

Planning Act 2008 (as amended) and the Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 (as amended)

EN010048: Application by Capture Power Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for White Rose Carbon Capture and Storage Project

Response by North Yorkshire County Council/Selby District Council to First Round of Questions

Development Consent Order (DCO)

2.1 - DCO Articles (A) 10 and A40

Applicant, Selby District Council (SDC), North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) and any interested party

Articles (A)10 & A40 – power to alter the layout of streets and procedure in relation to certain approvals. There is currently a conflict between A10(5), which provides that the street authority will be deemed to have granted consent after 8 weeks, and A40(2), which provides generally that such consents, including those from street authorities will be deemed to be granted after 28 days.

Which should be the correct period, allowing a reasonable period for affected parties to respond?

SDC/NYCC comment

This should be 28 days,

2.3 – DCO Article (A) 30

Applicant

A30 – temporary use of land for carrying out authorised development. A30(3)(a) provides that the land may be used temporarily until 3 years after the completion of commissioning. This seems to be a very long period, in comparison to other projects like Thames Tideway DCO, which only allows one year from the completion of works. Could the applicant justify the period requested?

SDC/NYCC comment

It is noted that A30(3)(a) provides that the land may be used temporarily until 3 years after the completion of commissioning. We are concerned about the total length of time that this land may be disturbed, and residential and recreational amenity, agricultural land use, and the landscape setting of Drax Priory SM/Drax Abbey Farm detrimentally affected. The concern over the potential extension of time is because:

- The land is also to be used in connection with the construction of the Y&H CCS pipeline and the construction of the raised platform, which may precede or overlap with the construction of the power station, with potential for it to be left in a disturbed state between phases of work;
- The power station construction is said to take around 5 years but work may not start immediately after receiving approval – there could be several years delay;
- Commissioning may not occur immediately after completion of construction – there could be technological and/or economic factors which affect the start date, including the need for the CCS pipeline to also be available and functioning.

2.4 – Requirement (R) 2 – notice of commencement

Applicant and SDC

Requirement (R)2 – notice of the start of commissioning.

The requirement is not clear, in that it requires notice to be given both prior to commissioning and within 14 days of the start of commissioning. Which is the actual period of notice required?

Selby comment

Selby District Council would suggest that this should be:

The undertaker shall give the relevant Local Planning Authority 14 days notice of their intention to commence development and no development shall commence until this notice has been served.

2.5 – Requirement R4 – detailed design

Applicant, SDC and NYCC

R4(2) prevents the commencement of Work 1B (other than site raising) until details have been provided to the local planning authority. However, the description of Work 1B does not include site raising but relates to temporary laydown and construction areas. Either the requirement should be reworded or the description of the Work should be updated so that the two are consistent.

Also, is the LPA content with the level of detail provided with the application, so that the detailed design can be covered by R4?

SDC/NYCC comment

The LPA would refer the Inspector to Paragraph 8.20 of the Local Impact Report which confirms that further detail is required so that detailed design can be covered by R4.

NYCC and SDC would like to see R5 amended to require information to be submitted and approved before commencement rather than before the generating station is brought into commercial use. Areas of particular landscape concern are Work No 1A (generating station site), Work No 1B (Laydown Areas 1-7), 6 (Laydown Area 7 consisting of jetty on River Ouse) and Work No 7 (11kV Diversion Works which could affect trees on Pear Tree Avenue). This is justified by the need to incorporate relevant vegetation and soil protection and ground preparation into programming from the beginning, to consider the potential for advance planting to increase its effectiveness and value, and to reduce the length of time of unmitigated visual impact if there are delays in commissioning. It is understood that the Applicant is considering the amendment of DCP Requirement 5 so approval is required prior to commencement (with the exception of site-raising).

2.6 – Requirement R31 – changes approved by the relevant planning authority

Applicant and SDC

This requirement currently refers to the words “unless otherwise approved by the relevant planning authority”. However, the wording used in requirements 6-19, 21 and 23-26 is “unless otherwise agreed”. So, the requirement should be reworded to reflect the wording in other requirements.

Selby comment

The LPA would suggest that the DCO be revised so that it reads ‘unless otherwise approved’ throughout.

