



STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND BETWEEN THE NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNCIL AND DRAX POWER LIMITED

Drax Bioenergy with Carbon Capture and Storage

The Planning Act 2008 (as amended)

Document Reference Number: 8.1.3

Applicant: Drax Power Limited

PINS Reference: EN010120



REVISION: 07

DATE: July 2023

DOCUMENT OWNER: WSP UK Limited

AUTHOR: Matthew Stocks

APPROVER: Cassie Fountain

CONFIDENTIAL

OFFICIAL - SENSITIVE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE	1
1.1. Purpose of the Statement of Common Ground	1
1.2. Description of Proposed Scheme	1
1.3. This Statement of Common Ground with NYC	1
2. RECORD OF ENGAGEMENT UNDERTAKEN TO DATE	3
2.1. Record of Engagement	3
3. SUMMARY OF TOPICS COVERED BY THIS STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND AND RELEVANT DOCUMENTS	17
3.1. Topics covered in this Statement of Common Ground	17
3.2. Relevant documents for this Statement of Common Ground	17
4. CURRENT POSITION	21
4.1. Relevant planning history and current proposals	21
4.2. Planning Policy.....	22
4.3. Need for and principle of the Proposed Scheme and the examination of alternatives 25	
4.4. Climate Change Resilience	28
4.5. Population, Health and Socio-Economics	30
4.6. Traffic and Transport.....	31
4.7. Air Quality.....	36
4.8. Noise and Vibration	38
4.9. Ecology	43
4.10. Design, Landscape and Visual Impact	49
4.11. Heritage	62
4.12. Ground Conditions	66
4.13. Water Environment	68
4.14. Materials and Waste	70
4.15. Greenhouse Gases	73
4.16. Major Accidents and Disasters.....	75
4.17. Cumulative Effects	76
4.18. Draft DCO (including Requirements in the draft DCO).....	77
4.19. Other Consents and Licenses	78

TABLES

Table 2.1 – Schedule of Meetings and Correspondence during the Pre-application Stage 3

Table 2.2 – Schedule of Meetings and Correspondence during the Pre-Examination and Examination Stages 14

Table 3.1 – List of Relevant DCO Application Documents for this SOCG..... 18

Table 4.1 – Relevant planning history and current proposals 21

Table 4.2 – Planning Policy..... 22

Table 4.3 – Need for the Proposed Scheme 25

Table 4.4 – Climate Change Resilience 28

Table 4.5 – Population Health and Socio-Economics 30

Table 4.6 – Traffic and Transport..... 31

Table 4.7 – Air Quality..... 36

Table 4.8 – Noise and Vibration..... 38

Table 4.9 – Ecology 43

Table 4.10 – Design, Landscape and Visual Impact 49

Table 4.11 – Heritage 62

Table 4.12 – Ground Conditions 66

Table 4.13 – Water Environment 68

Table 4.14 – Materials and Waste 70

Table 4.15 – Greenhouse Gases 73

Table 4.16 – Major Accidents and Disasters..... 75

Table 4.17 – Cumulative Effects 76

Table 4.18 – Draft DCO (including Requirements in the draft DCO)..... 77

Table 4.19 - Other Consents and Licenses..... 78

Table 5.1 - Signatures..... 81

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) is a written statement produced during the application process for a Development Consent Order (DCO). It is prepared jointly by the applicant and another party, to assist the Examining Authority in examining the DCO Application by providing an understanding of the status of discussions or negotiations between the applicant and the other party.

This SoCG has been prepared between The North Yorkshire Council (NYC) and Drax Power Limited (the 'Applicant') (jointly referred to as the Parties) to show where agreement has been reached to date in relation to the Applicant's application (the DCO Application) for a DCO their Bioenergy with Carbon Capture and Storage (BECCS) project (referred to as the Proposed Scheme). NYC is a new single council which was launched on 1 April 2023, replacing the current county council and seven district and borough councils in North Yorkshire, including Selby District Council (SDC) and North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC). This SoCG therefore constitutes a further revision of the previous SoCG with SDC and NYCC. The SoCG represents an accurate and up to date reflection of matters discussed between the Parties. It is a document which has evolved during the examination, and concludes with this version which confirms the Parties' positions on relevant matters.

NYC is interested in the Proposed Scheme as a local planning authority, highway authority, street authority, Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) and in their services in regard to ecology, heritage, minerals and waste, and landscape.

The agreed s106 has been signed by Drax and NYC, and has now been submitted into the Examination.

Throughout this document, points of agreement and disagreement between the Parties are clearly indicated.

1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

1.1. PURPOSE OF THE STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

1.1.1. A Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) is a written statement produced during the application process for a Development Consent Order (DCO) and is prepared jointly by the applicant and another party or parties.

1.1.2. Paragraph 58 of the Department for Communities and Local Government's (DCLG, now Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities) guidance entitled 'Planning Act 2008: examination of applications for development consent' (26 March 2015) (DCLG, 2015) hereafter referred to as DCLG Guidance) describes a SoCG as follows:

“A statement of common ground is a written statement prepared jointly by the applicant and another party or parties, setting out any matters on which they agree. As well as identifying matters which are not in real dispute, it is also useful if a statement identifies those areas where agreement has not been reached. The statement should include references to show where those matters are dealt with in the written representations or other documentary evidence.”

1.1.3. The aim of a SoCG is to assist the Examining Authority in examining the DCO by providing an understanding of the status of discussions or negotiations between the applicant and the other party. The effective use of SoCGs aids an efficient examination process.

1.1.4. A SoCG is updated as necessary or as requested during the examination.

1.2. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED SCHEME

1.2.1. A full description of the Proposed Scheme description is included in Chapter 2 (Site and Project Description) of the ES submitted with the DCO Application (APP-038), as amended by the Change Request - 8.5.1 Proposed Changes Application Report (AS-045) and Change Request - 8.15 Second Change Application Report - Rev 1 (AS-126).

1.3. THIS STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND WITH NYC

1.3.1. This SoCG has been prepared between The North Yorkshire Council (NYC) and the Applicant (jointly referred to as the Parties) in relation to the DCO Application.

1.3.2. It addresses topics of interest to NYC, which is interested in the Proposed Scheme as a local planning authority, in respect of Proposed Scheme which is located within their administrative boundary, and as a highway authority, street authority, Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) and in their services in regard to ecology, heritage, minerals and waste, and landscape.

1.3.3. NYC will be responsible for discharging many of the requirements of the DCO should development consent be granted for the Proposed Scheme. NYC would also be

responsible for monitoring and enforcing many of the DCO provisions and requirements.

- 1.3.4. Section 3 summarises the topics of relevance to this SoCG and Section 4 then details whether matters are agreed, not agreed or under discussion between the Parties.
- 1.3.5. In respect of matters relevant to the Proposed Scheme but not referred to in this SoCG, NYC have no comments to make.
- 1.3.6. Following the Applicant's consultation on the Proposed Changes to the Application, (both Applicant's change requests dated 5 December 2022 and 2 April 2023) and the acceptance of them into the Examination by the Examining Authority, NYC agrees that the statements in this SoCG apply to the application inclusive of those Proposed Changes.
- 1.3.7. The SoCG is a document which has evolved during the examination, and concludes with this version which confirms the Parties' positions on relevant matters.
- 1.3.8. This SoCG has been prepared in accordance with the DCLG Guidance.

2. RECORD OF ENGAGEMENT UNDERTAKEN TO DATE

2.1. RECORD OF ENGAGEMENT

2.1.1. The tables below set out a summary of the key meetings and correspondence between the Parties in relation to the Proposed Scheme. Meetings and correspondence up to 1 April 2023 are stated to be with SDC and NYCC, prior to their merger as NYC.

Table 2.1 – Schedule of Meetings and Correspondence during the Pre-application Stage

Date	Form of Contact and Attendees	Summary
08 December 2020	Online meeting SDC Planning; NYCC Planning; Drax; WSP ¹ Planning.	Introduction to the Applicant team, the Site and the Proposed Scheme. Outline of the case for BECCS and overview of the Consenting Strategy. Detail as to the activities, surveys and stakeholder engagement to date, and the future proposed consultations to commence early 2021. Noted that the Applicant may need to apply for some compulsory acquisition powers. Agreement to enter into a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) with SDC and NYCC.
01 February 2021	Online meeting SDC Planning; NYCC Planning; Drax; Grayling; WSP Planning and Stakeholder Engagement.	Introduction to the aims of engagement and the DCO consultation timelines. WSP is currently preparing non-statutory consultation and will develop the draft Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) for LPA comments. Grayling is working with the Applicant on social media and methods used to reach hard to reach groups.

¹ WSP attending on behalf of the Applicant

<p>22 February 2021</p>	<p>Online meeting NYCC Ecology; Drax; WSP Planning, Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Ecology</p>	<p>Introductions and overview of the Proposed Scheme. Ecology EIA Scoping input and ecology survey and assessment scope. NYCC content with assumptions and scope.</p>
<p>22 February 2021</p>	<p>Email From WSP to NYCC (Highways), National Highways, East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERoY).</p>	<p>NYCC, National Highways, and ERoY provided comments on the proposed transport assessment parameters set out in a Transport Scoping Note, which had been provided to them by the Applicant. The approach was generally accepted by the highway authorities, but further discussions are required to reach final agreement ahead of the completion of the ES. The Transport Scoping Note issued covered all transport related parameters including baseline conditions, predicted trip generation, trip distribution, assessment scenarios, proposed growth factors, and other general items ahead of a scheduled meeting with consultees.</p>
<p>02 March 2021</p>	<p>Online Meeting NYCC (Highways); ERoY; National Highways; Drax; WSP Transport.</p>	<p>Inception call to introduce Drax BECCS to highway authorities, Proposed Scheme overview, transport scoping note content, Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL) strategy, and approach to future engagement. NYCC, National Highways, and ERoY resolved to provide comment on the Transport Scoping Note and AIL strategy.</p>
<p>08 March 2021</p>	<p>Email From WSP to LLFA.</p>	<p>The LLFA confirmed that the submitted documents demonstrate a reasonable approach to the management of surface water and are in line with what has been discussed and as such the LLFA confirmed its agreement in principle to</p>

		<p>the proposed surface water drainage strategy.</p> <p>In addition, the LLFA advised on further information which would be needed to allow the LLFA to accept the proposed surface water drainage strategy during DCO examination.</p>
16 March 2021	<p>Online meeting</p> <p>SDC Planning;</p> <p>NYCC Planning;</p> <p>Drax;</p> <p>WSP Planning and EIA.</p>	<p>Update on PPA and consultation.</p> <p>Overview of updates to the Proposed Scheme, various technical matters and update on our response to the comments in the EIA Scoping Opinion.</p> <p>Agreement to a single SoCG with NYCC and SDC.</p> <p>Update that the Applicant is not implementing the Drax Repower DCO which will therefore not be considered in the EIA cumulative impact assessment.</p> <p>Confirmation that the Applicant submitted no comments to the consultation version of the Preferred Options iteration of the Selby Local Plan in relation to the Proposed Scheme.</p>
19 March 2021	<p>Email</p> <p>From WSP to NYCC Heritage (and Historic England).</p>	<p>Outlining initial discussions with WSP Landscape and Visual Impacts (LVIA) and sending plan showing the proposed winter viewpoints.</p> <p>VP7 will pick up the view to/from Drax Abbey.</p> <p>Proposal that WSP review these images and if necessary, supplement with additional photographs taken from the two viewpoints indicated, during the site walkover. Images taken for the Repower project to be used as supporting information, if appropriate.</p>
23 March 2021	<p>Online meeting</p>	<p>Meeting to discuss proposed winter viewpoints; night-time photography; and photomontages.</p>

