

ExQ1	Question to:	Question	Hull City Council Response
BGC 1.1	Applicant East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) Hull City Council (HCC)	<p><b>Development Plan policies</b></p> <p>Please provide to the Examination full copies of any Development Plan policies that you have referred to in any of your submissions. Should you refer to any additional Development Plan policies at any time in your future submissions (for example in a Local Impact Report) then, if they have not already been provided, please also submit copies of these into the Examination.</p> <p>Have there been any relevant updates to the statutory Development Plan since the compilation of the application documents? Are the local planning authorities content with the Applicant's policy analysis?</p>	<p>Relevant policies from the Hull Local Plan 2016-2032 are listed below and can be accessed via the link set out within the appendix to this document:</p> <p>Policy 18 - Renewable and low carbon energy</p> <p>Policy 25 - Sustainable travel</p> <p>Policy 26 - Location and layout of development</p> <p>Policy 27 - Transport appraisals</p> <p>Policy 47 - Atmospheric Pollution</p> <p>There have not been any relevant updates to the statutory Development Plan since the application documents were compiled. The review of the Hull Local Plan has commenced but is currently at the very earliest of stages of evidence gathering within that process.</p>
BGC 1.2	ERYC HCC	<p><b>Neighbourhood Plans</b></p> <p>Can you confirm whether there are any relevant made or emerging neighbourhood plans that</p>	<p>i. Newington Neighbourhood Plan 2022-2032. Emerging. Submission expected shortly.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question	Hull City Council Response
		<p>the ExA should be aware of? If there are can you:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Provide details, confirm their status and - if they are emerging - the expected timescales for their completion.</li> <li>ii. Provide a copy of the made plan or a copy of the latest draft.</li> <li>iii. Indicate what weight you consider the ExA should give to these documents.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. Please see a copy of the latest draft via the link set out within the appendix to this document.</li> <li>iii. Limited weight, given status, location of plan area, and policy content. Limited potential for indirect traffic impact in the context of Policy GP15 thereto.</li> </ul>
BGC 1.6	Applicant ERYC Any Interested Party	<p><b>Central Government Policy and Guidance</b></p> <p>Are you aware of any other updates or changes to Government Policy or Guidance relevant to the determination of this application that have occurred since it was submitted? If yes what are these changes and what are the implications, if any, for the application?</p>	<p>Although not directly relevant to Town and Country Planning or infrastructure Planning, the following Central Government Strategies may be considered relevant to the determination of the application:</p> <p>Net Zero Strategy (published Oct. 2021, updated April 2022). This strategy sets out how the UK will become a net zero carbon emitting country by 2050, including an increase in the generation of electricity from offshore wind.</p> <p>Heat and Buildings Strategy (published Oct. 2021) This strategy sets out the approach to decarbonising heating in residential properties. The primary approach involves a shift from gas to electric heating which will</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question	Hull City Council Response
			<p>require a significant increase in electricity requirements, with Hornsea 4 offering to support the delivery of the power required for heating transition.</p> <p>Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Strategy (published Oct. 2021)</p> <p>This strategy implies a significant increase in electricity demand, supporting a requirement for renewable energy generation and related infrastructure.</p>
BGC 1.7	ERYC HCC	<p><b>Updates on development</b></p> <p>Please provide an update on any planning applications that have been submitted, or consents that have been granted, since the Application was submitted that could either affect the Proposed Development or be affected by the Proposed Development and whether these would affect the conclusions reached in the ES.</p>	<p>No relevant updates or new application or consents to report at this stage.</p>
CA 1.4	Affected Persons Interested Parties	<p><b>Known inaccuracies</b></p> <p>Are any Affected Persons or Interested Parties aware of any inaccuracies in the BoR [AS-002], Statement of Reasons [APP-227] or Land Plans [APP-210]? If so, please set out what these are and provide the correct details.</p>	<p>HCC has no comments to make on the documents referred to.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question	Hull City Council Response
