

YG-DCO-101

Yorkshire Green Energy Enablement (GREEN) Project

Volume 8

Document 8.10 Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports

**Final Issue A
April 2023**

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN020024

Infrastructure Planning (Applications, Prescribed Forms and Procedure)
Regulations 2009 Regulation 5(2)(q)

Page intentionally blank

Contents

1.	About this document	1
1.1	Introduction	1
2.	Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports	2
2.1	City of York Council	2
2.2	Leeds City Council	7
2.3	North Yorkshire Council	11
	Table 2.1 – City of York Council	2
	Table 2.2 – Leeds City Council	7
	Table 2.3 – North Yorkshire Council	11

Version History

Document	Version	Status	Description / Changes
26/04/2023	A	Final	First Issue

1. About this document

1.1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This document provides National Grid Electricity Transmission plc's (National Grid) (the Applicant) comments on the Local Impact Reports (LIRs) submitted at Deadline 1 for the Yorkshire Green Energy Enablement Project (Yorkshire GREEN or the Project).
- 1.1.2 Three Local Impact Reports were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) at Deadline 1 by City of York Council, Leeds City Council and North Yorkshire Council. Section 2 below specifies the Interested Party and sets out National Grid's comments on each topic discussed in the relevant Local Impact Report. The reference provided refers to the section or paragraph number within each Local Impact Report.

2. Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports

2.1 City of York Council

Table 2.1 – City of York Council

Reference	Topic	National Grid's Response
1	Introduction	The introduction of the Local Impact Report (LIR) [REP1-047] prepared by City of York Council (CYC) is clear in setting out the scope and purpose of the LIR, which it is considered is in accordance with the Planning Act 2008 (as amended) and the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) <u>Advice Note One</u> (Local Impact Reports).
2	The Development Proposal	National Grid considers that the description of the Project provided by CYC, which relates to works proposed in the CYC administrative boundary specifically, is accurate. National Grid notes that it is a summary overview and does not include detail of every individual work proposed within the CYC administrative boundary.
3	Consenting Regime – Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project	National Grid considers that CYC's summary of the consenting regime for the Project is correct.
4	Pre-application process	National Grid acknowledges that CYC and National Grid have engaged constructively during the pre-application process, including through the ongoing production of a draft Statement of Common Ground between National Grid Electricity Transmission plc and City of York Council (Document 8.5.3, Version 1) [REP1-023] as submitted at Deadline 1. It is further acknowledged that CYC consider the documentation submitted by National Grid to the Examining Authority (ExA) to date to align with pre-application discussions.
5.1-5.3	Policy Context - National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)	National Grid notes and agrees with paragraph 5.2 of the LIR which states that the NPPF <i>“does not contain policies for nationally significant infrastructure projects. These are determined in accordance with the decision-making framework in the Planning Act 2008 (as amended) and relevant national policy statements for major infrastructure, as well as any other matters that are relevant (which may include the National Planning Policy Framework)”</i> .
5.4	Policy Context - National Policy Statements	National Grid notes and agrees that the relevant National Policy Statements have been identified by CYC in paragraph 5.4 of the LIR.
5.5-5.10	Policy Context - Statutory Development Plans	National Grid notes that CYC has confirmed in Table 3.1 of the Statement of Common Ground between National Grid Electricity Transmission plc and City of York Council (Document 8.5.3, Version 1) [REP1-023] that key policies of relevance have been considered in the submitted Planning Statement (Document 7.1) [APP-202] .
5.11-5.12	Policy Context - Neighbourhood Plans	National Grid notes that CYC has confirmed in Table 3.1 of the Statement of Common Ground between National Grid Electricity Transmission plc and City of York Council (Document 8.5.3, Version 1) [REP1-023] that key policies of relevance have been considered in the submitted Planning Statement (Document 7.1) [APP-202] .
5.13-5.14	Policy Context - North Yorkshire Minerals and Waste Joint Plan (2022)	National Grid notes that CYC has confirmed in Table 3.1 of the Statement of Common Ground between National Grid Electricity Transmission plc and City of York Council (Document 8.5.3, Version 1) [REP1-023] that key policies of relevance have been considered in the submitted Planning Statement (Document 7.1) [APP-202] .

Reference	Topic	National Grid's Response
6	Project Need	National Grid welcomes the comments in paragraph 6.6 of the LIR which state “CYC therefore acknowledge the overarching need and justification for the proposed development” and that “In principle CYC support the proposed development”.
7	The York Green Belt	<p>National Grid notes that at paragraph 7.4 of the LIR that CYC confirms that “development management decisions relating to proposals falling within the general extent of the Green Belt are made on the basis that the land should be treated as Green Belt; utilising NPPF Green Belt policies for the purposes of determining development proposals”. National Grid has provided an assessment against Green Belt items in the NPPF in paragraphs 7.4.7 to 7.4.17 of the Planning Statement (Document 7.1) [APP-202].</p> <p>In relation to the exception of Paragraph 150(b) of the NPPF, National Grid welcomes that CYC confirms in paragraph 7.9 of the LIR that CYC concurs “with this position that the proposed development be regarded as being an engineering operation”.</p> <p>At paragraph 7.13 the LIR states “the applicants’ statement that the proposals would not affect the openness of the Green Belt overly simplifies what is a more nuanced matter and set of considerations”. National Grid respectfully highlights that this is not an accurate reflection of its statement, and that careful and detailed consideration has been given to the effects of the Project on the Green Belt as set out in paragraphs 7.3.59 to 7.3.105 and 7.4.7 to 7.4.17 of the Planning Statement (Document 7.1) [APP-202]. National Grid has made a distinction between the overhead line and reconductoring works, which it considers do not affect openness, and the cable sealing end compounds and substations, which it considers do affect openness.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.3.74 of the Planning Statement (Document 7.1) [APP-202] makes clear that “although overhead lines may occupy long corridors within Green Belt, they involve little physical change to the land through which they pass and leave a large majority of the land beneath them free from development and therefore open. As pylons are spaced up to approximately 360m apart the perception of openness is maintained as one is able to ‘see through’ the widely spaced pylons and conductors to whatever is beyond”.</p> <p>For cable sealing end compounds and substations, Paragraph 7.3.75 of the Planning Statement (Document 7.1) [APP-202] is clear that the “substations and CSECs, by their design may be considered inappropriate development in the Green Belt, because they comprise a physical development footprint which may not be considered to preserve the openness of the Green Belt”.</p> <p>National Grid notes that at paragraph 7.13 the LIR states, “it would be necessary to consider whether Very Special Circumstances exist which would justify such harms”. National Grid has set out the very special circumstances in detail at Paragraph 7.3.98 of the Planning Statement (Document 7.1) [APP-202].</p>
8	Landscape and Visual Impact Considerations	<p>National Grid acknowledges the summary of the landscape baseline provided by CYC at paragraph 8.1 of the LIR. The overall landscape and visual impacts of the Project during the construction phase are set out in paragraphs 8.2 to 8.4 of the LIR, where it is acknowledged by CYC that significant effects during the construction phase, including the works compounds and associated activity, would be both temporary and unavoidable. National Grid notes that CYC welcomes the adoption of mitigation measures, such as the use of landscape bunds. In paragraph 8.4 of the LIR, CYC specifically note the net gain of infrastructure resulting from the overlap between new infrastructure being commissioned and existing equipment being decommissioned. National Grid acknowledges this net gain during construction, which is set out in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ES Chapter 6 Landscape and Visual (Document 5.2.6) [APP-078] • ES Appendix 6F Landscape Character Receptor Assessment (Document 5.3.6F) [APP-113] • ES Appendix 6G Visual Receptor Assessment (Document 5.3.6G) [APP-114] • ES Appendix 6H Viewpoint Assessment (Document 5.3.6H) [APP-115] <p>Paragraphs 8.5 and 8.6 of the LIR summarise the operational long-term effects of the Project, recognising the lasting landscape and visual impact of the pylons and overhead transmission lines. National Grid acknowledges CYC’s recognition that opportunities to screen or limit the visual impact of the pylons and overhead lines are limited given their design, scale, nature and general function.</p> <p>CYC state at paragraph 8.6 of the LIR that they wish to see suitable screening of the larger elements of infrastructure, in particular the Overton Substation, to reduce the overall landscape and visual impact as far as practicable. National Grid considers that the mitigation proposed in the Outline Landscape Mitigation Strategy provided in Figures 3.10 to 3.12 (Document 5.4.3(B)) [AS-017] and described in ES Chapter 3 Description of the Project (Document 5.2.3) [APP-075] is</p>

Reference	Topic	National Grid's Response
		sufficiently detailed at this stage of the Project design to demonstrate that likely significant landscape and visual effects would be mitigated where possible and appropriate, in accordance with paragraph 5.9.8 of NPS EN-1. A detailed landscape strategy that accords with the Outline Landscape Mitigation Strategy (Document 5.4.3(B)) [AS-017] , a scheme for mitigation planting, and a tree and hedgerow protection strategy is secured under Requirements 6, 8, and 10 in the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1(B)) [AS-011] once the detailed engineering design has been completed.
9	Heritage Considerations	<p>National Grid acknowledges the comments from CYC regarding effects to heritage assets in paragraphs 9.1 to 9.4 of the LIR and regarding archaeological remains in paragraph 9.5. It is noted that at paragraph 9.2 of the LIR, CYC confirms that it does not believe that works at Osbaldwick substation would result in any significant changes that would harm the character and setting of existing heritage assets. It is further stated by CYC at paragraph 9.4 that the effects of the net gain of infrastructure arising from the link to the proposed substation at Overton would be balanced by the benefits of realigning the existing overhead line away from Poppleton Conservation Area.</p> <p>National Grid also note that in paragraph 9.6 of the LIR, CYC welcome the inclusion of an archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI). It is considered that ES Appendix 3C Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation (Document 5.3.3C) [APP-096] and the assessments reported in ES Chapter 7 Historic Environment (Document 5.2.7) [APP-079] adequately address the points raised in the LIR. Paragraph 9.5 of the LIR states the dDCO does not explicitly limit downward vertical deviation other than 'as far as the undertaker considers necessary or convenient'. A detailed response to this is provided in Point 15 of Applicant's Response to Open Floor Hearing 1 (OFH1) and Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) Hearing Action Point (Document 8.4.2) [REP1-018]. This states for the purposes of assessment the maximum depth of excavation for open trench cabling is assumed to be up to 2m. However, archaeological mitigation as defined in the WSI would not be dependent on a vertical downward limit.</p>
10	Ecology and Biodiversity	<p>National Grid acknowledges the points made by CYC regarding the proximity of proposed development to some landscape features in paragraphs 10.1 to 10.2 of the LIR. National Grid notes that CYC concurs with the biodiversity assessment within the DCO submission.</p> <p>National Grid notes that CYC welcomes and concurs with the inclusion of embedded environmental measures with respect to biodiversity in paragraph 10.3 of the LIR and confirms that ecological disturbance would be kept to an absolute minimum and would be adequately mitigated and/or compensated in line with the mitigation hierarchy as set out for each feature in in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 8.9 of ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity (Document 5.2.8) [APP-080] • ES Appendix 3A Embedded Measures Schedule (Document 5.3.3A) [APP-094] • ES Appendix 3D Biodiversity Mitigation Strategy (Document 5.3.3D) [APP-097] secured by Requirement 5(2)(c) <p>National Grid acknowledges the comments relating to veteran or ancient trees and hedgerows in paragraph 10.4 of the LIR and confirms that within the administrative boundary of CYC less than 1km of native hedgerow would be permanently lost as a result of the Project as set out in section 8.9 ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Document 5.2.8) [APP-080]. Hedgerow loss would be mitigated by hedgerow planting and reinforcement which has been embedded into the Project as set out in paragraph 8.9.44 ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity, (Document 5.2.8) [APP-080]. This comprises 1027m of new hedgerow planting and 849m of hedgerow reinforcement (comprising thickening, gapping up, and planting trees within existing hedgerows) at Overton Substation (Section B), Tadcaster (Section D) and Monk Fryston Substation (Section F), as depicted in the Outline Landscape Mitigation Strategy, Figures 3.10 to 3.12, (Document 5.4.3(B)) [AS-017].</p> <p>National Grid acknowledges the points made in relation to Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) and the avoidance of loss of irreplaceable habitat in paragraphs 10.5 and 10.7 of the LIR, and notes that CYC welcomes the Project commitment to deliver 10% BNG ahead of the legal requirement for NSIPs. The approach to achieving BNG is in line with the 10 BNG Good Practice Principles for Development as stated in Appendix A, Biodiversity Net Gain Report (Document 7.9) [APP-210], including Principle 2 which relates to avoidance of impacts on irreplaceable habitat. National Grid confirms that it is actively engaging with CYC regarding the delivery of BNG including possible locations for offsite delivery of BNG, and is seeking to secure gains via a Section 106 agreement which has been issued to CYC in draft form.</p> <p>National Grid has provided further details on its approach to BNG in response to written question 3.4.2 in Applicant's Response to ExQ1 (Document 8.9.1). This response includes detail of relevance to the points raised in CYC's LIR regarding delivery of BNG, including the aim to achieve this within the same LPA as the associated loss. National Grid is actively engaged with a range of stakeholders in order to identify opportunities to deliver meaningful BNG enhancements across the extent of the project. While it is National Grid's primary aim to deliver BNG within the same LPA administrative area as the associated loss where this is not possible</p>

