

AQ	Air Quality & Dust	
AQ 1.3	Baseline Data  <b>North Yorkshire CC</b> <b>Selby DC</b> <b>Environment Agency</b>	Provide a response to paragraphs 8.4.7 to 8.4.10 of the ES [APP-046], which refer to sources of air quality monitoring data in the local area and why the most appropriate source for the modelling is the Defra mapping.
	Response	<p>The Defra mapping is specifically produced to assist local authorities and developers with air quality levels where no local monitoring is undertaken. In this case the monitoring for Nox is referred to in paragraphs 8.4.8 to 8.4.10 but as pointed out this is some distance from the proposed development site.</p> <p>However, as referred to in paragraph 8.4.12, it is understood that some monitoring has been undertaken as part of the Aire Valley Power Stations Joint Environment Programme. This information has been considered by the Applicant and the Authorities. The information provides no significant differences in levels, which would suggest that the Defra mapping information is an appropriate source of modelling. The Applicant also conducted a survey of Nox levels in the vicinity of the Site during the period of November 16 to February 17 at 7 receptor sites (paragraph 8.4.13). As provided in the ES, as the survey was only a four month sampling period (and therefore reading levels cannot be directly related to a yearly mean) but it is expected that the months monitored would be those which would be expected to have higher Nox levels than the average.</p> <p>On that basis, consideration of the additional data for the area does not indicate that the Defra mapping is inappropriate.</p>

AQ 1.22	Cumulative Impacts <b>The Applicant</b>	Paragraph 8.4.20 of the ES [APP-046] states that the adjacent Saint Gobain manufacturing facility “ <i>is not expected to emit the same pollutants as the Proposed Development and therefore does not represent a risk to attainment of the NAQS for the study species</i> ”. Justify this assertion.
	Response	The new manufacturing facility adjacent to the Saint Gobain glass plant produces polyisocyanurate insulation board (PIR) and is permitted by Selby DC. The permit sets emission limits for Di-isocyanate, particulate matter and volatile organic compounds. The particulate matter originates from the cutting of the board and is mitigated through a fabric filters prior to discharge.
<b>AH</b>	<b>Archaeology and Heritage</b>	
AH1.2	Outline Written Scheme of Investigation  <b>North Yorkshire County Council</b>	<i>Provide a response as to the adequacy of Requirement 16 of the draft DCO [APP-005] in reducing potentially significant archaeological effects during construction to a not significant level.</i>
	Response	The Applicant proposes to undertake a staged programme of archaeological investigation followed by mitigation. North Yorkshire County Council is satisfied that requirement 16 of the draft DCO will reduce potentially significant archaeological effects to a not significant level, subject to additional wording to secure mitigation measure referred to below. Please see paragraph 8.16 and 8.17 of the Local Impact Report for further comment on this.  NYCC have recommended that targeted archaeological trial trenching takes place to further assess the significance including features in the Hall Garths area. It is acknowledged that it is usual to require this information prior to a planning decision being made; which is in line with the advice given in the NPPF (para. 128).

		<p>In discussions with the Applicant the Authorities have been made aware that trial trenching is not possible due to access along the pipeline route. Whilst the advice given in line with the NPPF remains, the Authorities have sought to find a suitable alternative with the Applicant.</p> <p>It has been established that the archaeological risk can be managed by DCO requirement. The requirement will require a programme of archaeological evaluation which will inform a mitigation strategy comprising either preservation in situ or archaeological investigation and reporting.</p> <p>As above the relevant DCO Requirement (Requirement 16) will require a programme of archaeological evaluation which will inform a mitigation strategy comprising either preservation in situ or archaeological investigation and reporting. In its current state it is felt by the Authorities that the wording does not go far enough to secure the mitigation element of this strategy. The Authorities will seek to propose amended wording for including into the draft DCO which adequately secures how such mitigation will be carried out.</p> <p>Requirement 16 is therefore will be considered fit for purpose once revised wording can be agreed as above.</p>
AH1.4	<p>Hall Garths Medieval Moated Site</p> <p><b>Selby DC</b> <b>North Yorkshire DC</b></p>	<p><i>Set out your concerns in respect to the effect of the proposed development on the Hall Garths Medieval Moated Site Scheduled Ancient Monument (and in particular its peripheral features) as, raised in your Relevant Representation [RR-018].</i></p>
	<p>Response</p>	<p>The geophysical survey provided by the Applicant indicates that archaeological features may survive in the periphery of the site.</p>

