



HELIOS RENEWABLE
ENERGY
PROJECT

PINS Document Number:
EN010140/APP/8.1.3

Draft Statement of Common Ground with North Yorkshire Council

January 2025

Helios Renewable Energy Project

Draft Statement of Common Ground with North Yorkshire Council

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN010140

January 2025

Prepared on behalf of Enso Green Holdings D Limited

Project Ref:	33627/A5/SOCG	
Status:	Issue	
Issue/Rev:	Procedural Deadline A	Deadline 3
Date:	November 2024	January 2025
Prepared by:	AB/JB	AB
Reviewed by:	GW	JB

Stantec
7 Soho Square
London
W1D 3QB

Tel: [REDACTED]



COPYRIGHT

The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the written consent of Stantec.

All Stantec stationery is produced using recycled or FSC paper and vegetable oil-based inks.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction.....	3
1.1. Overview.....	3
2. Record of Engagement	4
2.1. Summary of consultation and engagement	4
3. Current Position.....	10
4. Signatures	13
Appendix A: Detailed Matters	14
A.1 Relevant planning history and current proposals.....	14
A.2 Planning policy.....	16
A.3 Need For and Principle of the Proposed Development and the Examination of Alternatives	18
A.4 Climate Change Resilience.....	19
A.5 Socio-Economics and Public Health	20
A.6 Traffic and Transport.....	22
A.7 Public Rights of Way.....	25
A.8 Air Quality	27
A.9 Noise and Vibration.....	28
A.10 Ecology.....	29
A.11 Landscape and Views.....	33
A.12 Heritage	38
A.13 Ground Conditions	40
A.14 Water Environment	41
A.15 Soils and Agricultural Land	44
A.16 Cumulative Effects.....	46
A.17 Draft DCO (Including requirements in the Draft DCO).....	47

1. Introduction

1.1. Overview

- 1.1.1. This Statement of Common Ground ('SoCG') has been prepared by Enso Green Holdings D Limited (the 'Applicant') in conjunction with North Yorkshire Council ('NYC') in respect of the Helios Renewable Energy Project Development Consent Order (the 'Proposed Development').
- 1.1.2. The SoCG sets out the matters of agreement between the Applicant and NYC and also explains those matters which, at the time of writing, remain in progress, or where agreement has not been achieved.
- 1.1.3. This SoCG is based on NYC's Relevant Representations received on 10 October 2024 [**RR-277 and RR-278**], NYC's Local Impact Report received on 14 January 2025 [**REP2-034**] and additional engagement with NYC.
- 1.1.4. The SoCG will be amended as the examination progresses in order to enable a final version to be submitted to the Examining Authority.
- 1.1.5. This SoCG covers all the matters which are relevant to NYC.

2. Record of Engagement

2.1. Summary of consultation and engagement

2.1.1. In addition to the consultation undertaken as part of statutory consultation, there have been a number of meetings and correspondence relating to the Proposed Development. Tables 2.1 and 2.2 show a summary of the meetings and correspondence that has taken place between the Applicant (including consultants on its behalf) and NYC in relation to the Proposed Development.

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

Date	Form of Correspondence	From	To	Summary
11/10/23	Email	Applicant	NYC	Email providing advanced notice of upcoming Statutory Consultation and provision of final Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC). Email was accompanied by a letter outlining how the Applicant had addressed NYC's comments on the draft SoCC.
18/10/23	Email	NYC	Applicant	Email raising local MPs interest in the Proposed Development and identification of suspected Travelers site (Burn Caravan Park) nearby and request for them to be included in the formal consultation.
18/10/23	Email	Applicant	NYC	Email requesting appropriate meeting time to discuss feedback.
25/10/23	Email	Applicant	NYC	Email notification, accompanying formal postal notification, of commencement of Statutory Consultation.
30/10/23	Email	NYC	Applicant	Email requesting clarification of consultation material provided online versus via formal post and confirmation that County Hall has been listed as a location hardcopy documentation can be displayed.
30/10/23	Email	Applicant	NYC	Email stating online and hard copy information via post are identical and that both Selby and Snaith libraries provide free internet access for the viewing of consultation material, with a hard copy of the SoCC provided at both libraries.
02/11/23	Email	Applicant	NYC	Email requesting appropriate meeting time to discuss feedback.
20/11/23	Email	Applicant	NYC	Email requesting appropriate meeting time to discuss feedback.

**Helios Renewable Energy Project
SOCG – North Yorkshire Council**

Date	Form of Correspondence	From	To	Summary
28/11/23	Email	Applicant	NYC	Email requesting confirmation of key views for photomontages, list of cumulative schemes and request for post-statutory consultation feedback meeting
28/11/23	Email	NYC	Applicant	Email advising suggested meeting teams to discuss statutory consultation feedback and seek clarification on nature of key views and list of cumulative schemes for assessment.
29/11/23	Email	Applicant	NYC	Email accepting meeting time proposal and providing clarification on key views and reissue of cumulative schemes.
14/12/23	Email	NYC	Applicant	Email confirming meeting time acceptability.
15/12/23	Email	NYC	Applicant	Email providing NYC formal statutory consultation response.
20/12/23	Email	Applicant	NYC	Email requesting email addresses of council technical staff to set up socio-economics and landscape calls.
22/12/23	Email	Applicant	NYC	Email following up request for email addresses.
03/01/24	Email	NYC	Applicant	Email advising suggested meeting times for landscape and socio-economics.
08/01/24	Email	Applicant	NYC	Email setting up meeting time for socio-economics post-statutory consultation feedback.
10/01/24	Email	NYC	Applicant	Email cancelling upcoming landscape meeting and suggestion of alternative dates.

