

Drax Re-Power - Examining Authority's Further Written Questions

The following table sets out the Examining Authority (ExA)'s Written Questions and requests in relation to the Drax Re-Power project.

Responses are required by Wednesday 30 January 2019. Please note that if this deadline is missed the ExA is not obliged to take account of your response.

Please use the number reference system when responding to a question. Column 2 identifies the organisation(s) or individual(s) from which answers are sought. Column 3 sets out the question, often with a contextual introduction.

The ExA would be grateful if all named bodies would answer questions directed at them, providing either a substantive response or explaining why the question is not relevant to them. The expectation is that each organisation will provide an answer to each question asked of it, but joint answers are acceptable if the relevant issue is addressed. If the answer to a question is set out in, for example, a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) then a cross reference to where the issue is addressed is acceptable.

The list of organisations to which an individual question is addressed is not exclusive. You may put relevant evidence to the ExA in response to any question asked of any party.

For the avoidance of doubt, the ExA is using the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) submitted at Deadline 5 referenced in the Examination Library as [REP5-011].

Contents

Alternatives, Need and Climate Effects.....	3
Air Quality.....	6
Biodiversity and Habitats Regulations	6
Compulsory Acquisition.....	8
Construction and Operation Effects.....	9
Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)	9
Historic Environment	13
Landscape and Visual	13
Noise and Vibration	15
Traffic and Transport	16

ANC	Alternatives, Need and Climate Effects	
ANC 2.1	<p><i>NPS EN-1</i> <i>Paragraph 3.2.3</i></p> <p>The Applicant</p>	<p>At the Issue Specific Hearing (ISH) on Environmental Matters held on Wednesday 5 December 2018 [EV-010 – EV-013] and in its response at D4 [REP4-012], the Applicant stated that the starting point for assessing the individual contribution a project makes to meeting need is the overall policy towards need, which should be afforded significant weight. The Applicant then stated that the contribution towards the three pillars then needs to be added to that weight when assessing a scheme’s individual contribution to meeting general need, as advocated by Paragraph 3.2.3 of National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1.</p> <p>The ExA suggests that Paragraph 3.1.3 will already have considered the contribution new power projects would have to meeting the three pillars, and to do so again to assess individual contributions as advocated by Paragraph 3.2.3 of NPS EN-1 would in essence amount to double counting. Provide a response.</p>
ANC 2.2	<p><i>Baseline Scenario</i></p> <p>The Applicant</p>	<p>Table 15-15 (amongst others) within Chapter 15 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-083] sets out the baseline scenario of the existing coal-fired units operating at current and then reduced emissions intensity. This figure is 188,323,000 tCO₂e from 2020 – 2050. Paragraph 15.4.2 of the ES provides for two future scenarios for the existing coal-fired capacity. Either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Existing coal-fired units 5 and 6 would be converted/adapted to continue energy production to 2050; or b) Existing coal-fired units 5 and 6 would close/cease operating, with replacement generation capacity of a similar scale and nature being sourced elsewhere from another thermal power station. <p>Paragraph 15.4.2 of the ES is clear that both are only assumptions. In the latter case, the ES acknowledges that it has <i>"not been considered in detail"</i>.</p>