2.7- Requirement R33 – interpretation of this Schedule – definition of ‘commence’

Applicant, SDC and NYCC

R33 – interpretation of this Schedule – definition of “commence”.

a) Firstly, the requirement excludes certain material operations and so conflicts with requirements such as R15 (which prevents commencement until a scheme of archaeological investigation has been approved) and R14 (requirement for a contaminated land scheme). For example, “diversion and laying of services” is

excluded from the definition of development and so can take place before these schemes have been approved, which could mean that services could be laid through archaeologically important areas or contaminated land. Similarly, “remedial work in respect of any contamination or other adverse ground conditions” does not constitute development, making R14 ineffective as remediation works can commence before a contaminated land scheme is approved.

SDC/NYCC comment

SDC/NYCC consider that the exemptions have not been justified.

Requirement 15 is clear that no “authorised development” may “commence” until a scheme of archaeological investigation is submitted and approved. Amendment is sought to Requirement 33 to include “any works that may cause ground disturbance” to the definition of commencement.

Transport

5.1 – Transport – Traffic flow

Applicant, NYCC and East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC)

The updated model for the Ouse Renewable Energy project states that only two locations would experience more traffic and that peak hour flows would not change significantly (Chapter E, section 3.5 of the ES (vol. 2)). Are the assumptions and outputs from this model robust and where can the justification for these results be found?

NYCC comments

The Applicant should be able to provide the relevant traffic data to demonstrate the changes in traffic flows. Only one of the routes listed in Table 3.2 which experiences an increase greater than 5% is in North Yorkshire - A1041 between A63 and Selby. We have a permanent traffic counter on this stretch of road which shows the AADF flows in 2013 were actually similar to the 2012 flows quoted in Table 3.2 with only a 0.34% increase. However even based on the flows in the Transport Assessment the junction modelling of the A63/A1041 roundabout demonstrates that there will not be a capacity problem in the peak periods.

5.8 – Transport – Cumulative Impacts

Applicant, SDC and NYCC

What was the justification for the other projects considered as part of the cumulative impact assessment for transport and were they agreed with the Local Planning/Highway Authority?

NYCC comments

The other projects considered as part of the cumulative impact will all have an impact on the highway network and the Local Highway Authority are satisfied with their inclusion.

5.9 – Transport – Limits to Operational impact

Applicant and NYCC

Is there a need for any further requirements to limit the operational impact on the transport system, for example, a limit on total HGV trips per day?

NYCC comment

As we understand fuel is to be transported by road rather than rail, the LHA would support a limit on the total number of HGV trips per day. The recently submitted sensitivity test quoted 234 HGV trips per day and we would support this being the limit.

5.10 – Transport – Limiting deliveries

Applicant and NYCC

What would be the effect of limiting deliveries during construction to off-peak hours, during day time rather than night time? If beneficial, does this need to be included in the R19?

NYCC comment

This question is not clear. If the suggestion is that deliveries are limited to night time rather than day time, this would obviously be beneficial in terms of impact on the local highway network.

Ecology

6.1 – Ecology – Baseline Information

Applicant, NE, YWT, EA, SDC and NYCC

Has the amount of baseline information, for example North and East Yorkshire Ecological Data Centre (NEYEDC) ecological records, the level of survey effort and data and the level of detail of the assessment been sufficient to ensure that the impact on protected species and habitats has been fully assessed against relevant criteria? Is any further information required?

NYCC comment

The PEIR which we previously commented on concluded that further survey work would be required, including bait marking to determine badger territories and that this would be required prior to the submission of the ES as NSIP guidance requires a draft licence application to be submitted. The ES has not been informed by further badger survey work and relies upon the same information as the PEIR (last survey October 2013). The ES confidential badger report concludes that there is a need to undertake further badger survey work including bait marking to finalise the detail of the mitigation strategy. It is disappointing that the further survey work has not been undertaken in advance of the ES being produced as this would have allowed the badger mitigation strategy and licence application to be more detailed and up to date. All other baseline information was considered to be accurate at the time, although we note that YWT have raised concerns about the baseline data and surveys for water vole.

