



Examining Authority Written Questions to LPAs – Response from City of York Council

Proposal: Application for a Development Consent Order relating to the Yorkshire GREEN Project.
Applicant: National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET).

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN20024

City of York Council – PINS Unique Reference: YOGN-AFP049

Submission Made at Deadline 2
April 2023

Yorkshire Green Project – ExA Written Questions to LPA's
City of York Council – Submission Deadline 2

Q	RR	Question	CYC Comment/Response
Q1.1.2	City of York Council, Hambleton District Council, Harrogate Borough Council, Leeds City Council, North Yorkshire County Council and Selby District Council, or any successor body	Development Plan policies referred to in Local Impact Reports For any Development Plan policies referred to in Local Impact Reports or other submissions, the relevant local authorities are requested to submit copies of those policies in PDF format (not web links).	Copies of the policies referenced in CYC's LIR will be provided to the ExA.
Q1.2.2	City of York Council, Hambleton District Council, Harrogate Borough Council, Leeds City Council, North Yorkshire County Council and Selby District Council, or any successor body	<p>Cumulative effects: inter-project assessment Table 18.9 of [APP-090] contains a shortlist of developments for consideration in the inter-project assessment. Locations are depicted on ES Figure 18.1 [APP-194]. Table 18.4 of [APP-090] states that the shortlisted developments were agreed with relevant local authorities.</p> <p>a) Do the local authorities agree with the plans and projects shortlisted for inclusion within the cumulative effects assessment (ES Chapter 18 [APP-090])?</p> <p>b) Can the local authorities confirm whether they are aware of any other plans or projects that have come to light since August 2022 that should be included in the shortlist of developments for consideration in the inter-project assessment?</p>	<p>A) Yes. CYC can also confirm that application 21/02444/FULM (item 72 in table 18.9) has received planning consent from the LPA in December 2022.</p> <p>B) CYC at not aware of any other plans or projects at this stage.</p>
Q1.2.5	The Applicant and North Yorkshire County Council, or any successor body.	Cumulative effects on biodiversity: Lumby quarry Chapter 18 of the ES [APP-090] concludes that significant cumulative effects in relation to biodiversity receptors could occur as a result of the Proposed Development taken together with proposals for the extraction and processing of magnesian limestone on land north of the A63 at Lumby. [APP-161] indicates that the Lumby quarry proposals are the subject of a current planning application to North Yorkshire County Council.	CYC have no comments to make in response to this question.

Yorkshire Green Project – ExA Written Questions to LPA's
City of York Council – Submission Deadline 2

Q	RR	Question	CYC Comment/Response
		<p>a) Can the Applicant and North Yorkshire County Council provide any update about the status of Lumby quarry planning application ref. NY/2022/0102/ENV</p> <p>b) [APP-161] indicates that the Lumby quarry, if consented, would be operational '2023- 2032'. Can the Applicant and North Yorkshire County Council provide the most up to date available information about the likely timescales for the construction and operation of the proposed Lumby quarry, if consented?</p> <p>c) Does North Yorkshire County Council agree with the Applicant's conclusions [APP-090] in relation to the cumulative effects of the Proposed Development take together with other plans and projects in the Lumby area? If not, why not?</p> <p>d) Para 18.6.46 of [APP-080] states that the application site for the proposed Lumby quarry falls partially within the Order limits for the Proposed Development. Can the Applicant provide a plan at an appropriate scale which demonstrates the geographical relationship between the two proposals by overlaying the Lumby quarry application site and location of proposed quarry works onto the Works Plan Section F (Sheet 1) [APP-025].</p> <p>e) Para 18.6.48 of [APP-080] describes the potential for the construction of the Proposed Development to remove areas of boundary planting along the A63, including some that had been planted 1-2 years previously as part of the screening bunds for the Lumby quarry proposal. Can the Applicant provide a more detailed explanation of the likely temporal and geographical interaction between the two proposals in this respect, using drawings where they assist in illustrating the relationship.</p>	

Yorkshire Green Project – ExA Written Questions to LPA's
City of York Council – Submission Deadline 2