	NYCC Landscape Officer; Drax; WSP Landscape and Visual Impacts (LVIA).	
24 March 2021	Online meeting NYCC Landscape Officer; Drax; WSP LVIA.	Night-time photography discussed and covered in various emails dating from 23/03/2021. Five night-time photos agreed with NYCC based on a priority list in accordance with Landscape Institute (LI) guidance.
25 March 2021	Online meeting NYCC Heritage; Drax; WSP EIA and Heritage.	Introduction to the Proposed Scheme. Outline of programme for assessment. Overview of proposed assessment strategy. Review of key heritage constraints.
25 March 2021	Online Meeting NYCC (Highways); ERoY; National Highways; Drax; WSP Transport.	AIL call with highway authorities to discuss approach to AIL routes. National Highways to liaise with the DfT and seek confirmation and Approval in Principle for the Port of Goole 'Road Option' (as per the agreed approach for AIL movements associated with Drax Repower).
25 March 2021 Online Meeting	Email From WSP to NYCC (Highways), National Highways and ERoY	Request from the Applicant for National Highways to liaise with the DfT and seek confirmation and Approval in Principle for the Port of Goole 'Road Option' (as per Drax Repower).
13 April 2021	Email From WSP to SDC Planning.	Initial consultation on Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and whether SDC have any comments / requirements regarding the FRA.

<p>13 April 2021</p>	<p>Email From WSP to NYCC LLFA.</p>	<p>Initial consultation. Introduction of the Proposed Scheme and request for confirmation on the following queries: Sequential Test is assumed to be not required as the infrastructure is proposed within the existing Drax Power Station Site; and Asking for any comments/requirements regarding the proposed works and the supporting FRA.</p>
<p>16 April 2021</p>	<p>Email From WSP to SDC Environmental Health Officer (EHO).</p>	<p>Request for information in relation to ground conditions and groundwater. Also requested opinion on aspects scoped in/out of the EIA.</p>
<p>23 April 2021</p>	<p>Online meeting NYCC Planning and Landscape Officers; SDC Planning; Drax; WSP LVIA and EIA.</p>	<p>Meeting to run through NYCC's LVIA comments in the EIA Scoping Opinion relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A topographic survey; • Cumulative effects; • Existing trees and vegetation; • Soil management / agricultural land; • Study area; • Site design; • Alternative design options; • Landscape proposals, mitigation, maintenance and aftercare; • Green infrastructure; and • Representative viewpoints, summer views and night-time assessment.
<p>23 April 2021</p>	<p>Online meeting SDC EHO and Planning; Drax;</p>	<p>Proposed methodology and scope for the noise and vibration assessment presented. SDC EHO confirmed that this aligned with their expectations for the assessment.</p>

	WSP Noise, EIA and Planning.	
23 April 2021	Email From WSP to NYCC Landscape Officer.	Email confirming further to meeting on 23 April 2021 representative viewpoints to be omitted and further visualisations to be prepared.
27 April 2021	Email From WSP to NYCC Landscape Officer.	Email confirming viewpoints but requesting further visualisations, further commentary on the need for a topographic survey, soil survey, assessment and management plan, night-time assessment and photomontages, use of cross sections /elevations and site design / alternative design solutions.
04 May 2021 Email	Email From WSP to NYCC (Highways)	NYCC (Highways) provided comments on the Transport Scoping Note and agreed the level of assessment, mitigation measures, use of 2018 traffic survey data, feedback on committed development, agreed assessment scenarios, distribution, and study area. NYCC highlighted the need to link sustainable travel options with shift patterns, understand how the large workforce will be managed including incentives to travel by sustainable means, and concerns about the number of HGV movements.
17 May 2021	Email From WSP to NYCC Landscape Officer.	Email circulated including minutes from 23 April 2021, draft LVIA methodology for comment and memo dated 14 May 2021 covering responses to points made in NYCC email of 27 April 2021.
01 June 2021	Emails Between WSP and SDC in respect of ground conditions	Agreement with proposed approach to scoping out of operational effects relating to ground conditions.

03 June 2021	Emails Between WSP and NYCC Landscape Officer.	Minutes circulated from 24 April 2021 regarding the LVIA discussing the photomontages, night-time photomontages and assessment, topographic survey, cross sections / elevations, soil survey and design. NYCC confirmed that they agreed with the methodology.
14 June 2021	Email From WSP to NYCC Landscape Officer.	Email confirming an additional night-time photomontage and contextual cross sections / elevations and that a soil survey would not be undertaken.
21 June 2021	Online meeting NYCC Planning; SDC Planning; Drax; WSP Planning and Stakeholder Engagement.	Update meeting advising the jetty is no longer part of the Proposed Scheme, providing an update on the project timeline, update on SoCC and progress on discussions between the LPAs and technical specialists relating to environmental matters.
19 July 2021	Online meeting NYCC Planning; Drax; WSP Planning.	Update meeting running through the current schedule, update on activities on Site and progress on discussions between the LPAs and technical specialists relating to environmental matters.
06 August 2021	Online meeting NYCC Planning and Landscape Officer; SDC Planning; Drax; WSP EIA and LVIA.	Briefing meeting running through baseline data collected and timings of work relating to the Design Framework / Design Principles, Landscape Mitigation and Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy and the Lighting Strategy.
11 August 2021	Emails From WSP to SDC and NYCC.	Email confirming scope of climate (GHG) assessment to scope out land use, land use change and forestry (LULUCF).

11 August 2021	Email From WSP to SDC.	Email confirming scope of air quality assessment.
18 August 2021	Emails From WSP to SDC.	Email confirming scope of climate (GHG) assessment to scope out land use, land use change and forestry (LULUCF).
02 September 2021	Telephone meeting SDC; NYCC; WSP EIA; Drax.	<p>Meeting to discuss scope of the Population, Health and Socio-economics assessment with NYCC and SDC.</p> <p>During the meeting, the Applicant, SDC and NYCC agreed the scope of the assessment will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generation of direct, indirect and induced employment opportunities; • Increased demand for accommodation and community facilities due to an influx of workers; and • Development land and businesses - access and disruption to businesses during construction. <p>Following the meeting, NYCC and SDC provided confirmation that they were in agreement that this matter could be excluded from the Population, Health and Socio-economics assessment. It was agreed that, during the EIA, should it be the case that the Environmental Mitigation Measures mean that there would be impacts to the agricultural land, that this would then be scoped back into the Population, Health, and Socio-economics assessment.</p>
21 September 2021	Email From WSP to NYCC.	Email requesting any future committed plans for landfill expansion, resource extraction and management facilities within NYCC's area, which would have the potential to affect the sensitivity of receptors.

10 December 2021	Letter (S42 consultation response) From NYCC and SDC.	Formal S42 response.
13 December 2021	Online meeting NYCC Ecology; Drax; WSP Ecology and Planning.	Discussion around the NYCC S42 consultation comments on the Ecology Section of the PEIR. JC confirmed broad agreement to the approach and findings of the ecology assessment in the PEIR.
17 December 2021	Online meeting NYCC LLFA; Drax; WSP Water.	Meeting regarding the scope of the assessment.
20 December 2021	Online meeting SDC Planning; NYCC Planning; Drax; WSP Planning.	Discussion regarding the draft Statement of Common Ground concerning the format of the document and current position in respect of the technical matters in order to seek to identify areas where agreement can be confirmed.
20 December 2021	Online meeting SDC Planning; NYCC Planning; Drax; WSP Planning, EIA and cumulative impact team.	Discussion regarding the long and short lists for the cumulative impact assessment.
21 January 2022	Online meeting SDC Planning; NYCC Planning; Drax;	Following meeting with the Local Planning Authority (LPA) on 20 December 2021, a subsequent meeting was held to discuss the short list of 'other developments' and confirm with the LPA if there are any other developments to consider. The proposed inter-project

	WSP Planning, EIA and cumulative impact team.	cumulative effects assessment methodology was agreed.
28 January 2022	Online meeting NYCC Planning and Landscape Officer; SDC Planning; Drax; WSP EIA and LVIA.	Briefing meeting running through Design Principles including approach to scale, massing, appearance, and lighting strategy approach.
04 February 2022	Online meeting NYCC Planning and EHO; SDC Planning; Drax; WSP Planning, EIA and Noise.	Follow up meeting to go through previous discussion in 2021 and to agree on items on noise and vibration raised in the S42 letter.
17 February 2022	<u>Emails</u> From WSP to SDC, NYCC, ERoY and DMBC	A confirmation email of the updated short list of 'other developments' (including the inter-project cumulative effects methodology) was issued to the LPAs. Doncaster Council responded on 17 February 2022 with additional information regarding the status of the projects under consideration. East Riding of Yorkshire Council responded on 22 February 2022 stating that if the information was taken from the public access Planning Portal it would be up-to-date and correct. No formal response was issued from North Yorkshire County Council. Selby District Council responded on 25 February with comments on the short list. Responses to these comments and an updated short list were reissued on 3 March 2022.

24 February 2022	Emails From SDC to WSP.	Email confirming that land use, land use change and forestry (LULUCF) should be included in the scope of the climate (GHG) assessment. Queries on the wording of the technology and infrastructure being 'carbon negative'
03 March 2022	Online meeting SDC Planning; Drax; WSP EIA and GHG Emails From WSP to SDC.	Online meeting to discuss email sent on 24 February. Email confirming scope of climate (GHG) assessment to include (LULUCF) and clarification of carbon negative wording and operation at the site considered appropriate.
14 April 2022	Email From WSP to SDC and NYCC.	An email was sent to SDC and NYCC with the approach for agreeing the phasing of the FGD. Two options were put forward by the Applicant. The first would be to set out the phasing in an SoCG, and the second would be to secure the phasing via a requirement in the dDCO, which would reflect the ES assumptions in terms of the FGD.
04 May 2022	Email From SDC to WSP.	The email from SDC confirmed that a SoCG would not be sufficient to deal with the phasing satisfactorily. They asked for further detail regarding the wording on the DCO Requirement.
05 May 2022	Email From WSP to SDC.	Following the email from SDC on 4 May 2022, the Applicant responded via email with the draft requirement text, along with the suggestion that this is discussed further post-submission.

Table 2.2 – Schedule of Meetings and Correspondence during the Pre-Examination and Examination Stages

Date	Form of Contact	Summary
18 July 2022	Online meeting LLFA; Drax; WSP.	LLFA confirmed flood risk aspects of the DCO application are for Environment Agency / Internal Drainage Board, not the LLFA. LLFA stated that they did not consider that the proposal fulfils the requirements of the NPPF (detailed drawings and calculations). Discussion on under which legislation / policy the DCO application should be considered. In the LLFA opinion - it is the NPPF. Outcome from the call - LLFA is to discuss internally with planners and senior members of the LLFA.
19 and 27 July 2022	Emails Between WSP and LLFA.	Further discussion on the Applicants position as to which legislation / policy the DCO application should be considered.
20 September 2022	Phone call Between WSP and the LLFA.	Discussion between WSP and the LLFA in relation to the outstanding RR response, it was agreed that all matters in relation to the water environment were agreed bar the determining the operational design standard of the surface water drainage system. An approach for doing so was agreed.
13 October 2022	Email From WSP to LLFA.	Follow up email on the agreed approach to assessing the operational design standard for the surface water drainage system which will be adopted as part of the detailed design / post-consent.
22 December 2022	Online meeting Drax; WSP.	Update meeting in advance of first hearings to update on next steps and agree approach to updates to the SoCG.