**Helios Renewable Energy Project
SOCG – North Yorkshire Council**

Date	Form of Correspondence	From	To	Summary
15/01/24	Email	Applicant	NYC	Email distributing agenda for upcoming (and later cancelled) landscape meeting.
16/01/24	Email	Applicant	NYC	Email requesting meeting with NYC Highways team.
17/01/24	Email	Applicant	NYC	Email distributing agenda for upcoming socio-economics meeting.
18/01/24	Email	Applicant	NYC	Email requesting NYC to review and sign off List of Cumulative Schemes for Assessment.
26/01/24	Email	Applicant	NYC	Email requesting meeting with NYC Highways team and NYC/sign off of List of Cumulative Schemes for Assessment.
30/01/24	Email	Applicant	NYC	Email requesting any clarification or any information regarding a non-official safeguarding maps for Burn Airfield.
31/01/24	Email	NYC	Applicant	Email providing copy of non-official safeguarding map.
31/01/24	Email	NYC	Applicant	Email advising upcoming leave.
01/02/24	Email	NYC	Applicant	Email advising appropriate time for NYC highways meeting.
02/02/24	Email	Applicant	NYC	Email requesting sign off of List of Cumulative Schemes for Assessment and follow up landscape meeting time.
12/02/24	Email	Applicant	NYC	Email requesting sign off of List of Cumulative Schemes for Assessment and follow up landscape meeting time.

**Helios Renewable Energy Project
SOCG – North Yorkshire Council**

Date	Form of Correspondence	From	To	Summary
20/02/24	Email	Applicant	NYC	Email requesting sign off of List of Cumulative Schemes for Assessment and follow up landscape meeting time.
29/02/24	Email	Applicant	NYC	Email requesting meeting to discuss SoCG.
29/02/24	Email	NYC	Applicant	Email advising upcoming leave following request for meeting.
01/03/24	Email	NYC	Applicant	Email advising upcoming leave following request for meeting.
20/12/23	Meeting			Initial discussion of NYC stat consultation response and Statement of Common Ground.
18/01/24	Meeting			Meeting to discuss NYC Socio-Economics/Population and Human Health response.
01/02/24	Meeting			Meeting to discuss NYC Landscape response.
12/02/24	Meeting			Meeting to discuss NYC Highways response and Statement of Common Ground.
19/02/24	Meeting			Meeting onsite to discuss landscape strategy and assessment (including views).
07/03/24	Meeting			Meeting to discuss Statement of Common Ground format and draft content.
24/05/24	Meeting			Meeting to discuss Landscape Strategy.

Date	Form of Correspondence	From	To	Summary
31/05/24	Meeting			Meeting to discuss Statement of Common Ground.

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

Date	Form of Correspondence	Summary
18/11/2024	Meeting	Meeting to discuss Statement of Common Ground and approach to Examination.
21/11/2024	Meeting	Meeting to discuss Landscape and Views.
05/12/2024	Meeting	Informal meeting at the hearings.
08/01/2025	Meeting	Meeting to discuss NYC's progress in relation to the Local Impact Report.
10/01/2025	Email	Email from NYC with a draft copy of the Local Impact Report.
13/01/2025	Meeting	Meeting to discuss Statement of Common Ground following receipt of the draft Local Impact Report.
13/01/2025	Email	Email from NYC with the final version of the Local Impact Report.
27/01/2025	Meeting	Meeting to discuss an updated Statement of Common Ground following receipt of the Local Impact Report. It was agreed that the updated document would be submitted at Deadline 3.

3. Current Position

3.1.1. Table 3.1 provides a schedule that summarises the position on key matters between the Applicant and North Yorkshire Council. Appendix A details the position between the Applicant and North Yorkshire Council on each relevant representation.

3.1.2. Each matter is attributed a status as follows:

Agreed	The matter is agreed between the parties, or there are no significant disagreements such that the matter is considered closed.
Under discussion	This matter is neither 'agreed' or 'not agreed'. Technical work is being undertaken with the aim of achieving agreement, though the risk of disagreement remains.
Not agreed	The matter is not agreed between the parties and the outcome of the approach taken by the Applicant or North Yorkshire Council is considered to result in a materially different impact to the assessment conclusions.

Table 3.1: Key Matters

Matter	Status	Date
Relevant planning history and current proposals	Green	Jan 2025
Planning policy	Green	Jan 2025
Need For and Principle of the Proposed Development and the Examination of Alternatives	Yellow	Jan 2025
Climate Change Resilience	Yellow	Jan 2025
Socio-Economics	Yellow	Jan 2025
Public Health	Yellow	Jan 2025
Traffic and Transport	Yellow	Jan 2025
Air Quality	Green	Jan 2025
Noise and Vibration	Green	Jan 2025
Ecology	Yellow	Jan 2025
Landscape and Views	Yellow	Jan 2025
Heritage	Green	Jan 2025
Ground Conditions	Green	Jan 2025
Water Environment	Green	Jan 2025
Soils and Agricultural Land	Yellow	Jan 2025
Cumulative Effects	Yellow	Jan 2025
Draft DCO (Including requirements in the Draft DCO)	Yellow	Jan 2025

4. Signatures

4.1.1. This Statement of Common Ground is agreed upon:

On behalf of North Yorkshire Council:

Name:

