

Deadline 5: ERYC Actions & Response

The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ2)

ERYC Response

BGC.2.1 – None

BGC.2.4 – Statement of Common Ground has been prepared with the applicant.

CA2.6 – Technical matters have been agreed, it is now down to the land and legal teams to agree on wording.

DCO.2.1 – No.

DCO.2.3 – This is a small-scale temporary ramp to be used in the event of emergency access. Should it be extended to the intertidal zone there would be no additional requirements.

DCO.2.9 – ERYC do not consider the same requirement necessary for this DCO. It was for the DCO referred to in East Anglia. The purpose of the site preparation works in the DCO are to allow low impact activities to go ahead without a discharge.

DCO.2.11 – Environment Agency have confirmed they are satisfied and ERYC agree with the Environment Agency response.

DCO.2.13 – ERYC are satisfied with the applicant's response.

DCO.2.16 – ERYC are satisfied with the applicant's response.

LV.2.1 – No change. The updated photomontage accounts for a minor error in the model placement.

LV2.2 – ERYC are satisfied. Requirement 12 has been amended to ensure the information in the application documents is linked to the design of fencing and screening (outline design plan and code of construction practice). This was missing previously.

OE.2.4 – ERYC have responded to the applicant separately that will be included within the Statement of Common Ground.

OWE.2.3 – ERYC agree with the Environment Agency response.

OWE.2.4 – ERYC are of the opinion that the updated guidance does not alter the conclusions of the Onshore Infrastructure Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Onshore Infrastructure Drainage Strategy documents. Furthermore, the drainage design will continue to utilise the conservative value of 30% within the drainage design, in accordance with the current ERYC and Environment Agency guidance.

SEL.2.1 – ERYC have responded to the applicant separately that will be included within the Statement of Common Ground.

SEL.2.2 – ERYC have responded to the applicant separately that will be included within the Statement of Common Ground.

TT.2.1 – ERYC note the plan shows the different widths at Station road, demonstrating where an equivalent access would be on the eastern side of the A164 on Station Road. ERYC are satisfied with the justification for the site selection in this location on the west.

TT.2.3 – ERYC are satisfied that the DCO application includes a detailed appraisal of all scoped in effects arising from the construction and operation of the OnSS and its proposed access road.

Furthermore, the Applicant has undertaken a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and an accompanying designer's response. This provided evidence that the design is robust and fit for purpose. The access has been designed to coexist with the new access to Jillywood Farm, incorporating input from ERYC's design team associated with the A164 Jocks Lodge Highways Improvement Scheme. The design has therefore considered the dual use of the A1079 layby to support both Hornsea Four and Jillywood Farm. Different access options have been considered and assessed prior to option 4 A1079 via the existing northbound layby was agreed with ERYC because it provides the best option from those considered for providing both construction and operations/ maintenance access.

TT.2.4 – Correct. Condition 22 attached to planning permission reference 20/01073/STPLF states:

No development shall take place on site until access details to private properties known as Platwood Farm, Mouse Hill, Jillywood Farm, Rose Villa, Bentley Lodge, Spring Mount and Bramble Hill Farm have been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

This pre-commencement condition is imposed in accordance with policy ENV1 of the East Riding Local Plan and to allow safe access and egress to each named private property.

Applicant has not applied to discharge this condition at the present time but should be submitted and agreed by end of June 2023.

Satisfied with data submitted.

TT.2.5 – The JLAF have recommended that specific monitoring of the soil reinstatement is required for all the PROWs affected. The preferred position of the highway authority is that this condition is a requirement on the applicant to undertake the monitoring on a regular basis for 7 years.

TT.2.6 – Apologise for the typographical error. The route described by Lockington PC is not a Public Right of Way (PROW) recorded on the Definitive Map.

TT.2.7 – ERYC can confirm that the Applicant's response noted the impact of construction at the OnSS on the PROW network has been reviewed to ensure minimum long-term impact to the wider PROW network at the OnSS. Full details can be found within the PROW Outline Management Plan provided by the Applicant. ERYC do not agree with Ramblers concern.