Reference	Topic	National Grid's Response
		<p>due to limited availability of suitable sites, or more favourable outcomes for biodiversity would be achieved by delivering BNG at a site outside the relevant LPA, delivery of 10% BNG would apply across the extent of the project rather than being split between LPAs.</p> <p>National Grid acknowledges the point made in paragraph 10.6 of the LIR in relation to permanent and temporary habitat loss and confirms that temporary habitat loss would be reinstated in accordance with embedded environmental measure Mitigation ID11 Habitat reinstatement (Appendix 3A Embedded Measures Schedule (Document 5.3.3A) [APP-094]), described in Table 8.11 ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity, (Document 5.2.8) [APP-080] and paragraph 3.2.1 Appendix 3D Biodiversity Mitigation Strategy (Document 5.3.3D) [APP-097].</p>
11	Noise and Air Quality Considerations (Noise)	<p>National Grid considers that the comments made by CYC in paragraphs 11.1 to 11.2 of the LIR reflect the assessment reported in ES Chapter 14 Noise and Vibration (Document 5.2.14) [APP-086], and acknowledge CYC's comments regarding the Project approach to core working hours in paragraph 11.3 of the LIR.</p> <p>With respect to paragraph 11.4 of the LIR, National Grid acknowledges that CYC's comments in relation to Requirement 7(3)(c) of the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1(B) [AS-011], which allows for operations to take place outside of core working hours where the completion of operations commenced during the core working hours cannot be safely stopped. National Grid notes that whilst CYC acknowledges the principle of the exclusion under Requirement 7(3)(c), CYC note that this flexibility could be abused and suggests that works are sequenced as much as possible to avoid working outside of core hours. National Grid considers that this clause will be used rarely and by exception and will undertake monitoring to ensure this exclusion is not abused. National Grid considers that the complaint process detailed within the Noise and Vibration Management Plan (NVMP Document 5,3,3H) [APP-101] should provide CYC with a mechanism to address any issues where this exclusion causes noise impacts.</p>
11	Noise and Air Quality Considerations (Air Quality)	<p>National Grid notes CYC's acknowledgement that there are likely to be air quality impacts during the construction phase, which accords with the submitted air quality assessment reported in ES Chapter 13 Air Quality (Document 5.2) [APP-085]. The LIR outlines the approach followed in assessing impacts from construction dust and concludes that overall impacts from the development are not significant. National Grid notes that CYC welcomes the measures set out within the submitted Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (Document 5.3) [APP-095] to address noise and air quality impacts and concludes that these measures should be capable of achieving a balance between facilitating development in a timely manner in the event of the DCO being granted; whilst also providing important and necessary mitigations and safeguards to those receptors most impacted by the development.</p>
12	Highways Considerations	<p>National Grid acknowledges the comments regarding highways considerations in paragraphs 12.1 to 12.6 of the LIR.</p> <p>Paragraphs 12.1 and 12.2 summarise that there are not expected to be significant highway and transportation impacts during the operation of the Project and the primary highways impacts would occur within the construction phase of the Project with vehicle movements around the works areas and temporary access arrangements. This aligns with the assessment reported in ES Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport (Document 5.2.12) [APP-084]. CYC also states in paragraph 12.1 of the LIR that the proposed works at Osbaldwick Substation would primarily utilise existing routes and accesses This aligns with Table 3.2 and Figures 3F.4 to 3F.7 of Appendix 5.3.3F Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (Document 5.3.3F) [APP-099], which detail that access at Osbaldwick would utilise existing routes and accesses.</p> <p>It is noted that in paragraph 12.3 of the LIR that CYC does not believe any permanent effects on Public Rights of Way (PRoWs) or Other Routes of Public Access (ORPA) have been identified, and that impacts on these will be temporary and occur only during the construction phase. This aligns with the Public Rights of Way Management Plan (PRoWMP) (Document 5.3.3G) [APP-100].</p> <p>National Grid acknowledges that CYC summarises mitigation measures proposed through the Project in paragraph 12.3 of the LIR, noting the need to provide a temporary alternative route for part of the National Cycle Network (NCN) Route 65. As outlined in the PRoWMP (Document 5.3.3G) [APP-100] paragraph 4.2.1 an alternative route for NCN65 will be provided for the duration of the construction works to allow users of the NCN Route 65 route to avoid a heavily used section of Overton Road during the construction period, however the existing route will remain open. In paragraph 12.4 of the LIR, CYC states its desire that disruption to cycle routes, PRoWs and ORPAs are kept to a minimum and that diversions, stopping up and closures are publicised (where relevant with the Local Highway Authority receiving advance notification). This point is fully acknowledged by National Grid, which has provided a PRoWMP (Document 5.3.3G) [APP-100] as part of the DCO application and which sets out further details on mitigation measures for the temporary impact on the PRoWs and ORPAs. Section 3 of the PROWMP includes commitment for agreement of PRoW measures with the relevant Rights of Way Officer at the Council. The PRoWMP is secured by Requirement 5 of the draft DCO (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011].</p>

Reference	Topic	National Grid's Response
		<p>Paragraph 12.5 of the LIR notes the pre-application engagement with CYC on highways matters, including the production of the Statement of Common Ground between National Grid Electricity Transmission plc and City of York Council (Document 8.5.3, Version 1) [REP1-023]. National Grid is in agreement that CYC has engaged on highways matters.</p> <p>CYC states in paragraph 12.6 that it welcomes the inclusion of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) as it is important to provide assurances in relation to adequate measures for the management of construction traffic. National Grid has provided a CTMP as part of the application in ES Appendix 3F Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document 5.3.3F) [APP-099] and is secured by Requirement 5 of the draft DCO (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011].</p>
13	Socio-Economic Considerations	<p>National Grid acknowledges the comments regarding socio-economic considerations in paragraph 13.1 of the LIR which identifies that CYC's Draft Local Plan seeks to deliver the development required in the city as long as that development supports the city's special qualities. ES Chapter 16 Socio Economics (Document 5.2.16) [APP-088] and the Planning Statement (Document 7.1) [APP-202] identify and utilise these policies within the assessments contained within them.</p> <p>National Grid welcomes the acknowledgement from CYC in paragraph 13.2 that delivering the aspirations of the Local Plan will require numerous forms of supporting infrastructure, including the type proposed within the Project. National Grid also welcomes CYC's acknowledgment in paragraph 13.3 of the LIR that due to changes in how electricity is being generated, where it is being generated and how it is being consumed, the transmission network needs to adapt and evolve.</p>
14	Requirements of the DCO	<p>In section 14 of the LIR, CYC identifies concerns relating to Schedule 4 of the draft DCO (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011], which sets out details relating to the Discharge of Requirements (DoR) process, including timescales and fees. National Grid understands that these concerns relate primarily to the timescales included in the draft DCO, which CYC considers may be too stringent and challenging to adhere to. In paragraph 14.3 of the LIR, CYC recognises that pre-application discussions would assist with smoothing the discharge of requirements process, however National Grid notes that CYC raises concern that this pre-application process is not formally secured through the draft DCO (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011]. National Grid notes the request made by CYC at paragraph 14.4 for a mechanism to secure the pre-application process or revise prescribed timings, and a comment at paragraph 14.5 regarding the need for any discharge of requirement application fees to reflect any changes to the statutory fee's regime.</p> <p>The approach proposed by National Grid reflects that of previous DCO projects, including Hinkley Point C Connection Project and Richborough Connection Project. In relation to discharge of requirements procedure and timescales, National Grid considers that this tried and tested mechanism is appropriate for the Project. Initial discussions have also taken place with LPAs regarding a PPA to cover time to assist with the post-determination stage of the DCO, should consent be granted. This PPA is intended to cover the time required to engage in pre-application discussions regarding the content of submissions to discharge requirements. It is intended that regular meetings would take place and any technical discussion required would be held in order for matters to be discussed prior to a formal submission being made against the DCO and before the statutory timescales set out within the DCO for discharging requirements are triggered. A draft of the delivery PPA is being prepared to be shared with LPAs. It is the intention of National Grid to secure the provision of a PPA document through a S106 agreement, with the intention that the agreed S.106 agreement being in place prior to the end of the examination. (See response to Action No. 31 in the Applicant's Response to OFH1 and ISH1 Hearing Action Points (Document 8.4.5)). National Grid will liaise with the Councils to agree this mechanism to secure the PPA's provisions through the S106 agreement. National Grid considers this approach will allow greatest flexibility for both parties to work together.</p> <p>In terms of fees payable, National Grid's response to written question 5.5.2 in Applicant's Response to ExQ1 (Document 8.9.1) confirms that the drafting of the draft DCO (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011] allows for the fees payable to discharge requirement to reflect any changes to the statutory fees regime.</p>
15	Conclusion	National Grid acknowledges the positive engagement with CYC to date and will seek to continue this engagement throughout the Examination process.

2.2 Leeds City Council

Table 2.2 – Leeds City Council

Reference	Topic	National Grid's Response
1-2	Context	The context of the Local Impact Report (LIR) [REP1-053] prepared by Leeds City Council (LCC) is clear and its understanding of the Project is accurate.
3-6	Site Description	National Grid considers that the site description within the LIR, provided by LCC which explains the existing electricity infrastructure and surrounding landscape within the LCC administrative boundary specifically, is accurate.
7	Planning History	National Grid notes the planning history.
8-14	Local Planning Policy	National Grid note that LCC has confirmed in Table 3.1 of the Statement of Common Ground between National Grid and Leeds City Council – Version 1 (Document 8.5.4) [REP1-024] that key policies of relevance have been considered in the submitted Planning Statement (Document 7.1) [APP-202] . In terms of providing further detail, in respect of the Bramham Cum Oglethorpe Neighbourhood Plan (2018 – 2033), National Grid has undertaken a review of Policy H2 “Bramham Moor Battlefield”. Bramham Moor Battlefield was scoped out of the assessment at an early stage in the Project due to the lack of any proposed groundworks or alteration to the appearance of the overhead lines in this area. It was not considered to be a concern through consultation with West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service, on behalf of LCC. The Order Limits extend into the site specified as Bramham Moor Battlefield in the Bramham Cum Oglethorpe Neighbourhood Plan (2018-2033) to allow for works to existing pylons XD006, XD007 and XD008 on the existing XD overhead line. As stated in Paragraph 3.4.24 of ES Chapter 3 Description of the Project (Document 5.2.3) [APP-075] this is in the case that design development indicates a need for works such as re-tensioning of the overhead line. Consequently, no intrusive works are anticipated, and there would therefore be no adverse effects on archaeological remains associated with the identified battlefield and there will be no change to the appearance of the existing overhead line. As a result of these factors, no adverse effects to Bramham Moor Battlefield will occur. Bramham Moor Battlefield was scoped out of the assessment at an early stage in the Project due to the lack of any proposed groundworks or alteration to the appearance of the overhead line in this area Therefore, the Project accords with the Bramham Cum Oglethorpe Neighbourhood Plan (2018-2033).
15	Strategic Impacts: Green Belt	<p>National Grid welcomes that the LIR makes clear that LCC agree that the reconductoring works to upgrade the existing XD 275kV overhead line within the Leeds administrative area would not have a greater effect on the Green Belt than the current infrastructure existing within the Leeds Green Belt. The only exception to this is “for where proposed works are required to provide permanent or temporary highway infrastructure and/ or mitigation”. National Grid acknowledges this comment and considers that any highway infrastructure would not have a negative impact on the Green Belt on the basis that the highways works in the LCC administrative boundary will be minimal and will utilise existing roads and bellmouths.</p> <p>National Grid also welcome that LCC agree with the very special circumstances put forward by National Grid. This is because they consider “<i>the intended positive purpose of the development proposal, as a whole, clearly outweighs the harm to the Leeds Green Belt and any other harm subject to the imposition of restrictive planning conditions on any Development Consent Order (DCO) and planning obligations contained in a S106 legal agreement.</i>”.</p> <p>National Grid confirm that a draft S106 has been circulated to LCC, and at the time of writing National Grid are awaiting feedback from LCC on this.</p>
16-18	Strategic Impacts: Landscape Character and Visual Impact	<p>The LCC response within the LIR identifies the relevant landscape and visual receptors within the administrative boundary and associated assessment of effects as reported in ES Chapter 6 Landscape and Visual (Document 5.2.6) [APP-078].</p> <p>LCC agree that visual clutter from pylons would only be experienced by landscape and visual receptors on the edge of Bramham and on Bramham Moor during the construction phase from the temporary pylons, however LCC state that there may also be opportunity for longer-distance views of the proposals site from “<i>parts of the eastern side of Bramham Village</i>”. National Grid notes that the settlement of Bramham including the eastern edge of the settlement is assessed in Table 6G.59 of Appendix 6G Visual Receptor Assessment (Document 5.3.6G) [APP-114] which acknowledges that “<i>ground level views towards the Project are available from the south-east end of the village off Aberford Road and Windmill Hill</i>”. The assessment concludes a Minor adverse effect on views from Bramham during the construction phase that is Not Significant.</p> <p>LCC state that during the operational phase as the XD001T pylon would be replaced by the XD001 pylon there is predicted to be little, if any, potential for additional visual clutter from pylons. LCC agree with National Grid's assessment that the effect upon views of the ~15m taller replacement pylon and the Cable Sealing End</p>