Signature:

Date:

On behalf of the Applicant:

Name:

Signature:

Date:

Appendix A: Detailed Matters

A.1 Relevant planning history and current proposals

Table A.1: Relevant planning history and current proposals

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
A.1.1	Relevant Planning History	<p>The site is largely agricultural and the relevant planning history of the land within the Order Limits is limited. There are no pending or extant planning permissions across the Proposed Development Area and Underground Cable Connection Area. The following have overlapping red line boundaries with the Underground Grid Connection Cable Area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2021/0788/EIA - land north and south of Camela Lane, Camblesforth, Selby • 2022/1125/FULM - Drax Power Station New Road, Drax, Selby • 2023/0128/EIA - Wade House Lane, Drax, Selby • ZG2023/0381/FUL - Drax Power Station, Selby <p>The following applications overlap the Order Limits along the A645:</p>	Paragraph 4.14 of the Local Impact Report (LIR) [REP2-034] states that NYC relies on the Applicant’s summary of the relevant planning history as set out in Section 2.4 of the Planning Statement [APP-228] .	Agreed

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2023/0128/EIA – land south of A645, Wade House Lane, Drax, Selby • 2021/0788/EIA – land north and south of Camela Lane, Camblesforth, Selby 		
A.1.2	Current Proposals	The details of the Proposed Development are set out in the Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 3: Site and Development Description [APP-023].	The LIR [REP2-034] does not raise any matters in relation to the description of development.	Agreed

A.2 Planning policy

Table A.2: Planning policy

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
A.2.1	National Policy Statements	The relevant National Policy Statements (NPSs) for the Proposed Development include the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) (Department for Energy and Climate Change, 2024) and the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy and Infrastructure (EN-3) (Department of Energy and Climate Change, 2024), which represent the policy basis for the DCO Application.	NYC confirms at paragraphs 4.2 and 4.3 of the LIR [REP2-034] that EN-1 and EN-3 represent the primary policy basis for the determination of the Application.	Agreed
A.2.2	National Planning Policy Framework	The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was originally published in 2012 and last updated in December 2024. Whilst the NPSs are the primary consenting framework against which the DCO application will be assessed, the NPPF is important and relevant, against which the proposals must also be assessed. The government’s ‘Planning Practice Guidance’ (PPG) constitutes guidance to support the government’s planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.	NYC confirms the relevance of the NPPF and PPG in decision making for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) at paragraphs 4.4 and 4.5 of the LIR [REP2-034] .	Agreed
A.2.3	Development Plan	Local planning policies from the relevant authorities are ‘important and relevant’ considerations for the Secretary of State (SoS) in determining the DCO Application. The current	NYC confirms at paragraph 4.6 of the LIR [REP2-034] that these are the relevant Development Plan documents. Paragraph 6.7 confirms	Agreed

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
		<p>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>North Yorkshire Council are in the process of preparing a new Local Plan and given the stage of preparation the following draft document is a material consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Selby Local Plan – Publication Version Consultation (2024) 	<p>that the Application identifies the relevant local planning policies within the Development Plan against which the application is to be assessed.</p>	

A.3 Need For and Principle of the Proposed Development and the Examination of Alternatives

Table A.3: Need For and Principle of the Proposed Scheme and the Examination of Alternatives

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
A.3.1	Need for the Proposed Development	The Applicant considers that there is a clear need for this type of development as set out NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-3.	NYC notes at paragraph 6.8 of the LIR [REP2-034] the national need for energy security and provision and the national policy position contained in the National Policy Statements regarding renewable energy.	Agreed
A.3.2	Principle of the Proposed Development	Given the need for the Proposed Development and in the absence of any policies which would dictate otherwise, the Applicant considers the principle of the Proposed Development is acceptable.	NYC confirms at paragraph 6.2 of the LIR [REP2-034] that local planning policies support the proposed development in principle.	Agreed
A.3.3	Examination of Alternatives	<p>The consideration of alternatives to the Proposed Development is set out in the ES Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [AS-013] and the Alternative Site Assessment [APP-227]. This is considered to be in accordance with the requirements of the EIA Regulations and relevant policy.</p> <p>The Applicant benefits from a grid connection at Drax 132kV National Grid Substation. Taking the grid connection as a starting point (EN-3, Paragraph 2.10.24), the Applicant has undertaken a detailed Alternative Site Assessment which takes into consideration the extent and availability of land required, the site and surrounding land uses, known environmental designations, relevant policies and</p>	NYC states at paragraph 18.6 of the LIR [REP2-034] that it seeks to understand better the site selection process, in particular whether there are alternative grid connections available in the UK and if so, are these in areas where soil quality is not BMV. If there are alternatives, NYC seeks to understand why the Drax connection was chosen and alternatives discounted.	Under discussion

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
		committed developments. This has resulted in the proposed location of the Proposed Development.		