		<p>The Application has demonstrated that the medieval moated site at Hall Garths will be avoided, although peripheral features might be present and any impact here will require additional mitigation.</p> <p>The Applicant proposes to undertake a staged programme of archaeological investigation followed by mitigation which will either involve the retention of archaeological remains by design or a programme of archaeological investigation and recording that could be secured by DCO requirement 16.</p> <p>These requirements would be agreed with the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with NYCC's archaeologist, in the form of a written scheme of investigation for each phase of archaeological work, which will be secured by the DCO. In its current state it is felt by the Authorities that the wording does not go far enough to secure the mitigation element of this strategy. The Authorities will seek to propose amended wording for including into the draft DCO which adequately secures how such mitigation will be carried out.</p>
AH1.5	<p>Historic Assessment of Existing Coal-Fired Station</p> <p><b>The Applicant</b></p> <p><b>Selby DC</b></p> <p><b>North Yorkshire CC</b></p>	<p><i>North Yorkshire County Council and Selby District Council in their Relevant Representation [RR-018] expressed concerns as to whether an assessment had been undertaken on the loss of the existing power station on the historic environment.</i></p> <p><i>For NYCC/Selby DC:</i></p> <p><i>i) Explain your comments further.</i></p>
	Response	<p>Chapter 13 of the environmental statement includes in it a broad discussion of the existing power station as a heritage asset in its own right. Paragraph 13.6.40 acknowledges that Eggborough Power Station will be lost as a heritage asset but the assessment criteria has not been applied specifically to it as it has in other areas, eg negligible impact, significant impact etc.</p>

		<p>The Authorities would refer you to paragraph 8.10 of the Local Impact report in relation to this topic.</p> <p>The Authorities agree whilst the existing coal-fired power station is a heritage asset in its own right, Historic England ('HE') does not consider there to be sufficient justification in heritage terms to warrant listing the existing power station. While it is acknowledged that there is continuing uncertainty as to the exact date for the closure of the existing coal-fired power station, it is agreed that the Applicant, in accordance with the guidance produced by HE relating to recording later C20th power stations, will appropriately record the existing power station prior to its demolition.</p> <p>The authorities are satisfied that the loss of the exiting power station will be sufficiently recorded.</p>
<b>BE</b>	<b>Biodiversity and Ecology</b>	
BE1.3	<p>Woodland Screening</p> <p><b>The Applicant</b></p> <p><b>Selby DC</b></p> <p><b>Yorkshire Wildlife Trust</b></p>	<p><i>Yorkshire Wildlife Trust in its Relevant Representation [RR-011] states that the proposed woodland screening proposals may not be sufficient to raise the condition of the woodland to 'good' as non-native trees cannot be removed and the canopy is mainly closed which reduces opportunities for improving the understorey of the woodland. These comments are made in reference to paragraph 5.1 of the Indicative Landscape and Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy [APP-035].</i></p> <p><i>For the Applicant:</i></p> <p><i>i) Explain the extent to which maintaining the existing level of screening may compromise the ability to achieve "meaningful enhancement".</i></p>