6.4 - Otters

Applicant

National Grid has identified the presence of otter (EPS) in Carr Dyke. Is this a potential omission from the surveys?

NYCC comment

We have no direct response to this question which was not asked to us but note that we have not picked up on this in the LIR but if this is the case then it needs to be considered as the otter is a EPS.

6.6 – Biodiversity offsetting

Applicant, EA and YWT

Provide a formal offsetting calculation to demonstrate that an appropriate level of compensation for habitat loss would be given e.g. using the Defra 2012 offsetting methodology (Biodiversity Offsetting Pilots. Guidance for developers. DEFRA, March 2012).

NYCC comment

We have no response to this question which was not directed at us but would note that NYCC very much welcome the need for the applicant to develop an appropriate strategy to deal with mitigation, compensation and enhancement in Landscape and Ecology terms.

6.11 – Biodiversity management plan

Should YWT also be a consultee on the biodiversity management plan in R16?

NYCC comment

Not a question directly for NYCC to answer but NYCC would support YWT being a consultee.

6.12 - Maintenance period for the mitigation and enhancement works

Applicant, NE and YWT

A period of maintenance for the mitigation and enhancement works needs to be specified in R16 2(b). Can the applicant comment on a suitable maintenance period eg aligned with the landscaping maintenance proposals.

NYCC comment

Not a question directly for NYCC to answer but we would comment on the need to consider a period of maintenance for mitigation and enhancement that is suitable to the habitats/features being provided in ecological terms, it should not just look at standard landscaping maintenance which is not suitable for biodiversity. A much longer period of maintenance is recommended.

6.13 - Landscape plans and the biodiversity management plan

Applicant

R5 and R16 require the landscape plans and the biodiversity management plan to be submitted and approved before commissioning. Should these not be required before development commences to allow for them to be integrated into the overall scheme?

NYCC comment

Not a question directly for NYCC to answer but NYCC absolutely agree that the biodiversity management plan need to be submitted and agreed before the commencement of development – otherwise we cannot know whether or not it will be acceptable and we would also agree that measures need to be incorporated within the overall scheme.

6.14 - Flood attenuation pond

Applicant and YWT

Justify the use of the proposed flood attenuation pond for mitigation for both flood risk and biodiversity.

NYCC comment

Not a question directly for NYCC to answer but NYCC would say that the flood attenuation ponds primary function will always be flood management, any biodiversity benefits are secondary and should therefore not be used as the sole mitigation/compensation/enhancement for those species/habitats. More information is required from the applicant on mitigation, compensation and enhancement.

Comments are again focused on the same issues in the LIR, SoCG and my attached response to the ES.

Water Resources/Flooding Issues

7.1 – Water Resources/Flooding – Private abstraction data

Applicant, SDC and EA

Private abstraction data has not been sought from the Local Authority. To what extent is this significant in this area and would it have implications for increased abstractions at Drax?

Selby comment

Selby District Council would defer to the Environment Agency for a response on this matter.

7.12 – Flooding – Flood risk zones

Applicant, EA and SDC

Confirm the exact flood risk zones for the proposed development including whether parts of the site are in Zone 3a or 3b and what are the implications for any mitigation. Does this zoning take into account any updates to the EA Upper Humber modelling?

Selby comment

Please see Appendix 1 which provides the latest Flood maps which Selby District Council would refer to in establishing the Flood Zones for the development.

SDC would defer to the Environment Agency for a response with respect to updates regarding Upper Humber modelling.

7.16 – Land drainage consent

Applicant

Land drainage consent is likely to be required. Should this be added to the list of other consents?

NYCC comment

NYCC is the Lead Local Flood Authority for the whole county of North Yorkshire. However, the project falls within the administrative boundary of the Shire Group of IDBs (Selby Area IDB) to whose opinion as local risk management authority we would defer.

We note that section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991, that details the requirements for Land Drainage Consent, subsection (6) states that the requirement for Land Drainage Consent does not apply to “any works carried out or maintained under or in pursuance of any Act or order having the force of an Act”. If the Development Consent Order for this project fulfils that parameter of the Land Drainage Act then Land Drainage Consent will not be required. However, the consideration of Land Drainage Consent, and whether it would be required, would be the decision of the Internal Drainage Board, if not dealt with separately in the DCO.