		<p>ClientEarth (CE) in its Written Representation (WR) [REP2-002] and its D4 [REP4-017], and Yorkshire Wildlife Trust (YWT) in its WR [REP2-046] and within the draft Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) [REP4-009] challenge if either scenario would occur, owing to the absence of funding for the former and the unproven and un-evidenced nature of the latter. The Applicant's response at D4 [REP4-012] deals principally with the latter point in respect to the National Grid stack arrangement.</p> <p>Having regard to the assumptions made in establishing the baseline position, and taking into account points being advanced by both CE and YWT, explain why the future baseline scenarios used to inform the assessment in the ES [APP-083] are appropriate.</p>
ANC 2.3	<p><i>Baseline Scenario</i></p> <p>National Grid</p>	<p>Paragraph 15.4.2 of the ES [APP-083] states that if the existing coal-fired units 5 and 6 were to close, the lost energy would be replaced elsewhere on the National Grid, and that this would be sourced from thermal power sources with similar scale and nature, and similar emission intensity as the existing coal-fired units 5 and 6. The ES acknowledges that this is an assumption and has not been considered in detail.</p> <p>The Applicant provided some further explanation of this at the ISH on Environmental Matters held on Wednesday 5 December 2018 [EV-010 – EV-013], and confirmed in writing in Paragraph 3.63 of its D4 response [REP4-012]. This states that National Grid would replace lost capacity by dispatching power plant capacity based on a stack list, with the more efficient and thus cheaper energy producers being dispatched first. While this might refer to renewable plants if there was an abundance of wind or sun, it is likely to result in thermal plants being called on as they offer grid stability and transfer requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Comment on the Applicant's assumptions. ii. Explain why renewable resources would not more frequently fill the gap given the quantum of renewable energy source generating stations within the vicinity of Drax Power Station.
ANC 2.4	<p><i>Baseline Scenario</i></p>	<p>CE has submitted at D5 [REP5-022] an alternative baseline scenario and quantitative climate impact assessment in respect of Drax Re-power in response to a request made</p>

	The Applicant	<p>by the ExA at the ISH on Environmental Matters held on Wednesday 5 December 2018 [EV-010 – EV-013].</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Comment on CE’s summary of requirements relating to baseline scenarios in Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA), and set out how the baseline scenario in the ES meets the relevant requirements of the EIA Regulations. ii. Comment on the net greenhouse gas emissions in its version of Table 15-13 [REP5-023]. iii. Consider CE’s alternative methodology used to provide a revised baseline scenario, and explain if there is merit in considering a range (best case scenario to worst case scenario) when setting out the impact of the development in terms of net increase in greenhouse gas emissions.
ANC 2.5	<i>Written Ministerial Statement May 2018</i> ClientEarth	Provide a response to the Written Ministerial Statement from the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy dated 17 May 2018 in respect only to their comments on the role of gas (and <u>not</u> the role of shale gas), which has been introduced by the Applicant in Appendix 2 of its responses to D4 [REP4-012].
ANC 2.6	<i>Carbon Capture Storage Readiness</i> The Applicant	<p>At the ISH on Environmental Matters held on Wednesday 5 December 2018 [EV-010 – EV-013], and confirmed in its written submissions for D4 [REP4-012], the Applicant stated that it is not economically feasible to install carbon capture storage.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Justify this response. ii. Given the increase in greenhouse gas emissions from the Proposed Development as set out in Chapter 15 of the ES [APP-083], and the concerns raised above in respect to baseline scenarios, explain whether a commitment to carbon capture storage should be made to the relevant planning authority at a later stage. iii. If so, amend the dDCO [REP5-011] accordingly.

AQ	Air Quality	
AQ 2.1	<i>Selective Catalytic Reduction (SCR) and Ammonia Cap</i> The Applicant	<p>In the draft SoCG with Environment Agency (EA) [REP4-007] in paragraph 3.2.1e, it is stated that the use of secondary abatement technology, selective catalytic reduction (SCR) may be required to achieve the reduction of oxides of nitrogen emissions by injecting ammonia from the emissions stack, called the “ammonia slip”.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Set out what, if any, further information does the Applicant need to determine whether or not use of secondary abatement technology, SCR, will be required. ii. Explain whether it is likely to be determined before the close of the Examination.
BHR	Biodiversity and Habitats Regulations	
BHR 2.1	<i>Biodiversity Net Gain</i> The Applicant	<p>At the ISH on Environmental Matters on Wednesday 5 December 2018 [EV-010 – EV-013] it was stated by North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) and Selby District Council (SDC) that the biodiversity net gain secured of 5% and 6% was the minimum expected and that a recent DEFRA consultation recommended 10%. This has also been set out as one of the matters to resolve in Paragraphs 3.2.4-3.2.7 within the SoCG with YWT [REP4-009].</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Provide a further response or update to Paragraph 3.146 of the Applicant’s written response to D4 [REP4-012] and whether opportunities exist to use existing owned land to improve and enhance ecology. ii. If so, provide an updated Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (LBS) and Biodiversity Net Gain Report. iii. Provide an update on outstanding matters in the SoCG with YWT [REP4-009].
BHR 2.2	<i>Watercourse</i>	At the ISH on Environmental Matters on Wednesday 5 December 2018 [EV-010 – EV-