		<p><i>For Selby DC/Yorkshire Wildlife Trust</i></p> <p><i>ii) Comment on the extent to which you are satisfied that the Applicant’s biodiversity offsetting metrics summarised in table 5.2 and Appendix 2 of the Indicative Landscape and Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy [APP-035] are satisfactory in demonstrating the achievement of “a small net gain in biodiversity” as a result of the proposed development.</i></p> <p><i>iii) Comment on the extent to which reliance is placed on the condition of the woodland as achieving a “good” condition.</i></p>
	<p>Response</p>	<p>Overall the Authorities would refer the Examining Authority to paragraphs 7.32 to 7.37 of the Local Impact Report as well as 7.50 to 7.53.</p> <p>In summary, the Authorities are of the opinion that whilst some mitigation and enhancement measures for local biodiversity impacts have been detailed within the ES and the ILBS, net gain has not yet been fully provided and there is still a need to secure further mitigation, compensation and/or enhancement measures in order to secure net gain.</p> <p>Proposed improvements to the screening woodland are welcomed, however the Authorities do not agree with the biodiversity offsetting calculations relied on by the Applicant, which indicate that the condition of the woodland can be elevated to ‘good’. This is partly due to the need to retain dense canopy for screening purposes.</p> <p>The Authorities have held detailed discussions with the Applicant and made suggestions which we believe will help address the net gain deficiencies.</p> <p>The Authorities are of the view that there are opportunities that are available in the wider geography to positively address net gain which should be explored further through discussions between the Applicant and the Environment Agency.</p>

BE 1.7	Mitigation  <b>Statutory Bodies</b>  <b>Selby DC</b>  <b>Others</b>	<i>Comment on the adequacy of the Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy [APP-035] in respect to mitigation of ecology effects. You may alternatively wish to do so within your Written Representations.</i>
	Response	<p>The Authorities refer the Examining Authority to the joint Local Impact Report in respect of this issue. The Examining Authority is specifically referred to paragraphs 7.13, 7.14, 7.35-7.39, 7.43, 7.49 and 7.58.</p> <p>In summary, the Authorities find the Indicative Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy ILBS acceptable in principle, and consider its delivery through the relevant DCO requirements to be sufficient.</p> <p>There are, however, areas of the Indicative Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy that the Authorities consider require further work in order to be satisfactorily addressed.</p> <p>In particular, the biodiversity net gain calculations. The Authorities have held detailed discussion on how the deficiencies in the ILBS can be addressed including holding discussions with relevant stakeholders,, specifically the Environment Agency and Yorkshire Wildlife Trust in order to discuss identified realistic opportunities for additional biodiversity mitigation/enhancement.</p>
<b>DCO</b>	<b>Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)</b>	
DCO 1.25	Requirements	Sched 2

	<p><b>The Applicant</b></p> <p><b>Selby DC</b></p>	<p>Req 1</p> <p><i>Definition of “A Part”</i></p> <p><i>The ExA considers that, as currently worded, the Applicant could apply in relation to any part of any work to partially discharge a requirement. The ExA is concerned that potentially allows for a very large number of discharge requests to be made to LPAs.</i></p> <p><i>i) Comment.</i></p> <p><i>ii) Explain whether the definition needs to be altered to refer to specific parts of each work.</i></p>
	<p>Response</p>	<p>Selby District Council (SDC) acknowledge that, as currently worded in the draft DCO, it would be possible for the Applicant to submit a number of requests for discharge of Requirements to the relevant planning authority.</p> <p>This would be a concern for the relevant planning authority if submission of a significant amount of simultaneous applications for discharge of requirements was a realistic prospect. The concern for SDC is that there would be insufficient officer capacity to deal with a significant amount of simultaneous requests within the timescales provided in Schedule 11 of the draft DCO.</p> <p>The Authority is not aware of the Applicant’s intentions in relation to the phasing of the Works and whether submission of a number of applications (e.g for all works) is a realistic prospect. It would greatly assist the Authority to understand whether the current wording of the DCO (in particular the definition of “a part”) is likely to realistically equate to a significant number of simultaneous applications into the relevant planning authority, which may not be able to be dealt with within the reasonable timescales provided in Schedule 11 of the draft DCO.</p>