Reference	Topic	National Grid's Response
		Compound would be Minor Adverse or less and Not Significant on visual receptors within the LCC administrative boundary as reported in ES Chapter 6 Landscape and Visual (Document 5.2.6) [APP-078] .
19-20	Strategic Impacts: Archaeology	<p>The LCC LIR references Sections 7.32.1- 7.32.4 in ES Chapter 7 Historic Environment (Document 5.2.7) [APP-079] in relation to effects of the Project on identified archaeological remains within Bramham Moor. Whilst the identified archaeological remains described in Sections 7.32.1- 7.32.4 are within the Bramham Moor area, they are all outside of the site specified as Bramham Moor Battlefield in the Bramham Cum Oglethorpe Neighbourhood Plan (2018-2033). Instead, they specifically relate to cropmarks and a possible Roman Road in the area between Brick House Farm and the A659 road, as shown on Sheet 15 of 20, Figure 7.3 of ES Chapter 7 Historic Environment Figures (Document 5.4.7) [APP-182].</p> <p>The Order Limits extend into the site specified as Bramham Moor Battlefield in the Bramham Cum Oglethorpe Neighbourhood Plan (2018-2033) to allow for works to the existing XD overhead line. As stated in Paragraph 3.4.24 of ES Chapter 3 Description of the Project (Document 5.2.3) [APP-075] this is in the case that if design development indicates a need for works such as re-tensioning of the overhead line. No intrusive works are anticipated, and there would therefore be no adverse effects on archaeological remains associated with the identified battlefield and there will be no change to the appearance of the existing overhead line. As a result of these factors, no adverse effects to Bramham Moor Battlefield will occur. Bramham Moor Battlefield was scoped out of the assessment at an early stage in the Project due to the lack of any proposed groundworks or alteration to the appearance of the overhead line in this area. It was not considered to be a concern through consultation with LCC and West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that LCC has accepted the proposed approach to archaeological investigation and mitigation as described in Appendix 3C Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation (Document 5.3.3C) [APP-096] agreed with West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service.</p>
21-22	Strategic Impacts: Disturbance	<p>LCC considers that working hours should be restricted to 08:00 - 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 - 13:00 Saturdays, and not at any other time. LCC considers these restrictions to be necessary due to potential noise impacts, flare or lighting impacts, and/or impacts associated with vehicle movements, all of which could impact the living conditions of occupants of nearby properties in the LCC administrative boundary.</p> <p>LCC refer to ES Chapter 3 Description of the Project (Document 5.2.3) [APP-075], which refers to 'night-time working'. National Grid seeks to clarify that the proposed working hours are detailed in full in Schedule 3, Requirement 7 of the Draft Development Consent Order (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011]. This requirement significantly limits works that could take place outside of the core hours, and alongside the interpretation of 'start up and close down activities' in Schedule 3, Requirement 1 of the Draft Development Consent Order (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011], limits the scope of noisy activities outside of core hours. Part 2 of requirement 7 of the Draft Development Consent Order (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011] places further restrictions on piling operations, which have the potential to generate noise disturbance.</p> <p>In terms of the approach used to assess noise impacts, the assumptions for construction noise predictions for the night-time period are reported in Appendix 14B Construction Plant and Activity Assumptions (Document 5.3.14B) [APP-151]. Any plant running at night is assumed to be on all the time, with no time corrections applied. Therefore, the worst-case 1-hour assessment period used to characterise the night-time noise and applied across the night-time period is consistent with the standard methodology.</p> <p>The use of the phrase '<i>significant effects are unlikely as the duration of such activity is very limited</i>' relates to the nature of conducting works whereby there will be a very short duration of intensive works in one location for two or three nights and then the works move along the line. Therefore, the Project temporal criterion for significant effects is not triggered.</p> <p>Irrespective of whether the noise is significant in EIA considerations, where the temporal threshold is not triggered by night works, but the BS5228-1 Annex E threshold of significance for night (45 dB L_{Aeq,T}) is exceeded by 10dB (or more) at a sensitive receptor, there is a requirement in Appendix 3H Noise and Vibration Management Plan (Document 5.3.3H) [APP-101] secured through Requirement 5 of the Draft Development Consent Order (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011] to provide acoustic screening, and there is also the overarching requirement to work to Best Practicable Means (BPM). The nearest receptors within the LCC administrative boundary are 200m north and 330m south of the overhead line. As such this is further evidence that the likely impact upon LCC receptors from night time works will be of low magnitude and not significant.</p> <p>In terms of lighting impacts, as described in Appendix 3B Code of Construction Practice (Document 5.3.3B) [APP-095] measures regarding directional lighting for works within the Order Limits undertaken outside of the core working hours include: '<i>lighting will be used only when required and will comprise lighting of work areas and access and egress with portable, low level directional lighting positioned and directed to minimise glare and nuisance to residents.</i>'</p>

Reference	Topic	National Grid's Response
		<p>National Grid can confirm that the use of flares will not be required for any construction work. Limited construction works are proposed for the section of overhead line falling within the LCC administrative boundary (section 275kV Tadcaster Tee to Knaresborough (XD/PHG) overhead line between pylons XD004 and XD007). The section of overhead line between XD002 and XD007 is included in the Order Limits should further design development indicate works, for example re-tensioning of the overhead lines, be required, as stated in Paragraph 3.4.24, ES Chapter 3: Description of the Project (Document 5.4.3) [APP-075]. Therefore, the only construction works likely to take place during hours of darkness in the LCC administrative boundary would comprise the installation of scaffolding across Warren Road and the pulling of bonds across the scaffolding. These works would be of a short duration, for example, a single night to erect scaffolding across the road, and a single night to dismantle the scaffolding. It is not expected that conductor works will be required in this location and this worst case is provided as a precaution. The nearest receptors within the LCC administrative boundary are 200m north and 330m south of the overhead line. As described in Section 3.3 of the Statement of Statutory Nuisance (Document 6.5) [APP-201], there is limited potential for light pollution during construction as identified in the ES Chapter 3: Description of the Project (Document 5.2.3) [APP-075] and Chapter: 6 Landscape and Visual (Document 5.2.6) [APP-078]. A lighting scheme would be implemented through Requirement 6 of the Draft Development Consent Order (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011] to minimise the extent to which lighting associated with construction activity impacts residential and other receptors, as described in Appendix 3B Code of Construction Practice (Document 5.3.3B) [APP-095]. This strategy would be informed by the latest research and guidance. No significant lighting effects associated with the Project that could potentially generate a nuisance issue have been identified.</p> <p>In terms of vehicle movements, Requirement 7 of the Draft Development Consent Order (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011] does not allow for vehicle movements to take place outside of the core hours.</p> <p>LCC considers that a flexible approach to working hours could lead to public uncertainty and be unenforceable. National Grid considers that the proposed working hours set out in Schedule 3, Requirement 7 of the Draft Development Consent Order (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011] are clear and enforceable. Similar approaches have been taken in other National Grid Development Consent Orders (DCO) which have entered delivery, such as the Hinkley Point C Connection Project and Richborough Connection Project. The interpretation of the working hours set out in these DCOs has not presented confusion.</p> <p>In summary, the working hours proposed within the Draft Development Consent Order (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011] reflect the urgent need for the Project to be operational by 2027 in order to enable the connection of customers; ensure the connection of renewable generation without incurring significant constraint costs; facilitate net zero; and meet National Grid's transmission licence obligations, as set out in the Updated Need Case (Document 7.4) [APP-205].</p>
23-26	Strategic Impacts: Traffic and Transport	<p>National Grid acknowledges the comments provided by LCC regarding traffic and transport in paragraphs 23 to 26 of the LIR.</p> <p>LCC summarises details of the highways it maintains, which are considered within the assessment of transport impacts within ES Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport (Document 5.2.12) [APP-084]. LCC acknowledge that there are three vehicle accesses proposed within its highway area, at existing field access points, which is in line with Table 3.2 within Appendix 3F Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document 5.3.3F) [APP-099]. LCC notes two proposed Traffic Regulation Orders on Warren Lane as identified within the Traffic Regulation Order Plan Section D (Document 2.12.4) [APP-059] and with reference to Article 45 of the Draft Development Consent Order (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011]. Paragraph 24 of the LIR states duration of construction is likely to take place over 176 weeks subject to change. National Grid notes that the assessment of traffic and transport impacts was based on a forecasted 198-week construction programme. As can be derived from Appendix 12A Traffic Modelling Tables (Document 5.3.12A) [APP-148] construction traffic routing along Warren Lane is, as stated by LCC, anticipated to be 738 vehicle movements (consisting of 376 HGV movements and 362 LV movements) the majority of which occur between weeks 45 and 67. The peak traffic on Warren Lane is expected to occur in week 65 of the construction programme. The routing strategy summarised by LCC in Paragraph 23 is in line with that submitted within Tables 4.2 and 5.2 of the Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document 5.3.3F) [APP-099].</p> <p>Paragraph 25 of the LIR summarises the highways crossing on Warren Lane and provides agreement that the construction method mitigates disturbance to the public highway and removes the need for shuttle working and road closures. LCC notes agreement for a short rolling roadblock for netting installation where appropriate at scaffolding locations on Warren Lane, in line with Paragraph 6.2.2 of the Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document 5.3.3F) [APP-099].</p> <p>National Grid welcomes the agreement stated in Paragraph 26 of the LIR regarding Paragraphs 7.3.10 – 7.3.11 of the Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document 5.3.3F) [APP-099] and in the submitted Statement of Common Ground between National Grid Electricity Transmission plc and Leeds City Council – Version 1 (Document 8.5.4) [REP1-024]. LCC notes that it considers it necessary for the applicant to carry out highway condition surveys before and after construction for the length of Warren Lane. The committed highway condition surveys will assess the existing quality of the access routes and mitigation will be agreed post-works to return the local road network to a position of nil detriment, as stated within the Statement of Common Ground between National Grid Electricity Transmission plc and Leeds City Council – Version 1 (Document 8.5.4) [REP1-024]. National Grid consider these highway condition surveys to be covered within</p>

Reference	Topic	National Grid's Response
		Section 7.3.10-7.3.11 of the Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document 5.3.3F) [APP-099] and thus secured by Requirement 5 of the Draft Development Consent Order (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011].
27-28	Strategic Impacts: Agricultural Land	National Grid welcomes that the LIR makes clear that LCC considered that the effect of the Project on the agricultural land and soils within the LCC administrative boundary is Not Significant, with the embedded mitigation measures in place. As recognised by LCC the impact of the proposed works on agricultural and soils will be temporary, and it is considered that the Project will result in no permanent loss of agricultural land. LCC also recognises that the soil management practices outlined in the ES Appendix 3E Outline Soil Management Plan (Document 5.3.3E) [APP-098] are sufficiently informed by site specific soil information identified in Table 11.13 of ES Chapter 11: Soils and Agricultural Land (Document 5.2.11) [APP-083] to address site specific risks to the soil resources that will be impacted.
29	Strategic Impacts: Gas Networks and Utilities	LCC identifies that the Project lies in proximity to a number of third-party assets. National Grid has undertaken engagement with both National Gas Transmission and Northern Gas Networks, as reflected by the associated Statement of Common Ground between National Grid Electricity Transmission plc and National Gas Transmission plc – Version 1 (Document 8.5.19) [REP1-039] and Statement of Common Ground between National Grid Electricity Transmission plc and Northern Gas Networks Limited – Version 1 (Document 8.5.20) [REP1-040] . In addition, as noted by LCC, National Grid is aware that the Project is located within a National Grid Electric Control Zone.
30-32	Strategic Impacts: Biodiversity	National Grid acknowledges the comment in Paragraph 30 and the points made in Paragraph 31 of the LIR relating to Leeds Green Habitat Network. As identified in Appendix 3I Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Document 5.3.3I) [APP-102 to APP-104] tree T894 will not be affected and will be protected from harm. Trees T1079 and T1080 are not impacted by the current design but could be potentially affected if the design changes within the Limits of Deviation. Any change to tree impacts due to the final design would be captured by the Tree and Hedgerow Protection Strategy secured by Requirement 10 (1) of the Draft Development Consent Order (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011] which must accord with the submitted Appendix 3I Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Document 5.3.3I) [APP-102 to APP-104] and will be submitted to the relevant Local Planning Authority in advance of commencement of that stage of works, for approval. The detailed design and implementation of the Project will seek to further avoid or reduce impacts to trees where at all possible in line with embedded environmental measure Mitigation ID3 'Minimise land take and micro-site' as identified in Table 8.11, ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Document 5.2.8) [APP-080] . National Grid seeks to clarify that embedded environmental measures are set out in Section 8.6 of ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Document 5.2.8) [APP-080] . National Grid confirms that mitigation and/or reinstatement will be secured in accordance with Section 8.6 ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Document 5.2.8) [APP-080] and Appendix 3D Biodiversity Mitigation Strategy (Document 5.3.3D) [APP-097] . National Grid confirms that it is actively engaging with LCC regarding the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) including possible location for offsite delivery, and is seeking to secure gains via a Section 106 agreement which has been issued to LCC in draft form. National Grid welcomes the suggestion of potential locations for delivery such as at Green Habitat Network surrounding Bramham Substation, and this option will be further explored. National Grid has provided further details on its approach to BNG in its response to ExQ1 Q3.4.2 in Applicant's Response to ExQ1 (Document 8.9.1) . This response includes further detail of relevance to the points raised regarding delivery of BNG including the aim to achieve this within the same Local Planning Authority as the associated loss. National Grid is actively engaged with a range of stakeholders in order to identify opportunities to deliver meaningful BNG enhancements across the extent of the project. While it is National Grid's primary aim to deliver BNG within the same Local Planning Authority as the associated loss, as set out in the Statement of Common Ground between National Grid Electricity Transmission plc and Leeds City Council – Version 1 (Document 8.5.4) [REP1-024] , where this is not possible due to limited availability of suitable sites, or more favourable outcomes for biodiversity would be achieved by delivering BNG at a site outside the relevant Local Planning Authority, delivery of 10% BNG would apply across the extent of the Project rather than being split between Local Planning Authority areas.