A.4 Climate Change Resilience

Table A.4: Climate Change Resilience

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
A.4.1	ES Methodology, baseline and design, mitigation and enhancement measures	The approach to the assessment of Climate Change Resilience (Adaptation) and the approach to the assessment of climate change mitigation (GHG Emissions) is set out in ES Chapter 12: Climate Change [APP-032]. The Chapter also addresses embedded mitigation measures and concludes that with the mitigation measures included residual effects were assessed as being not significant.	NYC has not yet confirmed its position on this matter.	Under discussion

A.5 Socio-Economics and Public Health

Table A.5: Socio-Economics and Public Health

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
A.5.1	Assessment of Socio-Economic factors	Chapter 13: Socio-Economics [APP-033] provides an assessment of the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development with respect to socio-economics. The assessment concludes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That no existing agricultural employment will be lost; • Additional employment opportunities will be created by the Proposed Development and the jobs supported by the construction phase will generate economic output in the form of GVA; • Effects on local amenity in respect of accommodation services are not expected to be significant; and • Effects on local amenity during the construction phase from noise and traffic will be negligible to minor adverse. Visual effects on local amenity are anticipated to be moderate negative immediately adjacent to the Site, rapidly diminishing with distance from the Site and within the Local Study Area there is not considered to be any likely 	NYC has not yet confirmed its position on this matter.	Under discussion

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
		significant negative effects on local amenity.		
A.5.2	Consideration of Human Health in EIA	<p>Human Health impacts have been scoped out of the ES, as per the adopted scoping opinion from July 2022. Impacts to human health arising from the Proposed Development have however been considered in ES, throughout various independent chapters. The Population and Human Health Technical Note [APP-118] includes summaries of, and signposting to, these assessments of the impact of the Proposed Development on human health.</p> <p>The Applicant is responding to NYC’s latest comments on human health in the Response to NYC Local Impact Report, which will be submitted at Deadline 3.</p>	<p>NYC has stated at paragraph 17.12 of the LIR [REP2-034] that the Application is not accompanied by an appropriate assessment of the potential and likely impact of the proposal on the population, including a number of sensitive population groups therefore the Applicant cannot accurately conclude that the Proposed Development does not identify any likely significant effects.</p> <p>NYC will review the Applicant’s Response to NYC Local Impact Report.</p>	Under discussion

A.6 Traffic and Transport

Table A.6: Traffic and Transport

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
A.6.1	Study Area	The study area is set out in ES Chapter 10: Transport and Access [APP-030] .	NYC agrees with the assessment Study Area. This position will be confirmed by NYC highways team at the meeting due to take place between NYC and the Applicant on 29 January 2025.	Under discussion
A.6.2	Future Baseline	The Applicant has set out the approach to committed development in Sections 10.4.19-10.4.23 of ES Chapter 10: Transport and Access [APP-030] .	NYC agrees with the Applicant's approach to committed development. This position will be confirmed by NYC highways team at the meeting due to take place between NYC and the Applicant on 29 January 2025.	Under discussion
A.6.3	Trip Generation, Distribution and Assignment (Construction Workers and Construction Vehicles)	The Applicant has set out the trip generation, trip distribution, and trip assignment in Table 10.12 of ES Chapter 10: Transport and Access [APP-030] .	NYC state in paragraph 12.11 of the LIR [REP2-034] that construction traffic generated by the scheme is not considered to be severe in terms of traffic generated. This position will be confirmed by NYC highways team at the meeting due to take place between NYC and the Applicant on 29 January 2025.	Under discussion
A.6.4	Construction route	The construction traffic route is set out in paragraphs 10.5.31-10.5.38 of ES Chapter 10: Transport and Access [APP-030] .	NYC acknowledge at paragraph 12.5 of the LIR [REP2-034] that the construction route will be as follows:	Under discussion

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
			<p>Junction 36 (M62) then A614 (East Riding) then onto A645 (New Road) passing Drax power station along to the A1041 which bypasses the village of Camblesforth and then heads north towards Selby. All major junctions along this route are roundabouts.</p> <p>NYC does not raise any objections to the construction route subject to construction traffic being managed in accordance with the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) and, as indicated at paragraphs 12.11 and 12.15 of the LIR, NYC will engage with the Applicant in respect of the final CTMP to be secured through Requirement 6 of the dDCO [AS-007]. This position will be confirmed by NYC highways team at the meeting due to take place between NYC and the Applicant on 29 January 2025.</p>	
A.6.5	Predicted Impacts (Operation)	The Applicant considered the potential impact during operation in paragraphs 10.5.68-10.5.70 of ES Chapter 10: Transport and Access [APP-030] and it was concluded that the traffic impacts during the operational phase will likely be negligible.	NYC does not raise any concerns in respect of operational traffic. This position will be confirmed by NYC highways team at the meeting due to take place between NYC and the Applicant on 29 January 2025.	Under discussion

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
A.6.6	Design, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures	Mitigation has been identified to safeguard the environment in the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-122] . These measures will be secured in the detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan as a Requirement of the DCO.	NYC states at paragraphs 12.14 and 12.15 of the LIR [REP2-034] that traffic in respect of the Proposed Development will be controlled by the CTMP and Construction Workers Travel Plan (CWTP) and that the impact on the highway network will be acceptable if the measures proposed in the CTMP and CWTP are both initiative and practical and implemented by the Applicant. This position will be confirmed by NYC highways team at the meeting due to take place between NYC and the Applicant on 29 January 2025.	Under discussion
A.6.7	Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL)	AIL Strategy – The Applicant’s AIL strategy is subject to ongoing engagement with the LHA and National Highways. AIL movements will be subject to measures included in the oCTMP [AS-006] to manage the movements including all necessary notifications.	NYC does not raise any objections to the Applicant’s AIL strategy. This position will be confirmed by NYC highways team at the meeting due to take place between NYC and the Applicant on 29 January 2025.	Under discussion
A.6.8	Residual Effects	It is considered that there will be no significant residual effects on the highway network within North Yorkshire.	NYC agrees with the Applicant’s assessment that there will be no significant residual effects on the highway network within North Yorkshire subject to the implementation of the CTMP and CWMP. This position will be confirmed by NYC highways team at the meeting due to take place between NYC and the Applicant on 29 January 2025.	Under discussion