		<p>The relevant planning authority must also have regard to the planning application that the Applicant intends to submit for the Enabling Works. If granted, that permission is likely to be subject to conditions, which will also require discharge (including pre-commencement conditions).</p> <p>It would be of concern to the relevant planning authority, in terms of officer capacity for validation of applications to discharge planning conditions and DCO requirements if there was a realistic prospect of untenable amounts of applications being submitted at one time.</p> <p>The relevant planning authority does not feel able to comment specifically as to whether the definition of “a part” in Requirement 2 should be amended until further clarification is provided by the Applicant in relation to intended phasing of the works and, consequently, the likelihood of phasing of applications submitted for discharge.</p>
DCO 1.36	<p>Procedure for Discharge of Requirements</p> <p><b>Selby DC</b></p>	<p><i>Sched 11</i></p> <p><i>Provide comments on this Schedule.</i></p>
	Response	<p>The wording of Schedule 11 is acceptable in principle to the relevant planning authority, provided that an untenable amount of applications to Discharge Requirements are not likely to be submitted simultaneously, which would significantly affect officer capacity to enable timely determination. As referred to in response to question DCO 1.25 the timing of the submission and determination of the Enabling Works application is also considered relevant to the relevant authority’s capacity to deal with all applications and discharge requests that may be required to be determined in close proximity to one another.</p>
<b>FW</b>	<b>Flooding and Water</b>	

FW 1.11	<p>Cofferdam Removal</p> <p><b>The Applicant</b></p> <p><b>Selby DC</b></p> <p><b>North Yorkshire CC</b></p> <p><b>The Environment Agency</b></p> <p><b>The Marine Management Organisation</b></p>	<p><i>i) Comment on the need for a specific plan for cofferdam removal.</i></p> <p><i>For the Applicant:</i></p> <p><i>ii) If necessary, provide this plan.</i></p>
	Response	<p>In its capacity as Lead Flood Authority, and in respect of any flooding and water implications of the Cofferdam removal, North Yorkshire County Council along with Selby District Council (in its capacity as relevant planning authority) would defer to any comments made specifically in relation to this point by the Environment Agency and/or Selby Internal Drainage Board.</p>
FW1.21	<p>Outline Drainage Strategy</p> <p><b>The Environment Agency</b></p> <p><b>North Yorkshire CC</b></p>	<p><i>Comment on the Outline Drainage Strategy (Appendix 11A to the ES) [APP-112] and the draft DCO [APP-005] Requirement 13 in respect to control of surface and foul drainage.</i></p>

	<b>Internal Drainage Boards</b>	
	Response	NYCC, in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority has no specific concerns regarding the proposals to control foul and surface water drainage. The project also falls within the administrative boundary of the Shire Group of IDBs (Selby Area IDB) to whose opinion as local risk management authority NYCC would defer.
<b>LV</b>	<b>Landscape and Visual</b>	
LV 1.2	Baseline Data  <b>Selby DC</b>	<i>Paragraph 16.4.5 of the ES [APP-054] explains that the effects of the proposed development on national character areas are not considered further within the assessment.</i>  <i>Provide a response on the conclusions reached.</i>
	Response	<p>The Authorities would defer this to Natural England as well however we would make this response in landscape terms.</p> <p>The Authorities would agree with the assessment that : ‘16.4.5 The NCAs are large in scale and cover a considerable area ‘...and that .....’due to the scale of the NCAs in relationship to the size and nature of the Proposed Development, it is considered that they are unlikely to be significantly affected.’</p> <p>The Authorities agree with the statement ‘that the development is not going to have a significant effect on NCA 39 (Natural England, 2013) which is described as being characterised by big skies with long open views with vertical elements such as water towers and power stations including Eggborough and the iconic grouping of cooling towers at Drax. Wind turbines are considered to be prominent within the NCA. ‘</p>