Q	RR	Question	CYC Comment/Response
		f) In light of (e), can the Applicant foresee any way of avoiding the need to temporarily remove the advance planting planned for the proposed quarry?	
Q2.0.1	Hambleton District Council, or any successor body, and the Applicant	<p>Air quality monitoring: A19 through Shipton by Beningbrough ES Chapter 13 [APP-085], paragraph 13.7.9 states that Hambleton District Council (HDC) identified concerns about local air quality from current traffic flows through Shipton by Beningbrough on the A19. It put in place additional monitoring from September 2022, with data becoming available in 2023.</p> <p>a) Can Hambleton District Council provide an update as to when monitoring data will be available and whether there are any initial observations that can be reported?</p> <p>b) Can the Applicant comment on whether it considers that the additional baseline information has any implications for assessment of air quality impacts arising from construction traffic emissions?</p>	CYC have no comments to make in response to this question.
Q2.0.3	The Applicant and City of York Council, Hambleton District Council, Harrogate Borough Council, Leeds City Council, North Yorkshire County Council and Selby District Council, or any successor body	Dust control measures In [RR-014] and [RR-020] concerns are raised regarding the potential dust impacts on Lumby. Residential areas also lie in relatively close proximity to the location of other proposed Works. Whilst the Code of Construction Practice [APP-095] contains some control measures neither Requirement 5 nor Requirement 6 of the dDCO [AS-011] contain the specific requirement for a Dust Management Plan to be submitted. In the absence of such a Plan are the measures set out in [APP-095] likely to be sufficient?	The measures set out within APP-095 would be regarded as being sufficient. This reflects the position that has been reached with regard to the Statement of Common Ground between the LPA and the applicant.
Q3.3.3	The Applicant and Natural England, City of York Council, Hambleton District Council, Harrogate	Mitigation of lighting effects on nocturnal fauna Para 3.2.1 of the BMS [APP-097] specifies that a lighting design for the project would decrease the potential displacement effects of lighting on light-sensitive nocturnal fauna. Paras 4.6.2, 4.7.2	The principles outlined within the BMS are considered to be sound. The provision of a draft strategy at this stage may provide all parties a greater degree of confidence

Yorkshire Green Project – ExA Written Questions to LPA's
City of York Council – Submission Deadline 2

Q	RR	Question	CYC Comment/Response
	Borough Council, Leeds City Council, North Yorkshire County Council and Selby District Council, or any successor body	and 4.9.3 explain how this would minimise effects on bats, badgers and otters respectively. The lighting scheme secured under Requirement 6(1)(d) of the dDCO [AS-011] must accord with the BMS. The BMS outlines some headline principles such as minimising usage / light spill and using the most appropriate wavelengths. In the absence of a draft or outline version of the lighting scheme, does the BMS [APP-097] contain sufficient practical detail about how lighting design should minimise effects on light-sensitive nocturnal fauna?	however as the lighting plan forms a requirement for each stage CYC consider that should significant issues arise these can be resolved with the applicant at the pre-application stage of the requirements approval process, which the applicant has indicated their intention to undertake with the LPAs.
Q4.0.5	Affected Persons	Easements/ Wayleaves The Applicant explains that voluntary rights in land for overhead lines and towers will be sought by way of an option for easement under the terms of a Deed of Grant, rather than via wayleaves [APP-069] , para 5.8.3 to 5.8.4. The Applicant justifies its need for permanent easements rather than wayleaves. a) Do you agree with the Applicant's approach? b) If not, explain why not with reasons. c) If not, and this affects land that you have an interest in, set out specific reasons.	CYC have no comments to make in respect of this question.
Q4.2.5	Affected Persons	Interested Parties Known inaccuracies a) Are any Affected Persons or Interested Parties aware of any inaccuracies in the BoR [APP-071] , SoR [APP-069] or Land Plans [AS-005] to [AS-010]? b) If so, set out what these are and provide the correct details.	CYC are not aware of any inaccuracies.
Q4.3.2	City of York Council, Hambleton District Council, Harrogate Borough Council, Leeds City Council, North Yorkshire	Reasonable alternatives and necessity of land and rights Are any of the Councils in their roles as the Local Planning Authority and the Highway Authority aware of: a) Any reasonable alternatives to the CA or the TP which is sought by the Applicant?	CYC have no comments to make in respect of this question.

Yorkshire Green Project – ExA Written Questions to LPA's
City of York Council – Submission Deadline 2

Q	RR	Question	CYC Comment/Response
	County Council and Selby District Council, or any successor body	b) Any areas of land or rights that the Applicant is seeking the powers to acquire that you consider would not be needed?	
Q4.4.7	North Yorkshire County Council, City of York Council, Leeds City Council, or any successor body	Land required for visibility splays If not covered in your SoCG with the Applicant, confirm whether you are content with the visibility splays set out in the Table Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [APP-099], Table 3.3.	The visibility splays reflect the discussions the applicant has had with the Highway Authority, as is detailed in the Statement of Common Ground.
Q5.1.6	North Yorkshire County Council, City of York Council, Hambleton District Council, Harrogate Borough Council, Leeds City Council and Selby District Council, or any successor body	Article 5 : Limits of Deviation, sub-para (4)(a) and (4)(b): Parameter Plans Are you content that the parameter plans, contained within the Design Drawings [APP-064] provide the level of information you would require for approving future post-consent applications?	It is considered that submitted parameter plans provide suitable levels of detail.
Q5.1.1 5	North Yorkshire County Council, or any successor body City of York Council Leeds City Council Statutory Undertakers	Article 12: Application of the 1991 Act In your capacity as the highways authorities and utility companies which might have apparatus in streets, do you have any comments on the powers conferred under article 12 as proposed?	CYC have no comments to raise and refer the ExA to the Statement of Common Ground.
Q5.1.1 6	North Yorkshire County Council, or any successor body City of York Council Leeds City Council	Article 13: Power to alter layout, etc. of streets While this power is limited to those streets listed in the appropriate Schedules, it is potentially wide with authorisation potentially being given to any street within the Order Limits, subject to the need for consent from the street authority. This consent is subject to a 'guillotine' clause, with consent being deemed as given if the undertaker is not notified of the decision within 28 days. a) Provide your views on this article, if not set out elsewhere, or signpost where a response can be found.	The deemed consent after 28 days is an area of concern, as we have set out in various areas concerning the time limitations placed on the LPAs, the time limits appear to favour the applicant and place the onus upon the LPAs. We would like to see this period extended to 42 days (consistent with response provided to Q5.1.30).