2.3 North Yorkshire Council

Table 2.3 – North Yorkshire Council

Reference	Topic	National Grid's Response
1	Introduction	The introduction to the Local Impact Report (LIR) from North Yorkshire Council (NYC) is clear and sets out the basis for the provision of the LIR in accordance with the Planning Act 2008 (as amended) and the Planning Inspectorate's <u>Advice Note One</u> (Local Impact Reports).
2	Scope	National Grid considers that the scope of NYC's LIR is in accordance with the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note One.
3	Description of the Area	The LIR refers to the National Grid application document, (ES Chapter 3 Description of the Project, (Document 5.2.3), [APP-075]). Section 3.2 of this document provides an accurate description of the Project.
4	Planning Policy	National Grid acknowledge that NYC has identified the key National Policy Statements relevant to the Project. National Grid note that NYC has confirmed in Table 3.1 of the Statement of Common Ground between National Grid and North Yorkshire Council (Document 8.5.2) [REP1-022] that key policies of relevance from the development plans have been considered in the submitted Planning Statement.
5	Assessment of Impacts	National Grid considers that the description of the approach to assessment of impacts is in accordance with the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note One.
6	Principle of Development	<p>National Grid note that at paragraph 6.8 of the LIR [REP1-056] NYC state: <i>"The Application identifies the relevant adopted Development Plans against which the application is to be assessed in Section 5 'Legislation and Policy Overview'"</i>. In addition, NYC has confirmed in Table 3.1 of the Statement of Common Ground between National Grid and North Yorkshire Council (Document 8.5.3) [APP-022] that key policies of relevance from the development plans have been considered in the submitted Planning Statement. National Grid note that at paragraph 6.11 of the LIR [REP1-056] NYC consider that <i>"some elements of the scheme (e.g., the Pylons, overhead lines, any buildings, enclosures, boundary fencing or operational equipment) are structures which do not fall within the categories of paragraph 149 of the NPPF"</i>. NYC go on to state <i>"Other elements of the scheme such as underground cabling, ground works, engineering works, temporary construction sites etc., are engineering operations to which the Examining Authority should have regard"</i>. National Grid considers that all of the works (both temporary and permanent) required for the Project (including pylons, overhead lines, reconductoring, CSECs and substations) are "engineering operations" which fall under paragraph 150 of the NPPF.</p> <p>National Grid note that at paragraph 6.13 of the LIR [REP1-056] NYC consider <i>"that the proposal would not be consistent with Purpose c) set out under para. 138 of the NPPF which is "to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment"</i>. As such, it would conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. National Grid's assessment is that the pylons, overhead lines and reconductoring elements of the works preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it in line with paragraph 150 and paragraph 138 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) as described by NYC.</p> <p>The reasons why the pylons and overhead lines are not considered to affect openness are set out in paragraphs 7.3.73 and 7.3.74 of the Planning Statement (Document 7.1) [APP-202]. This explains that although overhead lines may occupy long corridors within Green Belt, they involve little physical change to the land through which they pass and leave a large majority of the land beneath them free from development and therefore open. As the pylons are of a lattice design and spaced up to approximately 360m apart, the perception of openness is maintained as one is able to 'see through' the widely spaced pylons and conductors to whatever is beyond. The reconductoring works to upgrade the existing XC 275kV overhead line would not have greater effects on the Green Belt than the current infrastructure (pylons and overhead lines) existing within the Green Belt. However, in the event that the Examining Authority or Secretary of State disagree with this view, National Grid consider that the need for the Project amounts to very special circumstances which outweighs any harm to the Green Belt as well as any other harm. These very special circumstances are set out below and in paragraph 7.3.98 of the Planning Statement (Document 7.1) [APP-202].</p> <p>In respect of the proposed substations and CSECs, whilst considered engineering operations that do not harm the purposes of the Green Belt, National Grid recognise by virtue of the density of the proposed infrastructure, and the size of its physical footprint, together with the requirement for security fencing, these works may be considered to be inappropriate development because they would not preserve the openness of the Green Belt. As explained above, National Grid consider that very special circumstances apply to the Project, and these very special circumstances would apply irrespective of whether the entire Project or part only is considered to be inappropriate development.</p>

Reference	Topic	National Grid's Response
		<p>National Grid note that at paragraph 6.16 of the LIR [REP1-056] that NYC consider the <i>“proposed project needs to be considered in the context of other developments allowed/proposed within the local area also within Green Belt, including, but not limited to, two applications granted permission in 2022 for battery storage facilities on land adjacent to the proposed Yorkshire Green project.”</i></p> <p>National Grid has undertaken a cumulative assessment in ES Cumulative effects, (Chapter 18:) [APP-090] of other developments and this included the two battery storage facilities. One of the battery storage facilities (immediately to the south east of the existing substation at Monk Fryston) was granted permission on appeal on 1st August 2022 (appeal ref: APP/N2739/W/2/3290256). The second battery storage facility (immediately to the south west of the existing substation at Monk Fryston) was granted permission on appeal on 1st December 2022. The cumulative assessment was undertaken on the basis that the second appeal would also be approved, on a precautionary basis.</p> <p>In the case of APP/N2739/W/2/3290256 it identified that cumulative effects would not be significant across all ES topics.</p> <p>In the case of APP/N2739/W/2/3300623 it identified that cumulative effects would not be significant across all ES topics, with the one exception - the views experienced by users of the public footpath to the south of the energy storage facility would be adverse significant. However, such effects would be significant regardless of the presence of the Project. Following the growth of mitigation planting along the southern boundary of the energy storage scheme the views of the Project and the majority of the closer energy storage scheme would be screened from the public footpath.</p> <p>In light of the above, National Grid has considered other developments in the Green Belt, and has been able to demonstrate the Project is acceptable in the Green Belt.</p> <p>National Grid welcome that NYC, at paragraph 6.18 of the LIR [REP1-056] <i>“acknowledge that this project is intended to support the production of energy from renewable sources”</i>. In addition, National Grid welcome that NYC, at paragraph 6.20 of the LIR [REP1-056] that <i>“the Authority is generally supportive of the project in principle, provided that and subject to the application of Green Belt policy and it being accepted that Very Special Circumstances are demonstrated to clearly outweigh the identified harm. The Authority notes the national need for energy security and provision and the national policy position contained in the National Policy Statements regarding energy”</i>.</p> <p>National Grid note that at paragraph 6.19 of the LIR [REP1-056] that NYC consider <i>“it is not clear to the Authority the extent of other harms at this stage and therefore it is not possible for it to give a view on the balancing exercise”</i>. National Grid has carefully set out the consideration of “other harm” in paragraphs 7.4.9 to 7.4.17 of the Planning Statement (Document 7.1) [APP-202]. It concludes <i>“Whilst CSECs and substations are also considered engineering operations which do not harm the purposes of the Green Belt, it is recognised they do not preserve openness. However, given the national need for reinforcement of the network to avoid constraint costs and support the net zero ambition (as summarised at paragraph 7.3.98 [of the Planning Statement (Document 7.1) [APP-202] very special circumstances have been demonstrated which outweigh the limited impact of these elements of the Project on the Green Belt such that development consent should be granted, thereby demonstrating these elements of the Project are in accordance with the NPPF paragraph 147”</i>. Paragraph 147 of the NPPF advises that <i>“inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances”</i> National Grid consider the Project is in compliance with paragraph 147 NPPF for the reasons set out above and in the Planning Statement (Document 7.1) [APP-202].</p>
7	Noise and Vibration	<p>The NYC Local Impact Report [REP1-056] states that there will be construction and operational noise impacts (7.2).</p> <p>In summary, NYC consider that there will be adverse construction noise impacts in the NYC area because such working hours are not aligned to those considered to avoid amenity impacts and NYC consider that the existing background sound impacts are not quantified for the purpose of understanding the magnitude of noise impacts. National Grid considers that the impacts will be mitigated and are not significant (Table 14.23, Document 5.2.14 [APP-086].</p> <p>The core working hours which have been proposed, represent the hours needed in order to complete the construction works required for the project to become operational in the required timescales.</p> <p>The proposed construction hours for the Yorkshire Green Energy Enablement Project are set out in Schedule 3 Requirement 7 paragraphs 1 to 3 of the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011]</p> <p>During ongoing engagement, NYC have identified concerns with respect to working hours for the shoulder periods (covered by Requirement 7 paragraph 3 clause (h)) and the core hours inclusion of Saturday 13:00 – 17:00, Sunday and Bank Holiday, 08:00 -17:00. It is understood that NYC agrees in principle with the other specific exclusion tasks (i.e. those covered by Draft DCO (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011] Requirement 7, Paragraph 3 (a)-(g), & (i)) being carried out outside the standard daytime hours.</p>

Reference	Topic	National Grid's Response
		<p>NYC are seeking to restrict core hours to 08:00 and 18:00 Mondays to Fridays and between 08:00 and 13:00 on Saturdays, with no work on Sundays and Bank Holidays. The justification for this presented by NYC at paragraph 7.7 of the LIR is that those hours “reflect those considered to safeguard residential amenity in the early mornings and into the evening”.</p> <p>Whilst NYC (and Selby District Council previously) has continued to reiterate this position, National Grid consider that it misrepresents the guidance within the Approved Code of Practice, British Standard 5228:2009 +A1:2014 part 1.</p> <p>BS 5228-1:2009 + A1:2014 ‘Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites – Part 1: Noise’ is the code of practice for construction noise approved under the Control of Pollution Act 1974. With respect to this project, the document has been used to form the basis of the noise and vibration management plan. BS5228 -1 recognises that the longer the duration of activities on a site, the more likely it is that noise from the site will prove to be an issue, assuming that Noise Sensitive Properties (NSPs) are likely to be significantly affected.</p> <p>The proposed working hours set out in the paragraph 14.8.11 of ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Document 5.2.14) [APP-086] have been developed with reference to, BS 5228-1:2009 + A1:2014 which does not specifically define daytime, evening, night-time or weekend periods. Furthermore, the standard does not identify any time period where construction activity would be precluded from a noise perspective. The code of practice does, however, provide an example, in Annex E, of how to consider these periods. Annex E does not impose any requirements but makes recommendations on the assessment of noise from construction activity. The method that has been used here, and on many other construction projects, is the “ABC method” described within the standard. The construction noise assessment periods presented as an example in the ABC method are: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Daytime: 07:00 – 19:00 weekdays and 07:00 – 13:00 Saturdays; • Evening and weekend: 19:00 – 23:00 weekdays, 13:00 – 23:00 Saturdays, 07:00 – 23:00 Sundays; and • Night-time: 23:00 – 07:00 every day. <p>Bank holiday hours are not specifically mentioned in the example time periods, but for the purposes of the proposed Project, they are considered to be equivalent to Sunday hours.</p> <p>Thresholds for significance are selected, whereby weekday (07:00 – 19:00), and Saturday morning (07:00 – 13:00) hours benefit from the highest threshold. That is to say that more noise can be tolerated in these hours. The next highest threshold is for evenings (weekday 19:00 – 23:00) and weekend hours (13:00 – 23:00 Saturdays, 07:00 – 23:00 Sundays).</p> <p>The most stringent thresholds are applied to the night-time period (all days 23:00 – 07:00). There are further modifications to the thresholds of significance for each period that depend on the measured ambient noise baseline, but as the Project is predominantly in rural areas, the lowest category of existing ambient sound level has been universally assumed without undertaking an extensive baseline investigation. This means that the lowest (most stringent) noise thresholds apply in each period for all receptors, which is considered to be a suitably precautionary approach to construction noise assessment. Therefore, ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Document 5.2.14) [APP-086] has applied the most stringent evening and weekend criteria for all main works that could be justified based on the approved code of practice.</p> <p>The assessment was also precautionary in that reasonable worst case plant assumptions were adopted and noise impacts from activities that the programme could allow to be operating at the same time have been considered additively.</p> <p>NYC acknowledge at paragraph 7.5 of the LIR that the construction noise assessment has been adequately undertaken, in accordance with the BS5228-1:2009 +A1:2014, Annex E, ABC method. However, paragraph 7.6 of the LIR then states “<i>the impacts have not been adequately addressed or mitigated in the application. The current proposals enable construction noise levels of between 45 and 81dB L_{Aeq,T} outside of hours considered to avoid amenity impacts. Moreover, whilst not quantified by the applicant, existing background levels at residential receptors are likely to be much lower than the predicted noise levels thus increasing the magnitude of such impacts</i>”.</p> <p>National Grid consider that this is an incorrect interpretation of the methodology and its implementation. The potentially very low ambient noise levels have been inherently considered within the construction noise assessment, with the selection of the most stringent Category A limit values.</p> <p>NYC may have inadvertently mischaracterised the influence of very low ambient noise levels with respect to significance of construction noise impacts as described by Annex E of BS5228-1.</p> <p>Paragraph E.3.2 of Annex E states “<i>Example method 1 — The ABC method</i>”</p>