		<p>16.4.2 The North Yorkshire and York Landscape Characterisation Project (Chris Blandford Associates, 2011) covers part of NCA 39 and is noted in the document. The document identifies landscape character types at a county level. The site falls within the character areas of 'Levels Farmland (23)' and 'Flood Plain (24),' (pages 149 -154).</p> <p>The Levels Farmland character area points out 'the high visual sensitivity as a result of the predominantly open character and flat landform, which facilitates long distance open views across the landscape and promotes strong intervisibility with adjacent Landscape Character Types;</p> <p>Low ecological sensitivity, resulting from the fact that much of this Landscape Character Type encompasses improved agricultural land. Moderate landscape and cultural sensitivity as a result of the presence of a patchwork of historic drainage features (ditches and dykes), moated sites and grange sites.'</p> <p>The Flood Plain character suggests some of the key characteristics of this areas are power stations, pylons and former collieries with an enclosure/ field pattern of sinuous belts of modern fields, following the course of the river corridor interspersed with pockets of piecemeal parkland, irregular strip fields and lowland meadow.</p> <p>The key conclusions from the document relevant to this proposal would be that the development appears in character with the current characterisation of the area and that impacts visually and on landscape patterns should be considered in the proposals. The key conclusions from the document relevant to this proposal would be that the development appears in character with the current characterisation of the area and that impacts visually and on landscape patterns should be considered in the proposals. The Authorities have highlighted to the Applicant opportunities through partnership with the Environment Agency and Yorkshire Wildlife Trust, ways in which they can ensure they have fully considered these requirements.</p>
--	--	---

LV1.4	<p>Design</p> <p><b>The Applicant</b></p> <p><b>Selby DC</b></p>	<p><i>Paragraph 16.5.8 of the ES [APP-054] discusses design matters. The ExA is concerned that much of the design details are unknown, and places a considerable reliance of approval of such matters under Requirement 5 of the draft DCO [APP-005].</i></p> <p><i>For the Applicant:</i></p> <p><i>i) Explain why the proposed development is not fixed to a particular design</i>  <i>ii) If fixing the design is not practical at this stage, explain why a separate design principles document has not been submitted on which the proposed development should adhere to.</i></p> <p><i>For Selby DC</i></p> <p><i>iii) Comment on this matter and Requirement 5 of the draft DCO [APP-005].</i></p>
	Response	<p>As referred to in the draft Statement of Common Ground between the Applicant and SDC and NYCC, it is acknowledged that the Applicant has sought to incorporate flexibility within the draft DCO in order to allow for the Proposed Power Plant to be constructed in either a ‘single-shaft’ or ‘multi-shaft’ plant configuration.</p> <p>It is understood that this flexibility is required on the basis that the Applicant does not consider that it is possible to fix the plant configuration in advance of a lead contractor having been appointed for the detailed design and construction of the Proposed Power Plant.</p> <p>It is the Applicant’s view that the decision on the plant configuration to be deployed would be informed by that detailed design work in addition to the contractor’s selection of plant and process equipment.</p> <p>The relevant planning authority is satisfied with the approach taken by the Applicant in relation to the EIA (i.e applying the “Rochdale Envelope” in order to provide the flexibility to deploy either a single-shaft or multi-shaft plant configuration.)</p>

		<p>The Authorities are satisfied that an adequate assessments of both potential configurations have been shown to have been carried out in the ES.</p> <p>The Authorities are satisfied that the proposed design parameters could be secured by Requirement 5 ‘Detailed design’ and Schedule 14 ‘Design Parameters’ of the draft DCO.</p> <p>The Authorities are satisfied that Requirement 5, sub-paragraph (1) secures the submission of the details of the Proposed Power Plant and sub-paragraph (3) requires those details to be in accordance with the design parameters. Sub-paragraphs (4) to (11) are designed to secure the submission of details in respect of the other components of the Proposed Development. Further details would be secured by the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requirement 6. ‘Landscaping and biodiversity protection management and enhancement’;</li> <li>• Requirement 8. ‘External lighting’;</li> <li>• Requirement 9 ‘Highway accesses’;</li> <li>• Requirement 10 ‘Means of enclosure’;</li> <li>• Requirement 11 ‘Site security - above ground installation (Work No. 7)’;</li> <li>• Requirement 13 ‘Surface and foul water drainage’; and</li> <li>• Requirement 14 ‘Flood risk mitigation’.</li> </ul> <p>It is agreed that the above requirements would secure the submission of the necessary level of detail (in accordance with the design parameter) and provide SDC, as relevant planning authority, in consultation with other relevant consultee, with sufficient control over and certainty as to the final design of the Proposed Development.</p>
NV	Noise and Vibration	