Yorkshire Green Project – ExA Written Questions to LPA's
City of York Council – Submission Deadline 2

Q	RR	Question	CYC Comment/Response
		b) If you are not content with drafting as proposed, set out your reasons why and propose alternative drafting in response to this question, or signpost where you have provided that if included elsewhere.	
Q5.1.1 9	North Yorkshire County Council, or any successor body City of York Council Leeds City Council	Article 14: Temporary stopping up of streets, cycle tracks and public rights of way a) Are you content with the wide nature of the powers authorising alteration and use as a temporary work site within the Order Limits? b) If not, propose alternative drafting in response to this question or signpost where you have provided that if included elsewhere. c) Are you satisfied that the information contained in Schedule 8, together with the Rights of Way Management Plan [APP-100] would provide you with sufficient information in your role as street authority?	CYC have no comments to raise and refer the ExA to the Statement of Common Ground.
Q5.1.2 3	Affected Persons Statutory Undertakers	Article 20: Protective work to buildings a) Are you content with the extent of the powers sought under this article? b) If not set out your reasons and any suggested amendments to the wording of this article. c) Your views are sought on (but not limited to): the powers sought in connection with your land, building, structure, apparatus and equipment; the powers sought outside of the Order Limits; the notice periods (article 20(5) and (6)); and the definition of “protective works” (article 20(12)).	CYC have not comments to raise in respect of this question.
Q5.1.2 4	The Applicant and affected persons	Article 21: Authority to survey and investigate the land Article 21(1) permits the undertaker to enter on any land “within the Order limits or which may be affected by the authorised development” which appears to be a wide power. To the Applicant:	CYC have no comments to make in respect of this question.

Yorkshire Green Project – ExA Written Questions to LPA's
City of York Council – Submission Deadline 2

Q	RR	Question	CYC Comment/Response
		<p>a) Is the scope of article 21(1) appropriate and proportionate in the context of the powers sought?:</p> <p>b) Explain why 14 days notice (article 21(3)) is considered to be an appropriate and reasonable amount of notice prior to entering land to undertake surveys and investigations. To affected persons:</p> <p>c) Do affected persons consider that 14 days notice (article 21(3)) is an appropriate and reasonable amount of notice for the undertaker to give prior to entering land to undertake surveys and investigations? If not, what notice period would you consider to be proportionate and reasonable?</p>	
Q5.1.30	Local Highway Authorities	<p>Article 45: Traffic Regulation Article 45 and Schedule 14 of the dDCO [AS-011] relate to traffic regulation. Question: Are you content with the wording of Article 45 paragraph (8) whereby the traffic authority is deemed to have granted consent if it fails to notify the undertaker within 28 days of receiving an application for consent under paragraphs (1) and (2) of Article 45?</p>	<p>CYC Consider that the 28-day time period could be difficult to attain. Deemed consent after 28 days is also a concern. Given the nature and location of the works there will likely need to be a degree of co-ordination with colleagues in the neighbouring Highway Authority (North Yorkshire). At present we deal with such notifications within 6 weeks (42 days) and would be content if this particular article was amended to 42 days.</p> <p>The applicant may wish to propose a similar approach to that which has been outlined for the Requirements stage whereby a pre-application process is undertaken with the Authority before formal submission is made in interests of front loading the process.</p>

Yorkshire Green Project – ExA Written Questions to LPA's
City of York Council – Submission Deadline 2