Landscape/Visual Impact

8.1 – Landscape/Visual Impact – LVIA Study Area

Applicant, SDC and NYCC

Give further justification for the extent of the LVIA study area of 7.5km, rather than the 15km originally proposed. Was this revised area the subject of consultation with the LPA? Would a 15km study area have resulted in other sensitive receptors being included in the study area?

SDC/NYCC comment

NYCC did not endorse the current 7.5 km radius for the LVIA study area, although there was discussion and there were queries over this and the extent of the CLVIA study area which was never clearly defined. The Final Scoping Report dated 4th December 2012 proposed a 15 km study area radius for the LVIA but did not say whether this was intended to also be the CLVIA radius. The apparent boundary for viewpoint selection of 7.5 km was discussed with ERM in January 2014, and queried, as was the extent of the CLVIA. The draft PEIR proposed a 7.5 km radius for the LVIA based on ‘professional judgement’ and this was again queried. The draft ES was not available for comment before submission.

8.2 – Landscape/Visual Impact – Cumulative Assessment

Applicant and SDC, NYCC

What was the justification for the other projects considered as part of the cumulative impact assessment for landscape and visual impact and were they agreed with the Local Planning Authority?

SDC/NYCC comment

ERM consulted NYCC on cumulative effects screening of development in June 2014. The areas of influence for the project were listed in Table 1, and for Landscape and Visual the area was ‘up to 10 km’. A number of developments were listed, but in relation to the cumulative EIA as a whole rather than the LVIA. The suggested area of influence of ‘up to 10 km’ was queried as being very minimal, with reference to the fact that the Eggborough Power Station was only just included. The draft PEIR did not include information on CLVIA, and the need for a CLVIA study area to be confirmed and justified was pointed out by NYCC. It was stated that more justification for limiting the study area was needed, given the general openness of the landscape and the intervisibility of some existing developments which are over 7.5 km apart. There was a wider concern about the incremental effects of industrialisation which needed to be considered under the CLVIA. . The CLVIA only looked at ‘in combination’ visual effects, not sequential effects from linear viewpoints.

In addition some landscape character areas were scoped out of the CLVIA with little justification, and therefore it may be the case that the incremental effects of industrialisation on the study area were underestimated.

8.4 – Landscape/Visual Impact – Impacts of works near Jetty

Applicant and NYCC

Little reference is made to the landscape impact of works near the jetty. On what basis were these ruled out? Also, little reference is made to the impact of the restoration of Barlow Mound and the works in connection with the National Grid pipeline, in terms of cumulative impact. Have these been scoped out and, if so, what was the reasoning?

SDC/NYCC comment

It is agreed that more information is needed on the landscape impact of works near the jetty (Laydown Area 7 under Work No 1B) which are considered to be temporary. It is also agreed that more information is needed on the impact of the works (including the sourcing of material from the Barlow Mound area for the associated land raising) on the future restoration of Barlow Mound. This needs to consider the implications and opportunities for potential visual impact mitigation through offsite screening afforded by the mound and its future landform and planting.

The impact of the works in connection with the National Grid CCS pipeline needs to be considered in relation to temporary and residual landscape and visual impacts, and it is considered that different timescale scenarios for associated works which are not part of the DCO application, and the generating station construction should be identified and assessed, including the impacts on mitigation.

8.9 – Landscape/Visual Impact – Magnitude of Change

Applicant and NYCC

In Chapter H, Table 4.2 of the ES (vol. 2), the magnitude of change to receptors has been reduced due to the presence of the existing power station. How has the magnitude been evaluated and has it been applied appropriately in all cases? A similar approach has been taken to lighting at night, with the light spill from the proposal largely discounted, when compared to that from the existing power station. Give further justification to this approach.

