

Hope Moor Wind Farm

Local Evidence, Scoping, and the Environmental Statement

A community perspective

Steve Myers
28/07/2026

Contents

Executive Summary	3
Background	5
Scoping request	5
Community evidence	6
Main conclusions.....	7
Overall assessment	7
High-level opinion	7
Evidence vulnerability	8
Community evidence tracking	9
The value of community evidence	10
The community's exclusion from Olsen's scoping exercise	10
The basis for community input into scoping	11
How CRIC entered the scoping record	12
The evidential value of community input	13
Council representations of community views	14
Reliability of Olsen's Scoping Request.....	16
Strategic implications for the next phase.....	18
Appendix A – Receptors and pathways checklist	20
Appendix B – Artificial intelligence statement	32

Executive Summary

This report provides a review of the Scoping Opinion and related documents for the proposed Hope Moor Wind Farm. It is the author's personal assessment from a community perspective. The aims of the review are to:

- support the use of relevant local knowledge to improve the coverage and quality of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Environmental Statement (ES);
- establish the extent to which community evidence has entered the assessment framework; and
- identify key risks to that evidence being followed through into the ES.

The Planning Inspectorate's (PINS') Scoping Opinion for Hope Moor Wind Farm is a mixed result. PINS did not simply accept the narrow scope proposed by Fred Olsen Renewables (Olsen). Many proposed exclusions were refused, qualified, or made conditional on further evidence and agreement with relevant consultation bodies. However, many community-identified receptors and pathways are not expressly named, including private water supplies, Newsham Village Green, integrated residential setting, combined disturbance, and other local receptors identified through the Community Receptor Identification Consultation (CRIC) report.

Their absence from the Scoping Opinion does not necessarily mean that they have been excluded. However, it does mean there is no clear assurance that they will be assessed in the EIA and ES, or assessed in the integrated way requested by the community. The main risks are therefore twofold:

1. that community-identified issues may be scoped out later by agreement; and
2. that they may be lost through fragmentation, inadequate tracking, or lack of attention to their preservation through the EIA and into the ES.

A central issue is the status of community evidence in scoping, where that evidence has been gathered through a structured receptor-identification exercise. Although Olsen did not seek or accept structured community input into the development of its Scoping Request, recent Planning Act 2008 guidance supports the relevance of local knowledge, including the identification of environmental effects, which can reduce

the risk of relevant issues being missed from the ES.¹ The CRIC report was designed for that purpose: to identify receptors and pathways for inclusion in the scope of the EIA and ES. The value of that community evidence is shown by the Scoping Opinion, in which many of the matters identified through CRIC remain within scope.

Looking forward to the EIA, the treatment of community evidence by consultation bodies is now particularly important. Although Newsham Parish Council and Durham County Council placed the CRIC report before PINS, North Yorkshire Council (NYC) did not, despite being provided with it. This raises questions over the degree to which NYC will integrate community evidence into its work as part of the process for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects. Such integration will be critical in the next stages that lead to the production of the ES.

In addition, PINS identified several issues in the Scoping Request which, in the author's view, raise questions about the consistency, completeness, and reliability of Olsen's scoping material. This matters because Olsen is responsible for managing the EIA process, including how community-identified receptors and pathways are carried forward into the ES. This concern is heightened by the risk register in Olsen's Programme Document, which presents the community as a project risk but does not identify the absence of community local knowledge at the scoping stage as a risk to the coverage or quality of the ES.

The practical conclusion is that community receptors and pathways now need active protection through the remainder of the pre-application process. Otherwise, there remains a serious risk that locally identifiable effects will be omitted not because they are insignificant, but because the community evidence was never properly carried through the assessment process.

¹ *Planning Act 2008: Guidance on preparing an application – Part 1: Pre-application steps*, <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/planning-act-2008-guidance-on-preparing-an-application-part-1-pre-application-steps>, published on 3 July 2026; see paras. 3.2, 4.12, 6.15, and 6.16.

Background

Scoping request

On 29th May 2026, the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) published a Scoping Request² for Hope Moor Wind Farm, which had been submitted to PINS by Fred Olsen Renewables (Olsen). The document represents the scope that Olsen was proposing for the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Environmental Statement (ES)³ that will accompany a planning application for the wind farm. The ES will be a major factor in the Secretary of State's decision whether to approve the application, and will also influence the forms of monitoring, mitigation, and remedial action that will take place if the development proceeds.

PINS asked a prescribed set of consultation bodies to comment on the Scoping Request and also carried out its own analysis. As a result, on 9th July 2026, PINS published its Scoping Opinion⁴ which is now the key reference point for what PINS considers should be included in the EIA and ES. The Scoping Opinion also includes, as appendices, the replies PINS received from the consultation bodies, with a small number of redactions.

Three other documents relevant to the submission were also published in June and July, including the first version of Olsen's Programme Document,⁵ an Inception Meeting Note (Section 51 advice),⁶ and recent Planning Act 2008 guidance.⁷

² Olsen titled the document as "Scoping Report", a term that is also sometimes used by PINS. However, it can be ambiguous so, throughout the present report, it is referred to as the Scoping Request, to ensure clarity in its relation to PINS' Scoping Opinion.

³ The term EIA refers to the processes involved in assessing the impact of the proposed wind farm, and the ES is the title of the report that is produced as a result and submitted with the planning application.

⁴ https://nsip-documents.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/published-documents/EN0110038-000008-Hope%20Moor%20Wind%20Farm_Scoping%20Opinion%202017%20EIA%20Regs_Combined_Redacted.pdf

⁵ https://www.datocms-assets.com/197579/1784546331-hope_moor_wind_farm_programme_document_for_pins_for-website.pdf

⁶ <https://nsip-documents.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/published-documents/EN0110038-000007-Final%20Hope%20Moor%20Wind%20Farm%20Inception%20Meeting%20Note.pdf>

⁷ *Planning Act 2008: Guidance on preparing an application – Part 1: Pre-application steps.*

Community evidence

Two of the submissions from consultation bodies included a copy of the Community Receptor Identification Consultation (CRIC) report,⁸ a copy of which was also provided directly to Olsen. This was an unofficial, independent, and limited exercise aimed at eliciting community nominations for receptors and pathways to be included within the scope of the EIA and ES. It was published on 5th June 2026 and included a chapter that evaluated the extent to which the Scoping Request covered each of the receptors and pathways identified by the community as needing assessment.

The need for such an exercise became apparent during the period November 2025 to February 2026, through email correspondence between the present report's author ('the author') and both Olsen and North Yorkshire Council (NYC). Olsen and NYC made clear they were neither seeking nor accepting community input into scoping, and neither saw it as their responsibility. The issues were detailed in a tripartite note of 31st January that was sent to Olsen, NYC, and PINS.

CRIC was not concerned with arguments for or against the wind farm, nor with general public consultation or project design, but with informing the Scoping Opinion and improving the quality of the EIA and ES through relevant local knowledge. The same is true for the present report, the aims of which are also to:

- establish the extent to which community evidence has entered the assessment framework; and
- identify key risks to that evidence being followed through into the Environmental Statement.