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
A.6.9	Management of street works	Management of street works is secured within the dDCO -[AS-007]. The Applicant will confirm their position following the meeting with NYC on 29 January 2025.	This position will be confirmed by NYC highways team at the meeting due to take place between NYC and the Applicant on 29 January 2025.	Under discussion

A.7 Public Rights of Way

Table A.7: Public rights of way

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
A.7.1	Baseline	Existing Public Rights of Way (PRoWs) have been identified within Environmental Statement Chapter 10 - Transport and Access [APP-030] and the Transport Assessment [AS-005].	NYC note at paragraph 13.2 of the LIR [REP2-034] that Figure 10.3 [APP-098] of chapter 10 shows the Public Rights of Way that run through or near to the Site. This position will be confirmed by NYC at the meeting due to take place between NYC and the Applicant on 29 January 2025.	Under discussion
A.7.2	Predicted impacts	Chapter 10 states that PRoWs that cross the Site will generally remain open during the construction phase of the Proposed Development. There may be the requirement	NYC note at paragraph 13.4 of the LIR that it would like to see proposed management measures to ensure that Public Rights of Way remain effectively open to users with	Under discussion

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
		for some very temporary diversions of PRowS where they cross cable corridors. This will only be required when the cable is being installed . If temporary diversions of a PRow are required , they will be appropriately managed in consultation with the local highway authority.	Temporary Stopping Up, Management and the use of Diversions only in identifies locations and only where necessary to ensure continues safe use of the Public Right of Way. This position will be confirmed by NYC at the meeting due to take place between NYC and the Applicant on 29 January 2025.	
A.7.3	Mitigation measures	Management measures for PRowS are set out in the oCTMP [AS-006] and summarised in Section 8 of the Transport Assessment [AS-005] . A Public Rights of Way Management Plan will be implemented, which will be secured by Requirement 12 of the DCO [AS-007] . The Plan will be subject to consultation with NYC.	NYC note at paragraph 13.5 of the LIR the matters that should be considered for the Public Right of Way Management Plan. This position will be confirmed by NYC at the meeting due to take place between NYC and the Applicant on 29 January 2025.	Under discussion

A.8 Air Quality

Table A.8: Air Quality

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
A.7.1	Design, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures during construction and operation	The mitigation measures proposed are set out in the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-121] .	NYC confirms at paragraphs 14.2 and 14.3 that construction air quality mitigation measures, including a Dust Management Plan (DMP) and a monitoring regime, are included within the oCEMP [APP-121] . Construction activities are to be undertaken in accordance with best practice guidelines. Overall NYC is satisfied that the requested safeguards are in place.	Agreed

A.9 Noise and Vibration

Table A.9: Noise and Vibration

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
A.8.1	Predicted Impacts and Design, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures	Section 11.5 of ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-031] sets out the results of the noise and vibration predictions. Construction and operational noise and vibration are identified as being not significant. The mitigation measures proposed are set out in the oCEMP [APP-121] .	NYC does not raise any objections in relation to construction and operational noise and vibration [RR-277] . NYC confirm at paragraphs 7.2 and 7.3 of the LIR [REP2-034] that it has reviewed the information within ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration and associated appendices including the oCEMP [APP-121] . Overall NYC is satisfied that the requested safeguards are in place.	Agreed

A.10 Ecology

Table A.10: Ecology

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
A.9.1	ES Study Area and Methodology	The ES Study Area and Methodology are set out in ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-028] . The Applicant considers the methodology described therein remains appropriate.	NYC confirms at paragraph 9.4 that it is satisfied with the extent of the ecological survey and assessment undertaken to inform the application.	Agreed
A.9.2	ES Baseline	The scope of the baseline data gathering is set out in Section 8.3 of ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-028] . The Applicant considers that the scope of ecological surveys is commensurate with the scale and scope of the Proposed Development. The Applicant is continuing to consult with NYC and Natural England with regards to the scope of the surveys.	NYC confirms at paragraph 9.4 that it is satisfied with the extent of the ecological survey and assessment undertaken to inform the application.	Agreed
A.9.3	Habitats Regulation Assessment	Information to inform a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Report is included in the ES [APP-151] . This Report considers the following European designated sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower Derwent Valley SPA/Ramsar; and • Humber Estuary SPA/Ramsar. 	NYC raises no objection to the findings of the information to inform the HRA and defers to Natural England for their input on the methodology and assessment.	Agreed

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
		The Information to Inform HRA [APP-151] concludes 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 Report.		
A.9.4	Predicted Impacts	The Applicant has set out their assessment of impacts on ecological receptors in Section 8.5 of ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-028] .	NYC has reviewed the ES and associated appendices in respect of ecology and has confirmed that it is satisfied with the predicted impacts.	Agreed
A.9.5	Design, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures	Primary design measures (i.e. embedded measures) are set out in ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-028] , including specific measures that will be contained within the detailed CEMP.	In respect of all matters other than ground nesting birds design, mitigation and enhancement measures are agreed. NYC agree with the proposed approach to compensation and enhancement for ground nesting birds, however, further information is required regarding the securing of skylark plots on and off site. The Applicant is preparing additional information in respect of skylark and will share this with NYC.	Under discussion