	<p><i>crossings and Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)</i></p> <p>North Yorkshire County Council</p> <p>Selby District Council</p>	<p>013] the Applicant offered to strengthen the wording in the Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [REP2-025] in respect of the watercourse crossings and the selected construction technique. An updated Outline CEMP submitted for D4 [REP4-005] amends Paragraph 1.3.11 to include the following statement: "<i>The confirmed construction technique at each crossing location and reasons for any deviation from the approach shown in Table 1-2 will be shared with North Yorkshire County Council and Selby District Council prior to the commencement of those works.</i>"</p> <p>Confirm the adequacy of the Outline CEMP.</p>
BHR 2.3	<p><i>Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)</i></p> <p>The Applicant</p>	<p>The Applicant's updated HRA Report [REP3-017] includes in respect to the description of the Proposed Development, confirming at paragraph 1.2.16 that "<i>Each HRSG will have a main stack, with a minimum height of 122.5m and a maximum height of 123m</i>". However, the air quality modelling data presented in Section 6 of the HRA Report, as relied upon for the purposes of the assessment, continues to refer to the modelling data presented in ES Chapter 6 Air Quality [APP-074] as submitted with the Application. The Applicant's 'Assessment of non-material amendments to the proposed scheme' [RE3-022] does not discuss how the proposed amendments to the scheme parameters has affected the HRA Report.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Provide a revised HRA Report or provide an addendum to the HRA Report [REP3-017] based on the Proposed Development as proposed by the non-material change request submitted at D3, to include the re-run air quality data and modelling. ii. Provide Word versions of any updated HRA screening and integrity matrices.
BHR 2.4	<p><i>Habitats Regulations Assessment</i></p> <p>The Applicant</p> <p>Natural England</p>	<p>The ExA acknowledges the additions made to the Outline LBS [REP2-026] in respect of otter and fish mitigation following the ExA's questioning (BHR 1.19 [PD-006]). However, additions made to the updated Outline CEMP [REP4-005] in respect of otters and fish species appear to be minimal and do not contain the same certainty as those included in the HRA Report [REP3-017] and Outline LBS [REP2-026]. For example, paragraph 3.4.6</p>

		<p>defers to the HRA Report and states that the measures "should be incorporated in the final CEMP for submission" and that "Such measures include pre-construction surveys ideally before site clearance is carried out, the avoidance of any obstructions to established otter paths, minimising light spill and the use of exclusion zones if necessary." [emphasis added].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Check and correct differences between the Outline CEMP, the Outline LBS and the HRA in this matter. ii. Comment on the revisions to the Outline CEMP and whether the revision will support the statements made in the Applicant's HRA Report and Outline LBS.
BHR 2.5	<p><i>Habitats Regulations Assessment</i></p> <p>The Applicant</p>	<p>Paragraphs 5.3.21 and 5.3.22 of the HRA Report [REP3-017] states that there may be some insignificant residual effects on the otter feature of the European sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Confirm how the Secretary of State could be confident that these effects would not interact with the effects of other plans or projects to lead to significant in-combination effects. ii. Comment on whether any insignificant residual effects on the fish features are anticipated and if so, confirm as per otters above how the Secretary of State could be confident that any such effects would not interact with the effects of other plans or projects to lead to significant in-combination effects.
CA	Compulsory Acquisition	
CA 2.1	<p><i>Plot 5</i></p> <p>The Applicant National Grid</p>	<p>At the Compulsory Acquisitions Hearing held on Thursday 6 December 2018 [EV-015], the ExA raised the issue of concern expressed by National Grid in its WR [REP2-044] in respect to the Plot 5 'limbs' in connections with Works Nos 8A and 8B, on which compulsory acquisition of new rights are sought as shown on the Land Plan [REP2-006]. The Applicant responded, also confirmed in writing in its submissions at D4 [REP4-010] that this point is wrapped up in discussions with National Grid on the protective</p>

		provisions, and that the issue was expected to be resolved by the end of the Examination. The 'limbs' remain on the Land Plans submitted at D5 [REP5-004]. Update this position and whether the objection is to be removed.
--	--	--