The present report therefore reviews the Scoping Opinion and other relevant documents from the perspective of CRIC. It is intended to assist Olsen, consultees, residents, and other participants in the Hope Moor Wind Farm project in tracking whether community receptors and pathways identified through the CRIC report are carried forward so that the EIA and ES can be relevant and of high quality.

⁸ <https://myers.co/hopemoor/scoping/>.

Main conclusions

Overall assessment

From a community perspective, the Scoping Opinion is a mixed result. Many of Olsen's requests for a narrow scope have either been rejected outright or challenged by PINS as requiring further justification. As a result, of the 80 community requests for assessment identified in the CRIC – summarised in Appendix A – very few have been scoped out. Many of the topics that the community wanted assessed have been scoped in.

However, many receptors or receptor classes that are important from a community perspective have not been explicitly mentioned, such as private water supplies (a receptor class of potentially existential importance for local farms, businesses, and residences) and Newsham Village Green (a children's play area directly adjacent to the proposed transport route). Their absence does not necessarily mean that they have been excluded, but neither does the Scoping Opinion provide clear assurance that the impact on them will be assessed.

High-level opinion

The Scoping Opinion is substantial but deals with many matters at a topic-chapter level rather than providing a detailed assessment of all the individual receptor and pathway issues. This may reflect a combination of a number of factors, such as the broad scope and scale of the application, the number of questions raised by the Scoping Request, the range of issues raised by consultation bodies' feedback, and the limited time in which PINS was required to produce a Scoping Opinion.⁹

Much of the detail has been left to later agreement between Olsen and consultation bodies. In the Scoping Opinion, there is one general statement and at least fourteen topic-specific examples where matters not accepted as scoped out may be narrowed or removed later, so long as Olsen provides further evidence and secures agreement with the relevant consultation bodies. In addition, there are around 50 passages where PINS requires Olsen to agree with consultation bodies on study areas,

⁹ The timetable for PINS' response to a Scoping Request is set out in legislation.

methodologies, photomontages, survey approaches, cumulative lists, mitigation, or related assessment matters.

The relevant consultation bodies included NYC, Durham County Council (DCC), the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority (YDNP), Natural England, the Environment Agency, and others. Given the high-level opinion and deferral of much scoping detail, these bodies have an ongoing and critical role in shaping the forthcoming scope and structure of the EIA and ES.

Evidence vulnerability

Given the deferral of much scoping detail to future agreement, Olsen may still have an opportunity to secure a narrower scope through subsequent discussions with the relevant consultation bodies. This means that many of the community-identified issues – which are treated only indirectly through the high-level opinion – remain vulnerable. Olsen might still seek agreement to narrow or exclude them from assessment.

Also, both the Scoping Request and the Scoping Opinion recognise some interactions across functional topics. However, the interactions identified by the community largely remain fragmented and are not specified as receptors in their own right. This creates a risk that the combined burden on receptors will not be measured, and that a potentially significant effect will not be recognised in the EIA or ES. For example, item #3 in Appendix A is ‘combined disturbance’. The risk is that noise, shadow flicker, dust, vibration, traffic, lighting, and construction effects may all be assessed individually, but the combined effect on the community, wildlife, the environment, and tourism will not be assessed.

Finally, future agreements over scoping involve two sides – the developer and the consultation bodies. As is detailed below, the Scoping Request has raised concerns about the developer’s consistency in managing its own processes. This presents the risk that agreements may not be well constructed, communicated, and consistently held. Also, NYC’s approach to community input to date raises questions over whether it will engage adequately with the community scoping evidence. This may in turn depend on whether NYC relies solely on Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) legislation to guide its work, or also takes account of the Planning Act

guidance. The risk of the former approach is that NYC may agree to scope out issues because they do not seem relevant to NYC's desk-based scoping exercise, even though local knowledge has identified them as important for assessment.

Community evidence tracking

The above factors lead to the conclusion that there is a need for certain activities to avoid unsupported scope contraction. That is, the scope might become narrowed inadvertently through a failure to follow through on assessment issues that the community has identified, or through later agreements being formed in which the community point of view is not adequately represented.

This calls for concerted action and transparent reporting on all sides, such as the publication of issues trackers to enable independent scrutiny of how the community-evidenced receptors and pathways are being treated in the agreements that form the basis of the EIA and ES.

The value of community evidence

The community's exclusion from Olsen's scoping exercise

One of the core issues that has been emerging through the development and publication of CRIC is whether community evidence has a role to play in scoping and, if so, what that role is and who should facilitate it. As was highlighted in the tripartite note of 31st January 2026,¹⁰ neither Olsen nor the author's Local Planning Authority (LPA) of North Yorkshire Council (NYC) were seeking or accepting receptor-nominations from the community.

NYC's stance was not based on community evidence having no value, but on its view that Olsen was responsible for the consultation exercise that elicits that evidence. NYC's stance will be examined in more detail in the next section.

Olsen's standpoint was summarised to the BBC by writing that "public consultation does not meaningfully happen at the scoping stage".¹¹ Olsen claimed there was confusion between what should be assessed (i.e. scoping) and whether people support the project or how it should be designed (public consultation). Also, at the project inception meeting, Olsen again noted some public confusion and misunderstanding between the two – scoping and public consultation – particularly in some online platforms. From his observations, the author agrees that such misunderstanding has occurred.

However, the CRIC report was solely about what should be assessed – and not support, opposition, or project design. It stated three times that the exercise was not for or against the development, and also that any community input that expressed support or objection to the wind farm was removed from the analysis. The exercise maintained a structure and discipline that focused on receptors and pathways and excluded other issues such as representations or project design. The report made this distinction clear, and the author also reiterated the point in numerous public presentations about the community scoping consultation exercise.

¹⁰ The tripartite note has not been published but was sent by the author to Olsen, NYC, and PINS.

¹¹ Email from Olsen to the BBC, 11th March 2026. The quote is shared with the BBC's permission.

It should also be noted that, despite the softening of legislative consultation requirements, Olsen has nevertheless chosen to continue with staged consultations that offer individuals the opportunity to comment on emerging proposals. The author's contention is that, as part of a wider engagement programme, Olsen could also have sought structured community input into scoping, for the purpose of improving the coverage and quality of the EIA and ES.

Olsen's Programme Document includes a risk register in which there is just one entry that mentions the community – presenting community and stakeholder opposition as a risk. To mitigate that risk, Olsen proposes a community engagement strategy that includes the community liaison group and public consultations.

However, the risk register does not identify that the assessment may be weakened if community local knowledge is not gathered early enough to shape scoping and the assessment framework. That omission matters because public engagement in scoping is not merely a matter of public relations but of taking advantage of local knowledge in the identification of receptors and pathways.

The basis for community input into scoping

The four nations of the UK operate under different legislative regimes for planning. Although English legislation does not give individual community members the right to participate in PINS' formal scoping consultation, this does not mean there is no place for community evidence. For example, in correspondence with the author,¹² at no time did PINS suggest that the community had no role in scoping. On the contrary, PINS suggested that community evidence could enter scoping via other bodies, even if PINS was not in this case accepting direct submissions.