Q	RR	Question	CYC Comment/Response
Q5.1.3 5	Historic England North Yorkshire County Council, City of York Council	Article 51: Removal of human remains a) Do you have any comments on the powers conferred under article 12? b) If so, set these out, including any changes to drafting that you consider necessary.	CYC have no comments to make in respect of this article.
Q5.2.2	City of York Council, Hambleton District Council, Harrogate Borough Council, Leeds City Council, North Yorkshire County Council and Selby District Council, or any successor body	Other associated development The list a) to u) at the bottom of page 50 and on page 51 of the dDCO [AS-011] sets out other works and activities for which consent is sought as associated development. Do you consider the breadth of these works to be proportionate and sufficiently precise so as to be understood in your role as local planning authority? If not, specify any items for which you consider that the wording should be refined, and explain why you take this view.	The works outlined in list a) to u) is quite wide ranging. However CYC are content that these would be proportionate and sufficiently clear in our role as LPA.
Q5.4.3	City of York Council, Hambleton District Council, Harrogate Borough Council, Leeds City Council, North Yorkshire County Council and Selby District Council, or any successor body	Requirement 1: Pre-commencement works Bearing in mind that Requirement 6 would not apply to pre-commencement activities, do you consider the definition of activities comprising 'pre-commencement works' in Requirement 1(1) to be sufficiently clear and precise? If not, specify which items in the list (a) to (n) require tighter definition and explain why you take this view.	CYC have made representations in respect of this question in our response to the ISH1 Action Points via letter dated 4 th April 2023.
Q5.4.5	City of York Council, Hambleton District Council, Harrogate Borough Council, Leeds City Council, North Yorkshire County Council and Selby District Council, or any successor body	Requirement 4: Stages of authorised development A number of the Requirements use the commencement of 'stages' of the authorised development as a control mechanism. a) Is it sufficiently clear to you what a 'stage' means in this context? b) Are you content with the drafting and practical application of Requirement 4? c) Should the written scheme be subject to approval by the relevant planning authorities?	a) Sufficient clarity is provided as to what a 'stage' means. b) Yes c) CYC do not consider it necessary for the written scheme to be subject to approval.

Yorkshire Green Project – ExA Written Questions to LPA's
City of York Council – Submission Deadline 2

Q	RR	Question	CYC Comment/Response
		<p>d) Should any amendments to the written scheme be subject to an approval process?</p> <p>e) Should there be a requirement to notify the relevant planning authorities when each stage is commenced and completed, as was the case in the parallel Requirement in the Richborough Connection Order (2017)?</p>	<p>d) CYC do not consider this necessary assuming any changes keep the development within the defined DCO limits and the agreed limits of deviation.</p> <p>e) CYC consider that this would be beneficial as it would assist with our understanding as to the overall progress of the scheme and also keep the LPA informed and allow us to answer possible questions or queries from residents who may not be fully aware of the scheme and what it involves.</p>
Q5.4.7	City of York Council, Hambleton District Council, Harrogate Borough Council, Leeds City Council, North Yorkshire County Council and Selby District Council, or any successor body	<p>Requirement 8: Landscaping and mitigation planting</p> <p>a) Are you satisfied with the split that the Applicant has applied to areas that have been included for outline landscape mitigation strategies (Overton Substation, Monk Fryston Substation and Tadcaster CSECs) and those other areas where reinstatement planting is not identified and would be subject to future approvals by the relevant planning authority, which would be in accordance with the Arboricultural Impact Assessment ExQ1 (AIA) [APP-102] to [APP-104] as set out in dDCO Requirement 8. The Applicant confirmed this is the case at ISH1.</p> <p>b) Do you consider the permanent landscape works, which would be based on the outline landscape mitigation strategies to be adequately secured?</p> <p>c) If not, what further information do you consider is required?</p> <p>d) Are you satisfied that the information in the AIA provides you with the information that you would need to consider and</p>	<p>a) Yes, the provision of outline landscape mitigation schemes in areas where the proposals would introduce new fixed development is appropriate whilst areas covered primarily by linear development where reinstatement would be subject to further approvals with the relevant planning authority in accordance with the AIA is consider appropriate for these areas.</p> <p>b) Yes.</p> <p>c) N/A.</p> <p>d) Yes.</p> <p>e) No comments to raise.</p> <p>f) No.</p> <p>g) No comments to raise.</p>

Yorkshire Green Project – ExA Written Questions to LPA's
City of York Council – Submission Deadline 2