January – February 2023	Emails Between WSP, SDC and NYCC	Agreement of Revision 02 of the Statement of Common Ground.
23 January 2023	Email from WSP to SDC and NYCC	As an updated planning application search was completed on 30 November 2022 to inform an update to the cumulative assessment, an updated short list of other developments was sent to SDC and NYCC for comment.
10 February 2023	Email from SDC to WSP	The response received from SDC in relation to the updated short list of other developments, offered comments on some developments plus ten additional to consider. SDC also asked for confirmation on whether this updated shortlist would be submitted at Deadline 2 (22 February 2023).
16 February 2023	Email from WSP to SDC	The Applicant responded to the developments already included within the shortlist had been taken into account and the shortlist updated accordingly. Of the ten additional developments put forward by SDC to be included in the assessment, four were included in the longlist but were not taken through to the shortlist as they did not meet the criteria. A further six developments were not able to be assessed due to the short timeframes to submission at Deadline 2. On the 20 February SDC asked for confirmation on whether these six developments will be included at some point during the Examination, just not at Deadline 2. On the 20 February SDC asked for confirmation on whether these six developments will be submitted later in the Examination.
22 February 2023	Email from WSP to SDC	In response to an email from SDC dated 20 February, the Applicant confirmed that the six developments were included in

		the shortlist at Deadline 2, however due to timescales, the full cumulative assessment for those developments would be submitted at a later Deadline.
February – March 2023	Emails Between WSP, SDC and NYCC	Agreement of Revision 03 of the Statement of Common Ground.
23 March 2023	Online meeting Between WSP and NYC	Discussions to progress noise matters.
March – April 2023	Emails Between WSP and NYC	Agreement of Revision 04 of the Statement of Common Ground.
05 April 2023	Online meeting Between WSP and NYC	Discussions to progress noise matters.
24 April 2023	Online meeting Between WSP and NYC	Discussions to progress noise matters.
27 April 2023	Online meeting Between WSP and NYC	Discussions to progress landscape matters.
April – June 2023	Emails Between WSP and NYC	Agreement of Revision 05 of the Statement of Common Ground.
June – July 2023	Emails Between WSP and NYC	Agreement of Revision 07 of the Statement of Common Ground.

3. SUMMARY OF TOPICS COVERED BY THIS STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND AND RELEVANT DOCUMENTS

3.1. TOPICS COVERED IN THIS STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

3.1.1. The following topics discussed between the Parties are covered by this SoCG:

- Relevant planning history and current proposals;
- Planning policy;
- Need for and principle of the Proposed Scheme and the examination of alternatives;
- Climate change resilience;
- Population health and socio-economics;
- Transport;
- Air quality;
- Noise and vibration;
- Ecology;
- Design, landscape and visual impact;
- Heritage;
- Ground conditions;
- Water environment;
- Material and waste;
- Greenhouse gases;
- Major accidents and disasters;
- Cumulative effects;
- Draft DCO (including requirements in the draft DCO); and
- Other consents and licenses.

3.2. RELEVANT DOCUMENTS FOR THIS STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

3.2.1. Table 3.1 provides a list of documents of particular relevance to this SoCG. This list will be updated to keep a record of the most recent version of the relevant document.

Table 3.1 – List of Relevant DCO Application Documents for this SOCG

Document Reference	Document Name
REP9-005	3.1 Draft Development Consent Order (Clean) - Rev 11
APP-032	5.2 Planning Statement
APP-033	5.3 Needs and Benefits Statement
APP-038	6.1.2 Environmental Statement - Volume 1 - Chapter 2: Site and Project Description
APP-039	6.1.3 Environmental Statement - Volume 1 - Chapter 3: Consideration of Alternatives
APP-041	6.1.5 Environmental Statement - Volume 1 - Chapter 5: Traffic and Transport; and associated figures and appendices
APP-042	6.1.6 Environmental Statement - Volume 1 - Chapter 6: Air Quality; and associated figures and appendices
APP-043	6.1.7 Environmental Statement - Volume 1 - Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration; and associated figures and appendices
APP-044	6.1.8 Environmental Statement - Volume 1 - Chapter 8: Ecology; and associated figures and appendices
APP-045	6.1.9 Environmental Statement - Volume 1 - Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual Amenity; and associated figures and appendices
APP-046	6.1.10 Environmental Statement - Volume 1 - Chapter 10: Heritage; and associated figures and appendices
APP-047	6.1.11 Environmental Statement - Volume 1 - Chapter 11: Ground Conditions; and associated figures and appendices
APP-048	6.1.12 Environmental Statement - Volume 1 - Chapter 12: Water Environment; and associated figures and appendices

Document Reference	Document Name
APP-049	6.1.13 Environmental Statement - Volume 1 - Chapter 13: Materials and Waste; and associated figures and appendices
APP-050	6.1.14 Environmental Statement - Volume 1 - Chapter 14: Climate Change Resilience; and associated figures and appendices
APP-051	6.1.15 Environmental Statement - Volume 1 - Chapter 15: Greenhouse Gases; and associated figures and appendices
APP-052	6.1.16 Environmental Statement - Volume 1 - Chapter 16: Population, Health and Socio-Economics; and associated figures and appendices
APP-053	6.1.17 Environmental Statement - Volume 1 - Chapter 17: Major Accidents and Disasters; and associated figures and appendices
REP4-035	Deadline 4 Submission - 6.1.18 Environmental Statement – Volume 1 – Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects (Clean) - Rev 3; and associated figures and appendices
REP9-019	6.5 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (Clean) - Rev 11
REP6-017; APP-181 – APP-183	6.6.1 – 6.6.2.3 Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (Clean) – Rev: 5; and Volume 2
AS-045	Change Request - 8.5.1 Proposed Changes Application Report - Accepted at the discretion of the Examining Authority
REP-039	Local Impact Report
REP6-030	8.8 National Policy Statement Compliance Tracker (Clean) - Rev 4
REP2-019	5.2.1 Planning Statement Addendum

Document Reference	Document Name
AS-126	Change Request - 8.15 Second Change Application Report - Rev 1
REP5-029	8.14 Project Updates Arising From Government Publications on Energy Matters in March 2023

4. CURRENT POSITION

4.1. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY AND CURRENT PROPOSALS

Table 4.1 – Relevant planning history and current proposals

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
4.1.1	Relevant Planning History	The relevant planning history for the Proposed Scheme is set out in the Planning Statement (APP-032).	NYC agrees that the planning history set out in the Planning Statement (APP-032) constitutes the relevant planning history for the Proposed Scheme.	Agreed
4.1.2	Current Proposals	The details of the Proposed Scheme is set out in 6.1.2 Environmental Statement - Volume 1 - Chapter 2: Site and Project Description (APP-038), as amended by the Change Requests - 8.5.1 Proposed Changes Application Report (AS-045) and Change Request - 8.15 Second Change Application Report (AS-126).	NYC agrees that the Proposed Scheme is set out in 6.1.2 Environmental Statement - Volume 1 - Chapter 2: Site and Project Description (APP-038), as amended by the Change Requests - 8.5.1 Proposed Changes Application Report (AS-045) and Change Request - 8.15 Second Change Application Report (AS-126).	Agreed

4.2. PLANNING POLICY

Table 4.2 – Planning Policy

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
4.2.1	NPS	The relevant National Policy Statements (NPSs) for the Proposed Scheme include the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) (Department for Energy and Climate Change, 2011) and the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy and Infrastructure (EN-3) (Department of Energy and Climate Change, 2011), which represent the primary policy basis for the determination of the DCO Application as is set out in the Planning Statement (APP-032) and the National Policy Statement Compliance Tracker (REP6-030). Draft revised NPSs were published for consultation from September to November 2021 and updated versions were issued in March 2023. As the DCO Application was accepted for examination before the designation of any amendments to the NPS, the original suite of NPSs represent the primary policy basis for	NYC agrees with the applicant’s position. There are no outstanding matters to be agreed with regard to the status of the Proposed Scheme as a NSIP and the applicability of the NPSs.	Agreed

		the determination of the DCO Application.		
4.2.2	NPPF	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was originally published in 2012 and last updated in July 2021. Whilst the NPSs are the primary consenting framework against which the DCO application will be assessed, the NPPF constitutes secondary planning policy framework, against which the proposals must also be assessed. The government's 'Planning Practice Guidance' constitutes guidance to support the government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.</p> <p>The policies of relevance to the Application are set out in the Planning Statement (APP-032) and proposed updates to the NPPF are considered in the Planning Statement Addendum (REP2-019).</p>	NYC agrees with the applicant's position.	Agreed
4.2.3	Development Plan	Local planning policies from the relevant authorities can be 'important and relevant' considerations for the	NYC agrees with the applicant's position in terms of the Development Plan of relevance to the proposals, and that the policies listed by the applicant in the Planning Statement are relevant	Agreed

		<p>Secretary of State (SoS) in determining the DCO Application.</p> <p>The current adopted Development Plan of relevance to the proposals comprises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan (2013) (SDCSLP); • Saved Policies of the Selby District Local Plan (2005) (SDLP); and • The North Yorkshire Minerals and Waste Joint Plan (2022) (NYMWJP). <p>The policies of relevance to the Application and how the Scheme accords with them are set out in the Planning Statement (APP-032) and the Planning Statement Addendum (REP2-019).</p> <p>NYC is preparing a new Local Plan for Selby area which will supersede the SDCSLP and SDLP upon adoption. The Preferred Options consultation took place in January to March 2021, and a subsequent consultation on additional sites proposed to be allocated was undertaken in August to September 2021. The Publication version of the new Local Plan was subject to</p>	<p>to the Proposed Scheme. This is confirmed in the Local Impact Report (REP-039).</p> <p>NYC considers that there are a number of additional adopted Development Management policies in NYMWJP which are relevant to this scheme, including D06 – Landscape. The applicant does not consider these policies are relevant to the Proposed Scheme as these policies only relate to Minerals and Waste development. There are however ‘equivalent’ policies in the Local Plan which the applicant has assessed the scheme against, and considers the proposal is policy compliant. NYC agrees that, if weight were to be afforded to these policies in NYMWJP, the proposal would comply with these policies, irrespective of the weight to be afforded to these policies in NYMWJP.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

		consultation from August to October 2022. It is anticipated that the new Local Plan will be adopted no earlier than January 2024. The latest draft version of the Local Plan can only be afforded limited weight given the stage of preparation, as it is subject to change.		
--	--	--	--	--