CO	Construction and Operation Effects	
CO 2.1	<i>Carbon Capture Readiness Statement</i> The Environment Agency	In its WR at D2 [REP2-041] the Environment Agency, stated that it was assessing the additional information provided by the Applicant following its request for it in its RR [RR-292] and again at WR stages. The Applicant tabled this into the Examination at D3 [REP3-015]. Provide an update on this assessment.
CO 2.2	<i>Combined Heat and Power Statement</i> The Environment Agency	In its WR at D2 [REP2-041] the Environment Agency, stated that it was assessing the additional information provided by the Applicant following its request for it in its RR [RR-292] and again at WR stages. The Applicant tabled this into the Examination at D3 [REP3-014]. Provide an update on this assessment.

DCO	Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)	
DCO 2.1	<i>Definition of Commence</i> <i>Part 1 Article 2</i> North Yorkshire	In Written Question DCO 1.1 [PD-006], the ExA explained that it was concerned the commencement of proposed Unit Y was not controlled by the dDCO [AS-012]. Notwithstanding its written response at D2 [REP2-035], the Applicant stated at the Issue Specific Hearing on the dDCO held on Thursday 6 December 2018 [EV-014], confirmed in its written response at D4 [REP4-011] that it would look to insert a new Requirement

	<p>County Council Selby District Council</p>	<p>into the dDCO which would require the development to accord with a phasing plan.</p> <p>The dDCO submitted at D5 [REP5-011] inserted new Requirement 3 in which this commitment is made.</p> <p>Provide a response as to its adequacy</p>
DCO 2.2	<p><i>Definition of Maintain</i> <i>Part 1 Article 2</i> The Applicant</p>	<p>In Written Questions DCO 1.3 and DCO 1.4 [PD-006], the ExA expressed concerns with the wording of the definition of “maintain” in the dDCO [AS-012]. Specifically, the ExA considers the terms “<i>materially new or materially different</i>” to be undefined and ambiguous; that there is no arbiter of what constitutes a maintenance work to be “<i>unlikely to give rise to materially new or different environmental effects</i>” as opposed to “<i>new or different</i>”. Moreover, the ExA considered the definition as worded could potentially allow maintenance works to individually or cumulatively exceed the scope of the ES. The ExA considered the Applicant’s response for D2 [REP2-035] focused on the need for the maintenance works rather than its precise wording. In its response at D4 [REP4-011], and at the Issue Specific Hearing on the dDCO held on Thursday 6 December 2018 [EV-014], the Applicant stated that it considered the definition to be acceptable.</p> <p>The ExA remains concerned for the reasons given above. It also considers the Applicant has failed to explain why the Secretary of State should accept the drafted wording [REP3-007] when they have accepted much tighter and precise wording for the Eggborough Gas Fired Generating Station Order 2018. NYCC/SDC in its response to D4 [REP4-019] have proposed changes to this wording.</p> <p>The ExA requests the definition of “maintain” is changed to:</p> <p><i>“includes inspect, repair, adjust, alter, remove, refurbish, reconstruct, replace and improve any part, but not the whole of the authorised development, to the extent that such activities have been assessed in the environmental statement and “maintenance” and “maintaining” are to be construed accordingly”</i></p>