Q	RR	Question	CYC Comment/Response
		<p>approve the mitigation planting scheme for areas outside the outline landscape mitigation strategy areas?</p> <p>e) What else might be useful if not?</p> <p>f) Are there any other geographic areas where you consider outline plans should be provided?</p> <p>g) Are there any exemplar planting types/ situations which you consider should be provided?</p> <p>h) Are you content with the proposed five years for the maintenance regime as set out in sub-para 8(2)(c)?</p>	h) Yes.
Q5.4.9	North Yorkshire County Council, City of York Council, Hambleton District Council, Harrogate Borough Council, Leeds City Council and Selby District Council, or any successor body	<p>Requirement 9: Implementation of landscaping and mitigation planting</p> <p>a) If not provided elsewhere, set out comments you may have on the wording of Requirement 9.</p> <p>b) Are you satisfied that five years is sufficient for replacement planting to be undertaken?</p>	<p>a) The definition of 'operational use' contained within the dDCO is noted and this provides a clear point at which the requirements needs to be complied with.</p> <p>b) Yes.</p>
Q5.4.10	North Yorkshire County Council, City of York Council, Hambleton District Council, Harrogate Borough Council, Leeds City Council and Selby District Council, or any successor body	<p>Requirement 10: Retention and protection of existing trees</p> <p>a) Do the items listed in Requirement 10(2) as forming the contents of the Tree and Hedgerow Protection Strategy (THPS) provide sufficient detail for the Councils to discharge this Requirement? If not, specify what additional details you would expect to see provided as part of the THPS.</p> <p>b) Would links to the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) Report's [APP-102] to [APP-104] embedded environmental measures and mitigation or provision of an Outline THPS assist?</p>	<p>a) yes, these items are considered sufficient.</p> <p>b) A link back to the AIA embedded measures and Outline THPS would assist with reinforcing requirement 10.</p>
Q5.4.12	North Yorkshire County Council, Hambleton District Council, Harrogate Borough Council, and	<p>Requirement 12: Contamination of land or groundwater, etc</p> <p>Can the Councils explain whether the draft wording of Requirement 12 sufficiently addresses the points raised in their joint RRs RR-018, RR-019, RR-032, RR-034]. If not,</p>	CYC have no comments to make in respect of this question.

Yorkshire Green Project – ExA Written Questions to LPA's
City of York Council – Submission Deadline 2

Q	RR	Question	CYC Comment/Response
	Selby District Council, or any successor body	what additional information would you wish to see included in this Requirement?	
Q5.5.5	North Yorkshire County Council, City of York Council, Hambleton District Council, Harrogate Borough Council, Leeds City Council and Selby District Council, or any successor body Environment Agency Internal Drainage Boards	Schedule 4: views of future discharging authorities a) Set out your views on Schedule 4, covering (but not limited to): the proposed timescales for decisions provided for under paras 1(1), 1(3), 1(4), 2(2) and 3 of this Schedule; whether Requirements may be discharged in parts, and if so, how fees should be payable; the acceptability of the proposed appeal provisions set out at paragraph 3; and other points raised for the Applicant to consider above. b) If you do not agree with the wording in this Schedule set out your reasons and any suggested amendments to the wording of this article.	<p>The application period of 35 days is an area of concern given the potential implications it could have for the LPA. Particularly where consultations are required within technical advisors.</p> <p>Provision 1(4) feels somewhat counter productive and should as a minimum be amended to 7 days to match provision 1(1). The provision appears to set a shorter time requirement on the LPA in scenario where more work is involved namely liaising with the requirement consultee.</p> <p>The LPA would not be averse to partial discharge of requirements, if necessary, however our preference would be to wholly discharge requirements as this will likely be a cleaner approach.</p> <p>Fees should be payable to the LPA, ideally via BACS transfer or other suitable online/digital payment method. The LPA is happy to liaise with the applicant further on this matter.</p> <p>The primary concern of the LPA with the wording this schedule is the potentially</p>

Yorkshire Green Project – ExA Written Questions to LPA's
City of York Council – Submission Deadline 2

Q	RR	Question	CYC Comment/Response
			onerous time requirements that would be placed upon the LPA. We note that the applicant has indicated their intention to front load this process and undertake pre-application discussions with the LPAs. This is welcomed however to provide security to the LPAs can the ExA consider incorporating this pre-application requirement into the DCO, should that be within their gift to do so?
Q5.11.3	Affected Persons	dDCO comments requested from Affected Persons Provide any comments on or suggested changes to the articles and/or Requirements and other Schedules in the dDCO [AS-011].	CYC have no comments to make in respect of this question.
Q7.0.4	North Yorkshire County Council, City of York Council, Hambleton District Council, Harrogate Borough Council, Leeds City Council and Selby District Council, or any successor body	Level of detail of information where site-specific infrastructure is proposed a) Do you consider that the Applicant has provided sufficient detail in areas where site-specific infrastructure is proposed? (North Yorkshire County Council, you have previously mentioned detailed topographical surveys to understand and explain all the key features and characteristics of the existing site including levels and landform, buildings and structures, existing vegetation and screening, hard/ soft surfaces [APP-195], page 199 to 200). b) If not, what else do you consider is required?	In the context of CYC site specific works are only proposed within the existing operational substation at Osbaldwick.
Q8.0.1	City of York Council, Hambleton District Council, Harrogate Borough Council, Leeds City Council, North Yorkshire County Council and Selby	Green Belts, Planning Statement [APP-202] The Applicant has made the case for the proposed development in the York and Leeds Green Belts in its Planning Statement in relation to the NPS [APP-202], Sections 7.3, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) [APP-202], Section 7.4 and the local planning context [APP-202], Appendix C. It appears	CYC have provided comments to this question within our submitted LIR.