At the inception meeting, Olsen noted there was no legal basis for separating out scoping from public consultation. The author agrees there is no legal requirement to conduct a public scoping consultation. However, the absence of legal prescription and the presence of community confusion does not negate the potential value of community evidence to the scope of the EIA and ES. Nor does it prohibit Olsen from explaining the difference to the public and then undertaking separate programmes

¹² Some of this correspondence was reported in the unpublished tripartite note of 31st January 2026. Other unpublished correspondence received by the author from PINS was dated 7th, 20th, and 23rd July 2026.

for each. That position is consistent with current PINS EIA advice, which recognises that non-statutory pre-application consultation or engagement may take place, whilst recommending that overlap with PINS' statutory scoping consultation is avoided where possible to prevent confusion between different purposes and response methods.¹³

The involvement of individual members of the community in scoping is advocated by organisations such as the *International Institute for Sustainable Development* (IISD). Citing the *World Bank*, the IISD identifies scoping-stage engagement as important to defining the issues, affected communities, and potential impacts that the environmental assessment should address.¹⁴

Furthermore, Planning Act 2008 guidance published on 3 July 2026 identifies the community as a stakeholder and indicates that local knowledge and evidence should be capable of contributing to the identification of environmental effects.¹⁵ This is guidance, not law, so the issue is not whether individual community members have a right to contribute to scoping; the legislation does not confer such rights, but neither does it exclude individuals from contributing via the applicant or consultation bodies. Rather, it implies that the absence of the community providing evidence to scoping could place at risk the coverage and quality of the EIA and ES.

How CRIC entered the scoping record

The CRIC report was published on 5th June 2026, and a copy was sent to PINS. However, at that time PINS would not take the CRIC report into account in its Scoping Opinion because, although PINS had discretion to take account of responses from relevant non-prescribed bodies or individuals, the author had not been identified as one of those whose response would be accepted.

¹³ Planning Inspectorate, *Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Pre-Application Advice on Environmental Impact Assessment*, <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/nationally-significant-infrastructure-projects-pre-application-advice-on-environmental-impact-assessment>, published 27 July 2026; see section "EIA Scoping".

¹⁴ <https://www.iisd.org/learning/eia/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Public-participation.pdf>

¹⁵ *Planning Act 2008: Guidance on preparing an application – Part 1: Pre-application steps*, published on 3 July 2026; see paras. 3.2, 4.12, 6.15, and 6.16.

PINS subsequently confirmed, however, that the CRIC report would be considered if it was submitted by a prescribed consultee. The CRIC report was therefore sent to three relevant consultation bodies: NYC, DCC, and Newsham Parish Council (NPC).

NPC decided to make it the primary content of its response to the Scoping Request, though it also raised a number of additional matters. DCC decided to include it as one of four appendices to its submission – describing it as “Hope Moor Scoping Community Input” – with the recommendation to PINS that it “should also be taken into account”. NYC (the local authority for the author of the CRIC report) did not include it — this will be discussed further in the next section. Nevertheless, the CRIC report appears in the appendices to the Scoping Opinion twice, in two of the responses of the three consultation bodies.

The evidential value of community input

The contents of the Hope Moor Scoping Opinion suggest that community evidence is indeed valuable in an NSIP wind farm project. Many of the scoping issues raised through CRIC were also raised by other consultation bodies, though CRIC has also identified different aspects of those issues as well as additional receptors, pathways, or detail not identified by any other consultation body. This is despite CRIC not being comprehensive due to the necessary limitations of the exercise, as the report itself noted.

The significance of these overlaps is that CRIC was not simply a list of isolated local issues. It captured community receptors and pathways that in many cases connected with issues also visible to other consultees, as well as raising some assessment issues that other consultees had not.

The decisions by NPC and DCC to place the CRIC report before PINS were important because they enabled the community evidence to enter the formal scoping record. They also demonstrated overlapping but complementary ways in which such evidence can inform the NSIP process: through the Parish Council’s detailed local knowledge and representation of the affected community, and through DCC’s wider statutory functions and professional involvement in environmental assessment.

Council representations of community views

Because the Scoping Opinion leaves many matters open to later evidence and agreement between Olsen and consultation bodies, this makes local-authority handling of community evidence especially important – i.e. NYC and DCC.

Depending on the LPAs' interpretations of the NSIP legislation and guidance, community-identified receptors and pathways could either be reflected in the EIA and ES or scoped out. There is some evidence in the Scoping Opinion, and events in the prior 12 months, that give some indication of how the LPAs are likely to treat community evidence.

In the Scoping Opinion appendices, DCC and NPC placed the community evidence before PINS. However, NYC did not, despite being provided with a copy and some suggestions on time-saving ways it could be included in its response to PINS. From a review of NYC's submission – which was substantial in some ways – it is difficult to ascertain whether, or to what extent, the community input documented in the CRIC had any impact on NYC's response. For example, with regard to Olsen's proposed viewpoints, NYC stated: "The locations of the current 18 appear to be appropriate for closer scrutiny of sensitivity" whilst also suggesting that additional viewpoints were needed at greater distances to the east and southeast. However, the CRIC report identified problems with some of these viewpoints because they "do not seem to provide the most representative perspective". Although NYC recognised that the initial selection was incomplete, its published response did not appear to engage with the community-identified problems with those viewpoints. NYC described its analysis as being the result of a desk-based assessment. Its response refers only to material having been received from 'internal consultees', with no acknowledgment in its response that it was informed by local community knowledge nor that it had been given a copy of the CRIC report containing local community evidence.¹⁶

To date, NYC's stance appears to have been that NSIP legislation defines its role in the development and it can do no more. The author's view is that legislation sets out the minimum, but guidance encourages it to do much more. This point was made in the tripartite note of 31st January 2026. However, after raising it with the council's

¹⁶ Acknowledgement of NYC's receipt was received by the author on 11th June 2026.

monitoring officer, the council solicitor replied by declining to take any further action on community input into scoping, placing the responsibility on the developer. The email stated that NYC “have a role in the process for NSIP applications, but that process is set out through legislation and regulations and we have no scope to alter that process”.¹⁷ However, the July 2026 Planning Act guidance supports the broader view that LPAs have an important role beyond the minimum statutory requirements, including helping ensure that the applicant understands community issues.¹⁸

There is a contrast between DCC’s and NYC’s general responses that may also be material. NYC’s scoping response was not insubstantial and raised important points, but DCC’s response appears broader: it included a short covering letter and four appendices, the first two of which were DCC’s own responses and the third was the CRIC report. The differing extent to which the two LPAs reflected community evidence in their scoping responses also sits against a wider history of differing levels and kinds of engagement over the preceding 12 months, though that history does not need to be rehearsed here.¹⁹

The reason for highlighting these issues is primarily forward-looking. The author’s concern is not merely that particular community-identified receptors were omitted from NYC’s scoping response, nor simply that DCC and NYC took different approaches at one point in the NSIP process. These things matter because they raise a practical question about whether NYC will now seek out, record, and represent community views and local evidence sufficiently in the forthcoming stages of the development consent process. For the community, NYC’s representation of community-identified receptors and pathways is a crucial aspect of the EIA, ES, and the remainder of the project. The issue is not whether NYC can alter the statutory NSIP process. It is whether, within its existing role as a local planning authority and consultation body, it will also seek to integrate the Planning Act guidance into its work, e.g. by ensuring that relevant local evidence is recognised when study areas, methodologies, receptor lists, and later exclusions are discussed.

¹⁷ Email from NYC’s Head of Legal, Property and Environment to the author, 13th February 2026.