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
A.9.6	Cumulative effects	The ecological assessment of cumulative effects is presented in Section 8.6 of ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-028]. The proposed development is not likely to have any discernible cumulative or in-combination effects. In addition there are no cumulative direct effects on statutory or non-statutory designated sites or their associated qualifying interest species.	NYC acknowledges local concerns in respect of the amount of development in the area and the cumulative impact on ground nesting birds. NYC welcome the compensation provided in respect of ground nesting birds subject to skylark mitigation being agreed.	Under discussion
A.9.7	Residual Effects	The Applicants assessment of residual effects is set out in Section 8.7 of ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-028]. There will be no significant adverse residual effects.	NYC agrees that there will be no significant adverse residual effects subject to skylark mitigation being agreed.	Under discussion
A.9.8	Securing biodiversity gains and long term monitoring and management	As set out in ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity [APP-028], the Proposed Development includes significant habitat enhancement provisions; these will be managed for the benefit of wildlife over the long term and will provide biodiversity gains for a wide variety of species. Additionally, the proposed creation of diverse grasslands, tree planting and hedgerow planting will deliver a quantifiable biodiversity benefit. This will be implemented	NYC welcomes the voluntary commitment to biodiversity gains and agrees with the framework for the management and monitoring of habitats as set out in the LEMP.	Under discussion

**Helios Renewable Energy Project
SOCG – North Yorkshire Council**

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
		<p>according to the detailed LEMP, which will be secured via Requirement 10 of the DCO. The Applicant has submitted a BNG assessment [APP-153] to demonstrate that a net gain can be achieved. The dDCO will not secure a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain as this remains non-mandatory for NSIPs.</p>		

A.11 Landscape and Views

Table A.11: Landscape and Views

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
A.10.1	ES Study Area	An initial study area for the purposes of desk studies and field surveys was set at 5km. Following the initial assessment, an updated Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) was prepared based on the parameters of the proposed development and the screen effect of existing vegetation and settlements. Updated ZTVs are presented in Figures 7.6-7.11 of ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Views [APP-069 to APP-074] .	NYC have not commented on the study area in the Local Impact Report [REP2-034] .	Under discussion
A.10.2	ES Methodology – viewpoints	The visual assessment viewpoints are based on those shown on Figure 7.12 of ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Views [APP-075] .	NYC consider in Paragraph 8.45 that there is too much emphasis on viewpoints rather than explaining the effects on receptors in a clear and concise way.	Under discussion
A.10.3	ES Methodology – visualisations	The visual assessment visualisations are based on those shown in Appendix 7.7 of ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Views [APP-140 to APP-141] . Additional photomontage locations have been added to the LVIA, taking into consideration comments received from NYC.	NYC has not commented on the visualisations in the Local Impact Report [REP2-034] .	Under discussion

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
A.10.4	ES Methodology	<p>The Applicant confirms that the LVIA will follow guidance stipulated in the EIA Scoping Report covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GLVIA Third Edition (LI and IEMA, 2013); and Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 2/21: Assessing landscape value outside national designations <p>The LVIA has been updated to address concerns from NYC regarding methodology.</p>	<p>NYC considers that the LVIA broadly follows the assessment guidelines as set out in GLVIA3 (Paragraph 8.35). NYC does not agree with aspects of method and the approach to the landscape and cumulative assessment.</p> <p>NYC considers that a cautious approach should be used in the assessment on a project of this type, scale and duration. It is considered that major and moderate effects are significant (Paragraph 8.38).</p>	Under discussion
A.10.5	ES Baseline	<p>The baseline conditions are set out in Section 7.4 of ES Chapter 7 Landscape and Views [APP-027]. The descriptions are based on a timeframe of winter (2023/2024) and therefore considers a maximum visibility scenario.</p>	<p>NYC has not commented on the ES baseline in the Local Impact Report [REP2-034].</p>	Under discussion
A.10.6	Designations	<p>The Site is not designated in landscape terms, and there are no national landscape designations within the study area.</p>	<p>NYC agrees that the Site is not designated in landscape terms and there are no national landscape designations within the study area.</p>	Agreed
A.10.7	Predicted Impacts	<p>The predicted impacts presented in the ES are an accurate reflection of the likely landscape and</p>	<p><u>Visual Effects</u> NYC stated in Paragraph 8.46 that they</p>	Under discussion

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
		<p>visual effects of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Following changes to the LVIA approach and presentation, there have been some changes to predicted impacts.</p>	<p>would wish to see further clarity and consistency between assessment of receptors identified within the study area and geographical extents of effects.</p> <p><u>Landscape Effects</u></p> <p>NYC considers that the impact on landscape character and setting within the LVIA is understated due to the overall timescale of the Proposed Development (Paragraph 8.39).</p>	
A.10.8	Design, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures	<p>The Applicant has provided reasonable and appropriate mitigation, proportionate to the level of effects predicted to result from the Proposed Development, 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>The Applicant has followed guidance made available by NYC in forming its Landscape Strategy, particularly the use of hedgerows for screening. Further, the Applicant has taken account of comments received from NYC in</p>	<p>NYC acknowledges in Paragraph 8.32 that the Applicant has made several changes and adjustments to the Landscape Strategy Plan and Illustrative Masterplan since initial consultation and engagement with NYC on landscape and visual matters. Whilst NYC generally supports the positive improvements made to the Strategy and Masterplan and other local positive effects set out in the LVIA, they consider that these positive effects are not outweighed by the negative and significant cumulative impacts that are</p>	Under discussion