4.3. NEED FOR AND PRINCIPLE OF THE PROPOSED SCHEME AND THE EXAMINATION OF ALTERNATIVES

Table 4.3 – Need for the Proposed Scheme

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
4.3.1	Need for the Proposed Scheme	The Applicant considers that there is a clear need for the Proposed Scheme as set out in the Needs and Benefits Statement (APP-033), as supported by 8.14 Project Updates Arising From Government Publications on Energy Matters in March 2023 (REP5-029).	NYC agrees with the applicant’s position in terms of the general need for the Proposed Scheme and are supportive of the project in principle, as set out in the Relevant Representation.	Agreed
4.3.2	Need for the Proposed Scheme (specifically)	In December 2019, Drax Power Ltd (Drax) announced a world-leading ambition to become a carbon negative company by 2030. This ambition is only achievable with an effective negative	NYC agrees with the applicant’s position.	Agreed

		<p>emissions policy and investment framework.</p> <p>Biomass is considered neutral from the point of view of carbon emissions, as carbon released from combustion is to be compensated with carbon absorbed during the lifecycle of the tree or plant. The existing biomass units and site infrastructure present an opportunity to turn Drax Power Station ‘carbon negative’ by utilising carbon capture technology to remove the carbon dioxide from the flue gas, and inherently the atmosphere.</p> <p>Further detail is provided in the Needs and Benefits Statement (APP-033).</p>	<p>There are no outstanding matters to be resolved with regard to the need for the Proposed Scheme.</p> <p>It is agreed that the Applicant has adequately considered and assessed biomass from the point of view of carbon emissions. The authorities have taken a pragmatic approach to the consideration and assessment of these issues and do not have any additional queries or concerns with them.</p>	
4.3.3	Wider Benefits	<p>The Proposed Scheme helps to position the UK as a global leader in developing innovative solutions to the fight against climate change.</p> <p>BECCS provides reliable renewable electricity to support the grid as more wind and solar are connected.</p> <p>Further detail is provided in the Needs and Benefits Statement (APP-033) and 8.14 Project Updates Arising From</p>	<p>NYC agrees with the applicant’s position.</p> <p>There are no outstanding matters to be resolved with regard to the need for the Proposed Scheme.</p>	Agreed

		Government Publications on Energy Matters in March 2023 (REP5-029).		
4.3.4	New Employment Opportunities	<p>The Proposed Scheme will create a range of social and economic benefits by providing new employment opportunities and generating economic activity. These benefits will be both temporary (during construction phase of the Scheme) and permanent (via the creation of good quality long term employment opportunities during the operational phase).</p> <p>The Applicant has provided a Needs and Benefits Statement (APP-033) which sets out the employment and economic benefits that the Scheme will bring. The Scheme will play an important role in creating jobs and generating economic growth across the Humber and North Yorkshire region.</p>	<p>NYC agrees with the applicant's position.</p> <p>There are no outstanding matters to be resolved with regard to the need for the Proposed Scheme.</p>	Agreed
4.3.5	Principle of the Proposed Scheme	Given the clear need for the Proposed Scheme and in the absence of any policies which would dictate otherwise, the Applicant considers the principle of the Proposed Scheme is acceptable.	NYC agrees with the Applicant's position.	Agreed

4.3.6	Examination of Alternatives	The consideration of alternatives to the Proposed Scheme has been carried out in Volume 1 Chapter 3 (Consideration of Alternatives) of the ES (APP-039). This is considered to be in accordance with the requirements of the EIA Regulations and relevant policy.	NYC agrees with the Applicant's position.	Agreed
--------------	-----------------------------	---	---	--------

4.4. CLIMATE CHANGE RESILIENCE

Table 4.4 – Climate Change Resilience

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
4.4.1	ES Study Area and Methodology	The ES Study Area for the climate resilience assessment is the Site Boundary and the assessment methodology and the significance of effects has been undertaken in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 114.	It is agreed that the Applicant has adequately considered and assessed the climate resilience implications of the Proposed Scheme. The authority has taken a pragmatic approach to the consideration and assessment of these issues and does not have any additional queries or concerns with them.	Agreed
4.4.2	ES Baseline	The existing baseline is determined using data from the Met Office. The future baseline utilises the UK Climate Projections 2018 (UKCP18) which	As above.	Agreed

		provide projected changes in climate variables for the UK. The Proposed Scheme has a design life of 25 years and therefore the projections are done for the 2020s (2010-2039) and 2050s (2040-2069).		
4.4.3	Predicted Impacts	The potential impacts assessed for the ES include flooding, overheating of equipment, risk of fire, increased wind loading on stacks, longer growing seasons and more vigorous vegetation growth, changes to ground conditions, windborne dust and debris clogging drainage channels and requiring clearing, deformation and melting of paved surface.	As above.	Agreed
4.4.4	Design, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures	Mitigation measures are set out in the REAC (REP9-019) which also sets out how the actions and commitments set out within it are secured.	As above.	Agreed
4.4.5	Residual Effects	With the additional mitigation measures applied residual effects were assessed to be 'minor adverse' therefore 'not significant'.	As above.	Agreed

4.5. POPULATION, HEALTH AND SOCIO-ECONOMICS

Table 4.5 – Population Health and Socio-Economics

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	RAG
4.5.1	ES Study Area and Methodology	The scope and methodology for this topic are set out in Chapter 16 of the ES (APP-052).	NYC has confirmed agreement regarding the ES Study Area and methodology for this topic.	Agreed
4.5.2	ES Baseline	Baseline characterisation for this topic is set out in Chapter 16 of the ES (APP-052).	NYC has confirmed agreement regarding the ES Baseline for this topic.	Agreed
4.5.3	Predicted Impacts	The predicted impacts of the Scheme are set out in Chapter 16 of the ES (APP-052).	NYC confirms agreement with the impacts the Proposed Scheme could have for this topic.	Agreed
4.5.4	Design, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures	The design, mitigation and enhancement measures for this topic are set out in the REAC (REP9-019).	NYC agrees the mitigation measures that have been included in the REAC for this topic and do not consider any additional matters are required.	Agreed
4.5.5	Residual Effects	The ES reports that there would be a residual significant beneficial effect relating to the generation of direct, indirect and induced employment opportunities during both the Construction and Operation phases.	NYC agrees with these conclusions.	Agreed

4.6. TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT

Table 4.6 – Traffic and Transport

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
4.6.1	Study Area	The study area is set out in Section 5.6 of Chapter 5 (Traffic and Transport) (APP-041) and shown on Figure 5.1 (Study Area (Traffic and Transport) (APP-062).	NYC agrees with the study area used in the assessment.	Agreed
4.6.2	Assessment Scenarios	The Applicant has set out the Assessment Scenarios in Section 5.5 of Chapter 5 (Transport) (APP-041).	NYC agrees with the scenarios assessed.	Agreed
4.6.3	Baseline Conditions (Traffic Flows)	The Applicant has set out the baseline conditions in Section 5.7 of Chapter 5 (Transport) (APP-041) including the use of 2018 traffic survey data.	NYC agrees the use of 2018 data is acceptable.	Agreed
4.6.4	Future Baseline (Committed Developments)	The Applicant has set out the approach to committed development in Section 5.7 of Chapter 5 (Transport) (APP-041).	NYC agrees with the inclusion of the identified committed development in the assessment.	Agreed
4.6.5	Trip Generation, Distribution and Assignment (Construction Workers and	The Applicant has set out the trip generation, trip distribution, and trip assignment in Section 5.7 and 5.9 of Chapter 5 (Transport) (APP-041). The approach is consistent with previous	NYC agrees that this approach is acceptable.	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
	Construction Vehicles)	assessments at the Drax Power Station Site and scoping discussions.		
4.6.6	Predicted Impacts (Operation)	The Applicant considered the potential impact during operation in Section 5.4 of Chapter 5 (Transport) (APP-041) and it was concluded that the traffic impacts during the operational phase will likely be negligible.	NYC agrees that this conclusion is acceptable. The LHA is satisfied that the project will not have a significant impact on the highway network within North Yorkshire and the road network will perform without significant issues.	Agreed
4.6.7	Predicted Impacts (Construction)	The Applicant considered the potential impact during construction in Section 5.9 of Chapter 5 (Transport) (APP-041) and concluded that the traffic impacts on NYC highway network during the construction phase will not give rise to significant environmental impacts within North Yorkshire and the impacts can be managed using a Construction Traffic Management Plan (OD-009) and Construction Worker Travel Plan (APP-120).	NYC agrees that this conclusion is acceptable. The LHA is satisfied that the project will not have a significant impact on the highway network within North Yorkshire and the road network will perform without significant issues. However, the construction phase of the project will have the greatest impact on the network and the LHA will work with the developer to reduce numbers of HGVs where possible.	Agreed
4.6.8	Design, Mitigation and	The following mitigation have been identified to safeguard the environment and updated versions have been	NYC is satisfied with the updated CTMP and CWTP and agrees that this will avoid as much as possible congestion on the network and mitigate	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
	Enhancement Measures	submitted to respond to feedback from NYC (Highways): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (REP2-028); 2. Construction Worker Travel Plan (CWTP) (REP2-030). 	accidents which may be attributed to the increase in traffic around the site.	
4.6.9	Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL)	AIL Strategy – The Applicant’s AIL strategy is to transport AIL by road from Port of Goole to Drax Power Station with measures included in the CTMP (OD-009) (including notification) to manage the movements including all necessary notifications.	NYC has agreed that the Port of Goole option is acceptable. NYC expects this work to be managed by the developer and for consultation to be undertaken with the local highway authority when such work is to be programmed.	Agreed
4.6.10	Residual Effects	It is considered that there will be no residual effects on the highway network within North Yorkshire.	NYC is satisfied that the project will not have a significant impact on the highway network within North Yorkshire and the road network will perform without significant issues.	Agreed
4.6.11	Public Right of Way	The Applicant considered the impact on the Public Right of Way Network during construction in Chapter 5 (Transport) (APP-041) and notes the need to	NYC recognises the need to temporarily close 35.6/6/1. NYC agree that the applicant has committed to provide all necessary information and	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
		temporarily close path 35.6/6/1 to allow for ecological mitigation.	address concerns related to the temporary closures in the final CTMP.	
4.6.12	Programme	Further to the submission of ‘Project Updates Arising From Government Publications on Energy Matters in March 2023 (REP5-029)’ to Deadline 5 which sets out the timescales for the Proposed Scheme will be extended, the Applicant does not consider that there would be any change to the conclusions of the Environmental Statement as submitted in May 2022 based on the changed timescales for implementation described in Section 2.2 of the report (REP5-029). This is due to the limited change in time frames involved and that the environmental baseline would not change sufficiently during that period to result in any new or different likely significant environmental effects compared to those reported in the	NYC confirm that the Applicant’s approach to managing the impacts through the CTMP and CWTP remains acceptable in light of the programme extension.	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
		<p>technical chapters of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>In relation to the traffic and transport assessment as set out in Chapter 5 (Traffic and Transport) of the ES (APP-041) and supporting information the worst-case scenario was modelled based on the peak year of construction. The changes set out above would result in that peak year moving back by approximately two years. It is anticipated that this extension to the programme would not make a material change to the future baseline conditions in the revised peak year assessment scenario and therefore would not result in any change to the significance of effects reported in the ES.</p> <p>The agreed monitoring and mitigation measures set out in the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (REP2-028) and Construction Worker Travel Plan (CWTP) (REP2-030) are considered sufficient and flexible enough to manage the impacts of the</p>		

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
		Proposed Scheme on the highway network in the context of the prevailing traffic conditions at the time of construction.		