Reference	Topic	National Grid's Response
		<p><i>Table E. 1 shows an example of the threshold of potential significant effect at dwellings when the site noise level, rounded to the nearest decibel, exceeds the listed value. The table can be used as follows: for the appropriate period (night, evening/weekends or day), the ambient noise level is determined and rounded to the nearest 5 dB. This is then compared with the site noise level. If the site noise level exceeds the appropriate category value, then a potential significant effect is indicated. The assessor then needs to consider other project-specific factors, such as the number of receptors affected and the duration and character of the impact, to determine if there is a significant effect.”</i></p> <p>Further description of the determination of significance is provided in paragraph E.3.3 in the comparable “5 dB change” method as follows:</p> <p><i>“Noise levels generated by site activities are deemed to be potentially significant if the total noise (pre-construction ambient plus site noise) exceeds the pre-construction ambient noise by 5 dB or more, subject to lower cut-off values of 65 dB, 55 dB and 45 dB from site noise alone, for the daytime, evening and night-time periods, respectively; and a duration of one month or more, unless works of a shorter duration are likely to result in significant effect. These evaluative criteria are generally applicable to the following resources:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • residential buildings; • hotels and hostels; • buildings in religious use; • buildings in educational use; • buildings in health and/or community use” <p>It can be seen that the underlying noise is not pertinent in this case, as the assessment has applied the lower cut-off values to represent the onset of significance which is the most conservative approach afforded by the approved code of practice.</p> <p>The sound level thresholds aligned with the onset of the significance in Annex E (Table E1) of BS5228-1 form the basis of the construction noise assessment and mitigation recommendations. These threshold values are reproduced within Appendix 3H Noise and Vibration Management Plan (NVMP) (Document 5.3.3H) [APP-101], with construction noise levels managed such that the thresholds of significance are not exceeded. This is secured under Requirement 5 paragraph 2 f) of Schedule 3 of the draft DCO (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011]. Fixed location worksites such as the substations, cable sealing end compounds (CSECs) and temporary construction compounds (TCCs) require works to be carried out over longer periods of time and encompass weekend work. For such locations, the more stringent “weekend and evenings” criteria have been used to determine mitigation requirements such that there are no significant residual effects from the works at any time.</p> <p>The core hours proposals are consistent with the approach proposed in BS5228-1, the approved code of practice. Adherence to the NVMP, and the BS5228-1 thresholds of significance structured within this document, are secured under Requirement 5 (f) of the draft DCO (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011], and worksites will be tightly controlled with mechanisms for additional mitigation to be required where noise generated by the works are higher than the thresholds of significance or where valid noise complaints arise. Also, it is considered that significant adverse impacts related to noise from the construction works will be avoided and any further restriction of working hours would add significant costs to the Project and delay the programme.</p> <p>Many activities on the linear aspects of the Project are of a short duration, such that, irrespective of the noise levels produced, the works will not trigger the temporal criterion for significance discussed in Section 14.9.17 of the ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Document 5.2.14) [APP-086], i.e. 10 days in any consecutive 15 days or 40 days in 6 months, and noise impact will therefore be not significant. Mitigation has been considered for such worksites and applied through the NVMP (Document 5.3.3H) [APP-101] where noise levels would be predicted to exceed the threshold values by a magnitude of 10dB or more at sensitive receptors. Mitigation (including screening) is secured via the NVMP under Regulation 5 paragraph 2 f) of Schedule 3 of the draft DCO (Document 3.1B) [AS-011].</p> <p>The core working hours proposed exclude start up and close down activities of up to one hour either side of the core working hours (often referred to as the “shoulder period”). It is understood that the shoulder period is an area of concern for the NYC EHO which is reflected in the LIR. It should be recognised that the shoulder period hours are required to cover, generally non-noisy elements of the job as defined in Schedule 3 Interpretation of the Requirements of the draft DCO (Document 3.1(B)) [AS011] such as: (a) arrival and departure of workforce and staff at site and movement to and from places of work; (b) general refuelling of plant; (c) site inspections and safety checks; (d) site meetings (daily briefings and quiet inspections/walkovers); (e) site clean-up (site housekeeping that does not require the use of plant); (f) general site maintenance; and (g) low key maintenance and safety checking of plant and machinery. The proposed shoulder periods are not to be used to start/finish</p>

Reference	Topic	National Grid's Response
		<p>construction activities other than those set out above, unless absolutely necessary (i.e. for safety reasons) and in any case the potentially noisy activities that would need to be undertaken in these hours fall under other specified provisions within Paragraph (3) of Requirement 7 of the draft DCO (Document 3.1(B)) [AS011].</p> <p><u>Operational Noise Impacts</u> Paragraph 7.8 of the LIR states <i>“The uncertainty concerning the difference between background sound levels and 37dBA operational noise levels creates a potential for significant operational noise impacts when assessed in accordance with recognised BS4142:2014+A1:2019 methodology”</i></p> <p>With respect to overhead line assessment and methodology, and in respect of the setting of appropriate trigger values, the method detailed in PS(T)134 (Document 5.3.14F) [APP-155] is based on a three-tier approach. Tiers 1 and 2 are based on predicted absolute noise levels for ‘worst case’ scenarios at distances either side of a proposed high voltage overhead line. Tiers 1 and 2 are screening tools to identify distances from the overhead lines where predicted absolute noise levels at noise sensitive receivers would be very low, such that, according to the method, a full BS4142-type assessment would be disproportionate and unnecessary i.e. the absolute sound from the overhead lines will not give rise to significant adverse impacts irrespective of the background sound level.</p> <p>The LIR refers to a >37dB criterion. The Tier 1 screening criteria (which applies to worst case wet noise only) is ≥34dB(A) as set out in Table 3.1 of Appendix 14E – Overhead Line Noise Assessment (Document 5.3.14E) [APP-154]. This is a worst-case screening tool which assumes worst-case wet noise occurs 100% of the time. The Tier 2 screening then considers wet noise and dry noise in combination, and a <36.8dB(A) criterion is derived (Table 3.2 of Appendix 14E (Document 5.3.14E) [APP-154] which takes into account annual average rainfall hours of 600 hours per year for the project area. It is assumed that it is this criterion (36.8dB rounded to 37dB) that the LIR refers to as the operational noise level.</p> <p>If the query relates to “dry noise” criteria, there may be a misunderstanding as to the prevalence of dry noise with respect to OHL. Dry noise is not present for all the time the weather is not wet, but rather occurs after long period of dry conditions, so would not be present often, even if the receptors in this case were close to the screening distance.</p> <p>Overhead line noise has mostly been scoped out of the assessment within the NYC area due to the fact that the reconductoring of the XC 275kV lines are a ‘like for like’ replacement and are not considered to give rise to any new operational noise effects. This is referenced within Table 14.4 of the noise and vibration chapter (Document 5.3.14) [APP-086], where the Planning Inspectorate states: <i>“On the basis that the fixtures and fittings used within the Proposed Development conform to the Technical Specification and Type Registration processes outlined in chapter 14 and therefore would result in no audible noise generation, the Inspectorate agrees that further assessment of this matter as part of the operation of the Proposed Development can be scoped out of the ES”</i></p> <p>The new sections of 275kV XC, XCP, SP and 400kV YN OHL are significantly distant from noise-sensitive receptors, with worst-case predicted rating levels (i.e. with tonal penalty applied) of 28dB (wet noise) being below the absolute levels that would constitute the onset of significance receptors When predicted absolute noise levels suggest there may be an adverse impact, which is not the case at any location within the Order Limits of the Project, (i.e. at distances within the Tier 2 screening area) a BS4142 assessment may provide additional useful context. When predicted absolute noise levels are low, as described here, then a BS4142 assessment would not affect the outcome. As part of the design process, embedded environmental measures have been adopted to reduce the potential for adverse noise and vibration effects. For the overhead lines these measures include selecting conductor configurations to minimise electrical stress (and hence audible noise), and routing new sections of overhead line away from Noise Sensitive Receptors (NSRs), as far as practicable.</p>
8	Landscape (AIA)	<p>National Grid acknowledges the points made by NYC in paragraph 8.4 to 8.7 of the LIR which align with the findings of the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Document 5.3.3I) [APP-102].</p> <p>National Grid confirms that the submitted scheme of new tree planting, hedgerow reinforcement and new hedgerow is limited to the Monk Fryston and Overton Substation sites and land at Tadcaster in proximity to two CSECs and these are detailed in the Outline Landscape Mitigation Strategy as Figures 3.10 to 3.12 of Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 3 Description of the Project Figures (Document 5.4.3(B)) [AS-017].</p> <p>This detail is limited to these locations because these are the locations of the most intensive works and more generally the final level of tree loss has yet to be determined and is likely to be refined and reduced during the detailed design process.</p> <p>National Grid confirms that this proposed planting ensures no net loss of tree cover (based on trees or hedgerows to be removed) and is focused on areas where the ES Chapter 6 Landscape and Visual (Document 5.2.6) [APP-078] has identified significant landscape and/or visual effects that have the potential to be mitigated by planting and/or earth mounding.</p>

Reference	Topic	National Grid's Response
		<p>As stated in paragraph 9.16 of the Local Impact Report, the final level of tree loss will be confirmed via the Tree and Hedgerow Protection Strategy secured via Requirement 10(1) of the Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011]. In addition, the scheme for mitigation planting is secured via Requirement 8 of the draft DCO and will be based on the final extent of tree and hedgerow loss. This will reflect the location and nature of removed trees and hedges and allow the most effective mitigation feasible.</p> <p>The Project will mitigate tree removals across the extent of the scheme (not just at substation or CSEC locations) and the approach to reinstatement planting is set out in ES Chapter 3 Description of the Project (Document 5.2.3) [APP-075] at paragraphs 3.6.59 to 3.6.61. This document explains that the majority of reinstatement planting would be at the same location as the loss apart from where it is not possible due to the infrastructure or associated easements and in those cases, a suitable location would be found as close as possible to the original planting.</p>
8	Landscape (LVIA)	<p>National Grid notes that NYC (at paragraphs 8.2 and 8.3 of the LIR) agree with the list of local plan policies detailed in Table 6.2 of ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual (Document 5.2.6) [APP-078] Policy NE7: Trees and Woodland of the Harrogate District Local Plan 2014-2035 is covered at Appendix 3I Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Part 1 of 3) (Document 5.3.3I) [APP-102].</p> <p>National Grid acknowledges that NYC (at paragraph 8.9 of the LIR) is generally satisfied that the DCO includes a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) to recognised guidelines, however this statement differs from the previous representation (RR032, Section 18.6) where the Authority state that <i>“The Authority is satisfied that the DCO Application includes an adequate Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) subject to further information as to how the applicant intends to address the mitigation of adverse effects on landscape receptors and visual receptors (judged as either Significant or Not Significant).”</i> National Grid will continue to engage with NYC to seek clarification of whether NYC have any concerns in relation to the adequacy of the LVIA and/or methodology adopted.</p> <p>National Grid acknowledge that NYC at 8.11 of the LIR wish to work on the detailed aspects of the landscape and visual mitigation plan to ensure an appropriate response in keeping with local landscape character and the opportunity to integrate with existing habitats in the vicinity. Opportunity was provided to NYC in April 2022 to review and comment on the draft mitigation proposals and the feedback received was incorporated into the Outline Landscape Mitigation Strategy as set out in Appendix 6B: Technical Engagement on Landscape and Visual Assessment (Document 5.3.6C) [APP-109]. National Grid clarify that the detailed landscape mitigation that accords with the Outline Landscape Mitigation Strategy is secured under Requirement 8 (1) of the Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011] which would be submitted to the relevant planning authority for approval.</p> <p>The localised significant landscape and visual effects that are predicted during the construction phase are referenced by NYC at 8.24 of the LIR where they consider that the LVIA does not seem to demonstrate iterative design or considered alternatives. National Grid draw attention to paragraph 6.6.3 of the ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual (Document 5.2.6) [App-078] where the options and selection process is cross referenced to ES Chapter 2: Project Need and Alternatives (Document 5.2.2) [APP-074]. The options of the principal infrastructure components considered comprising the CSECs, substations and new overhead lines considered are summarised in the Design and Access Statement (Document 7.2) [APP-203]. The preferred option for each principal infrastructure element was strongly influenced by consideration of the landscape and visual impacts accounting for the Holford and Horlock Rules. Additional landscape and arboricultural mitigation measures to reduce the adverse landscape and visual effects arising from the construction phase are detailed at Section 3.3 of the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (Document 5.5.3B) [APP-095]. National Grid draws attention to the construction phase mitigation that includes solid timber fencing to the perimeter of the construction compounds where there is the potential for views into the compounds from sensitive receptors at close range, as outlined at paragraphs 2.3.10 to 2.3.11 in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (Document 5.3.3B) [APP-095]. In addition, temporary grass seeded soil storage mounds would be implemented to screen views into the construction compounds as described in Measure LV01, Table 3.2 in the Code of Construction Practice (Document 5.3.3B) [APP-095]. It is considered that the solid fencing and temporary grass seeded earth mounding together provide reasonable and appropriate mitigation during the construction phase of the Project.</p> <p>National Grid consider that the potential addition of temporary fast-growing planting would have a limited role in reducing adverse visual impacts of the construction compounds both at close range and from more distant locations during the construction period when the proposals for 2.4m high solid fencing and soil storage mounds already proposed are considered. In addition, the inclusion of temporary planting may result in adverse impacts including the loss of additional agricultural land and/or the expansion of the Order limits, that could outweigh the limited benefit that temporary fast-growing planting could have over a relatively short period of time. Any expansion of Order limits would be difficult to justify from a compulsory acquisition perspective given the limited screening value such planting would provide. Maintenance access for potential temporary planting has also been considered, and in some locations, this could conflict with tree and hedgerow protection fencing or temporary soil storage e.g. at the western edge of the compound adjacent to the A659 at Tadcaster and between the northern edge of the eastern compound at Overton and the A19. Finally, the selection of fast growing species would typically result in a choice between willow/poplar or non-native conifers. Both planting options</p>

