccess1.selby.gov.uk/PublicAccess_LIVE/Document/ViewDocument?id=CE4DA88D771B4BDE84140075F4C0309C (Accessed May 2023)

experienced from any receptors including the PRoW along Red Hill Lane, users of the A63 and Rawfield Lane and residents of Lumby, Peckfield Lodge, Pollums House Farm, and Monk Fryston Lodge.

3.3.3 The assessment of cumulative biodiversity effects identified that in the short-term there would be significant adverse cumulative effects due to the potential that some areas of the Lumby Quarry boundary planting along the A63 would need to be temporarily removed to facilitate the Project construction works and re-instated post construction. However, in the long term these effects would reduce to negligible and not significant. The significance of cumulative effects on biodiversity features remain unchanged.

3.3.4 In terms of the historic environment, elements of the Project in this area comprise the refurbishment of pylon XC514. No effects to historic environment receptors in this area were identified. For this reason, no cumulative effects to historic environment receptors are expected.

3.3.5 With respect to noise, a review of the sound impact assessment prepared on behalf of Stone Cliff Aggregates Ltd to accompany the application, has noted that the quarry workings are unlikely to generate significant sound levels at sensitive receptors. As such, the quarry noise impacts and those of Yorkshire GREEN are not expected to give rise to significant cumulative noise impacts.

3.4 Significance Conclusions

3.4.1 In relation to inter-related cumulative effects, the following additional significant cumulative effects have been concluded since the submission of the ES, (**ES Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects (Document 5.2.18) [APP-090]**), as a result of the additional proposed developments identified.

3.4.2 Screening opinion in respect of ground mounted solar photovoltaic (PV) and battery storage development (22/01895/EIASN, ID136):

- Potentially significant cumulative effects on landscape character, that would be temporary in nature (up to 2 years).

  Potentially significant cumulative visual effects, that would be temporary in nature (up to 2 years).

National Grid plc
National Grid House,
Warwick Technology Park,
Gallows Hill, Warwick.
CV34 6DA United Kingdom

Registered in England and Wales
No. 4031152