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
		<p>updating its Landscape Strategy prior to submission.</p> <p>An outline Landscape Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-143] has been submitted with the DCO application.</p>	<p>likely to arise given the overall size and scale of the Proposed Development and in combination with other major developments in the area, including NSIPs (Paragraph 8.33).</p> <p>NYC's position as stated in Paragraph 8.55 is that landscape mitigation at a wider strategy scale and to resolve cumulative effects is insufficiently considered. NYC considers that it is reasonable and possible that more localised adverse effects can be further reduced through adjustment of the layout, design and mitigation (Paragraph 8.56).</p>	
A.10.9	Residual Effects	Current assessment shows there will be no long term significant adverse effects.	<p><u>Visual Effects</u></p> <p>NYC states in Paragraph 8.48 that the visual assessment identifies a number of significant effects relating to properties, PROW and local roads, during the short-term, medium-term and in the long-term.</p> <p><u>Landscape Effects</u></p> <p>NYC states in Paragraph 8.42 that the method and approach to the Landscape</p>	Under discussion

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
			Assessment is likely to understate and oversimplify the impacts, particular in how this filters to reporting of Significance and Residual Effects.	
A.10.10	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.	NYC considers that the LVIA does not follow a clear method and process for assessing cumulative landscape and visual effects within a defined study area (Paragraph 8.50). Significant adverse landscape and visual effects on local communities due to proximity to settlement, significance of the Grid connection points near Drax Power Station in relation to cumulative effects and ongoing erosion of the landscape baseline remain a concern (Paragraph 8.54).	Under discussion

A.12 Heritage

Table A.12: Heritage

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
A.11.1	Predicted Impacts - Archaeology	Measures to be adopted by the project in the form of an AMS have been established through consultation with the Principal Archaeologist for NYC.	NYC confirms at paragraph 11.4 of the LIR [REP2-034] that the application includes an Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy. This strategy takes the approach of a combination of designing out the more complex anomalies whilst ensuring that where impact might occur that this is mitigated by archaeological monitoring (watching brief). NYC agrees that this is a reasonable response and is an approach that has been supported elsewhere on solar schemes in North Yorkshire. It is considered that the archaeological potential of the site has been appropriately assessed and the mitigation strategy is suitable.	Agreed
A.11.2	Predicted Impacts – Built Heritage	The impacts of the Proposed Development on Grade 1 Listed Camblesforth Hall, Grade I Listed Carlton Towers and Grade II Listed Manor Farmhouse at the construction and	NYC confirms at paragraph 10.3 of the LIR [REP2-034] that ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [APP-026] includes a Cultural Heritage Technical Appendix [APP-125] which identifies the location of Grade 1, 2	Agreed

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
		operational phases are not significant.	and 2* listed buildings within a 3km radius of the site and non-designated heritage assets, and assesses significance and harm from construction, operational and decommissioning phases of the development. NYC confirms at paragraph 10.4 of the LIR [REP2-034] that the harm identified would amount to less than substantial harm to the setting and therefore significance of the listed buildings.	

A.13 Ground Conditions

Table A.13: Ground Conditions

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
A.12.1	Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment	The Phase 1 Ground Conditions assessment [APP-114 to APP-116] concludes that there are potential risks associated with possible contamination in limited areas of the site. An intrusive investigation is recommended to characterise the conditions at the site and to confirm the anticipated absence of contamination across the majority of the Site. The submission of an intrusive risk assessment will be secured in the CEMP, via DCO Requirement 4. The oCEMP will be updated accordingly at Deadline 4.	NYC notes at paragraph 16.4 of the LIR [REP2-034] that an intrusive site investigation is recommended to characterise the conditions and clarify the risks and paragraph 16.9.	Agreed
A.12.2	Unexploded Ordnance Survey	A detailed UXO desk based threat assessment will be undertaken post-consent to inform the need for mitigation during in-ground works including intrusive investigation. The submission of an assessment will be secured in the CEMP, via DCO Requirement 4. The oCEMP will be updated accordingly at Deadline 4.	NYC notes at paragraph 16.7 of the LIR [REP2-034] that a detailed UXO desk-based threat assessment is required.	Agreed

A.14 Water Environment

Table A.14: Water Environment

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
A.13.1	ES Study Area and Methodology	<p>The ES Study Area and Methodology are set out in ES Chapter 9: Water Environment [APP-029]. The methodology in the ES has drawn from the more detailed FRA and considers flood risk to and from the Site, and from all sources including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tidal (flooding from the sea); • Fluvial (flooding from watercourses); • Pluvial (direct rainfall and surface water flooding); • Groundwater; • Overwhelmed Sewers and Drainage Systems; and • Artificial Sources <p>The Applicant considers the methodology described therein remains appropriate.</p>	<p>NYC notes the following documents at paragraph 15.2 of the LIR [REP2-034]:</p> <p>Flood Risk Assessment (part 1 of 4), PFA Consulting, Dated June 2024.</p> <p>- Flood Risk Assessment (part 2 of 4), PFA Consulting, Dated June 2024.</p> <p>- Flood Risk Assessment (part 3 of 4), PFA Consulting, Dated June 2024.</p> <p>- Flood Risk Assessment (part 4 of 4), PFA Consulting, Dated June 2024.</p> <p>NYC does not raise any objections in relation to the study area and methodology, baseline, assessment and predicted impacts.</p>	Agreed
A.13.2	ES Baseline	<p>The scope of the baseline data gathering is set out in Section 9.4 of ES Chapter 9: Water Environment [APP-029]. The Applicant</p>		