Reference	Topic	National Grid's Response
		<p>implemented to achieve screening of views of the construction compounds above a height of 2.4m (the solid timber fencing) would appear incongruous in the landscape character context where the construction compounds are located.</p> <p>National Grid notes the concerns expressed by NYC at 8.12 about <i>“the lack of mitigation to the perimeter of the Tadcaster Tee West facility as illustrated on Figure 3.11 Outline Landscape Mitigation Strategy (Document 5.4.3) [APP-164] particularly as it is visible from the A659”</i>. National Grid clarify that reinforcement of the existing hedgerow alongside the A659 is outlined as Target Note 2 on Figure 3.11. In practice ‘reinforcement’ would comprise thickening of the hedgerow and infilling of gaps where required and would include the planting of trees at 10m centres where services permit. It is considered that new planting to improve the screening function of the existing hedgerow would be effective in mitigating visual effects of the Tadcaster Tee West Cable Sealing End Compound (CSEC) experienced by users of the A659. In addition, the proposal to enhance an existing hedgerow and restore an existing hedgerow north of the Tadcaster Tee West CSEC would enhance landscape character by improving green infrastructure, as opposed to planting around the Tadcaster Tee West CSEC compound that would reinforce the compound shape. By contrast, the Tadcaster Tee East CSEC is located on an embankment with 1:2 slopes, adjacent to the A64 embankment and in this location scrub planting around three sides of the compound to soften the appearance of the earthworks profile is considered appropriate. The design of the mitigation planting scheme has been cognisant of the need to identify essential mitigation only, whilst maximising the retention of BMV agricultural land. It may not be possible to agree with the landowners, further loss of BMV agricultural land from a compulsory acquisition perspective to accommodate non-essential mitigation.</p> <p>National Grid acknowledge that NYC (at 8.13 in the LIR) wish to see further information and clarification for long term maintenance and management of proposed landscape mitigation including responsibilities and how the landscape mitigation is secured through the DCO. The Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011] secures the details of the five-year maintenance regime including monitoring and management under Requirement 8 (2)c. that National Grid consider is a sufficient period for the planting to become established.</p> <p>NYC identifies at 8.14 of the LIR the significant adverse effects on two landscape character areas (LCA’s) during construction and operation. NYC queries at 8.15 of the LIR the lack of evidence on how significant adverse effects will be addressed or mitigated, citing at 8.16 that <i>“paragraph 5.57 of GLVIA, the guidance states that proposals for preventing/avoiding, reducing or offsetting should be described, acknowledging that significant landscape effects after mitigation can remain”</i>. National Grid draw the Authorities attention to paragraph 6.14.1 and 16.14.2 of ES Landscape and Visual (Document 5.2.6) [APP-078] which acknowledges that a small number of significant long-term landscape and visual effects that are localised in nature would remain, following the growth of mitigation planting. This is to be expected for an infrastructure Project of this scale considering the fairly open and predominantly rural landscape context. The introduction of new overhead lines and pylons is part of the Project and whilst locally significant, would not set a precedent in either of the two LCA’s experiencing significant residual effects because both LCA’s already contain high voltage overhead lines and pylons. Paragraph 5.9.8 of NPS EN-1 describes how projects need to be carefully designed to minimise harm to the landscape and provide reasonable mitigation where possible and appropriate. Section 6.5 of the Design and Access Statement (Document 7.2) [APP-203] explains how the Project accords with National Grid’s guidance on routing and siting of Infrastructure and the Holford Rules to avoid landscape of the highest amenity value, with the measures adopted at an early stage of the Project, representing embedded mitigation.</p> <p>National Grid agrees with the summary of significant visual effects upon private and public receptors at paragraph 8.18 of the LIR, acknowledging at paragraph 8.19 that in terms of private receptors, mitigation proposals were either rejected by the owner or there was insufficient space to implement planting. There are ongoing discussions with the owners of Woodstock Wedding Venue as a socio-economic receptor to seek to agree a scheme via voluntary negotiations. NYC state at 8.20 there are currently no proposals outside the vicinity of the substations and CSECs for mitigation for public receptors. National Grid notes that the Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011] secures at Requirement 8(1)(a) a scheme for mitigation planting that accords with the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) (Document 5.3.3) [APP102-104], in addition to a detailed landscape strategy that accords with the Outline Landscape Mitigation Strategy is secured under Requirement 8(1)(b). Together, Requirement 8(1)(a) and 8(1)(b) cover the full extent of the mitigation to accord with the Outline Landscape Mitigation Strategy, AIA and subsequently the Tree and Hedgerow Protection Strategy (THPS), the details of which are secured under Requirement 10.</p> <p>NYC cites at 8.21 to 8.23 of the LIR that GLVIA best practice guidance should be followed, requiring mitigation proposals for significant visual effects, summarising that effects should not be ignored and those effects not considered significant will not be completely disregarded. National Grid confirm, with reference to ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual (Document 5.2.6) [APP-078] that no effects on receptors scoped into the assessment have been ignored, although it is clearly not possible to mitigate all significant visual effects, especially where localised sections of public rights of way and highways pass under new overhead lines and in close proximity to new pylons. GLVIA provides guidance and not a prescriptive approach and does not consider sector specific constraints on secondary mitigation with planting, including specific advice or feasibility of mitigating tall energy infrastructure including pylons, chimney stacks telecommunication masts and wind turbines. The restrictions on mitigation with planting for transmission infrastructure includes the inability to plant trees within easements for overhead lines and maintenance access</p>

Reference	Topic	National Grid's Response
		<p>required around pylon bases have been considered. Furthermore, even beyond easements, it would not be appropriate or reasonable to seek to prevent transient and localised significant views of pylons with extensive, tall and fast growing mitigation planting along recreational and highway routes, where such planting would not accord with the baseline character and would be neither reasonable or appropriate in accordance with the principles outlined at paragraph 5.9.8 of NPS EN-1. Mitigation to avoid potentially significant effects has however been carefully considered. Section 6.5 of the Design and Access Statement (Document 7.2) [APP-203] explains how the Project accords with National Grid's guidance on routing and siting of Infrastructure and the Holford and Horlock Rules to maximise separation distance between the new infrastructure and settlements where a potentially higher number of visual receptors occur, in contrast to transient effects experienced by users of recreational routes and highways. The design measures adopted at an early stage of the Project, to avoid potentially significant effects, including the consideration of alternatives represents embedded mitigation.</p> <p>National Grid acknowledges the comments made at 8.26 of the LIR regarding missing details on the photomontages including insulators, steel cross arms and substation structures. National Grid confirm this is not unusual at this stage of a project where full three-dimensional models of every infrastructure component are not designed in detail. National Grids' response to the detailed comments in Appendix A are set out below and National Grid continue to engage with NYC on this issue.</p>
9	Ecology and Biodiversity	<p>National Grid notes that NYC in paragraph 9.1 agree with the list of the local plan policies detailed in Table 8.1 ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity, (Document 5.2.8 [APP-080]).</p> <p>National Grid acknowledges the comments made about Overton Borrowpits SINC in paragraph 9.2 and confirms impacts will be minimised through embedded environmental measures as set out in Tables 8.11 and 8.12 ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity, (Document 5.2.8 [APP-080]) and Section 3 of Appendix 3D Biodiversity Mitigation Strategy (Document 5.3.3D [APP-097]).</p> <p>National Grid acknowledges the comments made in relation to broad-leaved semi-natural woodland in paragraph 9.3 and confirms impacts have been minimised wherever possible and habitat loss would be reinstated in accordance with embedded environmental measure; Mitigation ID11 Habitat reinstatement (Appendix 3A Embedded Measures Schedule (Document 5.3.3A [APP-094])), described in Table 8.11 ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity, (Document 5.2.8 [APP-080]) and paragraph 3.2.1 Appendix 3D Biodiversity Mitigation Strategy (Document 5.3.3D [APP-097]).</p> <p>National Grid notes that NYC welcomes the amendments to the Project design to avoid permanent impacts upon all ancient woodland and ancient/veteran trees in paragraph 9.4. National Grid confirms the detailed design stage will continue to ensure protection of these habitats through embedded environmental measures as set out in as set out in Tables 8.11 and 8.12 ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity, (Document 5.2.8 [APP-080]), Appendix 3A Embedded Measures Schedule (Document 5.3.3A [APP-094]) and Section 3 of Appendix 3D Biodiversity Mitigation Strategy (Document 5.3.3D[APP-097]).</p> <p>National Grid acknowledges the comments relating to hedgerows in paragraph 9.5 of the LIR and confirms that less than 1km of native hedgerow would be permanently lost as a result of the Project as set out in section 8.9 ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity, (Document 5.2.8 [APP-080]). Hedgerow loss would be mitigated by hedgerow planting and reinforcement which has been embedded into the Project as set out in paragraph 8.9.44 ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity, (Document 5.2.8 [APP-080]) and comprises approximately 1027m of new hedgerow planting which will lead to a net increase in hedgerow and approximately 849m of hedgerow reinforcement (comprising thickening, gapping up, and planting trees within existing hedgerows) at Overton Substation (Section B), Tadcaster (Section D) and Monk Fryston Substation (Section F) (see Outline Landscape Mitigation Strategy, Figures 3.10 to 3.12, (Document 5.4.3 [APP-164]) secured through Requirement 8 of the Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011])</p> <p>National Grid are currently engaging with local stakeholders and authorities regarding the delivery of BNG (see below for more detail on BNG), which will be secured outside of the DCO through a S106 agreement with the Local Planning Authorities. National Grid acknowledge NYC's suggestion of gapping up hedgerows throughout the Order Limits in paragraph 9.5 to contribute to the delivery of BNG. Whilst hedgerow enhancement on land within National Grid ownership has been embedded into the Project as described above (via the Outline Landscape Mitigation Strategy, Figures 3.10 to 3.12, (Document 5.4.3 [APP-164])), it may not be feasible to secure a 30-year management plan (required for habitat creation/enhancement to contribute to BNG) across the many relatively small individual parcels of land in private ownership within the Order Limits. However, National Grid can confirm that a 10% net gain (with a 30-year management plan) will be delivered by the Project including for hedgerows across relevant LPA areas for the Project overall as set out in Appendix 3D Biodiversity Mitigation Strategy (Document 5.3.3D [APP-097]).</p> <p>National Grid acknowledges the comments made on ponds and wet ditches in paragraph 9.6 and confirms the permanent loss of one pond as a result of the Project. As noted, the Outline Landscape Mitigation Strategy, Figures 3.10, (Document 5.4.3 [APP-164]) includes the creation of a new waterbody within the Oder Limits to the west of Overton Substation. As set out in paragraph 8.9.52 ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity, (Document 5.2.8 [APP-080]), the granting of the great crested newt</p>

Reference	Topic	National Grid's Response
		<p>(GCN) district level licence (DLL) would allow Natural England to create high quality replacement habitat in targeted areas to benefit the wider GCN population. National Grid acknowledge the use of the GCN DLL scheme is welcomed by NYC in paragraph 9.10.</p> <p>National Grid acknowledges the comments made in relation to impacts on ditches in paragraph 9.7 of the LIR. As detailed in paragraph 8.9.53 ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity, (Document 5.2.8 [APP-080]), National Grid confirms there would be temporary degradation of habitat and minor reduction in connectivity at ditches holding standing water in seven locations. Each of these ditches have low ecological value and the extent of affected ditch habitat would be approximately 6m in length in each case.</p> <p>National Grid acknowledges the points made in relation to habitats of principal importance in paragraph 9.8 and confirms that with the inclusion of embedded environmental measures such as ID3 minimise land take and microsite, ID6 maintaining habitat connectivity and ID9 protection of retained habitats, habitat loss and fragmentation would be minimised where possible. These measures are described in Table 8.11 ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity, (Document 5.2.8 [APP-080]) and paragraph 3.2.1 Appendix 3D Biodiversity Mitigation Strategy (Document 5.3.3D [APP-097]), and listed in Appendix 3A Embedded Measures Schedule (Document 5.3.3A [APP-094]). National Grid welcome the suggestion of using native species appropriate to the local area to provide an improvement in species diversity where appropriate, and as set out in Section 3.2 of the Appendix 3D Biodiversity Mitigation Strategy (Document 5.3.3D [APP-097]), National Grid confirm that that wherever possible, reinstatement would be back to the type of habitat affected using species-rich mixes to increase species-diversity in agreement with landowners.</p> <p>National Grid acknowledges the comments made regarding bats in paragraph 9.9 and confirms that supplementary information regarding post-DCO submission survey results will be provided to the Examining Authority at Deadline 2 (26 April 2023) (ES Chapter 8 Appendix 8H: Bat Survey Report, Document 5.3.8H(B)). National Grid has provided additional details on its approach to bats in its response to Q3.1.1 in Applicant's Response to Examining Authority's First Written Questions (ExQ1) (Document 8.9.1). This response includes further detail of relevance to the points raised regarding supplementary information to be provided.</p> <p>National Grid acknowledges the comments relating to otter and water vole in paragraphs 9.7, and 9.11 to 9.13 and notes that NYC welcome and support the embedded environmental measures proposed (e.g. pre-commencement surveys) to minimise impacts to these species. National Grid welcomes the comment in paragraph 9.13 that the embedded environmental measures set out in Tables 8.11 and 8.12 ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity, (Document 5.2.8 [APP-080]) are appropriate.</p> <p>National Grid acknowledges the points made in relation to Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) in paragraphs 9.14, 9.15 and 9.18. The approach to achieving BNG is in line with the 10 BNG Good Practice Principles for Development (Appendix A, Biodiversity Net Gain Report (Document 7.9 [APP-210])). National Grid has provided further details on its approach to delivering BNG (of relevance to the points raised in paragraph 9.15 and 9.18 of the LIR) in its response to Q3.4.1 in Applicant's Response to Examining Authority's First Written Questions (ExQ1) (Document 8.9.1), and the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between National Grid and North Yorkshire Council - Version 1 (Document 8.5.2) [REP1-022]. The approach described includes conducting additional surveys, calculations and assessments to inform two updated BNG reports at: 1) post-consent detailed design stage, and 2) following completion of construction based on the as-built design. National Grid is actively engaging with NYC regarding the delivery of BNG including possible locations for offsite works, and is seeking to secure gains via a Section 106 agreement (as suggested in paragraph 9.19) which has been issued to NYC in draft form. In addition, National Grid is actively engaged with a range of stakeholders in order to identify opportunities to deliver meaningful BNG enhancements across the extent of the Project. While it is National Grid's primary aim to deliver BNG within the same LPA as the associated loss, where this is not possible due to limited availability of suitable sites, or more favourable outcomes for biodiversity would be achieved by delivering BNG at a site outside the relevant LPA, delivery of 10% BNG would apply across the extent of the Project rather than being split between LPAs (in consultation with the affected LPAs). National Grid will continue consultation with the affected LPAs to identify suitable sites for BNG delivery in each authority, and where not possible in neighbouring authority.</p> <p>National Grid acknowledges the comments in paragraphs 9.16 and 9.17 with regards to the Requirements to secure biodiversity avoidance and mitigation measures set out within ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity, (Document 5.2.8 [APP-080]), and notes that NYC consider the Requirements in the Draft Development Consent Order (Document 3.3 [APP-066]) to be sufficient.</p>
10	Built Heritage	<p>National Grid acknowledges that in paragraph 10.6 NYC has provided no objections to the adequacy of the application/DCO, in terms of the approach taken in assessing the significance of and impact on built heritage. The policies stated in paragraph 10.1 of the LIR are consistent with those referenced in Document 5.2.7 ES Chapter 7 Historic Environment [APP-079] and the forthcoming ES Addendum document, which National Grid seek to submit at Deadline 3 (10 May 2023).</p>