¹⁸ *Planning Act 2008: Guidance on preparing an application – Part 1: Pre-application steps*, <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/planning-act-2008-guidance-on-preparing-an-application-part-1-pre-application-steps>, published 3 July 2026; see paras. 6.4 and 6.5.

¹⁹ Some of this history is documented in Olsen’s Section 35 request, the tripartite note, and NYC’s solicitor’s response to the tripartite note. The latter two documents have not been published.

Reliability of Olsen's Scoping Request

There are several items in the Scoping Opinion that, in the author's view, raise concerns about the reliability or completeness of the work undertaken in producing Olsen's Scoping Request. PINS identified various contradictions, incomplete information, lack of clarity, unsupported or mismatched assertions, or topics not followed through to completion. Some examples include:

Contradictions within the report: For example, PINS points out that Table 7-7 of the Scoping Request proposes to scope out otter because surveys did not record the species and suitable habitat is said to be lacking; this contradicts Table 7-4 which says future presence of otter cannot be entirely ruled out and proposes to take the species forward. (See Scoping Opinion 3.3.5.)

Incomplete information: For example, peat is not included in the hydrology table of potential impacts, but elsewhere the Scoping Request acknowledges that peat impacts are likely to occur. (See Scoping Opinion 3.5.6.)

Lack of clarity: For example, for archaeological surveys, PINS notes that targeted site inspections are proposed and further surveys would be considered "if required". However, PINS notes that it is unclear what would trigger such requirements or how the baseline would be characterised. (See Scoping Opinion 3.2.11.)

Unsupported or mismatched assertions: For example, Olsen seeks to scope out Landscape Character Areas beyond 20 km. However, PINS notes that the Zone of Theoretical Visibility analyses show that visibility extends beyond 20 km in some directions, and that long-distance views are considered for cultural heritage but not landscape receptors. This suggests that the differing claims had not been fully aligned, or that further supporting argument was needed as to why similar categories of receptors were being treated differently. (See Scoping Opinion 3.1.4.)

Topics not followed through to completion: For example, Olsen indicates that the use of on-site concrete batching is currently uncertain, but it identifies some effects for assessment such as water supply. PINS requires that likely significant effects need to be assessed across all relevant topics, such as traffic, carbon, hydrology, and air quality. This suggests that uncertainty about whether batching would be used was

carried through into some relevant topic chapters but not others. (See Scoping Opinion 2.1.2.)

The relevance of these issues is forward-looking because Olsen remains central to the development process. Olsen has responsibility for managing the EIA process, including processing and reporting on the feedback from the community and consultation bodies, as well as proposing methodologies, defining study areas, preparing survey work, and carrying out the assessments. The various issues and examples described above suggest there needs to be careful scrutiny of whether community-identified receptors and pathways are followed through into the EIA and ES.

Strategic implications for the next phase

From the community perspective, the next phase should focus on preventing unsupported scope contraction. Some narrowing of scope may be appropriate where it is evidence-based and transparent. The concern here is the gradual narrowing of assessment through later methodological agreement, study-area decisions, survey design, receptor selection, or topic-specific exclusions in ways that could weaken the coverage, integration, or evidential quality of the EIA and ES.

Olsen has completed a stage one public consultation and is planning a second stage, which is now likely in early 2027. However, these consultations allow residents to comment on information Olsen chooses to present, and do not necessarily provide a structured mechanism for identifying missing receptors, pathways, dependencies, or combined effects. The Programme Document contains no evidence that the community-scoping gap identified in the January 2026 tripartite note will be addressed before Olsen finalises the EIA and ES.

It is therefore especially important that the community receptors and pathways identified to date are now entered into relevant technical discussions, issues trackers, local-authority work, Phase 2 environmental information, and the eventual ES. As Olsen already has the CRIC report, it should be able to map the issues identified in that report, as summarised in Appendix A, against the EIA and ES. This should be done transparently, so that the community can see with which consultation bodies Olsen raised the item, whether that evidence was carried forward, assessed, or excluded, and – where a community-identified receptor or pathway is not assessed – the evidential basis for that decision.

NYC's role is particularly important. As the Scoping Opinion leaves many matters open to further evidence and agreement with consultation bodies, and much of the proposed site falls within North Yorkshire, NYC will be a significant party to those agreements and thereby influence the preservation or potential narrowing of community assessment matters that PINS has not yet agreed to scope out.

Given the concerns raised earlier in this report, NYC needs to demonstrate how community views, local evidence, and community-identified receptors and pathways will be incorporated into its continuing and iterative engagement with Olsen. NYC

should also explain how it will report any significant agreements reached with Olsen on study areas, methodologies, or scope, and to whom, so that its actions are transparent and accountable.

The present report also asks other consultation bodies to help ensure that relevant community evidence is not lost during later technical discussions, where matters fall within their respective functions or expertise. This will not require each consultation body to consider every issue. Newsham Parish Council may, for example, have a particularly important contribution on Newsham Village Green and other local receptors; DCC may be involved across a wider range of environmental and community matters; whilst specialist bodies such as Natural England will be more directly relevant to matters including peat and the upland water interdependence. Appendix A is offered as a tracking aid to help each body identify the community evidence relevant to its own role.

The centrality of the applicant's role to the NSIP process means that responsibility for maintaining the quality and coverage of the EIA and ES rests with Olsen.

Nevertheless, other consultation bodies could assist the community by asking – whenever Olsen proposes a study area, methodology, receptor list, survey approach, mitigation measure, or later scope exclusion – whether it captures the full range of community receptors and pathways identified through CRIC.

A particular area for care is not allowing a matter to be treated as resolved merely because it has been addressed within a conventional technical chapter, because the wider interactions or integrations should also be considered. For example, a private water supply, village setting, or moorland route may depend on interactions between several technical topics, not only on the conclusions of any one chapter.

Not all 80 issues in Appendix A have equal weight, but it is divided into priority categories and can be used as a tracking tool to help consultees focus effort where the risk of omission or fragmentation appears greatest. This report asks Olsen to use Appendix A as the basis of a transparent audit trail that shows whether, how, and with whom community views and local evidence have been discussed and carried forward into the EIA and ES.

Appendix A – Receptors and pathways checklist

This appendix contains a landscape table that lists the 80 community-raised scoping and assessment issues in the CRIC report, along with a short summary of how each issue is treated in the Scoping Opinion. It is similar to Chapter 4 of CRIC, but differs in the structure, level of detail, and comparison. Not all issues are equally important, but the appendix can act as a tracking tool to identify which receptors and pathways have been carried through into the EIA/ES, or to ensure there is adequate evidence to support any decision to exclude them.

The CRIC report is structured thematically – e.g. collating issues relevant to the upland water interdependence in one section. Also, when supplemented by the corresponding sections in Chapter 3, Chapter 4 of the CRIC report provides a detailed explanation of each community-identified receptor, pathway, or assessment issue. The comparison in Chapter 4 is between each community-identified issue and the coverage in the Scoping Request.