4.7. AIR QUALITY

Table 4.7 – Air Quality

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
4.7.1	ES Study Area and Methodology	This is detailed in Chapter 6 of the ES (APP-042).	NYC agrees with the scope and methodology for the construction and operational assessments.	Agreed
4.7.2	ES Baseline	Chapter 6 of the ES (APP-042) sets out a description of the existing Air Quality baseline.	NYC confirms their acceptance of the baseline as described in the ES.	Agreed
4.7.3	Predicted Impacts	As detailed in ES Chapter 6 (APP-042), all impacts with respect to human health are predicted to be negligible (not significant). The results of the air quality assessment with respect to ecological receptors were passed to the Proposed Scheme ecologist to determine whether	NYC agrees this position.	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
		or not there is a likely significant effect. The outcomes of this analysis are reported in Chapter 8 (Ecology) of the ES (APP-044).		
4.7.4	Design, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures	As detailed in ES Chapter 6 (APP-042) and Appendix 6.2 Construction & Decommissioning Dust Assessment (APP-042). Operation phase mitigation is detailed in ES Chapter 6, focussed on reducing acid deposition impacts to sensitive features within identified designated habitat sites.	NYC agrees the proposed mitigation measures for the construction and operational phases.	Agreed
4.7.5	Cumulative effects	The approach to cumulative assessments is set out in chapters 6 and 18 (REP4-035) of the ES.	NYC agrees with the approach undertaken by the Applicant.	Agreed
4.7.6	Residual Effects	ES Chapter 6 (APP-042) confirms that no residual effects are predicted for Air Quality.	NYC agrees this position.	Agreed
4.7.7	Relevant dDCO Requirements/ Articles	Draft DCO (REP9-005) includes a commitment to implement a CEMP and CTMP that will be approved by the relevant local planning authority, which	NYC agrees with this approach.	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
		includes construction mitigation measures, as detailed in Chapter 6 (APP-042), Appendix 6.2 of the ES (APP-042) and set out in the REAC (REP9-019).		

4.8. NOISE AND VIBRATION

Table 4.8 – Noise and Vibration

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
4.8.1	ES Study Area and Methodology	The study area and methodology are set out in section 7.6 of the ES (APP-043) and built on engagement undertaken with NYC.	The study area and methodology are agreed.	Agreed
4.8.2	ES Baseline	The baseline is described in section 7.7 of the ES (APP-043), taking into account monitoring undertaken at locations agreed with NYC.	The approach to developing, and the description of, the baseline is agreed by NYC.	Agreed
4.8.3	Predicted Impacts	The ES sets out the results of the noise and vibration predictions in Section 7.9 in accordance with the methodology agreed with NYC.	NYC has acknowledged the conclusions of the assessment. A comment was received from NYC in relation to high-impact noise activities	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
		<p>The significant of effects for construction noise and vibration and also for operational noise are identified as being not significant.</p>	<p>during construction phase. The comment states that impulsive noise cannot always be controlled effectively using a long LAeq and instead suggests specifying a short LAeq or looking to control maximum levels (LAFmax). Therefore, high-impact noise activities should be well defined, for example piling works, rollers and tunnel boring, and consideration given to a more representative LAeq,T for such works.</p> <p>NYC has confirmed the matters outstanding and this item is not one of them. Therefore we consider this matter closed.</p>	
4.8.7	Design, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures	<p>Best Practicable Measures (BPMs) will be required during the construction phase.</p> <p>Mitigation during the operational phase of the Proposed Scheme will be required to meet the DCO requirement on operational noise (see next item).</p>	<p>NYC has provided comments stating that there is uncertainty regarding good acoustic design in terms of noise mitigation measures seeking to avoid adverse operational noise impacts.</p> <p>Parties discussed this issue during Issue Specific Hearing 3 on 22 March 2023, and also on follow up meetings</p>	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
		<p>Parties held a further discussion on 24 April 2023. It was agreed during this meeting that the Applicant would issue a note to NYC describing the potential implication on noise impact related to the alternative layout presented in Chapter 3 (Consideration of Alternatives) of the ES. The Applicant issued this information to NYC on 5 May 2023. The outcome of this exercise shows that the nearest noise sensitive receptors would be closer to the southern layout option compared to the preferred northern layout option. Therefore, the preferred northern option is most favourable in terms of noise impact.</p>	<p>on 23 March and 5 April 2023. The good acoustic design process undertaken during preparation of the ES was described by the Applicant.</p> <p>NYC acknowledge the Applicant's case regarding the northern option being most favourable in terms of noise impact and this is agreed.</p> <p>NYC to confirm their position.</p>	
4.8.8	Residual Effects	<p>The residual effects for both construction and operation are likely to be not significant provided that required mitigation is implemented in the design.</p> <p>Parties held a further discussion on 24 April 2023. The Applicant reiterates that the assessment concludes an initial estimate in accordance with</p>	<p>Contextual considerations were discussed between parties during Issue Specific Hearing 3 on 22 March 2023, and also on follow up meetings on 23 March, 5 April and 24 April 2023.</p>	Not Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
		<p>BS4142:214+A1:2019 indicating an adverse impact depending on the context at two receptors. Taking into account the contextual considerations, then the operational noise effect due to operation of the post combustion carbon capture technology would be not significant, as noted in paragraph 7.9.20 of ES Chapter 7 (Noise and Vibration).</p>	<p>It is agreed that at receptors R6 and R14 there is an indication of adverse impacts depending on context.</p> <p>It is agreed that NYC are still requesting the rating levels in DCO requirement 17 to be lowered to remove potential for adverse impact.</p> <p>However, NYC acknowledge the Applicant's case for contextual considerations and that the assessment methodology provides for a deflated background noise level against an inflated rating level, and that the ExA will balance this against the likelihood for adverse impact and the need for the proposed development.</p>	
4.8.9	Relevant dDCO Requirements/ Articles	<p>Control of noise during operation (17) (REP9-005). Requirement 17 of Schedule 2 of the draft DCO requires a noise mitigation scheme to be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority containing details of how the design has incorporated noise mitigation measures for work nos. 1 (carbon</p>	<p>The effectiveness of Requirement 17 was discussed between parties during Issue Specific Hearing 3 on 22 March 2023, and also on follow up meetings on 23 March, 5 April and 24 April 2023. NYC to confirm their position.</p> <p>Matter in ongoing discussion as inherently linked to the above point.</p>	Not Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
		<p>capture plant), 2 (infrastructure to transport compressed CO₂) and 3 (supporting works), to ensure that the operational noise rating levels will not be exceeded.</p> <p>The relevant planning authority therefore has an opportunity to ensure that a good acoustic design is achieved during the detailed design stage. As such, it is considered that a suitable and robust mechanism for mitigating noise impacts during the operation phase is secured via the DCO.</p>	<p>NYC also raised concerns about Requirement 14 and the potential for noise impacts arising from construction compounds and preliminary works. This matter was discussed between parties during Issue Specific Hearing 3 on 22 March 2023, and also on follow up meetings on 23 March and 5 April 2023. The Applicant provided references to links showing the location of compounds.</p> <p>Issues related to Requirement 14 were agreed between parties.</p> <p>It is agreed that NYC are still requesting the rating levels in DCO requirement 17 to be lowered to remove potential for adverse impact.</p> <p>However, NYC acknowledge the Applicant's case for contextual considerations and that the assessment methodology provides for a deflated background noise level against an inflated rating level, and that the ExA will balance this against the</p>	

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
			likelihood for adverse impact and the need for the proposed development.	

4.9. ECOLOGY

Table 4.9 – Ecology

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
4.9.1	ES Study Area and Methodology	The ES Study Area and Methodology are set out in Sections 8.4 and 8.5 of Chapter 8 (Ecology) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (APP-044). The Applicant considers the methodology described therein remains appropriate.	NYC is satisfied that the DCO application includes an adequate ecological impact assessment and biodiversity net gain assessment.	Agreed
4.9.2	ES Baseline	The scope of surveys and their results are summarised in Sections 8.5, 8.6, and 8.7 of Chapter 8 (Ecology) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (APP-044). Further details are provided in the supporting survey information set out in Appendices 8.1 to 8.13 (APP-136 to APP-148). Other sources of data utilised are set out in Chapter 6 (Air Quality),	NYC is satisfied with the scope of ecological survey undertaken to inform the ES and HRA and that alongside the use of existing data sources set out in the ES, that the characterisation of the ecological baseline is sufficient.	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
		Chapter 7 (Noise and Vibration) and Chapter 12 (Water Environment) of the ES (APP-044). The Applicant considers that the scope of ecological surveys, including use of survey data gathered for the Drax Repower scheme, is commensurate with the scale and scope of the Proposed Scheme.		
4.9.3	Habitats Regulation Assessment	The Applicant has produced a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Report, which sets out the Applicants assessment of potential effects on European Sites (6.8.1). As set out in the HRA Report, the Applicant has concluded that the Proposed Scheme would not lead to adverse effects on the integrity of any European Site, subject to the securing of the mitigation measures identified in the HRA Report.	NYC agrees with the scope of sites that have been screened into the Habitats Regulations Assessment documentation; and that the Habitats Regulations Assessment undertaken is sufficient. To date no agreement with the conclusions of the HRA have been made by NYC. NYC would defer to Natural England for their expert opinion on the findings of the HRA.	Agreed
4.9.4	Predicted Impacts	The Applicant has set out their assessment of impacts on ecological receptors in Sections 8.9 to 8.13 of Chapter 8 (Ecology) of the ES (APP-044).	NYC is in agreement with the Applicant on this matter.	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
4.9.5	Design, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures	<p>Primary design measures (i.e. embedded measures) are set out in Chapter 2 (Site and Project Description) of the ES (APP-038). Ecological mitigation and enhancement measures are set out in Section 8.10 of Chapter 8 (Ecology) of the ES (APP-044) and are secured as set out in the REAC (REP9-019).</p> <p>In addition, the Applicant has completed a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (APP-196) and is seeking to deliver 10% BNG for all habitats affected by the Proposed Scheme. The Applicant has undertaken additional work to refine the extent of habitat loss required to facilitate construction and also to confirm the habitats that may be reinstated post-construction. The Applicant submitted revised BNG Assessments into the Examination at Deadline 3 (REP3-010) and Deadline 6 (REP6-027) which demonstrates that 10% BNG can be achieved for area-</p>	<p>The use of the off-site preferred option for delivery of riverine BNG units (the Off-Site River Restoration BNG) has been agreed, with the 10% BNG proposed to be delivered through support to river restoration works to be carried out on the Black Brook by CCRT.</p> <p>The s106 agreement has been agreed between the Applicant and NYC. The parties are agreed that the agreement secures the delivery and ongoing maintenance of the rivers BNG.</p>	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
		<p>based, linear (hedgerow) and river habitats</p> <p>The Colne and Calder Rivers Trust (CCRT) within the Humber River Basin is delivering a project which can provide the number of river units required to meet the 10% BNG targets for the Proposed Scheme. The Applicant has agreed with NYC, the Environment Agency, and Natural England that this project is appropriate for delivering 10% BNG for river units. Provision of this Off-Site River Restoration BNG will be secured through the section 106 agreement which has now been agreed negotiated with NYC.</p> <p>The final agreed draft of the s106 agreement has been submitted into the Examination at Deadline 7.</p>		
4.9.6	Cumulative effects	<p>The ecological assessment of cumulative effects is presented in the Cumulative Assessment Matrix at Appendix 18.5 of the ES (APP-177). With the application of mitigation from</p>	<p>NYC agrees with the Applicant's approach to cumulative assessment.</p>	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
		<p>the Proposed Scheme and the other developments assessed, significant residual effects are predicted in relation to Development 6 (Barlow Mound) during Construction. Cumulative effects are predicted to be non-significant for all other developments, and to be non-significant for all developments during the Operation phase.</p>		
4.9.7	Residual Effects	<p>The Applicants assessment of residual effects is set out Section 8.11 of Chapter 8 (Ecology) of the ES (APP-044).</p> <p>Significant residual effects during the construction phase are identified for habitats, bats, breeding and wintering birds, terrestrial invertebrates, and vascular plants.</p> <p>With the application of mitigation where required, no significant residual effects are predicted during the Operation phase.</p>	NYC agrees with the Applicant's conclusions.	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
4.9.8	Relevant dDCO Requirements/ Articles	<p>Schedule 2 of the dDCO (REP9-005) includes Requirements that secure mitigation and enhancement measures for ecological receptors.</p> <p>Relevant Requirements include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirement 7 - Provision of landscape and biodiversity mitigation and enhancement; • Requirement 8 – External lighting during operation; • Requirement 14 – Construction environmental management plan; • Requirement 17 – Control of noise during operation; and • Requirement 18 – Decommissioning environmental management plan; <p>The Applicant considers that the identified Requirements secure the embedded measures that form an integral part of the Proposed Scheme, adequately secure the ecological mitigation and enhancement measures</p>	<p>In their Relevant Representation responding to the Proposed Scheme’s DCO application, NYC stated that the Authority is satisfied that the DCO application includes an adequate ecological impact assessment and biodiversity net gain assessment.</p>	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
		identified in Chapter 8 (Ecology) of the ES (APP-044).		

