



Examining Authority Written Questions (ExQ2) – Response from City of York Council

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

**Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN20024**

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

Submission Made at Deadline 5  
July 2023

**Yorkshire Green Project – ExAQ2 Written Questions  
City of York Council – Submission Deadline 5**

Q	Question	CYC Comment/Response
Q1.3.2	<p><b>Illustrative Plan: SP005 Access During Construction Phase [REP4-026], Appendix D</b></p> <p>a) Is this the level of detail that you would find useful post consent as part of the THPS?</p> <p>b) If not, what else would be of use?</p>	<p>CYC Highways advise that these plans would be insufficient post consent. The utility or their contactors will be required to enter into a Section 184 Licence agreement or Section 278 Agreement (Highways Act 1980), which will require fully detailed construction drawings.</p>
Q4.2.5	<p><b>Land interests within the local highway network</b></p> <p>National Highways (NH) post hearing submission from CAH1, says that the objection extends to NH land interests located within the local highway authority network and that the local highway authority shares NH concerns around uncontrolled powers being granted in, on, over or adjacent to the highway network [REP4-029], para 4.5.</p> <p>North Yorkshire Council has confirmed this is an objection for its administrative area [REP4-041].</p> <p>a) National Highways: From your point of view, is this also the case for plots in which NH has an interest which lie in the administrative boundary of City of York Council?</p> <p>b) National Highways: Are plots B3-07, B3-08, B3-09, B3-11, B3-66, B3-74 and B3-75, in which NH has an interest, part of the strategic road network (SRN), or are they on a de-trunked section of the A19?</p> <p>c) National Highways: Does this point just refer to the possibility of any interests being extinguished, or is it also in connection with the safety implications of the local road network as well as the SRN?</p> <p>d) City of York Council to confirm its position with regards to whether it has an objection.</p>	<p>City of York Council Highways have no objections.</p>

**Yorkshire Green Project – ExAQ2 Written Questions  
City of York Council – Submission Deadline 5**

<b>Q</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>CYC Comment/Response</b>
Q5.4.1	<p><b>Timescales for discharge of Requirements</b></p> <p>Would the Service Level Agreement provisions of the draft section 106 agreement, if completed, address your concerns in relation to the timescales for the discharge of Requirements specified in Schedule 4 of the dDCO [REP3-004]? If not, explain the extent to which your previously stated position on the timescales specified in Schedule 4 is maintained and why.</p>	<p>CYC welcomes the applicants undertaking to enter into a Service Level Agreement which allows for the front loading of the discharge of Requirements process and this mechanism does address our concerns. Reviewing the draft <a href="#">Schedule 4</a> we note that there are no defined time periods outlined for this front loading process however these have been subject to ongoing discussions within the SoCG which outlines the position of the LPA and the applicant.</p>
Q9.0.2	<p><b>Impact on the setting of designated heritage assets</b></p> <p>In paragraphs 9.3 and 9.4 of your Local Impact Report [REP1-047] you refer to the potential impacts of the proposed works to the north of Poppleton including the realigned section of overhead line being further away from the village of Poppleton but that cumulatively this would be offset by the works to link the CSEC north of Corban Lane to the proposed substation at Overton, which would lead to a net gain in equipment being installed.</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt, confirm whether or not you are content that overall the Proposed Development would not adversely affect the significance of any designated heritage asset.</p>	<p>CYC is satisfied that overall the Proposed Development would not adversely affect the significance of any designated heritage asset.</p>
Q11.2.3	<p><b>Replacement planting</b></p> <p>At ISH3, Leeds City Council indicated that its policy for replacement planting is three new for every one lost [EV-006d].</p> <p>a) Leeds City Council: – provide the policy that was referred to in ISH3.</p> <p>City of York Council and North Yorkshire Council: do you have similar policies and if so, submit a copy, or refer to one that has already been submitted into the Examination.</p>	<p>CYC does not have a similar policy in respect of replacement Tree Planting which explicitly defines a ratio to which lost trees should be replaced.</p>

**Yorkshire Green Project – ExAQ2 Written Questions  
City of York Council – Submission Deadline 5**

<b>Q</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>CYC Comment/Response</b>
Q14.0.1	<p><b>Construction Worker Travel Plan</b></p> <p>National Highways in its submission [REP2-079] has requested the inclusion of a Requirement in the dDCO in relation to a Construction Worker Travel Plan (CWTP). In response [REP3-032], the Applicant has indicated that it does not consider that this would be feasible due to the nature of construction activities but that measures were contained in the Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-099].</p> <p>Can North Yorkshire Council, City of York Council and Leeds City Council explain why they consider that a Requirement for a CWTP should or should not be provided and, if so, how this should be secured in the dDCO?</p>	<p>CYC would not request a Construction Worker Travel Plan as it is expected that these workers will arrive in cars, vans and other construction related vehicles as there will be limited/no viable alternatives in the areas of York where they will be working.</p>
Q14.0.3	<p><b>Highway visibility at proposed alternative access to the north of Skelton Springs Cottages</b></p> <p>At the Accompanied Site Inspection [EV-001b], a potential alternative route to gain access to pylon SP005 was indicated that would be located directly off the A19 to run along the boundary of the field that lies approximately 200m to the north of Access Point 93 and Skelton Springs Cottages.</p> <p>Can the Applicant and City of York Council comment on the acceptability of the visibility splays and any other highway safety matters that would exist should an alternative access point to/from the A19 be undertaken at this location?</p>	<p>CYC Highways advise that it is for the applicant to demonstrate that adequate visibility can be provided at this location.</p>

**ENDS**