NV 1.1	<i>Operational Noise</i> <b>Selby DC</b>	Paragraph 9.3.43 of the ES [APP-047] states that an assessment of operational noise from the above ground installations (AGI) has not been undertaken as the AGI does not contain any significant noise emitting plant sources. Comment on this assertion.
	Response	Consideration was given to the plant listed in Chapter 4 of the ES Statement on the Proposed Development and specifically paragraphs 4.2.71 to 4.2.75. As the list does not include equipment which is considered to be noisy such as fans, engines, conveyors, fork lift trucks and due to the distance to the nearest noise sensitive receptor no further information on this part of the development was requested.
NV1.2	<i>Night-time Noise</i> <b>The Applicant</b> <b>Selby DC</b> <b>North Yorkshire CC</b>	Selby DC and North Yorkshire CC in their Relevant Representation [RR-018] raise concerns in respect to night time noise levels during the operational phase. For Selby DC/NYCC: i) Explain the concerns, and suggested changes necessary to Requirement 24 of the draft DCO [APP-005].  For the Applicant ii) Provide a response.
		When considering planning applications where there may be a noise impact due to new industrial or residential development, the change in noise level can be assessed using British Standard 4142 to consider whether the increase in noise level will impact on the residential amenity of either the existing or new dwellings.  The 2014 version of BS 4142 “Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound” introduces the terms ‘ <i>adverse impact</i> ’ and ‘ <i>significant adverse impact</i> ’. When comparing the <i>rating level</i> against the <i>background sound level</i> , BS 4142:2014 states that:

- A difference of around +10 dB or more is likely to be an indication of a significant adverse impact, depending upon the context.
- A difference of around +5 dB is likely to be an indication of an adverse impact, depending upon the context.

In this case the Applicant has carried out such an assessment and has, following concerns raised by the relevant planning authority, carried out additional work and assessment and refined the data since submission of the relevant ES chapter in May 2017.

The original data consulted on and submitted, indicated, during the night time an increase of 7/8 dBA, which would be an indication of adverse impact and significant adverse impact, depending on the context.

Following a meeting between the Applicant and the relevant planning authority (on 27.9.17) to discuss the Applicant's approach to its noise assessments, the Applicant's noise consultant produced a technical note (dated 11.10.17) in order to detail the additional work carried out

Included in the technical note, the Applicant provided the following,

*“Following further refinements to the noise model since the DCO submission, a reduction in the predicted rating levels is expected. All predicted rating level excesses over the background sound level are less than +5 dB (i.e. resulting in negligible/minor adverse at worst), and below SDC's requested 0 dB criterion at all NSRs except NSR 2 and NSR 3 (168 Weeland Road and 1 Roall Waterworks respectively) at night. At NSR 2 the excess of the rating level over the background sound level at night is predicted to be +1 dB for both the single-shaft and multi-shaft layouts, and for NSR3 the excess of the rating level over the background sound level at night is predicted to be +3 dB for both layouts.*

*Based upon the context of the Eggborough site, even the highest predicted unmitigated rating levels of +7 dB/+8 dB over the night-time background sound levels for the single shaft/multi-*

		<p><i>shaft layouts (as set out in 9.35 and 9.36 of the ES), would have resulted in less than a 1 dB increase in existing ambient noise levels when added to the existing night-time noise levels (in Table 9.27 of the ES). This increase would be considered negligible above existing average ambient LAeq,8h night-time noise levels. The reduced excess of the rating level over the background sound level of +3 dB would result in an even smaller increase in ambient noise level.</i></p> <p><i>With respect to the operational noise modelling and assessment, conservative assumptions have been used including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- <i>The use of 10th percentile background sound levels, which tend towards the lower end of the measured range. Given the large extent of sound level data obtained during the surveys, significantly different ‘representative’ background sound level values can be obtained using different statistical analysis methods. The example analysis used in BS 4142:2014 is the ‘mode’. However, in the ES assessment the mode was considered alongside the 10th percentile of the measured LA90,15mins values and the graphical representation of all of the LA90,15mins data at each location. As a result, background sound levels equal to or lower than the mode (lower by up to 13 dB during the daytime and 6 dB at night at some NSRs) have been assigned as ‘representative’ and used in the assessment.</i></li><li>- <i>A +3 dB character correction has been used, which is considered conservative in the context of the operation of the existing coal-fired power station.”</i></li></ul> <p>This indicates that following further refinements to the noise model, a reduction in the predicted rating level is <b>expected</b> and all predicted rating levels excesses over the background are less than +5 dBA, indicating that the impact would be less than an adverse impact. The technical note also indicates that during the detailed design stage of the CCGT plant measures to further reduce this rating level will be considered in order to try to achieve the requested rating level of 0dB above background. This is proposed to be secured by DCO requirement.</p> <p>It is, therefore, suggested that Requirement 24 should be amended to the following:</p>
--	--	--