4.10. DESIGN, LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT

Table 4.10 – Design, Landscape and Visual Impact

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
4.10.1	ES Study Area	The Applicant has applied a maximum Study Area of 10 km from the Site Boundary and a focused 3 km study area covering built and natural environmental features. A 15 km cumulative radius is applied.	NYC supports the size of the applied study areas.	Agreed
4.10.2	ES Methodology – viewpoints and visualisations	Zone of Theoretical Visibility: A ZTV was prepared to inform the selection of viewpoints and has been verified in the field to establish an accurate visual envelope. Viewpoints: Ten viewpoints have been selected. The Applicant notes that these are winter viewpoints and it has been agreed that summer viewpoints are not	Zone of Theoretical Visibility: NYC is in agreement with the process of establishing the ZTV. Viewpoints: NYC confirmed agreement of the viewpoints and that summer viewpoints were not required. NYC would like however to reserve the	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
		<p>required.</p> <p>Visualisations: In response to NYC’s comments, six visualisations (a mix of Type 2 and 3) have been prepared.</p>	<p>right to review the photo viewpoints and photomontages once more detailed design and layout information becomes available.</p> <p>Visualisations: NYC confirmed agreement with the six day-time visualisations suggested.</p> <p>It was also agreed between NYC and the Applicant that two night-time visualisations would also be prepared from viewpoint 2 and 7.</p>	
4.10.3	ES Methodology	<p>The Applicant confirms that the LVIA will following guidance stipulated in the EIA Scoping Report covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GLVIA Third Edition (LI and IEMA, 2013); • An approach to Landscape Character Assessment (Natural England 2014); and • Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 06/119: Visual Representation of Development Proposals. 	<p>NYC confirmed agreement with the approach and the methodology.</p> <p>NYC confirmed that they are happy with the list of baseline documents referred to in the PEIR.</p> <p>NYC agreed the threshold for Significant Adverse effect to be Moderate Adverse.</p>	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
		The Applicant is using the methodology and baseline documentation as agreed with NYC’s landscape officer.		
4.10.4	ES Methodology – night-time assessment	<p>The Applicant has undertaken a night-time assessment and prepared two night-time photomontages from viewpoint 2 and 7b (now 7).</p> <p>The Applicant notes that Drax Power Station is already well lit, and the future baseline is likely to reduce the extent of lighting. The reduction in lighting associated with the future baseline relates to the demolition of the FGD equipment (which are cream coloured structures) covered under a Town and Country Planning application (reference 2020/0994/FULM). As such this change cannot form part of the assessment of the Proposed Scheme and the positive benefit attained cannot be acknowledged.</p> <p>Lighting will be required for health and safety reasons and it is expected that lighting introduced would be down lit</p>	<p>NYC have requested that future lighting on the site is minimised to prevent the incremental build-up of lighting on the site and reduce adverse visual effects.</p> <p>The process has been agreed and the applicant has discussed some draft documents with the Authorities. The final document remains in development and completion to the satisfaction of the Authorities will need to be secured through the DCO.</p> <p>NYC confirmed that they agree with this approach.</p>	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
		LED lights; this will be detailed in a lighting strategy.		
4.10.5	ES Baseline	<p>Detailed Study of Existing Landscape Components:</p> <p>The Applicant confirms that existing landscape components have been considered in the LVIA and presented as part of the design framework, and that the relationship between the existing Drax Power Station Site and Proposed Scheme have been shown.</p>	<p>Detailed Study of Existing Landscape Components:</p> <p>NYC confirmed that they are content with the Applicant’s approach.</p>	Agreed
4.10.6	ES Baseline	<p>Existing trees and vegetation survey:</p> <p>The Applicant considered that a tree survey and arboricultural impact assessment was not necessary.</p> <p>Elsewhere, existing vegetation will remain undisturbed and will be protected through a CEMP which will be secured through a requirement of the draft DCO. References to the protection of trees under BS 5837 trees in relation to design, demolition and construction will also be made in a proposed Outline</p>	<p>Existing Trees and Vegetation survey:</p> <p>NYC confirmed they are content with the Applicant’s approach.</p> <p>NYC confirmed they are content with the Applicant’s Response to LIR Response Ref. 2.26, where it is stated there is no provision for an arboricultural impact assessment but there will be a tree survey and tree protection to BS5837, etc.</p>	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
		<p>Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (OLBS).</p> <p>Furthermore, the Applicant has included Measure [G5] within the REAC, which details that trees and their roots that are within or enter the construction areas will be protected in accordance with BS5837:2012 (LIR Response Ref. 2.26).</p>		
4.10.7	ES Baseline	<p>Existing trees and vegetation survey:</p> <p>NYC have stated that they would like the long-term maintenance and management to extend to all existing and proposed landscape and vegetation within the Works areas and not just new vegetation.</p> <p>The Applicant’s position is that this is unnecessary in terms of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment findings (which have been agreed by NYC), i.e. there will be no significant adverse effects as a result of the Proposed Scheme, and the current landscape proposals which include long term (30 year) maintenance for existing</p>	<p>Existing Trees and Vegetation survey:</p> <p>Following ISH3, NYC have stated they have concerns relating to the removal of existing vegetation and the protection of existing trees and vegetation including long term maintenance.</p> <p>Further detail is set out in 4.10.12.</p>	Not Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
		vegetation identified for retention, and for new landscape, habitat creation and enhancement works.		
4.10.8	ES Baseline	<p>Soil management / agricultural land:</p> <p>The Applicant has confirmed that a soil survey, assessment and management plan were not necessary given that agricultural land will be temporary and limited to the Laydown Area.</p> <p>Restoration of the temporary Laydown Area to the east will be covered under a mitigation measure (LVIA7) in the REAC (REP9-019) and measures will be taken to set back construction activities from the field boundaries to avoid damage to root protection areas. A CEMP will be secured through the DCO. This land will be reinstated to the same quality and condition as existing.</p> <p>The Applicant has confirmed that a Soil Handling Management Plan (SHMP) will be included in the CEMP, which will include best practice measures and that the soil will be returned to the same</p>	<p>Soil management / agricultural land:</p> <p>NYC are content with the Applicant's approach.</p>	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
		quality after the works (LIR Response Ref. 2.25 & 2.27).		
4.10.9	Predicted Impacts	The Applicant has set out the predicated impacts in the ES (APP-045).	NYC agree with the applicant's position.	Agreed
4.10.10	Design, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures	<p>Site Design / Alternatives Design Options:</p> <p>The Proposed Scheme meets the requirement for good design. This will be further supported by the requirement in the dDCO (REP9-005) which would require the approval by the LPA of detailed design, design principles and mitigation including the landscape and biodiversity strategy.</p> <p>In addition, a clear design strategy has been prepared through a design framework and accompanying design principles / objectives.</p> <p>The applicant intends to work with NYC to implement design principles / objectives from the design framework where appropriate and necessary, within the context of this DCO application.</p>	<p>Site Design / Alternatives Design Options:</p> <p>NYC has confirmed that they are content with the Applicant's approach and that a design framework / design principles has been prepared and included as an appendix to the project description of the ES.</p> <p>NYC has expressed an interest in working with the Applicant on detailed aspects of the design framework to understand how opportunities can be secured through this Application, to ensure an appropriate design response. The parties are agreed that the DCO requirements, OLBS and design principles in the REAC ensure that relevant aspects of the design</p>	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
			framework are secured and will be implemented at detailed design stage.	
4.10.11	Design, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures	<p>Landscape Proposals, Mitigation, Management and Aftercare:</p> <p>The Applicant confirmed that an OLBS has been developed. Careful consideration was given to how landscape and visual impacts can be reduced, whilst being mindful that adverse significant visual effects are likely to remain.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided reasonable and appropriate mitigation, proportionate to the level of effects predicted to result from the Proposed Scheme, and as a result has minimised harm to the landscape resulting from the Proposed Scheme (in accordance with paragraph 5.9.8 of NPS EN-1).</p>	<p>Landscape Proposals, Mitigation, Maintenance and Aftercare:</p> <p>NYC confirmed that they are content with the Applicant’s approach.</p> <p>NYC agrees that the final LBSs are to be prepared by the Applicant and submitted to NYC for its approval and that this process is secured via the DCO requirement.</p>	Agreed
4.10.12	Design, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures	<p>Landscape Proposals, Mitigation, Management and Aftercare:</p> <p>The Applicant has proposed landscape mitigation proposals that minimise harm</p>	<p>Landscape Proposals, Mitigation, Maintenance and Aftercare:</p> <p>NYC is content with the OLBS subject to one point which relates to vegetation</p>	Not Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
		<p>caused by the Proposed Scheme to the landscape, and these have been set out in the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (REP6-017) which is secured via Requirement 7 of the Draft DCO (LIR Response Ref. 2.4)</p> <p>Furthermore, the Applicant has carried out an assessment of the potential impacts from the Proposed Scheme and identified appropriate measures to mitigate likely significant effects in this respect. (LIR Response Ref. 2.5)</p> <p>The Applicant will undertake long term (30 year) maintenance for existing vegetation identified for retention, and for new landscape, habitat creation and enhancement works. The Applicant cannot commit to 30 year maintenance of existing vegetation beyond what has been identified for retention, due to operational requirements on the Drax Power Station site in the future.</p> <p>The Applicant is not currently in a position to identify the location of new</p>	<p>retention. NYC is content that the vegetation retention is sufficiently covered in the REAC and within the revised OLBS. NYC wants clarification that the long-term maintenance and management will extend to all existing and proposed landscape and vegetation within the Works areas and not just new vegetation.</p> <p>NYC acknowledges the updates to the latest versions of the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (OLBS) (REP6-017) and Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REP6-15). NYC is happy that progress has been made since the discussions in Issue Specific Hearing on environmental matters. The 30 year maintenance commitment for new and retained planting is welcomed as erosion of the landscape features at the power station site has been a main concern for the Council.</p> <p>NYC had asked the Applicant to amend the Landscape commitment to</p>	

