

Q	Question	Answer
1.2.1	<p>Projects scoped into the cumulative effects assessment The Councils are referred to the Applicant's response to ISH2 Action Points 32 and 33 [REP4-026]. a) Are Leeds City Council and North Yorkshire Council content with the Applicant's explanation as to how the proposed Hayton House solar farm project has been dealt with in the cumulative effects assessment? b) Are Leeds City Council and North Yorkshire Council content with the Applicant's explanation as to why the East Yorkshire Solar Farm has not been included in the cumulative effects long list?</p>	<p>a) Yes b) Yes</p>
1.3.2	<p>Illustrative Plan: SP005 Access During Construction Phase [REP4-026], Appendix D a) Is this the level of detail that you would find useful post consent as part of the THPS? b) If not, what else would be of use?</p>	<p>a) Yes, in the main, subject to the inclusion of the items shown in b) b) The proposed materials to be used/ thicknesses etc shown on the plans and any new drainage/ existing drainage</p>
5.4.1	<p>Timescales for discharge of Requirements 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>Leeds City Council will not be using a third party to discharge any Requirements or Articles. The discharge timescales therefore remain an important consideration.</p> <p>We understand that the applicant is proposing revised timescales for the processes relating to the discharge of Requirements and consents relating to Articles. For discharging Requirements, the applicant's proposed timescales are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 weeks for pre-app consultation with LA's. This timeframe offers 30 working days to the LA's; and, • 5 weeks for LA's to issue a decision on a discharge application (subject to caveats). This timeframe offers 25 working days to the LA's. <p>In principle, the applicant's proposal to front-load the discharge of Requirements process via the introduction of a pre-application period is preferable to Leeds City Council, in terms of manageability. It would also allow for discussions to take place to assist in making good any subsequent Requirements discharge application.</p> <p>In terms of discharging consents relating to Articles, the applicant's revised timescales are much tighter, as follows:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 weeks for pre-app consultation with LA’s. This timeframe offers 10 working days to the LA’s; and, • 4 weeks for LA’s to issue a decision on any Article. This timeframe offers 20 working days to the LA’s. <p>In principle, the applicant’s proposal to front-load the consent timescale for Articles via the introduction of a pre-application period is more appealing. However, the proposed timescale for determining an Article consent is not achievable. For example, consent sought in respect of a 278 Highway Agreement and/or a Traffic Regulation Order would take longer than 4 weeks for the LHA to determine. In any event the consultation period for such processes typically takes longer than the 20 working days being offered up by the applicant. Additionally, Highway Authority officers at Leeds City Council do not have delegated powers to issue such consents. They must be presented to the Council’s Highway Board for consideration and decision. This Board takes place monthly, which is unlikely to meet the consenting timeframe proposed by the applicant. This matter therefore remains a point of negotiation and it is requested that the applicant takes account of our views by proposing more realistic timescales in respect of the pre-app and consent stages for the Articles.</p> <p>We note that the applicant proposes for their appointed contractors to enter regular dialogue with the LA’s on progress and the timing of submissions requiring consent. This is acceptable in principle but, in addition to any proposed service level agreement, this must also be subject to an agreed and signed post-determination Planning Performance Agreement, something which has not been received from the applicant to date and therefore remains a point of negotiation.</p>
<p>11.2.3</p>	<p>Replacement planting At ISH3, Leeds City Council indicated that its policy for replacement planting is three new for every one lost [EV-006d]. a) Leeds City Council: – provide the policy that was referred to in ISH3. b) 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>a) Adopted policy ‘Land 2’ was provided in Appendix A of REP2-076.</p>

14.0.1	<p>Construction Worker Travel Plan</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]. 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>Leeds City Council has previously confirmed with the applicant's highway consultant that a CWTP would not be required for the Leeds district. Should a CWTP be found necessary, then we would recommend that this could be consolidated within the CTMP.</p>
--------	--	---