Yorkshire Green Project – ExA Written Questions to LPA's
City of York Council – Submission Deadline 2

Q	RR	Question	CYC Comment/Response
	District Council, or any successor body	from your RRs [RR-018], [RR-018], [RR-032], [RR-034] that you disagree with the Applicant's differentiation between overhead line (OHL) work in the Green Belts and substation and CSEC work in Green Belt in terms of whether they are inappropriate development and also whether it would conflict with the purposes of land in Green Belt [APP-202], page 90 to 91. Whilst acknowledging this information is likely to be provided in your Local Impact Report(s) (LIR) and/ or SoCG(s), to assist the ExA's Green Belt balancing exercise, you are asked to ensure your views on the following are provided in response to this question if not included elsewhere.	
Q8.1.2	City of York Council, Hambleton District Council, Harrogate Borough Council, Leeds City Council, North Yorkshire County Council and Selby District Council, or any successor body	Green Infrastructure policies a) Are you content that the outline landscape mitigation strategies when detailed post-consent [APP-164] , Figure 3.10 to 3.12 would meet relevant green infrastructure Local Plan policies? b) If not set out what is required to meet those policies.	a) Yes.
Q9.2.3	Historic England and Selby District Council, or any successor body Marston Moor Registered Battlefield and the Battle of Towton Can Selby District Council and Historic England	Comment on the Applicant's approach to mitigation of potential direct effects to archaeological remains associated with the Marston Moor Registered Battlefield and the Battle of Towton, as described in the WSI? Do you consider that these are sufficient to reduce the effects to not significant?	CYC have no comments to make in respect of this question.
Q10.0.2	City of York Council, Hambleton District Council, Harrogate Borough Council, Leeds City	Effects of permanent loss of agricultural land ES Chapter 11 [APP-083] , Table 11.26 concludes that the Proposed Development would give rise to moderate adverse effects on agriculture as a result of the permanent loss of between 5 to	CYC concur with the conclusion that has been reached in table 11.26.

Yorkshire Green Project – ExA Written Questions to LPA's
City of York Council – Submission Deadline 2

Q	RR	Question	CYC Comment/Response
	Council, North Yorkshire County Council and Selby District Council, or any successor body	20 hectares of Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Grades 2 to Subgrade 3b. Do you agree that these effects would be of moderate significance? If not, why not?	
Q11.3. 2	City of York Council	Woodstock Lodge Wedding Venue: additional measures Do you have any views on the Applicant's approach to additional measures at this location, consisting of planting outside the Order limits, which is not secured?	CYC do not have any views on this matter and understand that whilst the measures may not be secured via the DCO they are as a result of dialogue between the applicant and the venue operators; and would be a benefit to the venue. However the absence of such measures is unlikely to be a determining factor in the overall assessment of the proposals.
Q11.4. 1	City of York Council, Hambleton District Council, Harrogate Borough Council, Leeds City Council, North Yorkshire County Council and Selby District Council, or any successor body	Ongoing work on detailed aspects of the landscape and visual mitigation You said you want further information as to how the Applicant intends to address the mitigation of adverse effects on landscape and visual receptors (significant or not significant) and that you would welcome the opportunity to continue to work with the Applicant on detailed aspects of the landscape and visual mitigation, to ensure an appropriate response in keeping with local landscape character [RR-018] , [RR-019], [RR-032], [RR-034]. If not set out elsewhere: a) Explain what further information is required, including clarification for long-term maintenance and management. b) Is this dialogue continuing during the Examination and if so what if any additional information do you anticipate submitting/ or expect the Applicant to submit? c) Are there mechanisms set up for this to continue post-consent if the Order is consented?	CYC have no comments to raise in respect of this question, the referenced RR's are from the North Yorkshire authorities.

Yorkshire Green Project – ExA Written Questions to LPA's
City of York Council – Submission Deadline 2