		Provide a response.
DCO 2.3	<p><i>Application and modification of legislative provisions</i></p> <p><i>Article 8 Part 2</i></p> <p>The Applicant</p>	<p>In Written Question DCO 1.6 [PD-006] and at the Issue Specific Hearing on the dDCO held on Thursday 6 December 2018 [EV-014], the ExA sought clarification from the Applicant as to whether consents have been obtained in order to dis-apply a number of consents sought by the Article. The Applicant stated [REP4-011] that while the Internal Drainage Board had given its consent in respect to Articles 8(3)(a) and 8(3)(b), the Environment Agency had not done so in respect to Articles 8(3)(c) and 8(3)(d).</p> <p>Provide an update.</p>
DCO 2.4	<p><i>Temporary and permanent lighting</i></p> <p><i>Requirement 9</i></p> <p><i>Schedule 2</i></p> <p>North Yorkshire County Council</p> <p>Selby District Council</p>	<p>At the Issue Specific Hearing on the dDCO held on Thursday 6 December 2018 [EV-014], the ExA requested that the Applicant consider splitting Requirement 9 into separate Requirements so as to separate temporary and permanent lighting. NYCC/SDC stated that they saw benefits in such a move, and the Applicant stated it would consider doing so. The dDCO submitted at D5 [REP5-011] does not separate the Requirement itself, but divorces temporary and permanent lighting with the insertion of new subparagraphs (4), (5) and (6).</p> <p>Comment on their adequacy.</p>
DCO 2.5	<p><i>Flood Risk Mitigation</i></p> <p><i>Requirement 13</i></p> <p><i>Schedule 2</i></p> <p>The Environment Agency</p>	<p>In its WR [REP2-041], the Environment Agency stated that it required changes to the dDCO [AS-012] in respect to flood risk mitigation. The Applicant inserted a new Requirement 13 into the dDCO submitted at D2 [REP2-014].</p> <p>Comment on its adequacy.</p>
DCO 2.6	<p><i>Ground Conditions</i></p> <p><i>Requirement 14</i></p> <p><i>Schedule 2</i></p>	<p>In its WR [REP2-041], the Environment Agency stated that it required changes to the dDCO [AS-012] in respect to ground conditions. The Applicant substantially re-worded Requirement 14 in the dDCO submitted at D2 [REP2-014].</p>

	<p>The Environment Agency</p> <p>North Yorkshire County Council</p> <p>Selby District Council</p>	<p>Comment on its adequacy.</p>
DCO 2.7	<p><i>Combined Heat and Power</i></p> <p><i>Requirement 21</i></p> <p>The Applicant</p> <p>The Environment Agency</p>	<p>At the Issue Specific Hearing on the dDCO held on Thursday 6 December 2018 [EV-014], the ExA requested details as to why Requirement 21 had been deleted in the updated version of the dDCO [REP2-014]. The Applicant responded, confirmed in its written response to D4 [REP4-011] that it had been removed as it was deemed unnecessary because the matter is controlled by the Environmental Permit Regime (EPR).</p> <p>The ExA has considered the response. However, it considers a separate Requirement in the dDCO is necessary. The ExA considers that even though the Secretary of State, should they decide to make the Order, could rely on the Environment Agency to police the CHP readiness of the scheme, the ExA is concerned that it has other implications, such as an effect on layout, which would fall outside of the EPR.</p> <p>Provide a response, and re-insert Requirement 21 as worded in the dDCO submitted with the Application [AS-012] or suitable appropriate wording.</p>
DCO 2.8	<p><i>Amendments to the dDCO</i></p> <p>The Applicant</p>	<p>Provide a response to NYCC/SDC's suggested amendments tabled at D4 [REP4-019] to the dDCO [REP2-014].</p>
DCO 2.9	<p><i>Protective Provisions</i></p> <p><i>Schedule 11</i></p> <p>National Grid</p>	<p>The Applicant has updated its dDCO with its submissions at D5 [REP5-011] in which Schedule 11 has been significantly amended to include new protective provisions for National Grid Gas, National Grid Electricity Transmission and the Environment Agency.</p> <p>Provide a response on these additions.</p>

	The Environment Agency	
HE	Historic Environment	
HE 2.1	<p><i>dDCO Requirement 15 – permitted preliminary works</i></p> <p>North Yorkshire County Council</p> <p>Selby District Council</p>	<p>Following the ExA's question DCO 1.17 [PD-006] and subsequent responses from NYCC and SDC [REP2-047], amendments were made to the Requirements in the dDCO [REP2-014] with regards to permitted preliminary works. Requirement 15 was amended to insert "... (<i>including permitted preliminary works comprising intrusive archaeological surveys only</i>)..."</p> <p>Provide a response on these additions.</p>
LV	Landscape and Visual	
LV 2.1	<p><i>Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy</i></p> <p>The Applicant</p>	<p>In its WR, Local Impact Report and responses to WQs [REP2-047], as well as submissions at D4 [REP4-021] [REP4-020] NYCC and SDC expressed concerns with the Outline LBS [REP2-026]. NYCC and SDC have made suggestions such as referring back to key impacts in the ES [APP-078] to identify the 'need' for mitigation, compensation and enhancement requirements; and in that context considering wider options for landscape and biodiversity mitigation.</p> <p>i. Explain how the Outline LBS [REP2-026] addresses the concerns and recommendations set out by the NYCC and SDC in the submissions at D4 [REP4-021] [REP4-020].</p>