This appendix is structured according to what are likely to be the main community priorities. It lists the same issues as the CRIC report, but in summary form only, and it compares each issue with its treatment in the Scoping Opinion. The list is then sorted, and broadly categorised, based on a combination of three factors: how important it is likely to be to the community; how well the issue is covered by the Scoping Request; and how well it is covered by the Scoping Opinion. For example, important issues that receive little treatment in either the request or the opinion appear at the top of the list as priority concerns. There are six such items, which are then followed by those requiring close attention (23), monitoring (45), and low tracking priority (6).

The priority issues for assessment include: Newsham Village Green; private water supplies; the overall residential setting; consultation limitations; combined disturbance; and blade erosion, where blade-derived material might enter food-production and human-consumption water systems. The blade-erosion issue is a topic requiring careful evidential treatment because the pathway by which PFAS or other blade-derived contaminants might enter human or food-production water sources is under-researched and uncertain. However, it is a matter of potentially significant concern to the community members who depend on the water system, of

which Hope Moor is in a headwater position. This matter may need to be addressed through research that assesses the impact of blade erosion in headwater situations, though at the time of writing the author has not found any.

There are 23 further items that need close attention. These range from human health and residential wellbeing to older buildings in Newsham close to construction traffic, vulnerable foundations, farm-business and livestock management, the integrated upland water system, long-range downstream flood pathways, historically meaningful routes, rural access, and recreation/destination use.

A further 45 items need to be monitored because the Scoping Request and Scoping Opinion have tended to leave the scope open for further specification and assessment. The presence of items in this category does not mean the assessment needs have been resolved. It means their adequacy will depend on the methodologies, study areas, receptor lists, assessment assumptions, and later agreements that are yet to be developed. If those are inadequate, some of these matters may become priority concerns.

A further six issues require low tracking priority, because they were given relatively strong coverage in both the Scoping Request and Scoping Opinion. These include on-site and nearby heritage features in the moorland context, and heritage character beyond individual assets.

Depending on reader preference, either the CRIC report or Appendix A can act as a checklist for the adequacy of agreements between Olsen and consultation bodies, the EIA, ES, and later Local Impact Reports (LIRs).

Ref	CRIC summary	Scoping Opinion treatment
1	Newsham Village Green (4.11.1) - Priority concern: assessment of construction-traffic and increased-traffic effects on Newsham Village Green as a shared community space used by residents, children, and pets – including interim risks before any alternative access route is available.	PINS includes traffic/access and human/community safety in general terms but does not identify Newsham Village Green as a specific shared community-space receptor.
2	Private water supplies (4.1.5) - Priority concern: identification and assessment of all potentially affected springs, boreholes, streams, and other private water sources, including reliability, quality, dependence on the wider water system and water table, and effects on homes, farms, livestock, hospitality businesses, and other local uses.	PINS requires justification of the hydrology study area and assessment of water supply needs, but does not expressly require all potentially hydrologically connected private supplies to be identified and baselined.
3	Combined disturbance (4.2.1) - Priority concern: assessment of combined burden on receptors exposed to multiple disturbance pathways together, rather than only separate treatment of noise, shadow flicker, dust, vibration, traffic, lighting, and construction effects.	PINS recognises some cross-topic and cumulative disturbance issues, especially for ornithology, but does not require a human/community multi-pathway disturbance receptor.
4	Overall residential setting (4.5.1) - Priority concern: assessment of residential character as the combined experience of dwelling, setting, external amenity, outlook, peace and quiet, dark skies, wildlife, and rural character.	PINS treats relevant residential matters through landscape/visual, noise, shadow flicker, traffic, socio-economics and human-health determinants, but not as an integrated residential-setting receptor.
5	Consultation limitations (4.12.6) - Priority concern: consultation should not be assumed to cure omissions in the Scoping Request unless residents are given sufficient information and a clear opportunity to identify missing receptors, pathways, and mitigation questions relevant to the Environmental Statement.	PINS notes consultation bodies' comments and requires justification for later scope-outs, but does not directly address whether consultation can cure missing local receptors/pathways.
6	Blade erosion and water sensitivity (4.1.8) - Priority concern: assessment of whether PFAS or other substances associated with blade erosion could enter human and food-production water sources.	No specific PINS treatment identified for PFAS, blade erosion, blade-derived contaminants or operational water contamination from blade wear. Topic requiring careful evidential treatment due to the lack of research on blade erosion in headwater situations.
7	Historically meaningful routes and places (4.4.4) - Needs attention: assessment of routes and places whose heritage value depends on continuity of use, setting, and local memory, including examples such as the Funeral Walk between Newsham and Barningham.	PINS strengthens heritage setting assessment generally but does not specifically identify historically meaningful routes such as the Funeral Walk.

8	Gardens, shared spaces, and external amenity (4.5.2) - Needs attention: assessment of day- and night-time enjoyment of gardens, outdoor spaces, and nearby shared spaces valued for ambience and community use.	PINS treats relevant residential matters through landscape/visual, noise, shadow flicker, traffic, socio-economics and human-health determinants, but not as an integrated residential-setting receptor.
9	Residential restorative value (4.5.3) - Needs attention: assessment of the residential environment as a source of peace, escape, psychological restoration, and day-to-day lived benefit, not only as visual or acoustic amenity.	PINS treats relevant residential matters through landscape/visual, noise, shadow flicker, traffic, socio-economics and human-health determinants, but not as an integrated residential-setting receptor.
10	Human health (4.5.4) - Needs attention: assessment of health sensitivity and wellbeing where community evidence identifies residential setting, sleep, stress sensitivity, and disturbance vulnerability as relevant to physical or mental health.	PINS accepts human-health matters being assessed through separate topic chapters rather than a separate human-health chapter; some decommissioning health scope-outs are refused.
11	Older buildings close to construction traffic (4.5.6) - Needs attention: assessment of construction-traffic effects on listed buildings and private houses, especially older buildings close to the proposed route that may have little or no modern foundations, including whether Historic England should be consulted.	PINS requires heritage setting and traffic/vibration/noise assessments where relevant, but does not specifically address older buildings without modern foundations along construction routes.
12	Farm-business and livestock management (4.7.3) - Needs attention: assessment of effects on sheep and cattle breeding, livestock movement, livestock water points, pasture, field access, and other farm operations.	PINS does not specifically assess sheep/cattle breeding, livestock movement, livestock water points, or farm-business continuity, although water/access/land-use components are present.
13	Integrated upland water system (4.1.1) - Needs attention: assessment based on systemic interactions rather than only on separate hydrology, ecology, peat, drainage, water-quality, or land-use topics.	PINS recognises some interrelationship between hydrology/geology and requires peat impacts to be assessed across relevant chapters, with cross-reference and consultee agreement.
14	Water table (4.1.4) - Needs attention: assessment of how it might change and impact private water supplies, ponds, streams, and habitats.	PINS requires assessment of peat disturbance effects on hydrology in terms of quantity, flow and quality, and relevant peatland processes, but the water table as a pathway for private water supplies is not addressed.
15	Recreation and destination use as a receptor (4.8.1) - Needs attention: assessment of the site, surrounding area, and wider locations as places people travel through, visit, and value for recreation and destination use, not only as isolated rights-of-way or visitor assets.	PINS refuses to scope out tourism and requires Right to Roam land to be considered in access and socio-economics.