NYCC comment

Table 4.2 covers effects on visual receptors at selected viewpoints. The 3rd edition GLVIA describes how the magnitude of visual effects is evaluated (paragraph 6.39). It is related to the size or scale of the change in the view including the proportion of the view occupied by the proposed development. It is also affected by factors including the degree of contrast or integration with the existing landscape, whether the views will be full, partial or glimpsed, the nature of the development and the relative amount of time over which it will be experienced. It is therefore a relatively objective assessment. However it is only evaluating a view from a point and so can underestimate the degrees of magnitude experienced from linear viewpoints. The photomontages show that the design of the proposed power station is very different from the existing, and therefore there will be a contrast which has not sufficiently been taken into account. In some views it is seen as separated from the existing power station. It is also possible that there has been some underestimation of the magnitude of change because the photomontages were taken in summer when trees can effectively provide screening whereas in winter the development might be more clearly visible. NYCC does not agree with the following assessments of magnitude of change:

- Viewpoint 1 (small magnitude, minor significance) from Barmby Barrage on the Trans Pennine Trail, only 1.1 km distant, where the proposed development would be seen as very distinctly separate from the existing power station, and only partly backgrounded by Barlow Mound. The ES assessment of cumulative impact with the existing Drax Power Station from this point gives a medium magnitude, with receptors of high sensitivity, giving an impact of moderate significance. However this is the same assessment as was made for the previous Ouse Renewable Energy Project which was much smaller and also further away from the viewer. The cumulative impact is what would be experienced. It is considered that the ES assessment of magnitude and significance is an underestimate, particularly since it depends on vegetation which could be less effective in winter.
- Viewpoint 2 (medium magnitude, receptors of high sensitivity, moderate significance) from the Trans Pennine Trail less than 1 km to the north north east from where there are open views towards the development, seen as a linked but largely separate development which is closer to the viewer and therefore proportionally larger in the field of view, comparable with that of the existing power station. The ES assessment of cumulative impact from this point gives the magnitude as high, resulting in a **major** cumulative effect.
- Viewpoint 14 (small magnitude, high sensitivity of receptor, minor significance) from Pear Tree Avenue, 1.38 km distant. However the ES assessment of cumulative impact from this point gives the magnitude as medium and the cumulative effect as moderate. The development forms a distinct grouping of a sizeable scale, separated from the existing power station. Lower parts of the

development are screened by trees but these are in full leaf and will be less effective in winter.

- Viewpoint 17 (medium magnitude of change, high sensitivity of receptor, moderate significance) which is on PROW 35.47/6/1, next to construction laydown areas and close to the WRCCS site and where inevitably the magnitude of change will be substantial rather than medium. The change in character of the view is also more significant – at least moderate-major - than is apparent because of the proximity to the Drax Abbey Farm ‘island’ which the photomontage does not show. This is also a point on a linear route around the site which currently crosses open farmland and from which the Drax Abbey ‘island’ effect can currently be viewed. A substantial change will be evident, of at least moderate-major significance.

NYCC generally agrees with the following assessments of magnitude of change experienced;

- Viewpoints 3, 4 and 5 (negligible) where the power station and laydown areas would be generally screened by existing Drax Power Station buildings and infrastructure;
- Viewpoints 8, 12 and 16 (negligible) where Barlow Mound would be in the forefront of views and would provide substantial screening;
- Viewpoints 10 and 11 (negligible) where the viewpoints are 5 km or over and there are some intervening features, although even so ‘small’ might be a better assessment in the case of Viewpoint 10 at Wressle where the view is open and the power station would be seen as a separate development;
- From Viewpoint 6 the visibility is dependent on intervening trees which are shown in full leaf. Trees may not be permanent features in the landscape and winter views may reveal more of the development, which would be viewed as a large development only 2 km distant and separate from the existing power station. There is therefore some doubt over the assessment of magnitude.
- From Viewpoint 15 at White House Farm a small part of the WRCCS power station is screened by Barlow Mound, but the current restoration plan shows a significant future northward extension of the Mound. The degree to which the northern part of the Mound may be subject to change as a result of the proposals and associated development is unclear. The development of offsite planting on Barlow Mound would be important in mitigating these views, but at present the potential has not been assessed.

The assessment of significance will take into account the sensitivity of the receptors. Generally this has been established as high. Some are users of linear routes who will experience sequential views, including cumulative effects in combination or in succession.