LV 2.2	<p><i>Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy – Mitigation</i></p> <p>North Yorkshire County Council</p> <p>Selby County Council</p>	<p>At the ISH on Environmental Matters held on Wednesday 5 December 2018 [EV-010 – EV-013], NYCC and SDC referred to a document prepared by its appointed consultant, submitted at D4 [REP4-016], in which a scheme of mitigation and its costings were advanced. NYCC stated orally at the ISH that it considered the document [REP4-016] was a starting point on which to base negotiations with the Applicant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Set out the position in respect to offsite landscape mitigation including the Outline LBS [REP2-026] and the wording of Requirement 8 of the dDCO [REP5-011]. Update any documents accordingly. ii. Justify the mitigation as set out in the D4 submission [REP4-016], specifically that the financial contributions sought meet the tests of Paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework in that they are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;</i> b) <i>Directly related to the development; and</i> c) <i>Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.</i> iii. Confirm to what extent the land required for the mitigation as set out in the D4 submission [REP4-016] is within their control.
LV 2.3	<p><i>Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy – Mitigation</i></p> <p>The Applicant</p>	<p>Paragraph 3.16.13 of the draft SoCG with NYCC and SDC [REP4-008] states that the Applicant does not agree with the contents, observations, conclusions and recommendations of NYCC’s D4 submission entitled Drax Re-Power Off-Site Mitigation Strategy [REP4-016].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Set out the main concerns with the submission in terms of the scope of its recommendations, and the proposed financial contribution. ii. Explain how it can be revised to address concerns.
LV 2.4	<p><i>Revised Viewpoints and Additional Photomontages</i></p>	<p>The Applicant submitted revised Viewpoints and Additional Photomontage as part of its D5 submissions [REP5-017]. However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Figures 1.1 and 1.4 do not have labels for the photomontage locations; these

	The Applicant	<p>have to be referenced from previously submitted documents. Provide a revised version of the Figures with the photomontage locations labelled on the Figures.</p> <p>ii. Section 4.1.9 states that new information on site topography has been provided, such that although the stacks associated with Units X and Y would increase in height by up to 3m, the difference in height between the stacks and the existing cooling towers would remain the same. Confirm that the correct topographical information has been used in the construction of all of the photomontages and that all of the submitted photomontages are accurate representations.</p> <p>iii. Sections 4.2.3 and 4.3.2; confirm which character area or viewpoints are referred to in the statements "...G / given the oblique angle from which the stacks would be viewed..." or otherwise clarify the statement.</p>
--	----------------------	---

NV	Noise and Vibration	
NV 2.1	<p><i>Implications of stack height changes for noise emissions</i></p> <p>The Applicant</p>	<p>The parameters of the stack heights have been amended in the dDCO [REP3-008]. This increases the stack heights to 123m AGL (129m AOD) from 120m (126m). A minimum stack height is set at 122.5m AGL (128.5m AOD).</p> <p>Confirm what implication the change in stack height will have for noise levels at receptor locations and whether this affects the conclusions of significance in the noise and vibration assessment.</p>

TT	Traffic and Transport	
TT 2.1	<p><i>Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan</i></p> <p>North Yorkshire County Council</p> <p>Selby District Council</p>	<p>Comment on the Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan submitted at D5 [REP5-018].</p>
TT 2.2	<p><i>Agreement regarding footbridge</i></p> <p>The Applicant</p> <p>North Yorkshire County Council</p>	<p>Provide an update regarding progress towards any further provisions or agreements required in respect of the footbridge.</p>
TT 2.3	<p><i>SoCG with Highways England</i></p> <p>The Applicant</p>	<p>Provide an update on progress regarding the draft SoCG with Highways England [REP2-028], in particular with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the movement of Abnormal Indivisible Loads by water; • the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan and Outline Construction Workers Travel Plan; and • J36 of the M36 at Goole.