Q	RR	Question	CYC Comment/Response
Q12.0.2	Hambleton District Council, Harrogate Borough Council, North Yorkshire County Council and Selby District Council, or any successor body	Noise Assessment Methodology In your joint Local Authorities' RR you have commented that; "The intention is to assess operational noise in accordance with document ref: 29 'National Grid (2021). Policy Statement PS(T)134 - Operational Audible Noise Policy for Overhead Lines. National Grid, London'. I am not familiar with this document nor am I able to locate it, but I did raise concerns regarding the overall assessment methodology which are yet to be agreed. Notably, the trigger for Tier 3 assessment being >37dBA without a full understanding of background LA90,T values during rainfall at sensitive receptors. BS4142:2014+A1:2019 assessment methodology should be adopted in its entirety over National Grid criteria. In view of the above, I would advise that Noise and Vibration EIA assessment and methodology was raised as a matter for further discussion and yet to be agreed." Having regard to Table 14.5 of ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [APP-086] and Appendices 14F to 14H [APP-155] to [APP-157] do you have any further comments to make in relation to the Applicant's noise assessment methodology?	CYC have no comments to make in respect of this question.
Q13.0.2	Selby District Council	Travellers' Site adjacent to the A63 near to the A1(M) junction. In paragraph 16.6.11 of ES Chapter 16: Socio-economics [APP-088] it is understood that an application for a Lawful Development Certificate was refused by Selby District Council in April 2022. Can the Council provide the following information about the site: a) The planning history and current permitted use/ status of the travellers' site. b) Whether there is any ongoing enforcement action to resolve any outstanding planning matters? If so, provide a copy of any relevant enforcement notices.	CYC have no comments to make in respect of this question.

Yorkshire Green Project – ExA Written Questions to LPA's
City of York Council – Submission Deadline 2

Q	RR	Question	CYC Comment/Response
Q14.0.3	The Applicant and Local Highway Authorities (North Yorkshire County Council, City of York Council and Leeds City Council)	<p>Traffic Management: Abnormal Loads In the joint Local Authorities' RR [RR-018], [RR-019], [RR-032] and [RR-034] reference is made to the likely requirement that some large items delivered to the site will be classed as abnormal loads and discussion with the Local Highway Authority will be required. The ExA also notes that an Abnormal Indivisible Load Assessment has been provided in Annex 3F.1 of the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [APP-099]. Having regard to this:</p> <p>a) When is it envisaged that such discussions will take place?</p> <p>b) What mechanism will there be for public consultation and notification regarding the timing and routing of abnormal loads beyond that set out in Section 3.6 of [APP-099]? To Local Highway Authorities:</p> <p>c) Are you content with the measures set out in the CTMP or should an Outline Abnormal Loads Management Plan be submitted into this Examination in order to provide more detailed information on this matter?</p>	<p>CYC would refer the ExA to the draft statement of common ground in respect of this question.</p> <p>In specific response to point c) it would be beneficial for all parties if an Outline Abnormal Loads Management Plan were to be submitted. This could establish base principles for such movements and likely identify likely routing options. The applicant will presumably have knowledge of the equipment likely to form an abnormal load and the sites/locations these will be required at.</p>
Q14.0.4	Local Highway Authorities (North Yorkshire County Council, City of York Council and Leeds City Council)	<p>Potential requirement for further off-site highway works The joint Local Authorities' RR [RR-018], [RR-019], [RR-032] and [RR-034] advise that "other site locations near Shipton may require further investigation with junction widening expected on East Lane and Corban Lane. Corban Lane at present has a 7.5 tonnes weight limit".</p> <p>a) Can you clarify more precisely the locations where additional highway improvement works might be required and in so doing whether these locations are within or outside the Order limits of the Proposed Development? If they are outside the Order limits then how can the ExA be confident that there would be an appropriate mechanism in place to</p>	<p>a),b),c) these potential works would be outside of the CYC area.</p> <p>The purpose of the 7.5t weight limit is assumed to mitigate the possible risk of the route becoming a 'rat run' for traffic between A19 and B1363. A corresponding 7.5t restriction sign is positioned at the junction of Corban Lane and B1363 (Sutton Road/Wigginton Road). This measure effectively routes 7.5t+ traffic between these points via the A1237 York</p>

Yorkshire Green Project – ExA Written Questions to LPA's
City of York Council – Submission Deadline 2

Q	RR	Question	CYC Comment/Response
		<p>ensure that the additional improvement works are undertaken?</p> <p>b) Can the Local Highway Authorities clarify whether it is their view that without such improvements, the development would result in unacceptable highway safety or would significantly affect the performance of the highway network?</p> <p>c) If you consider that these additional highway works are essential to avoid significant harmful effects, can you explain your assessment of the likely effects if they were not done.</p> <p>d) Can you explain the reasons why there is a weight restriction limit on Corban Lane and how this might impact on the Applicant's routing strategy for construction and operational traffic?</p>	Outer Ring Road or along the A170 East of Thirsk.
Q14.0.5	The Applicant and North Yorkshire County Council, or its successor body	<p>Access: design standards In the joint Local Authorities' RR [RR-018], [RR-019], [RR-032] and [RR-034] it is stated that "The application has included some design details illustrating how the developer will access each location showing roads either within the site or accesses onto the highway network. The LHA has its own design standards and the one's (sic) presented do not necessary follow what the authority wishes to see installed either as a temporary measure or as a permanent solution". To the Applicant:</p> <p>a) Explain your use of a design standard that does not necessarily follow what the Local Highway Authority wishes to see? To North Yorkshire County Council:</p> <p>b) Has the Applicant been made aware of your preferred design standards and are these publicly available?</p> <p>c) For the sake of clarity, confirm whether your concerns are only in regard to accesses on to the public highway or whether you also have concerns regarding the design of internal construction access roads.</p>	CYC have no comments to raise in respect of this question.