16	Newsham Conservation Area (4.12.8) - Needs attention: clarification of whether Newsham Conservation Area and associated heritage assets have been included in the cultural heritage baseline and assessed for relevant pathways, including setting, construction traffic, vibration, older buildings, residential character, and historic setting.	PINS strengthens heritage setting assessment and refuses fixed-threshold scope-outs for conservation areas/assets, but does not specifically name Newsham Conservation Area in the main Opinion.
17	Long-range downstream flood management (4.1.9) - Needs attention: implications for the Swale, Ure, Ouse, and York system, including flood-management work such as the Mid Swale project, current river levels, and projected increases in future years due to climate change.	PINS requires flood risk assessment with latest climate change allowances and consideration of small catchments, plus assessment of peat/hydrology effects.
18	Long Green telecommunications mast (4.12.9) - Needs attention: verification of the location and distance of the Long Green mast from the Scoping Boundary, and whether telecommunications effects can properly be scoped out.	PINS aviation/telecoms treatment is generic and agrees to scope out receptors not present in the study area; no specific Long Green mast verification mentioned.
19	Whole landscape experience (4.3.1) - Needs attention: assessment of the moor as an immersive landscape experience, rather than only as separate views, routes, noise, wildlife, dark skies, archaeology, or landscape-character topics.	PINS strengthens landscape/visual assessment, protected landscape treatment and lighting/photomontage requirements, but does not frame the moor as an immersive/restorative landscape receptor.
20	Agricultural use and rural land management (4.7.1) - Needs attention: assessment of the effect on farms, grazing land, crops, livestock areas, gamekeeping land, conservation-managed land, and other managed rural land.	PINS includes some land-use/geology/traffic/water/peat issues and asks about Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land, but does not identify agricultural/rural land management as an integrated receptor.
21	Rural access network as a receptor (4.9.1) - Needs attention: assessment of the wider rural road and access network serving villages, farms, dispersed properties, businesses, and visitors, rather than only individual road links.	PINS keeps access/traffic/transport matters in scope and requires transport of materials to be assessed, but does not identify the rural access network as an integrated receptor.
22	Operational environment (4.10.1) - Needs attention: assessment of the area as a flexible operational environment, not only as landscape, amenity, recreation, aviation, lighting, noise, or military activity.	PINS has a short aviation/radar/telecoms section and addresses lighting/visual matters elsewhere, but does not identify the area as a flexible operational environment.
23	UNESCO Global Geopark status (4.11.4) - Needs attention: assessment of the North Pennines National Landscape as a UNESCO Global Geopark.	PINS treats North Pennines National Landscape and protected landscapes, but does not specifically mention the UNESCO Global Geopark status.

24	Other locally identified receptors (4.11.7) - Needs attention: assessment of any remaining locally significant receptors not captured either by Olsen's standard categories or by the present non-comprehensive exercise. Public consultation should provide a clear opportunity to identify specific places, uses, or pathways of importance that may otherwise be overlooked.	PINS notes consultation responses were taken into account and requires evidence/justification for scope-outs, but does not create a mechanism for further locally identified receptors outside standard categories.
25	Grid connection imagery (4.12.5) - Needs attention: inclusion of a reasonable representation of grid connection impacts in the ES.	PINS requires proportionate grid connection assessment but does not specifically address misleading/limited consultation imagery of wooden poles or possible pylon scale.
26	Private helicopters and paramotors (4.10.4) - Needs attention: assessment of locally reported helicopter and paramotor use.	No specific PINS treatment identified for locally reported private helicopter or paramotor use.
27	Displacement effects (4.10.5) - Needs attention: assessment of whether affected operational activity could be displaced elsewhere and create indirect disturbance for residents.	No specific PINS treatment identified for operational displacement effects creating indirect disturbance elsewhere.
28	Overhead services in Newsham (4.11.2) - Needs attention: assessment of effects of oversized construction traffic on telephone, broadband, and power cables crossing the road through Newsham, and the residential and business services that depend on them.	PINS main text does not specifically address overhead telephone, broadband, or power services in Newsham affected by oversized construction traffic.
29	Travellers at Rokeby Inn / Smallways junction (4.11.3) - Needs attention: assessment of effects on the established stopping point at the Rokeby Inn / Smallways junction of the A66.	PINS main text does not specifically address the Rokeby Inn/Smallways stopping point.
30	Residential and wellbeing dimension (4.2.9) - Monitor: assessment of how multiple concurrent disturbances may affect residential amenity, sleep, tranquillity, stress sensitivity, and peace and quiet, without needing to assert a specific medical outcome.	PINS accepts assessment of human-health determinants through separate chapters rather than a separate human-health chapter.
31	Geographical scope (4.1.3) - Monitor: given the site's upland/headwater position, include all water sources and uses between the Tees and Swale that may be affected by changes to the upland water system.	PINS questions fixed hydrology study areas and requires appropriate study areas to be justified/agreed, including Zones of Influence in ecology.
32	Construction and operation effects on water supplies (4.1.6) - Monitor: including reliability and quality of private and mains water supplies and potential contamination from concrete or other substances.	PINS requires water supply impacts of on-site concrete batching to be assessed where water is required, and requires batching effects across relevant chapters.

33	Application of multi-pathway disturbance to homes (4.5.5) - Monitor: assessment of the residential effects of the pathways identified in 4.2, including how the combined effect varies by location, distance, exposure, and residential use.	PINS keeps several component pathways in play, including shadow flicker study area, noise guidance, lighting, traffic and human-health determinants.
34	Effect of fixed scoping boundaries on magnitude and significance (4.12.10) - Monitor: assessment boundaries should not be applied in a way that excludes receptors whose omission may reduce the apparent magnitude or significance of effects.	PINS repeatedly requires study areas to be justified/agreed and refuses several fixed-distance scope-outs where evidence is insufficient.
35	Peat-map discrepancies (4.12.1) - Monitor: reconciliation of differences between Natural England's 2025 peat mapping, Olsen's peat-depth mapping, and Olsen's habitat classification, with a clear explanation of the peat baseline used for assessment.	PINS strongly addresses peat baseline/processes and encourages agreement with Natural England on survey scope and peat baseline.
36	Grid connection and site access (4.2.3) - Monitor: inclusion of construction and operational disturbance associated with grid connection, power lines or pylons, site access, and any associated infrastructure.	PINS requires proportionate grid connection assessment and cumulative assessment with grid connection; site access/traffic remains within assessment.
37	Temporary concrete batching plant (4.2.5) - Monitor: assessment of concrete dust, air pollution, noise, traffic, vibration, water demand, and other disturbance associated with any temporary on-site concrete batching plant.	PINS gives concrete batching specific treatment and requires worst-case assessment across traffic, carbon, hydrology, air quality, and other chapters where pathways exist.
38	Species, habitats, and movement (4.6.2) - Monitor: assessment of the ecological interdependence of ground-nesting birds, waders, raptors, bats, deer, insects, amphibians, notable flora, and bird movement across the moors in relation to the habitats and conditions they depend on.	PINS refuses or qualifies several ornithology/ecology scope-outs and requires FLL, lighting, indirect effects, cumulative disturbance, and survey agreement.
39	Peat as water store and receptor (4.1.2) - Monitor: assessment of peat, sphagnum, and associated habitats both as receptors that may be damaged and as water stores helping to regulate the upland water system, including possible effects on runoff, drainage patterns, water retention, water table, drought resilience, and flood risk.	PINS gives strong treatment to peat impacts, including hydrological change, water storage implications, cross-references between carbon, ecology, hydrology, and geology, and the mitigation hierarchy.
40	Dark skies and night-time experience (4.3.4) - Monitor: assessment of dark skies, stargazing, Milky Way visibility, Northern Lights observation, and the effect of turbine lighting on the night-time landscape experience.	PINS requires construction/operation/decommissioning lighting levels and mitigation to be described and night-time photomontage viewpoints to be justified/agreed.