The effects on landscape character are covered by Table 4.1. Further views and changes in character will also be experienced by a broader range of receptors who

may be moving around within the study area and viewing the changes from different perspectives, and either in combination with other developments, or sequentially.

The effects of increased light spill are part of the incremental industrialisation which the CLVIA should address. Locally, to the north of the existing power station, an area which is currently greenfield land in agricultural use will be urbanised, with temporary or permanent effects. This will be seen in many views as an extension to the existing power station or as an almost separate area of development and should be assessed as additional to the effects of current development rather than discounted,

8.10 Landscape/Visual Impact – Links to Green Infrastructure Corridor

Applicant and NYCC

Give further details of the linkages from the landscape masterplan through to the green infrastructure corridors. To what extent has off site mitigation been considered to assist with these linkages and provide mitigation in the wider landscape?

NYCC comment

As mentioned in the LIR, NYCC/SDC are of the view that very little attention has been paid to GI linkage in the ES and landscape and biodiversity masterplan.!

Historic Environment

9.1 Archaeological investigation

Applicant

What progress has been made with the proposals for further archaeological investigation to evaluate the archaeological potential on site set out in the ES? How will it be possible to incorporate mitigation as a result of the further investigations into the proposal? Should a draft be supplied to ensure adequate mitigation, secured through R15?

NYCC comment

The WSI for evaluation by trial trenching has been approved by NYCC and Historic England. We are unsure when this is going to take place – we were under the impression that this was imminently but it would appear not.

At present it is difficult to determine the level of archaeological mitigation that is required as the archaeological potential of the site is not understood – however, a draft document (with the understanding that this would be revised/updated/agreed)

could be submitted and included to ensure that this element is not overlooked and is planned for within the programme etc.

Waste Management and Minerals

10.2 - Land raising

Applicant

List the materials and sources of fill that would be used in land raising. How does the use and sourcing comply with national and local waste and minerals policy?

NYCC comment

This directed at the Applicant, but raises issues relevant to NYCC in terms of the potential source of the fill material (and therefore potentially the issue of compliance with policy). We will need to respond to this question, given that it is an issue which we have queried because of the reference material is being sourced from an unspecified part within the footprint of the mound. Note only ash is permitted for recovery from the Mound

Socio-Economics

11.1 – Socio- Economics – Local Regeneration Strategy

Applicant and SDC

What are the positive and negative impacts on the Council's local regeneration strategy and the more general socio-economic impacts? Are there any impacts which require further resolution, either through requirements or S106 agreements?

NYCC Economic Growth comments

Selby District has some pockets of local deprivation and levels of unemployment which although above average for North Yorkshire are below the national average.

The White Rose CCS project along with the development of a new housing and employment site in Selby has the potential to make a significant local impact and in the wider area.

The York, North Yorkshire and East Riding Local Enterprise Partnership's Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) makes direct reference to the Drax Carbon Capture and Storage project stating that it,

'is a shining example of the innovative business transformations taking place within our region.'

The SEP includes the activity heading:

10) Support investment in energy and resource efficiency

There are no perceived negative impacts on the work of the SEP and there are opportunities to further support the project through SEP Priority, Inspired People which includes training measures and skills development including the following priority:

11) Increase productivity by investing in workforce skills.

- Research and communicate sector needs
- Develop specific training packages that meet local priority sector and investor needs

The project is therefore directly recognised for its strategic importance and there are measures in place to ensure that local workforce planning takes place.

NYCC Children and Young Peoples' Service comments

Capture Power Ltd's (CPL) Socio-economic Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) makes reference to employment opportunities for people living locally and also notes that the availability of labour and skills is critical in accommodating the demands, needs and requirements of the Project.

The ES confirms that the development will generate approximately 60 FTEs when the plant is up and running. In addition there will be an average of approximately 3,300 at the peak of construction, with an estimated average of approximately 1,000 staff employed on site during the five year construction period.

It appears that employment opportunities will relate to energy, infrastructure, manufacturing and construction.

CPL has indicated that the project could assist "in developing the skills and education of the local population through the involvement of local educational institutions with a view to upgrading the skills of the existing workforce and develop the skills of the younger people going forward." In addition CPL state that CPL and Selby District Council will engage with local educational providers to ensure that the number of skilled workers available locally is maximised.