		<p><b>24.—</b>(1) No part of the authorised development must be brought into commercial use until a scheme for management and monitoring of noise during operation of the authorised development has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority.</p> <p>(2) Noise (in terms of the BS4142:2014 rating level) from the operation of the authorised development must be no greater than +3 dB different to the defined representative background sound level adjacent to the nearest residential properties at such location as agreed with the relevant planning authority during the night time period (23:00 to 07:00), subject to sub-paragraph (4) below and no greater than +0 dB to the defined representative background sound level adjacent to the nearest residential properties at such location as agreed with the relevant planning authority during the day time period (07:00 to 23:00).</p> <p>(3) The scheme must be implemented as approved unless otherwise agreed with the relevant planning authority.</p> <p>(4) During the detailed design stage of the development consideration shall be given to the reduction of the noise (in terms of the BS4142:2014 rating level) level during the night time period of 23:00 to 07:00 to no greater than +0dB. Measures to reduce the predicted rating level shall be implemented as part of the agreed scheme required by subparagraph (1) above.</p> <p>The proposed amended wording is has been considered by the Applicant. We have been advised by the Applicant that they do not feel they can agree to this wording at this time. We will continue discussions and attempt to find common ground.</p>
<b>TT</b>	<b>Traffic and Transport</b>	

TT1.3	<p>Ports</p> <p><b>The Applicant</b></p> <p><b>North Yorkshire CC</b></p>	<p><i>Section 14.6 of the ES [APP-052] details the anticipated construction programme of the proposed development. It is stated that consideration will be given to the effect from abnormal indivisible loads on appropriate ports at the detailed design stage, but that a reasonable expectation exists that such ports will be able to accommodate the proposed development.</i></p> <p><i>For the Applicant:</i></p> <p><i>i) Explain how control of abnormal indivisible loads would be secured through the DCO.</i></p> <p><i>For North Yorkshire CC:</i></p> <p><i>ii) Comment on the adequacy of provisions for ALL's within the DCO as drafted.</i></p>
	Response	<p>The Local Highways Authority is satisfied that provisions for abnormal indivisible loads are adequately accounted for in the DCO.</p> <p>The Applicant has informed the Local Highway Authority that large loads delivered by HGVs may require the roundabout on A19/ A645 junction to be partly dismantled to allow any large load to be transported to the Site. It is proposed that traffic management measures will be introduced on the local network in order to manage this operation which has been included in the Construction Traffic Management Plan.</p>
TT 1.4	<p>Demolition of Existing Station</p> <p><b>Statutory bodies</b></p> <p><b>Selby DC</b></p>	<p><i>Demolition of the existing coal-fired power station.</i></p> <p><i>Respond to the conclusions reached on traffic flows, and in particular, whether they adequately represent potential flows associated with the scale of demolition likely to be required.</i></p>

	<b>North Yorkshire CC</b>	
	Response	<p>It is understood by the Local Highway Authority that the decommissioning and demolition of the existing coal fired power station is being progressed independently of the Eggborough CCGT project and therefore does not form part of the DCO Application.</p> <p>It is understood that the decommissioning and demolition will follow on from the current application and at that point the local highway authority will be consulted.</p>