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
		<p>landscape areas, as this will be done during the detailed design stage.</p>	<p>maintain all existing landscape features within the order limits. It is understood that the maintenance of the landscape features currently extends to new planting and that referenced on the existing vegetation plan – Figure 3 [APP-183]. The Council’s concern remains that prior to the detailed design stage it is unclear what vegetation is likely to be lost and how that might be compensated for. It is understood that the Planning Authority will be required to discharge the detailed design plans as they come forward. However, given the structure of figure 3 i.e vegetation to be retained and not vegetation to be removed, plus the caveat at section G8 of the REAC which states <i>“Areas of existing amenity planting will be retained wherever practicable. Where the loss of such planting is unavoidable, (for example if planting obstructs the construction and maintenance of the Proposed Scheme)”</i> the Council remains concerned that vegetation could be lost</p>	

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
			<p>on site on the basis of construction or maintenance and there would be little the Council could do to prevent such loss in the face of figure 3.</p> <p>The Council would prefer to see a commitment of no net loss of landscaping features within the OLBS. This would reassure the Council going into the detailed design stage.</p> <p>This should not be seen an overall objection to the scheme. NYC acknowledges that the power station site is an operational site but is seeking to express its concern that amenity planting could be lost because of the application rather than enhanced as it would require from development schemes. The applicant’s position on the matter is understood by the Council.</p>	
4.10.13	Design, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures	<p>Green Infrastructure (GI) initiatives:</p> <p>The Applicant has given consideration to GI and has referred to various</p>	<p>Green Infrastructure (GI) initiatives:</p> <p>NYC considers that landscape proposals should support the Government’s commitment to</p>	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
		<p>documents as per the Drax Repower Project OLBS.</p> <p>Consideration was given to community opportunities and Drax Power Limited’s work with adjacent communities.</p> <p>Following ISH3 and comments from NYC, the Applicant acknowledges the expectation that landscape proposals developed at the Detailed Design stage should include principles set out in the Design Framework, Environmental Statement, the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (OLBS), and included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC).</p> <p>However, these detailed landscape schemes will only include principles that are relevant, appropriate, and proportionate, in response to requirements for provision of landscape mitigation / green infrastructure associated with the site of the Proposed Scheme.</p>	<p>improving green infrastructure, health and wellbeing, as set out in the 25 Year Environment Plan. The Leeds City Region Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy, NPPF and other local policy, also recognise GI.</p> <p>NYC confirmed that they are content with the Applicant’s approach as it remains in development as part of the landscape strategy.</p> <p>NYC has agreed that mitigation outside of the Order limits is not sought / needed.</p>	

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
		The Applicant is not currently in a position to identify the location of new landscape areas, as this will be done during the detailed design stage.		
4.14	Residual Effects	Current assessment shows there will be no long term significant adverse effects - therefore, there will be no residual effects (see flow dia. on page 66 of GLVIA).	NYC agrees with the applicant's position.	Agreed
4.15	Cumulative effects	The Applicant has confirmed that cumulative effects during the Construction Phase have been considered should the construction programme overlap with other recently approved schemes. As a decision has been taken not to proceed with the Drax Repower Project this will now not form part of the future baseline.	NYC has confirmed that they are in agreement with this approach.	Agreed
4.10.16	Relevant dDCO Requirements/ Articles	Landscape works (including removal of hedgerows) will not be commenced until, a written strategy for that part, which is substantially in accordance with the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy (OLBS), has been submitted to	NYC agrees with the applicant's position.	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
		and, after consultation with NYC, approved by the relevant planning authority (REP9-005).		
4.10.17	Other Matters	N/A	N/A	N/A

4.11. HERITAGE

Table 4.11 – Heritage

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
4.11.1	ES Study Area and Methodology	The Applicant sets out a description of the Study Area and Methodology for assessment of heritage matters in Section 10.4 and 10.5 of the Heritage Chapter of the ES (APP-046). As only significant effects need to be reported, and because there are no significant effects on Grade II listed buildings, the ES chapter has limited the assessment of effects to Grade I and Grade II* listed buildings	NYC agrees with the applicant's position.	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
4.11.2	ES Baseline	The Applicant sets out the baseline in Section 10.6 of the Heritage Chapter of the ES (APP-046).	NYC confirmed that most of the Site has already been subject to geophysical survey with some trial trenching previously undertaken.	Agreed
4.11.3	Predicted Impacts	<p>The Applicant sets out the predicted impacts in section 10.8 of the Heritage Chapter of the ES (APP-046). The Applicant confirms that the environmental mitigation works are unlikely to impact on archaeological remains as no farmland will be altered. There is potential for some impacts in the Laydown Area, which the assessment will need to consider, including ground treatment and construction methods.</p> <p>As works to the Existing Drax Jetty have been removed from the Proposed Scheme, any possible paleoenvironmental impacts of this area of the Proposed Scheme are no longer a concern. Discussion of any paleoenvironmental assessment with the Historic England Regional Science</p>	<p>NYC agrees with the scope and paleoenvironmental approach.</p> <p>The NYC response in the Relevant Representations (RR) agrees with the recommendation for archaeological monitoring and recording prior to development within the proposed laydown area and environmental offset area as a proportionate response to the expected significance of archaeological remains.</p>	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
		advisor will therefore be taken forwards during the review of the draft assessment, rather than earlier in the programme.		
4.11.4	Design, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures	The Applicant confirms that mitigation measures will be developed as part of the design process and informed by the assessment. Measures are set out in section 10.10 of the Heritage Chapter of the ES (document reference APP-046). Measures identified will be undertaken in accordance with the standards and guidance from Historic England (2016, 2017) and Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014).	NYC agrees in the RR response with the recommendation for archaeological monitoring and recording prior to development within the proposed laydown area and environmental offset area as a proportionate response to the expected significance of archaeological remains.	Agreed
4.11.5	Residual Effects	The Applicant confirmed the mitigation measures as part of the design process and as such it is not anticipated there will be any significant adverse residual effects.	NYC agrees in the RR response with the recommendation for archaeological monitoring and recording prior to development within the proposed laydown area and environmental offset area as a proportionate response to the expected significance of archaeological remains.	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
4.11.6	Relevant dDCO Requirements/ Articles	The REAC (REP9-019) set out a scheme of archaeological mitigation in the form of archaeological monitoring and recording prior to development.	NYC agrees to the proposed environmental measures in relation to heritage that will be implemented during design and construction of the Proposed Scheme.	Agreed
4.11.7	Other Matters	The Applicant sets out the approach to public engagement in Section 10.10 of the Heritage Chapter of the ES (APP-046) and in the REAC (REP9-019). The Written Scheme of Investigation for the agreed mitigation will set out how public benefits may be achieved by means of engagement, participation and/or dissemination, as appropriate to the scale and circumstances of the work.	NYC agrees with the proposed approach for public engagement.	Agreed

4.12. GROUND CONDITIONS

Table 4.12 – Ground Conditions

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
4.12.1	ES Study Area and Methodology	The ES Study Area is described in full in Section 11.6 of Chapter 11 (Ground Conditions) of the ES (APP-047). The Methodology is described in full in Section 11.5 of Chapter 11 of the ES.	NYC agrees with the Applicant's position.	Agreed
4.12.2	ES Baseline	The Applicant sets out the baseline in Section 11.7 Chapter 11 (Ground Conditions) of the ES (APP-047).	NYC agrees with the Applicant's position.	Agreed
4.12.3	Predicted Impacts	The Applicant sets out the predicted impacts Section 11.4 (Scope of the Assessment) and Section 11.9 (Preliminary Assessment of Likely Impacts and Effects) in Chapter 11 (Ground Conditions) of the ES (APP-047).	NYC agrees with the Applicant's position.	Agreed
4.12.4	Design, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures	The Applicant sets out the design, mitigation and enhancement measures in Section 11.10 in Chapter 11 (Ground Conditions) of the ES (APP-047).	NYC agrees the proposed mitigation measures and Applicant's position.	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
4.12.5	Residual Effects	The Applicant sets out the assessment of likely significant effects in Section 11.11 in Chapter 11 (Ground Conditions) of the ES (APP-047) and confirms residual effects are not significant.	NYC agrees with the Applicant's position.	Agreed
4.12.6	Relevant dDCO Requirements/ Articles	Schedule 2 of the dDCO (REP9-005) includes Requirements that secure mitigation and enhancement measures for Ground Conditions receptors. Draft DCO includes a commitment to implement a CEMP that will be approved by the relevant local planning authority and regulatory bodies, which includes construction mitigation measures, as detailed in Chapter 11 (Ground Conditions) of the ES (APP-047) and set out in the REAC (REP9-019).	In their Relevant Representative response NYC agrees with the Applicant's position.	Agreed

4.13. WATER ENVIRONMENT

Table 4.13 – Water Environment

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC (LLFA) – Current Position	Position
Flood Risk Assessment				
4.13.1	Whole Report	The Applicant agrees with the LLFA.	The LLFA agree with the Flood Risk Assessment.	Agreed
Surface Water Drainage Strategy				
4.13.2	Whole Report	The Applicant has agreed the proposed conceptual drainage strategy with the LLFA. A new surface water drainage system will be installed within Work Nos. 1D and 2 (and 3 if required) shown on the Works Plans (AS-073) with the proposed operational design standard to be in line with the LLFA's guidance.	The LLFA agree with the approach and findings of the Surface Water Drainage Strategy.	Agreed
WFDa				
4.13.3	Whole Report	The Applicant agrees with the WFDa being a matter for the Environment Agency to review.	The LLFA agree that the Flood Risk Assessment is a matter for the Environment Agency to review.	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC (LLFA) – Current Position	Position
			It is agreed no adverse impacts are perceived by the proposed works from a WFD perspective.	
Water Environment ES Chapter				
4.13.4	Whole Report	The Applicant agrees with the LLFA.	The LLFA agree with the findings of the Water Environment ES Chapter.	Agreed
DCO				
4.13.5	Relevant DCO Requirements/ Articles	<p>The Applicant has disapplied the IDB byelaws as defined under section 66 of the Land Drainage Act 1991 and the need for IDB consent under section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991, pursuant to section 150 of the Planning Act 2008 and The Infrastructure Planning (Interested Parties and Miscellaneous Prescribed Provisions) Regulations 2015.</p> <p>However, it is noted that there are no ordinary watercourses which consent would be required from the LLFA to facilitate the proposed works.</p>	The LLFA is agreeable to the disapplication of section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991, pursuant to section 150 of the Planning Act 2008 and The Infrastructure Planning (Interested Parties and Miscellaneous Prescribed Provisions) Regulations 2015.	Agreed