DCO 1.2	Applicant Any Interested Parties	<p><b>Implications of recent SoS decision on Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas DCOs</b></p> <p>Can you comment on any implications for the drafting of the DCO for this Application that may have arisen as a result of the recent Development Consent Orders for the Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas OWF.</p>	HCC has no comments to make on potential implications.
<b>Requirements</b>			
LV 1.2	ERYC Historic England Natural England HCC	<p><b>Representative viewpoints</b></p> <p>The Applicant notes [APP-028, Table 4.4] that the viewpoints presented have been agreed by all stakeholders.</p> <p>Is the selection of viewpoints presented by the Applicant satisfactory or do you believe that additional viewpoints are required?</p> <p>If you believe additional viewpoints are required, please provide further details to explain why they are required.</p>	HCC is content with the range of viewpoints presented.
LV 1.3	ERYC Other Interested Parties	<p><b>Cumulative effects</b></p> <p>Are you satisfied with the list of projects included in the assessment of potential cumulative landscape and visual effects [APP-028, Tables 4.23 and 4.24]?</p>	HCC have not identified any additional projects which should have been included within the assessment.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question	Hull City Council Response
		If not, identify those projects that you believe should be included and indicate why you believe that they should be included.	
LV 1.7	ERYC Other relevant parties	<p><b>Outline Landscape Management Plan (LMP)</b></p> <p>Are you satisfied that the details of location, number, species, size and density of proposed planting around the onshore substation need not be considered during the Examination?</p>	HCC considers that such detailed planting specifications can be appropriately considered at the requirements compliance stage of the process.
LV 1.12	Applicant ERYC Other relevant parties	<p><b>Landscape mitigation planting</b></p> <p>The representative photomontage views do not appear to present a change between year 1 to year 10 and beyond which is so substantial that it would change the magnitude and significance of the visual effect of the onshore substation and energy balancing infrastructure buildings – particularly when seen from viewpoints 1 to 4 – as described in the ES. Provide further evidence to support the position that landscape mitigation as proposed would result in the change of magnitude and significance of effect described.</p> <p>In addition, there is an apparent contradiction between descriptions in the Applicant’s Landscape and Visual Assessment for the significance of effect at year 30 for viewpoints 1 to 4 [APP-028, paras 4.11.2.47, 4.11.2.56,</p>	HCC considers that, given the characteristics of the site and the nature and scale of the development, appropriate landscaping mitigation has been proposed with regard to likely visual effects insofar as they would register within the HCC area.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question	Hull City Council Response
		<p>4.11.2.65 and 4.11.274] which set out that there would remain an adverse effect, but that this would not be significant and [APP-028, para 4.15.1.5] which notes that as "<i>proposed planting matures, some of the identified effects will be reduced, though they are predicted to remain significant in EIA terms.</i>" Provide further clarification which establishes the consistency of these statements.</p> <p><b>ERYC and Other relevant parties:</b></p> <p>Would the mitigation planting illustrated by the Applicant [APP-115] be effective in reducing the magnitude and significance of the visual effect of the Proposed Development? If not, why not? What other steps should be considered in order to provide the necessary change in magnitude and significance of the visual effect of the onshore substation and energy balancing infrastructure buildings and/ or structures?</p>	
SEL 1.3	ERYC HCC Hull and East Riding Local Enterprise Partnership Greater Lincolnshire	<p><b>Employment and Skills Plan</b></p> <p>Are you content with the examples of measures to promote employment and skills that are set out in Table 2 of the Outline Employment and Skills Plan [APP-253] and if not, why not and what measures would you wish to see?</p>	HCC has not identified any additional measures which it would wish to see included within the plan.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question	Hull City Council Response
	Local Enterprise Partnership		
TT 1.4	ERYC HCC	<p><b>ES methodology – assessment of cumulative impacts</b></p> <p>In paragraph 7.15.1.4 of ES Vol. A3 Chapter 7, Traffic and Transport [APP-031, page 99] the Applicant states that “<i>No cumulative or inter-related effects have been identified which increase the significance of any standalone assessment set out in this chapter.</i>” Do you agree with this?</p>	HCC agrees with this statement.

## **APPENDIX**

### **Hull Local Plan 2016 – 2032:**

<https://www.hull.gov.uk/council-and-democracy/policies-and-plans/local-plan>

### **The Newington Neighbourhood Plan:**

<https://thenewingtonplan.co.uk>