Reference	Topic	National Grid's Response
11	Archaeology	National Grid acknowledges the statement in paragraphs 11.3 and 11.4 that the Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation (Document 5.3.3C) [APP-096] is a proportionate response to the expected significance of the archaeological remains, and that on balance the documents submitted represent an adequate assessment of the proposal on un-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest.
12	Highways and Transportation	<p>National Grid acknowledges the comments provided within the LIR regarding Highways and Transportation in paragraphs 12.1 to 12.15.</p> <p>Paragraphs 12.2 to 12.4 summarise access points information. It identifies that existing or new access points will be used for construction works, which is in line with Table 3.2 of the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (Document 5.3.3F) [APP-099]. At paragraph 12.3, NYC state a desire to be involved in order to understand the impact of the work on the road network and enable programming of streetworks. As committed to within the CTMP (Document 5.3.3F) [APP-099], which is secured by Requirement 5 of the draft DCO (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011], Section 7 outlines that agreement of traffic management (including but not limited to signage), detailed plans and implementation dates will be agreed with the relevant Local Highway Authority (LHA). Additional, Highway Works Requirement 14 of the draft Development Consent Order (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011] details that no vehicular access construction can commence until the access layout and design has been submitted to and approved by the relevant HA. The impact on the highways network is outlined within the ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Document 5.2.12) [APP-084].</p> <p>Paragraph 12.4 summarises the need for visibility splays to an approved standard. Agreement of the use of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges with NYC is outlined in Table 12.5, ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Document 5.2.12) [APP-084] and re-iterated in 3.9.1 of the Statement of Common Ground Document 8.5.2 [REP1-022]. The LIR states the LHA recognise some roads may need to be closed with diversion. For clarity, as stated in paragraph 7.2.1 of the CTMP (Document 5.3.3F) [APP-099] no road closures are proposed by National Grid and instead traffic management is proposed. The LIR, in paragraph 12.4 requires reassurance that bridging over roads is safe to undertake near the road network. However this is not intended, as stated in paragraph 6.2.2 of the CTMP (Document 5.3.3F) [APP-099] crossings would be undertaken using scaffolding and protected crossings of the road. This method has been used by National Grid safely on previous schemes nationwide.</p> <p>Paragraphs 12.5 to 12.9 regard substations and cabling sealing end compound. Paragraph 12.6 summarises that the access to the Overton substation is in line with the CTMP (Document 5.3.3F) [APP-099]. To confirm, HGV construction vehicles are currently expected to route to the Overton substation via the A19 corridor, however, it is currently proposed that any abnormal loads will be routed via the A64 and A1237, before approaching Overton substation on the A19 from the east, as outlined in the CTMP Section 3.6 (Document 5.3.3F) [APP-099]. The LIR states Overton Lane is likely to be closed at times to allow construction to proceed. As previously outlined in paragraph 7.2.1 of the CTMP (Document 5.3.3F) [APP-099] no road closures are proposed by the applicant. National Grid acknowledges that the vertical alignment of the A19 at Thormanby would be potentially unsuitable for wide or abnormal loads and engagement with NYC is ongoing.</p> <p>As identified in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (Document 8.3) [REP1-015], National Grid acknowledges the LHA comments in relation to the potential need for widening works on East Lane, however, this is unnecessary as Appendix 3F Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document 5.3.3F) [APP-099] requires that no HGVs use East Lane (with all trips originating from the B1363 and Corban Lane instead). In relation to Corban Lane, ES Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport (Document 5.2.12) [APP-084] acknowledges the presence of a 7.5 tonne weight restriction (although it must be noted that this excludes loading). Additionally, Appendix 3F Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document 5.3.3F) [APP-099] presents Swept Path Analysis for the B1363/Corban Lane junction in relation to the proposed Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) cable drum routing and did not identify a requirement for junction widening. National Grid's Response to Relevant Representations (Document 8.3) [REP1-015] also outlines that National Grid acknowledges the LHA comments in relation to the potential need for widening works on Rawcliffe Lane and the intersection with the A63. Again, Appendix 3F Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document 5.3.3F) [APP-099] presents Swept Path Analysis for the A63/Rawcliffe Lane junction in relation to the proposed AIL cable drum routing and did not identify a requirement for junction widening. Additionally, transport impact mitigation measures are outlined included in Section 7 of the CTMP (Document 5.3.3F) [APP-099], including paragraph 7.3.12 delivery management systems (DMS).</p> <p>National Grid welcomes the opportunity for continued proactive engagement with the LHA over future access to the proposed compound adjacent to Tadcaster (along with all other matters). Proposals for the Cable Sealing End Compound (CSEC) Tadcaster access are detailed in Annex 3F.A.4 of Appendix 3F Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document 5.3.3F) [APP- 099] and, as outlined previously, Highway Works Requirement 14 of the draft Development Consent Order (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011] details that no vehicular access construction can commence until the access layout and design has been submitted to and approved by the relevant HA.</p> <p>Paragraphs 12.10 to 12.12 of the LIR provide commentary on progressing the scheme. As previously noted, the management of traffic at access points will be agreed with the LHA in accordance with Section 7 of the submitted CTMP (Document 5.3.3F) [APP-099]. As outlined in section 18.7 of Applicant's Response to Relevant</p>

Reference	Topic	National Grid's Response
		<p>Representations (Document 8.3) [REP1-015] National Grid do not consider it necessary to provide a Construction Travel Plan, as the rural location of the Project means there will be a dependence on vehicular transport for construction staff. Furthermore, the construction sites are dispersed and there needs to be flexibility to allow inter-site travel. A Transport Co-ordination Officer (TCO) can, through the CTMP (Document 5.3.3F) [APP-099], encourage contractors to demonstrate how they will get staff to site in multi-occupancy vehicles where feasible. National Grid have committed to appointing a TCO to implement the CTMP and liaise with Principal Contractors' TCOs, as identified in paragraph 8.1.2 of the Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document 5.3.3F) [APP-099]. Discussions with NYC are ongoing to confirm that amendments are not required to the management plans. It is acknowledged that the LHA expects to see a phasing programme within the construction management plan. As outlined in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (Document 8.3) [REP1-015], Requirement 4 of the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011] necessitates that a written scheme setting out the stages of the authorised development be submitted to the relevant planning authority. It is acknowledged that settlements are avoided as much as possible and road closures avoided, which is in line with the CTMP (Document 5.3.3F) [APP-099]. Mitigation measures to minimise the impact of HGV movements is detailed in Section 7 of that document. As shown in Figure 12.11 (Document 5.4.12) [APP-188] HGV construction traffic will not route through the settlements of Hillam or Monk Fryston. HGV construction traffic will route through Lumby, however these movements will be limited in number and duration as, per Table 4.2 (Document 5.3.3F) [APP-099] as only one access point is reached via Lumby, Butts Lane.</p> <p>Paragraphs 12.13 to 12.15 concern the adequacy of the Application/DCO. National Grid welcome the Local Highway Authority statement of satisfaction that the development accords with local and national policy and that it can be managed on the highways network in collaboration with the LHA.</p> <p>The LHA outlines, in paragraph 12.15, that the CTMP and CWTP documents are agreed in principle and the draft DCO requirements will ensure traffic management and travel plans will be approved by the LHA prior to commencement of the development. A CTMP is provided in (Document 5.3.3F) [APP-099] which is secured by Requirement 5 of the draft Development Consent Order (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011] within which it is noted that there will be further engagement with the LHA with regards mitigation strategies concerning construction traffic and detailed traffic management proposals, as stated in paragraphs 7.1.2, 7.2.4 and 7.2.5 of the CTMP (Document 5.3.3F) [APP-099]. As previously outlined National Grid do not consider a Construction Worker Travel Plan to be necessary.</p>
13	Public Rights of Way	<p>National Grid acknowledges the statements in paragraphs 13.1 to 13.3 relating to Public Rights of Way. The LIR summarises that a significant number of footpaths and bridleways are affected by the scheme which are outlined in the Public Rights of Way Management Plan (PRoWMP) (Document 5.3.3G) [APP-100]. Within the PRoWMP Table 3.1 (Document 5.3.3G) [APP-100] 11 footpaths and 15 bridleways and 3 ORPAs are identified as being temporarily impacted during the construction phase of the development across the whole scheme. NYC are welcoming of the opportunity to refine the PRoWMP over the application's course, and further engagement with NYC is welcomed by National Grid. The PRoWMP Section 3 (Document 5.3.3G) [APP-100] includes commitment to discuss management, including inspections and post-construction reinstatement if required, with the relevant Rights of Way Officer. National Grid notes that NYC expect local requirements for the temporary closure and diversion of footpaths and bridleways to be taken into account. Within the PRoWMP there is a commitment to engage with the relevant Rights of Way Officers, as previously discussed, which will ensure management measures regarding PRoWs are agreed with the relevant Local Authority. The PRoWMP is secured by Requirement 5 of the draft DCO (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011].</p>
14	Air Quality and Emissions	<p>NYC acknowledges that there is the potential for air quality impacts at human receptors during construction and at operational phase, in line with the submitted air quality assessment (ES Chapter 13: Air Quality (Document 5.2) [APP-085]). In paragraphs 14.3 and 14.4 the LIR concludes that the Council are in agreement with the conclusions of the assessment, that state that impacts from construction dust are addressed through the submission of the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (Document 5.3) [APP-095]. Furthermore, operational traffic flows are not significant and are not likely to impact to local air quality.</p>
15	Hydrology and Flood Risk	<p>NYC state in paragraph 15.1 that the most up-to-date policy in relation to flooding matters is "<i>the overarching principles set out in the Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan and national planning policy contained within Chapter 14 of the NPPF</i>". National Grid note that national planning policy as well as relevant Local Plan documents from all three predecessor district councils (Hambleton, Harrogate and Selby) were reviewed in the process of preparing Environmental Statement Chapter 9 Hydrology (Document 5.2.9) [APP-081] and Appendix 9D Flood Risk Assessment (Document 5.3.9D) [APP-138]. As a consequence, National Grid is confident that the relevant assessments have been prepared in a manner that is consistent with current national and local planning policy requirements with regard to hydrology and flood risk.</p> <p>At paragraph 15.2, NYC states that "<i>The Lead Local Flood Authority looks forward to developing the outline plans in due course.</i>" National Grid notes that a commitment to develop a Drainage Management Plan (DMP) for the Project post-grant of the DCO is secured via Requirement 6(1)(b) of the Draft Development Consent Order (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011]. Requirement 6(4) specifies that the DMP "<i>must contain written details of the surface and foul water drainage system (including means of pollution control) for both permanent and temporary works, and any surface or foul water drainage system must be constructed in accordance with the details approved by the relevant planning authority ... following consultation with the relevant drainage authority.</i>" NYC is the relevant drainage authority (in its role</p>

Reference	Topic	National Grid's Response
		<p>as Lead Local Flood Authority) for those parts of the Project Order Limits that are situated within the NYC council area but which are outside Internal Drainage Board (IDB) administrative boundaries, as outlined below.</p> <p>In paragraph 15.3, NYC observes that “<i>Part of the application falls within the administrative boundary of the Shire Group of IDBs (Selby Area IDB) to whose opinion as local risk management authority the Local Lead Flood Authority would defer.</i>” National Grid note that the Order Limits intersect with the administrative boundaries of three (IDBs), as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section A in and around Osbaldwick substation to the east of York is located within the Foss IDB’s area (within the City of York Council area); • Part of Section B to the north-east of the River Ouse is located within the Kyle and Upper Ouse IBD’s area (within the former Hambleton District Council part of the NYC area); and • Part of Section B to the south-west of the River Ouse and most of Section C intersect with the Ainsty IBD’s area (falling across the former Harrogate District Council part of the NYC area, as well as part of the City of York Council area). <p>Although the remainder of the Order Limits (the southern part of Section C, and the whole of Sections D, E and F) is located within the former Selby District Council area, no part of the Order Limits falls within the administrative area of the Selby IDB. Therefore, National Grid has not consulted with the Selby IDB on its proposals. However, it has consulted with the three IDBs noted above, and has agreed preliminary Statements of Common Ground (SoCGs) with each of them for Deadline 1 of the Examination, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between National Grid Electricity Transmission plc and Ainsty Internal Drainage Board - Version 1 (Document 8.5.12) [REP1-032]; • Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between National Grid Electricity Transmission plc and Kyle and Upper Ouse Internal Drainage Board - Version 1 (Document 8.5.13) [REP1-033]; and • Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between National Grid Electricity Transmission plc and Foss Internal Drainage Board - Version 1 (Document 8.5.16) [REP1-036]. <p>These SoCGs set out the parties’ positions with respect to matters affecting runoff management and permitting of works in and around ordinary watercourses within the IDB areas. National Grid is committed to further consultation with the IDBs to ensure that as many matters as possible are agreed between the parties before the Examination concludes.</p>
16	Minerals and Waste Planning	<p>National Grid acknowledges the commentary provided by NYC, which explains that (i) the main issue is the consideration of mineral safeguarding, and (ii) the assessments undertaken demonstrate that the Project would not cause an increase in mineral sterilisation.</p> <p>NYC’s comments that there will be no additional sterilisation are fully consistent with National Grid’s assessment of the effects (i.e. that there will be no significant mineral sterilisation effects) provided in the Mineral Resource Assessment (Document 7.10) [APP-211], the conclusions of which have been agreed in writing by NYC as documented in Deadline 1 Submission – 8.5.2 Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between National Grid Electricity Transmission plc and NYC – Version 1 (Document 8.5.2) [REP1-022].</p>
17	Ground Conditions	<p>National Grid acknowledges and agrees with the conclusions of the Local Impact Report that “<i>The local impact has been adequately assessed and the proposed mitigation is acceptable</i>” and that “<i>With the implementation of the mitigation measures, no significant residual effects are anticipated in relation to ground conditions</i>”.</p> <p>National Grid acknowledges the reference in paragraph 17.4 that “<i>if any unexpected land contamination is found during the works, it must be investigated and remediated appropriately to protect human health, controlled waters and the wider environment</i>”. Requirements 5 & 12 of the draft DCO (Document 3.1(B) [AS-011] secure the investigation and remediation of unexpected contamination. National Grid has provided further details on this in Table 2.18 (Response Reference 18.3) of Deadline 1 Submission - Applicant’s Response to Relevant Representations (Document 8.3) [REP1-015].</p>
18	Adequacy of the DCO	<p>NYC state that they may request further alterations to the draft DCO (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011] through the examination process. This is noted, and National Grid would urge any points not previously provided to be raised as soon as possible, so discussions can commence.</p>