41	Wider ecological geography (4.6.3) - Monitor: assessment extending beyond the proposed site to connected conservation areas, sphagnum bogs, the Stang Road corridor, Newsham Tarn, water-fed habitats around Newsham, Scargill, Helwith, and the wider Barnard Castle environs.	PINS requires study areas based on project Zone of Influence rather than fixed distance, and requires assessment/justification for multiple connected designated sites.
42	National trails and recognised destinations (4.8.7) - Monitor: assessment of effects on Pennine Way and Coast to Coast National Trail users, North Pennines National Landscape and UNESCO Geopark, Yorkshire Dales National Park, Nidderdale National Landscape, Teesdale, and individual locations such as Tan Hill Inn, Scargill Castle, Helwith tea garden, Barnard Castle, Reeth, and other relevant visitor destinations.	PINS keeps protected landscapes/designated landscapes, long-distance views, National Landscapes, Right to Roam, and tourism in scope.
43	Abnormal construction, access, and grid traffic (4.9.3) - Monitor: assessment of abnormal loads, HGVs, construction traffic volume, and grid-connection traffic on the rural road network.	PINS requires grid connection assessment to inform cumulative assessment and keeps construction traffic/material transport within ES topics.
44	Peat and carbon storage (4.11.6) - Monitor: assessment of peat as a carbon store, including potential carbon release from the proposed development, access works, and grid connection.	PINS gives strong treatment to peat/carbon, including reduction of carbon storage/sequestration and greenhouse gas release from peat disturbance.
45	Existing and future baseline disturbance (4.2.4) - Monitor: assessment of how project-related disturbance may add to existing or planned disturbance, including military activity, RAF low-flying, heather harvesting, tractor/lorry movements, A66 accident overspill, and A66 dualling works.	PINS requires agreement on cumulative developments but does not expressly address military activity, RAF low flying, heather harvesting, A66 accident overspill, or A66 dualling as baseline disturbance for human/community receptors.
46	Restorative value and tranquillity (4.3.2) - Monitor: assessment of the value of the moor for psychological restoration due to the combination of its many natural aspects.	PINS strengthens landscape/visual assessment, protected landscape treatment and lighting/photomontage requirements, but does not frame the moor as an immersive/restorative landscape receptor.
47	Gamekeeping and conservation management (4.7.4) - Monitor: assessment of effects on gamekeeping, estate management, conservation management, and the continuity of existing land-management practices.	PINS includes ecology/land use/access components but does not specifically address gamekeeping, estate management, or conservation-management continuity.
48	Specific noise characteristics (4.2.8) - Monitor: cumulative assessment of repetitive swishing or thumping, low-frequency sound, and sounds with a distinct pitch.	PINS allows low-frequency/tonal/excess amplitude modulation matters to be scoped out for turbines if other project components do not give rise to those conditions; updated noise guidance is noted.

49	Access roads and grid connection (4.4.5) - Monitor: assessment of how new access roads, grid connection, and associated infrastructure may affect heritage setting, historic routes, archaeological features, and the wider historic landscape.	PINS requires proportionate grid connection assessment and strengthens heritage photomontage/setting treatment.
50	Guest confidence, insurability, and business viability (4.8.6) - Monitor: assessment of whether actual or perceived effects on landscape, access, tranquillity, or safety could affect hospitality or visitor-facing businesses.	PINS requires tourism effects to be assessed, but guest confidence, insurability, and business viability are not expressly mentioned.
51	Flooding and road-related property risk (4.9.6) - Monitor: assessment of increased flooding or drainage changes on road conditions and nearby houses.	PINS requires flood risk assessment, drainage effects from road alterations, and appropriate climate change allowances.
52	Pre-grid commissioning and temporary power (4.12.7) - Monitor: assessment of whether turbines could require temporary power generation, battery systems, diesel generators, or other auxiliary systems for commissioning, testing, safety systems, or operation before grid connection is available.	No specific PINS treatment identified for temporary power generation, batteries, diesel generators, or auxiliary systems before grid connection.
53	Film and television landscape settings (4.11.5) - Monitor: assessment of locations such as Healaugh Crag where the open landscape has value as a cultural backdrop, including for historical drama.	PINS requires tourism and landscape assessment, but does not specifically address film/television landscape settings such as Healaugh Crag.
54	Long views and surrounding protected landscapes (4.3.5) - Monitor: assessment of 360° views and the interrelationship between the proposed site and surrounding landscapes, including the Yorkshire Dales, North Pennines, Nidderdale, North York Moors, Teesdale, and views towards the North Sea.	PINS refuses to scope out several designated/protected landscapes and LCAs beyond 20km, notes lack of long-distance ridge views, and requires appropriate study area/visual assessment.
55	Wider heritage setting and intervisibility (4.4.3) - Monitor: assessment of the proposed site as part of the landscape setting of heritage assets beyond it, including intervisibility with Barnard Castle (the castle itself, not the town), Scargill Castle, Dalton Mill, Bowes Castle, Bowes Museum, Raby Castle, and other relevant assets.	PINS refuses to scope out heritage assets outside fixed thresholds without evidence/agreement and recognises setting can include non-visual factors.
56	Evidential basis for scoping out (4.12.11) - Monitor: transparent justification of effects that are judged unlikely, negligible, not anticipated, or adequately controlled by embedded mitigation.	PINS expressly requires professional judgement to be explained with reasoning, relevant consultation, guidance, and evidence; later scope-outs must be justified in the ES.