Yorkshire Green Project – ExA Written Questions to LPA's
City of York Council – Submission Deadline 2

Q	RR	Question	CYC Comment/Response
Q14.0.6	The Applicant and North Yorkshire County Council, or its successor body	<p>Routeing of construction traffic north of the A63 and west of Lumby Figure 3F.4 Sheet 11 of 11 (e-page 64) of the Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-099] indicates the routeing strategy to access overhead line works north of the A63 and west of Lumby. Access is shown to be gained via Lumby Village and then via a long access track running west towards the A1(M). To the Applicant:</p> <p>a) Comment on the suitability of this route having regard to the nature of Lumby village and the configuration and design of the highway from the A63 to the proposed construction access path:</p> <p>b) Comment upon the consideration of alternative access options for the construction of Works Nos. 9 and 10.</p> <p>c) Provide the predicted vehicle movements associated with the construction of this part of the Proposed Development, and explain the engineering works to be carried out to the access track to ensure it is fit for purpose to facilitate the Proposed Development. To North Yorkshire County Council:</p> <p>d) What are your views on the suitability of this route having regard to the nature of Lumby village and the configuration and design of the highway from the A63 to the proposed construction access path?</p>	CYC have no comments to raise in respect of this question.
Q14.0.7	North Yorkshire County Council, or its successor body	<p>Construction Management Plans In the joint Local Authorities' RR [RR-018], [RR-019], [RR-032] and [RR-034] it is stated that the Local Highway Authority "sees the importance of further discussions with the developer to formulate the production of the construction management plan and construction travel plan as well as the Development Consent Order (DCO)."</p>	CYC have no comments to raise in respect of this question.

Yorkshire Green Project – ExA Written Questions to LPA's
City of York Council – Submission Deadline 2

Q	RR	Question	CYC Comment/Response
		<p>a) Is your reference to the “construction management plan” a generic term to cover all the construction and traffic plans (ie the same as the heading used in Requirement 5 of the dDCO [AS-011])? Or did you instead mean to refer specifically to the Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-099]? The ‘Construction Management Plans’ are in effect a combination of the proposed Requirements 5 and 6 in the dDCO [AS-011]. Requirement 5 refers to specific plans and strategies, whilst Requirement 6 relates to the submission of further details for approval by the relevant authorities prior to the commencement of each stage of the Proposed Development relevant to the topic headings that are set out.</p> <p>b) Do you consider the submitted ‘Construction Management Plans’ and the submission of further details in Requirement 6 of the dDCO to be sufficient to satisfactorily control and manage the transportation and highway aspects of the development and if not, can you clarify what you consider to be inadequate or unclear? c) If you believe improvements and amendments are needed to either the suite of management plans or the dDCO can you submit to the ExA your proposed changes for consideration.</p>	
Q14.0.9	The Applicant and Local Highway Authorities (North Yorkshire County Council, City of York Council and Leeds City Council)	<p>Public Rights of Way Management Plan Table 12.12 of ES Chapter 12 [APP-084] states that the Public Rights of Way Management Plan (PRoWMP) would include a commitment to condition surveys of PRoWs on affected sections before, during and after construction to support reinstatement of the PRoW postconstruction to the same condition or better. To the Applicant:</p> <p>a) Can the PRoWMP can be revised to provide clarity of the commitment to reinstate PRoWs, including confirmation of</p>	CYC is content with the clarity provided by the PRoWMP.

Yorkshire Green Project – ExA Written Questions to LPA's
City of York Council – Submission Deadline 2

Q	RR	Question	CYC Comment/Response
		<p>the expected location, timing/ frequency of condition surveys, who the results would be reported to, and the timescales for reinstatement (if required) post-construction and the ongoing monitoring and, if required, maintenance of restored PRoWs? To Local Highway Authorities:</p> <p>b) Do you consider that there is sufficient clarity in the PRoWMP regarding the expected locations, timing and frequency of condition surveys and timescales for reinstatement work (if required) post-construction to adequately secure this commitment?</p>	
Q14.0.10	The Applicant and North Yorkshire County Council, or its successor body	<p>Construction Management Plan discussions In the joint Local Authorities' RR [RR-018], [RR-019], [RR-032] and [RR-034], reference has been made to the need to establish an approach with regard to the various access points and site compounds that are proposed and to the importance of further discussions with the developer to formulate the production of the "construction management plan and construction travel plan" as well as the dDCO. Provide a timetable for these further discussions and your views as to whether or not an approach will be agreed before the close of this Examination.</p>	CYC have no comments to make in response to this question.

ENDS