Reference	Topic	National Grid's Response
		<p>In particular NYC identify a number of durations associated with the Discharge of Requirement (DoR) process set out in Schedule 4 of the Draft DCO (Document 3.1(B)) [AS-011], which they consider should be extended.</p> <p>As detailed in the written response to question 5.5.1 (Document 8.9.1), the durations proposed reflect the urgent need for the Project to be operational by 2027 in order to enable the connection of customers; ensure the connection of renewable generation without incurring significant constraint costs; facilitate net zero; and meet National Grid's transmission licence obligations, as set out in the Updated Needs Case (Document 7.4) [APP-205].</p> <p>As detailed in the written response to question 5.5.1 (Document 8.9.1), to ensure the durations proposed in the Draft DCO are achievable, National Grid seeks to agree a pre-application advice process with the host Local Planning Authorities, which would be secured through a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA). This approach has worked successfully on previous National Grid projects such as Hinkley Point C Connection DCO and Richborough DCO.</p> <p>As such, National Grid consider that this tried and tested mechanism is appropriate for the Yorkshire GREEN Project. National Grid will continue to seek to discuss this PPA to cover the deliver phase of the Project with the host Local Planning Authorities, to ensure all parties are satisfied. National Grid will also liaise with the Councils to agree a mechanism to secure this, such as through a S106 agreement.</p>
Appendix A	Appendix A - Potential Inaccuracies in Photomontages	<p>National Grid consider that none of the omissions noted by NYC, and covered in detail below, could have a bearing on the judgements made in the LVIA. Attention is drawn to paragraph 1.2.12 of Technical Guidance Note TGN 06/19 where the Landscape Institute states, <i>“the degree of detail shown will typically be relative to the design and/or planning stage that has been reached”</i> and at 1.2.13 <i>“Two-dimensional visualisations, however detailed and sophisticated, can never fully substitute what people would see in reality. They should, therefore, be considered an approximation of the three-dimensional visual experiences that an observer might receive in the field.”</i> In terms of Type 3 photomontages and photowires TGN06/19 states at 4.4.3 that: <i>“Type 3 visualisations are intended to represent design, form and context to a reasonable degree of objectivity and accuracy, one which can be understood and relied on by competent authorities and others”</i>.</p> <p>Figure 6.28b - Viewpoint 4: View northwest from Public Bridleway along River Ouse, Document 5.4.6, [APP-168] National Grid do not agree with NYC that the proposed overhead line infrastructure appears to be incomplete in the photomontage.</p> <p>Figure 6.32b - Viewpoint 5: View north from Public Footpath near Moorlands Farm, Document 5.4.6, [APP-169]. National Grid agree with NYC that the proposed overhead line infrastructure is incomplete in the photomontage, noting that this affects a very small portion of the view (~7 horizontal degrees) in the far left side of the photomontage that is barely discernible. The full visibility of the overhead line connecting the pylons has been accounted for and this does not affect the landscape and visual magnitude of change assessment or the significance of effect</p> <p>Figure 6.47b – Viewpoint 14: View east from National Cycle Route 65, Overton Road near Overton Grange, Document 5.4.6, [APP-174]. National Grid acknowledge the comment by NYC that the overhead line tower structures appear incomplete and that the insulators have not been included. The depiction of the infrastructure reflects the 3D model prior to commencement of detailed engineering design. Whilst the insulators and some of the minor internal steel lattice work is not shown, this does not affect the magnitude of change assessment or the significance of effect.</p> <p>Figure 6.48b - Viewpoint 14: View southeast from National Cycle Route 65, Overton Road near Overton Grange, Document 5.4.6, [APP-174]. National Grid acknowledge the comment by NYC that the overhead line tower structures appear incomplete in their representation and the insulators have not been included. The depiction of the infrastructure reflects the 3D model prior to commencement of detailed engineering design. Whilst the insulators and some of the minor internal steel lattice work is not shown, this does not affect the this does not affect the landscape and visual magnitude of change assessment or the significance of effect.</p> <p>Figure 6.50b - Viewpoint 14: View northwest from National Cycle Route 65, Overton Road near Overton Grange, Document 5.4.6, [APP-174]. The overhead line tower structures appear incomplete in their representation and the insulators have not been included. National Grid acknowledge the comment by NYC that the overhead line tower structures appear incomplete in their representation and the insulators have not been included. The depiction of the infrastructure reflects the 3D model prior to commencement of detailed engineering design . Whilst the insulators and some of the minor internal steel lattice work is not shown, this does not affect the magnitude of change assessment or the significance of effect.</p> <p>Figure 6.51a Viewpoint 15: View east from National Cycle Route 65, Overton Road, near junction with A19 Grange, Document 5.4.6, [APP-175] NYC state that they are not clear as to whether the viewpoint location on the map corresponds to the baseline photograph. National Grid can confirm that the viewpoint location on the map corresponds with the baseline photograph.</p>

Reference	Topic	National Grid's Response
		<p>Figure 6.51b & c, Viewpoint 15: View east from National Cycle Route 65, Overton Road, near junction with A19 Grange, Document 5.4.6, [APP-175]. NYC state that there appears to be a tarmac surface in the foreground, however we are not clear as to what that represents. National Grid confirm this surface is part of the proposed bellmouth and permanent access road to the Overton Substation. NYC state that the overhead line pylon structures appear incomplete in their representation and the insulators have not been included. National Grid confirm that the depiction of the infrastructure reflects the 3D model prior to commencement of detailed engineering design. Whilst the insulators and some of the minor internal steel lattice work is not shown, this does not affect the magnitude of change assessment or the significance of effect.</p> <p>Figure 6.52b & c, Viewpoint 15: View south from National Cycle Route 65, Overton Road, near junction with A19 Grange, Document 5.4.6, [APP-175]. NYC state that some of the overhead line pylon structures appear incomplete in their representation and the insulators have not been included. National Grid confirm that the depiction of the infrastructure reflects the 3D model prior to commencement of any detailed engineering design. Whilst the insulators and some of the minor internal steel lattice work is not shown, this does not affect the magnitude of change assessment or the significance of effect.</p> <p>Figure 6.54b Viewpoint 16: View northeast from Public footpath near western edge of Shipton-by-Beningbrough, Document 5.4.6, [APP-176]. NYC state that a large part of the photo panorama includes a hedgerow in the foreground which screens views of the wider landscape. National Grid note that the photography was consulted upon and in the absence of any specific feedback the locations were stated to be agreed at Meeting #1 under item 3, as set out in Appendix 6B Technical Engagement of LVIA, Document 5.3.6B, [APP-109]. In addition, National Grid notes that the length of the public footpath in the view is flanked by a continuous hedge and relocation of the viewpoint along the footpath near the edge of the settlement would not have materially altered the view presented. NYC state that the insulators to the overhead line pylon structure have not been included. National Grid confirm that the depiction of the infrastructure reflects the 3D model prior to commencement of detailed engineering design. Whilst the insulators and some of the minor internal steel lattice work is not shown, this does not affect the magnitude of change assessment or the significance of effect.</p> <p>Figure 6.55b Viewpoint 16: View southeast from Public footpath near western edge of Shipton-by-Beningbrough, Document 5.4.6, [APP-176]. NYC state that the insulators to the overhead line tower structures have not been included. National Grid confirm that the depiction of the infrastructure reflects the 3D model prior to commencement of detailed engineering design. Whilst the insulators and some of the minor internal steel lattice work is not shown, this does not affect the magnitude of change assessment or the significance of effect.</p> <p>Figure 6.59b Viewpoint 19: Garnet Lane near Red Brick House Farm Photomontage: Year 0 and Year 15, Document 5.4.6, [APP-178]. NYC state that there is an incorrect representation of pylon XD001, in that the insulators are not showing. National Grid confirm that the depiction of the infrastructure reflects the 3D model prior to commencement of detailed engineering design. Whilst the insulators and some of the minor internal steel lattice work is not shown, this does not affect the magnitude of change assessment or the significance of effect.</p> <p>Figure 6.60b & c, Viewpoint 20: A659, Document 5.4.6, [APP-178]. NYC state that the new pylon appears incomplete in its representation and the insulators have not been included and in addition, the cables do not align (above the Tadcaster road sign). National Grid confirm that the depiction of the infrastructure reflects the 3D model prior to commencement of detailed engineering design. Whilst the insulators and some of the minor internal steel lattice work is not shown, this does not affect the magnitude of change assessment or the significance of effect. National Grid acknowledge that the overhead cables do not full align either side of the tree above the Tadcaster road sign as the cables in the far left of the view are the existing cables and the proposed cables would be marginally higher. This minor discrepancy does not affect the magnitude of change assessment or the significance of effect.</p> <p>Figure 6.65b Viewpoint 25: View southeast from Junction of Rawfield Lane and A63, Document 5.4.6, [APP-180]. NYC comment that it is an unfortunate photo selection as the group of pylons and cablescape are clipped at the right-hand side of the panorama. The selection is stated to reduce the adverse impact of the photo. New pylons are stated to appear incomplete in their representation and the insulators have not been included. National Grid note that Viewpoint 25 in Figure 6.65b presents a full 180-degree view of the road corridor and should be read in conjunction with Figure 6.66b taken from the same location. There is no addition of new infrastructure at the junction of the two sheets and consequently National Grid do not agree that the adverse impact of the Project has been reduced. National Grid note that the photography was consulted upon and in the absence of any specific feedback the locations and depiction of views were stated to be agreed at Meeting #1 under item 3, as set out in Appendix 6B Technical Engagement of LVIA (Document 5.3.6B) [APP-109]. National Grid confirm that the depiction of the infrastructure reflects the 3D model prior to commencement of any detailed engineering design. Whilst the insulators and some of the minor internal steel lattice work is not shown, this does not affect the magnitude of change assessment or the significance of effect.</p> <p>Figure 6.66b Viewpoint 25: View southwest from Junction of Rawfield Lane and A63, Document 5.4.6, [APP-180] NYC state that the new pylons appear incomplete in their representation and the insulators have not been included. National Grid confirm that the depiction of the infrastructure reflects the 3D model prior to</p>

Reference	Topic	National Grid's Response
		<p>commencement of detailed engineering design. Whilst the insulators and some of the minor internal steel lattice work is not shown, this does not affect the magnitude of change assessment or the significance of effect.</p> <p>Figure 6.67b Viewpoint 26: Rawfield Lane near Bay Horse Farm, Document 5.4.6, [APP-180] NYC state that the new pylons appear incomplete in their representation and the insulators have not been included. National Grid confirm that the depiction of the infrastructure reflects the 3D model prior to commencement of detailed engineering design. Whilst the insulators and some of the minor internal steel lattice work is not shown, this does not affect the magnitude of change assessment or the significance of effect.</p> <p>Figure 6.68b Viewpoint 27: Public Bridleway near A1246, Document 5.4.6, [APP-181]. NYC state that the new pylons appear incomplete in their representation and the insulators have not been included. National Grid confirm that the depiction of the infrastructure reflects the 3D model prior to commencement of detailed engineering design. Whilst the insulators and some of the minor internal steel lattice work is not shown, this does not affect the magnitude of change assessment or the significance of effect.</p> <p>Figure 6.70b Viewpoint 29: Public bridleway on eastern edge of Moor Monkton, Document 5.4.6, [APP-181]. NYC state that the new pylons appear incomplete in their representation and the insulators have not been included. National Grid confirm that the depiction of the infrastructure reflects the 3D model prior to commencement of detailed engineering design. Whilst the insulators and some of the minor internal steel lattice work is not shown, this does not affect the magnitude of change assessment or the significance of effect.</p>
Appendix B	Appendix B – Public Rights of Way, Local Guidance	<p>National Grid acknowledges the provision of the local guidance for Public Rights of Way provided in the LIR Appendix B. A Public Rights of Way Management Plan (PRoWMP) has been submitted as Document 5.3.3G [APP-100] which is secured by Requirement 5(e) of the draft DCO (Document 3.1(B) [AS-011]). The PRoWMP, Section 3 (Document 5.3.3G [APP-100]), outlines that further engagement will be undertaken with the relevant Local Authority Rights of Way Officer to ensure PRoWs impacted by the proposed development during the construction programme, have mitigation measures agreed with the Rights of Way Officer(s) in place.</p> <p>The draft Statement of Common Ground with the Local Highway Authority (Document 8.5.2) outlines the agreed position between NYC and National Grid that the PRoWMP appropriately reflects the mitigation required to protect PRoWs with the PRoWMP (Document 5.3.3G [APP-100]) agreed in outline with the expectation for further development as the application progresses.</p>