57	Grid connection deferral (4.12.4) - Monitor: inclusion of grid connection effects in the ES where connection infrastructure is necessary for the wind farm to operate and may give rise to substantial environmental effects, rather than deferring those effects to a later process after the DCO decision.	PINS requires the grid connection position to be clearly justified, corridor defined, proportionate assessment provided, viable connection demonstrated, and cumulative assessment undertaken with the grid connection.
58	Tourism, hospitality, and local destination effects (4.8.5) - Monitor: assessment of local tourism and hospitality businesses whose visitor draw depends on landscape character, tranquillity, habitat quality, conservation value, rural access, and the distinctive upland experience, rather than relying only on national or regional research.	PINS does not agree to scope out tourism and requires assessment of tourism economy and broader tourism-related effects, including landscape-related effects.
59	Representative ZTV viewpoints (4.12.3) - Monitor: expansion of viewpoints to include local settlements, dispersed residential receptors, cultural sites, heritage viewpoints, national trails, and other locations for which the current list may not provide a properly representative viewpoint.	PINS gives strong treatment to viewpoint/ZTV issues, long-distance ridge views, protected landscapes, representative photomontages, and study areas.
60	Conservation and nature-recovery context (4.6.4) - Monitor: assessment of the relation between the proposed development and wider initiatives – current and emerging – to restore nature, habitats, biodiversity, and wild-landscape character across the north of England, including work in the Tees-Swale and North Pennines landscape and the potential contribution of nearby areas to Golden Eagle recovery.	PINS refers to biodiversity/ecology receptors and protected sites but does not clearly address wider nature-recovery trajectories or Golden Eagle recovery context.
61	Bridleways, riding, and access deterrence (4.8.3) - Monitor: assessment of horse-and-rider behavioural responses to turbines, lighting, noise, moving shadows, and construction traffic.	PINS references PRow/Right to Roam and non-motorised users only indirectly; horse-and-rider safety and deterrence are not specifically addressed.
62	High wind, ice, and blade-shedding safety (4.8.4) - Monitor: assessment of recreation and access safety during high winds and icy conditions, including the potential shedding of ice from turbine blades.	PINS accepts scoping out major accidents/extreme weather if design measures are described and secured; it does not specifically address recreational/access safety in high wind/ice/blade-shedding conditions.
63	Constrained/fragile road conditions (4.9.2) - Monitor: assessment of the network of narrow lanes, single-track roads, verges, passing places, flood- and snow-prone routes, potholes, weak edges, and difficult passing conditions.	PINS' main text does not specifically address fragile narrow-lane conditions, weak verges, passing places, snow/flood vulnerability, or potholes.
64	Cumulative pressure with A66 works and accidents (4.9.4) - Monitor: assessment of how project traffic may combine with A66 dualling works and overspill from A66 accidents.	PINS requires agreement on cumulative developments generally, but the main Opinion does not specifically address A66 dualling works or accident overspill on the rural road network.

65	Historic mines, shafts, and shake holes (4.1.7) - Monitor: assessment of whether historic workings, collapsed features, or associated drainage pathways could affect water quality, water table, or ground stability, including whether lead, cadmium, zinc, or other contaminants could be disturbed or mobilised into human and food-production water sources or downstream watercourses.	PINS requires relevant geology/soils/hydrology effects, erosion, borrow pits, and contaminated land matters to be assessed where LSE may occur.
66	Construction and operational phases (4.2.2) - Monitor: assessment across both construction and operation, including how temporary construction effects may combine with longer-term operational disturbance.	PINS repeatedly refuses scope-outs for decommissioning where construction effects are scoped in and requires assessment across phases in several topics.
67	Multiple turbines acting together (4.2.6) - Monitor: assessment of whether multiple turbines may combine to increase effects, including shadow flicker, noise aggregation, and noise propagation.	PINS keeps shadow-flicker receptors beyond ten rotor diameters in scope at this stage pending agreement, and operational noise remains subject to updated guidance.
68	Real-world noise and propagation conditions (4.2.7) - Monitor: assessment of noise across the Tees, Swale, and Arkengarth dales under real-world conditions and using the latest research, including topography, temperature inversion, night-time conditions, low background sound, and open-window conditions during warmer periods.	PINS notes updated wind-turbine noise guidance replacing ETSU-R-97 and encourages agreement of assessment approach.
69	Movement through the landscape (4.3.3) - Monitor: assessment of how residents, walkers, cyclists, horse riders, visitors, and other users experience the moor whilst moving through it, not only from fixed viewpoints.	PINS requires appropriate LVIA study area, representative viewpoints and consideration of Right to Roam land; routes/users are considered mainly through visual/access topics.
70	Ecological conditions as a receptor (4.6.1) - Monitor: assessment of the vulnerable and interconnected conditions that sustain the ecosystem, rather than only separate assessment of individual habitats or species.	PINS requires Zol-based ecological study areas, SSSI/SAC pathways, lighting impacts, and hydrology/peat/ecology cross-reference.
71	Water, access, habitat, traffic, and land condition together (4.7.2) - Monitor: assessment of how water reliability, access changes, habitat disturbance, construction traffic, infrastructure corridors, and changes to land condition may combine to affect agriculture and land management in practice.	PINS keeps many component pathways in scope, especially water supply, traffic/access, peat/hydrology, and ecology, but does not combine them around land-management practice.
72	Local and long-distance recreational use (4.8.2) - Monitor: assessment of walking, cycling, open-access use, scenic climbing points, landscape photography, and long-distance routes.	PINS strengthens LVIA, protected landscape, Right to Roam, and tourism assessment; local/long-distance recreation is reflected through several conventional topics.

73	Moorland burning and heather management (4.7.5) - Monitor: assessment of air-quality baseline issues associated with moorland burning or heather management.	No clear PINS treatment identified for moorland burning/heather management as an air-quality baseline or potential altered practice.
74	Feldom Range night training (4.10.3) - Monitor: assessment of effects on night training, flare use, darkness, visibility, and the interaction with turbine lighting.	No specific PINS treatment identified for Feldom Range night training, flare use, darkness/visibility, or turbine lighting interaction.
75	MOD and RAF activity (4.10.2) - Low tracking priority: assessment of potential effects on military training land, RAF low-flying activity, telecoms, radar, signal interference, and related MOD operations.	PINS main Opinion gives only generic aviation/radar/telecoms treatment; MOD/RAF low-flying/radar concerns are present in Appendix 2 but not specifically analysed in main text.
76	Mixed road use (4.9.5) - Low tracking priority: assessment of effects on everyday access, commuting, agricultural movement, walking, cycling, horse-riding, driving, and shared roadside community use.	PINS includes access/traffic and non-motorised users at general level; operational traffic scope-out is conditional on explanation.
77	Routes that may be affected (4.9.7) - Low tracking priority: assessment of potentially affected routes including Barningham, Helwith, Newsham, Barnard Castle, the Stang Road corridor, Whipperdale Bank, Stang Lane, Moor Lane, and other relevant minor-road corridors.	PINS does not list local minor-road corridors in the main Opinion, but access/traffic assessment and material transport remain relevant.
78	Heritage character beyond individual assets (4.4.1) - Low tracking priority: assessment of the heritage character of the moor and its surroundings as a whole, shaped by assets, setting, intervisibility, cultural continuity, local memory, and the wider historic landscape, rather than only as a list of designated features.	PINS robustly rejects several heritage scope-outs and notes setting is not solely visual; it requires agreement/evidence before excluding assets.
79	On-site and nearby heritage features in moorland context (4.4.2) - Low tracking priority: assessment of historic routes, prehistoric landscape features, rock-art or carvings, burial features, archaeological remains, prehistoric settlement and stone features, and how the moorland setting contributes to their significance.	PINS requires assessment of effects, including an archaeological baseline and potential surveys, with consultee agreement.
80	Public rights-of-way classification in consultation material (4.12.2) - Low tracking priority: explanation of why community consultation material showed affected routes under a generic rights-of-way category, despite the legal and practical differences between footpaths, bridleways, restricted byways, and other route types.	PINS requires Right to Roam impacts to be considered, but does not specifically address consultation-map classification of PRowS/bridleways/restricted byways.

Appendix B – Artificial intelligence statement

Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools were used to assist in the preparation of this report by helping with preliminary sorting, comparison, summarising, editorial review, and clarity checking.

The author reviewed, checked, edited, and where necessary revised any AI-assisted material before inclusion.

The author remains responsible for the analysis, categorisation, conclusions, and final wording.