4.14. MATERIALS AND WASTE

Table 4.14 – Materials and Waste

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
4.14.1	ES Study Area and Methodology	<p>The ES Study Area and Methodology are set out in Sections 13.5 and 13.6 of Chapter 13 of the ES (APP-044).</p> <p>Following the response in the Scoping Opinion from PINS, the Applicant agreed to scope in a description of the potential impacts arising from the use of process chemicals (e.g. amine solvent, caustic soda, anti-foam and sulphuric acid) and an assessment of likely significant effects are included in the ES.</p>	<p>NYC’s response in the Relevant Representations (RR) noted that reference to the recently adopted Minerals and Waste Joint Plan (MWJP) has been referenced and relevant minerals and waste policies included. No action required on comment provided.</p> <p>NYC agrees with this position.</p>	Agreed
4.14.2	ES Baseline	<p>During the preparation of the ES, this incorporated current waste generation data.</p> <p>Baseline data for available landfill capacity indicates there will be a shortfall by the time of year of completion (2028). The Minerals and Waste Joint Plan (MWJP) produced by NYCC acknowledges this and states</p>	<p>NYC’s response in the Relevant Representations (RR) note that the site is within a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA). Paragraph 8.55 of the [MWJP] includes exemption criteria for MSAs one of which states:</p> <p>Redevelopment of previously developed land not increasing the footprint of the former development.</p>	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
		<p>that there are plans to increase landfill capacity in the region. The assessment was carried out without that information as a worst-case scenario.</p> <p>For clarity, we reconfirm that the MSA is already constrained by the existing site, and hence – as the proposed development does not increase the existing site footprint, its presence will not affect the overall findings of the assessment.</p> <p>The figure of 470,000 tpa was provided in the previous version of the MWJP – this can be updated. It is confirmed that this update does not affect the overall findings of the assessment.</p> <p>As per section 4.2 of this document, the development management policies relate to minerals and waste developments and mineral site reclamation. It is considered that these policies are not directly relevant to the Drax site (as it is neither a minerals nor a waste development), and therefore do not apply to this chapter.</p>	<p>This applies to the Drax site.</p> <p>NYC’s response in the Relevant Representations (RR) noted that in paragraph 13.7.22 of the report it states that the capacity gap for recycling CDE waste is approximately 470,000 tpa by 2030, the adopted MWJP states that it would be 437,000 tpa by 2030.</p> <p>As per section 4.2 of this document, NYC considers that there are a number of additional adopted Development Management policies in NYMWJP which are relevant to this scheme, including D06 – Landscape. The applicant does not consider these policies are relevant to the Proposed Scheme as these policies only relate to Minerals and Waste development. There are however ‘equivalent’ policies in the Local Plan which the applicant has assessed the scheme against, and considers the proposal is policy compliant. NYC agree that, if weight were to be afforded to these policies in</p>	

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
			NYMWJP, the proposal would comply with these policies, and therefore irrespective of the weight to be afforded to these policies in NYMWJP, this should not result in refusal of application.	
4.14.3	Predicted Impacts	Predicted impacts for materials relate to consumption of natural and non-renewable resources. Impacts predicted for waste result in a reduction in available landfill capacity.	NYC is in agreement with the Applicant on this matter.	Agreed
4.14.4	Design, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures	Design, Mitigation and Enhancement measures are set out in the ES and the REAC for the Proposed Scheme (REP9-019).	NYC agrees the mitigation measures have been included in the REAC for this topic and do not consider any additional matters are required.	Agreed
4.14.5	Residual Effects	Residual effects are set out in the ES.	NYC agrees with the Applicant's conclusions.	Agreed

4.15. GREENHOUSE GASES

Table 4.15 – Greenhouse Gases

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
4.15.1	ES Study Area and Methodology	<p>The study area for greenhouse gases (GHGs) is not restricted by geographical area, but instead includes any increase or decrease in emissions as a result of the Proposed Scheme. The GHG emission sources scoped in for assessment comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction Phase emissions from manufacture and transport of raw materials to suppliers; transport of materials to and waste from Site; plant and equipment used during construction; • Operational Phase emissions from biomass supply chain, solvent use, operational energy use and replacement and refurbishment. 	<p>NYC agrees that the Applicant has adequately considered and assessed the GHG implications of the Proposed Scheme.</p> <p>It is agreed that the Applicant has adequately considered and assessed the GHG implications of the Proposed Scheme. NYC has taken a pragmatic approach to the consideration and assessment of these issues and does not have any additional queries or concerns with them.</p>	Agreed
4.15.2	ES Baseline	The Construction Phase baseline scenario involves no construction activities and therefore the construction baseline is zero emissions. Operational	NYC agrees that the Applicant has adequately considered and assessed the GHG implications of the Proposed Scheme.	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
		baseline conditions assessed comprise the emissions from two of the existing biomass units at the Drax Power station (the two remaining coal units are excluded from the scope as they stopped generating electricity commercially in March 2021 and will cease operations entirely prior to works to construct the Proposed Scheme) and biomass supply chain emissions.		
4.15.3	Predicted Impacts	The magnitude and significance of emissions associated with the Proposed Scheme have been quantified and are presented in Chapter 15 (Greenhouse Gases) of the ES (APP-051).	NYC agrees that the Applicant has adequately considered and assessed the GHG implications of the Proposed Scheme.	Agreed
4.15.4	Design, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures	Design, mitigation and enhancement measures are set out in the ES and the REAC (REP9-019).	NYC agrees with the proposed mitigation measures.	Agreed
4.15.5	Residual Effects	Residual effects are set out in the ES. Construction phase mitigation measures are likely to reduce the adverse effects. Operational phase enhancement measures would seek to ensure	NYC agrees that the Applicant has adequately considered and assessed the GHG implications of the Proposed Scheme.	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
		continuation of beneficial impacts. However, the impact of mitigation measures are not quantifiable and therefore the impacts of the assessment remain unchanged, as reported in the ES (APP-051).		

4.16. MAJOR ACCIDENTS AND DISASTERS

Table 4.16 – Major Accidents and Disasters

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
4.16.1	ES Study Area and Methodology	The ES methodology and study area are set out in sections 17.6 and 17.7 of the ES (APP-053).	NYC agrees that the Applicant has adequately considered and assessed the major accidents and disasters implications of the Proposed Scheme.	Agreed
4.16.2	ES Baseline	The baseline relevant to this topic comprises: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Features external to the Proposed Scheme that contribute a potential source of hazard to it; 	As above.	Agreed

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensitive environmental receptors at risk of significant effect; and • Current (without the Proposed Scheme) major accident and disaster risks for the existing locality. 		
4.16.3	Mitigation Measures	Specific mitigation measures for each risk event have been presented in the ES and are secured as set out in the REAC (REP9-019).	As above.	Agreed

4.17. CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Table 4.17 – Cumulative Effects

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
4.17.1	Cumulative Effects Assessment Methodology	The methodology for carrying out cumulative assessment is set out in chapter 18 of the ES; and the longlist and shortlist of developments considered are set out in Appendices 18.1 and 18.2. Appendix 18.2 was	It is agreed that the methodology proposed, and the list of developments identified, by the Applicant provides the basis for an adequate assessment of cumulative effects. NYC has taken a pragmatic approach to the consideration of the methodology and	Agreed

		<p>updated to correct a typo and submitted on 7 October.</p> <p>An update to the cumulative assessment was submitted at Deadline 2 (22 February 2023). This used the same methodology as the assessment submitted with DCO Application.</p>	<p>does not have any additional queries or concerns with it.</p>	
4.17.2	Relevant dDCO Requirements/ Articles	<p>Article 2 of Schedule 2 of the dDCO (REP9-005) proposes how the phasing of the Flue Gas Demolition (FGD) and construction of the Proposed Scheme will be carried out.</p>	<p>This wording is agreed by NYC.</p>	Agreed

4.18. DRAFT DCO (INCLUDING REQUIREMENTS IN THE DRAFT DCO)

Table 4.18 – Draft DCO (including Requirements in the draft DCO)

Ref	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Position
4.18.1	DCO Requirements	<p>The DCO includes a number of Requirements which require matters of detail to be approved by the relevant authority as well as creating a process for the discharge of those requirements.</p> <p>Following Issue Specific Hearing 4 on 24 March 2023, all DCO Requirements</p>	<p>NYC agrees all Requirements are agreed other than Requirement 17.</p> <p>It is agreed that NYC are still requesting the rating levels in DCO requirement 17 to be lowered to remove potential for adverse impact.</p>	Not Agreed

		were agreed with NYC excluding Requirement 17 (Control of noise during operation) which remains under discussion.	However, NYC acknowledge the Applicant's case for contextual considerations and that the assessment methodology provides for a deflated background noise level against an inflated rating level, and that the ExA will balance this against the likelihood for adverse impact and the need for the proposed development.	
--	--	---	--	--

4.19. OTHER CONSENTS AND LICENSES

Table 4.19 - Other Consents and Licenses



Ref	Consent / Licence	Responsibility	Anticipated Submission Date / Timescales	NYC – Current Position	Position
4.19.1	Permit for Transport of Abnormal Loads. Road Vehicles (Authorisation of Special Types) (General) Order 2003 or under the Road Traffic Act 1988	NYC as local highway authority. This permit will only be applied for if required.	As required and in advance of any Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL) needing to be transported during the construction of the Proposed Scheme.	NYC considers that there is no impediment to it being able to consider and determine this consent in its usual fashion.	Agreed

4.19.2	Temporary Traffic Regulation Order ('TTRO')	<p>NYC as local highway authority.</p> <p>Only if required and to the extent the nature of restrictions is not covered by article [12] of the DCO.</p> <p>May be required to allow traffic management e.g. in respect of creating new access to the East Laydown Area or to minimise queuing / prevent certain vehicle movements / introduce waiting restrictions during the construction period. The need will be determined by the appointed contractor.</p>	TTRO would be sought once the number and nature of TTRO's is established following appointment of the contractor.	NYC considers that there is no impediment to it being able to consider and determine this consent in its usual fashion.	Agreed
4.19.3	Section 61 Construction Noise Consent. Control of Pollution Act 1974	NYC May be required during the construction of the Proposed Scheme for certain activities.	Apply for during construction, if required.	Acknowledgment of Section 61 construction noise consent set out within the Control of Pollution Act 1974. Clarification that this is optional and not a requirement of NYC. NYC considers that there	Agreed

				is no impediment to it being able to consider and determine this consent in its usual fashion, if required.	
4.19.4	Hazardous Substances Consent ('HSC') The Planning (Hazardous Substances) Act 1990 and the Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 2015	NYC. May be required for storage of chemicals/ hazardous materials in relation to the BECCS units.	Requirement for any application is to be established at least 12 months prior to operation of BECCS units.	NYC considers that there is no impediment to it being able to consider and determine this consent in its usual fashion.	Agreed

5. SIGNATURES

Table 5.1 - Signatures

Ref	The North Yorkshire Council	Drax Power Ltd (the Applicant)
Signature		
Printed Name	Nic Harne	Dr James Doyle
Title	Corporate Director Community Development	Planning and Consents Manager
On behalf of	The North Yorkshire Council	Drax Power Ltd
Date	14/07/2023	14/07/2023