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
		<p>considers that the scope of FRA is commensurate with the scale and scope of the Proposed Development.</p>		
A.13.3	<p>Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)</p>	<p>The Proposed Development has been informed by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) [APP-232-235], ensuring the Proposed Development does not increase flood risk elsewhere and incorporates sustainable drainage systems.</p>		
A.13.4	<p>Predicted Impacts</p>	<p>The Applicant has set out their assessment of impacts on flood risk in Section 9.5 of ES Chapter 9: Water Environment [APP-029].</p>		
A.13.5	<p>Design, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures</p>	<p>Primary design measures (i.e. embedded measures) are set out in ES Chapter 9: Water Environment [APP-029], including permanent design measures as well as specific measures that will be contained within the detailed CEMP.</p>	<p>NYC notes at paragraph 15.3 of the LIR [REP2-034] that the site will utilise attenuation basins that will use flow control chambers fitted with remotely operated/automated penstock valves:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The surface water will then discharge to watercourses at a controlled rate. - Watercourse buffers will also be used to slow overland flow rates. 	<p>Agreed</p>

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Swales will be incorporated to catch overland flow. - Flood defence bunds will be constructed to reduce the fluvial flood risk. <p>NYC confirms at paragraph 15.4 that, acting as LLFA, it finds this a suitable way to manage surface water on the Site.</p>	

A.15 Soils and Agricultural Land

Table A.15: Soils and Agricultural Land

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
A.14.1	ES Study Area and Methodology and baseline	The Study Area and Methodology and baseline are set out in Section 14.3 of ES Chapter 14: Soils and Agriculture [APP-034] .	<p>NYC confirms at paragraph 18.3 of the LIR [REP2-034] that it has reviewed the information supplied within Chapter 4 - Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-024] and ES Chapter 14: Soils and Agriculture [APP-034].</p> <p>NYC states at paragraph 18.4 of the LIR that the applicant’s Agricultural Land Classification and the Outline Soil Resources Management Plan [REP2-011] are noted.</p> <p>NYC does not raise any objections to the ES study area, methodology and baseline and the oSRMP.</p>	Agreed
A.14.2	Use of BMV land	<p>The Site Selection process as set out in the Planning Statement has determined that the use of BMV land is necessary.</p> <p>The site selection process determines that the use of BMV is unavoidable, given alternative sites within proximity of the grid connection point are also classified as BMV, or unsuitable on the basis of land fragmentation/severance, environmental</p>	<p>NYC notes at paragraph 18.5 of the LIR [REP2-034] that the Applicant has sought to locate the Proposed Development in areas of lower soil quality however it remains that it will be constructed on BMV.</p> <p>NYC states at paragraph 18.6 that seeks to understand better the site selection process, in particular whether there are alternative grid connections available in the UK and if so are</p>	Under discussion

**Helios Renewable Energy Project
SOCG – North Yorkshire Council**

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
		constraints or committed for other uses/development.	these in areas where soil quality is not BMV. If there are alternatives, the Authority seeks to understand why the Drax connection was chosen and alternatives discounted.	

A.16 Cumulative Effects

Table A.16: Cumulative Effects

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
A.15.1	Assessment of cumulative effects	<p>Each technical chapter within the ES includes a summary of cumulative effects, which are subsequently summarised in Chapter 15 Cumulative Effects [APP-035] which addresses both inter- and intra-project effects.</p> <p>The chapter discusses intra-project effects that may be relevant to the health and wellbeing of users of public rights of way (“PRoW”), such as the combined effect of noise disturbance and the visual effect of construction. and decommissioning activities, concluding that any adverse effects would be short term, temporary and not significant. It also considers the combined effect of noise disturbance (from plant), visual impacts and glint and glare on users of PRoW during operation of the Proposed Development, concluding that landscape planning proposals and the noise mitigation which is incorporated into the Proposed Development’s design means that significant intra-project effects are not anticipated.</p> <p>The only significant cumulative effects are identified in relation to landscape (adverse), biodiversity (beneficial) and socio-economics (beneficial). It is not anticipated the adverse cumulative landscape effect is significant in health terms.</p>	<p>NYC note at paragraph 19.1 of the LIR [REP2-034] that cumulative effects are set out in ES Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects. NYC notes at paragraphs 19.2 and 19.3 that a major/moderate adverse (significant) effect would remain as a consequence of the Proposed Development in combination with the cumulative schemes in respect of Landscape and that cumulative benefits are identified for Biodiversity and Socio-Economics.</p> <p>NYC state at paragraph 19.4 that it would like to see further assessment and consideration of cumulative impact, and how these impacts may be mitigated and offset.</p>	Under discussion

A.17 Draft DCO (Including requirements in the Draft DCO)

Table A.17: Draft DCO (Including requirements in the Draft DCO)

Ref.	Description of Matter	Applicant – Current Position	NYC – Current Position	Status
A.16.1	Procedure for discharge of DCO Requirements	Schedule 2 Part 2 of the dDCO [AS-007] sets out the procedure for discharge of requirements.	NYC are considering the procedure for discharge of requirements and will provide comments to the Applicant.	Under discussion
A.16.2	Traffic & Transport (inc PRow)	Management of street works and public rights of way are secured within the dDCO [AS-007]. The Applicant will confirm their position following the meeting with NYC on 29 January 2025.	This position will be confirmed by NYC highways team at the meeting due to take place between NYC and the Applicant on 29 January 2025.	Under discussion