11.2 – Socio- Economics – Local Workforce

Applicant and SDC

How would it be possible to recruit the workforce locally, where possible, and provide apprenticeships be implemented? What analysis has been carried out of skills

available in the local area which could be utilised at the facility? Might this form part of any S106 agreement and how would it be enforced?

NYCC Economic Growth comments

Selby has relatively low levels of JSA claimants – 1.3% compared to a national level of 1.9%. However the percentage of JSA claimants aged 18-24 years (3.4%) is higher than GB at 2.8%. In addition, Selby in broad terms has one of the highest percentage in North Yorkshire of young people aged 16-18 years who are NEET.

Given the district's proximity to a number of larger urban centres and the likelihood that some of the employment opportunities created through this development will be specialised, it is unlikely that the majority of the workforce will be recruited within the Selby District. NYCC, in partnership with Selby District Council, is working closely with the York, North Yorkshire & East Riding LEP to ensure that measures are in place to maximise local recruitment, skills and training.

NYCC Children and Young Peoples' Service comments

At present we are awaiting further discussions with CPL to determine the skills needs required to construct and run the plant. Until this is available it is difficult to determine the match between the local workforce and the needs of the employer, and what training would be needed to upskill people locally. NYCC has requested information in relation to the level and types of jobs which will be needed at the plant as follows:

- A breakdown of the types of jobs which might be available locally, including the number in each sector and the skills needed
- Confirmation of the number of apprenticeship vacancies arising (if any), including sectors and levels
- The construction of the site will, it appears, generate a substantial number of construction vacancies. It would be helpful if the Applicant could confirm the arrangements which might be in place with sub-contractors to encourage local recruitment, development of apprenticeship opportunities and support for adults who require re-training.
- In relation to North Yorkshire, Selby District generally has the highest percentage and/or volume of 16-17 year olds who are Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET) . In addition, more than 25% of unemployed adults are aged between 18 and 24 years. A development and skills strategy supporting local educational providers to deliver learning opportunities aimed at helping young people and adults to access local employment opportunities, would be welcomed.

Local educational providers would benefit from increased knowledge and understanding of Carbon Capture and Storage. Therefore, it may be appropriate to request a contribution to support curriculum development e.g. purchase of appropriate equipment and resources to support teaching and learning.

At present CPL is not able to clarify the details requested above but there is on-going dialogue with the Applicant regarding employment, skills and training. NYCC/SDC would welcome the opportunity to work with CPL to agree a development and skills strategy aimed at supporting local employment of young people and adults wherever possible.

In relation to the construction of the site and running of the plant, it may be appropriate for the Applicant to agree a development and skills strategy outlining CPL's skills and workforce requirements and how these might benefit the local community. NYCC/SDC are in discussion with CPL in relation to such a strategy and welcomes further discussion.

NYCC may request a S106/further DCO requirements to enable delivery of further employment and training opportunities in conjunction with Selby District Council

General

17.3 – General – Section 106 required

Based on existing information, would any S106 agreement be required or unilateral undertaking submitted? If so, what would this cover?

SDC/NYCC comments

Reference is made to the discussions that will be on-going with the Applicant in relation to whether landscape mitigation/compensation and skills training will be appropriately delivered using S 106- as suggested by NYCC/SDC in LIR.

The existing Barlow Mounds legal agreements will need to be considered more fully by NYCC in their capacity as Waste Planning Authority,

17.7 – General – De-commissioning

Applicant and SDC

The definition of the end-use of the site after decommissioning is wide (agriculture or other development activity). Has this constrained the assessment of decommissioning in the ES?

SDC/NYCC comment

Decommissioning and restoration has not been adequately covered in the ES, but it overlaps with the land raising application. This whole topic needs further clarification and discussion

APPENDIX 1 - Flood Zones

The map below is taken from the Selby District Council mapping system and shows the Flood Zones. Those areas containing no hatching are in Flood Zone 1, those with a single hatch are in Zone 2 and those which are cross hatched are in Zone 3.

The area does benefit from flood defences and as such the LPA would consider any areas located within the highest flood zone to be within Zone 3a.

