

## North Yorkshire Council

### Deadline 6 Action Points

6	Submit comments on updated Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP).	Please see below
7	Provide reasons for concerns about Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) passing through the village of Lumby and any potential mitigation measures that could be used throughout the village rather than the alternative haul road, if it is not confirmed.	To follow
10	Confirm agreement to Change Number 3.	Agreed
12	Confirm that the position has moved on and there is now agreement to the noise assessment in terms of the application of Annex E ABC categories to determine significance for the construction noise assessment.	<p>There is agreement that Annex E ABC categories are commonplace for determining significance for the construction noise assessment. The position set out in response to written question 12.0.02 submitted at Deadline 5 is accurate and we don't have anything to add.</p> <p>That response is added here for ease of reference:</p> <p><i>Document 8.23.1 Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Representations made at ISH2, Table 8.2 provides an accurate view of the differing positions between National Grid and North Yorkshire Council (Selby area). I concur that, whilst we do not agree with the methodology, we are in agreement regarding the conclusions that have been drawn.</i></p>

		<p><i>In response to Document 8.5.2(c) Statement of Common Ground between National Grid Electricity Transmission plc and North Yorkshire Council July 2023, the document provides an accurate representation so far as this department's interests are concerned in so far as we do not agree with the overhead line noise assessment methodology or the inclusion of Sundays and Bank Holiday in core construction working hours.</i></p>
13	<p>Consider the alternate Sunday working arrangements that are included in the Orders for Hinkley Point C Connector and Richborough Connection Project.</p>	<p>The ABC approach is limited in so far as the lowest noise threshold of 65dB L<sub>Aeq,T</sub> significantly exceeds existing background levels in quiet rural areas as is the case here. The issue regarding Sun/BH working arises in connection with the Monk Fryston substation where background levels are predicted to be around 30dB L<sub>A90,T</sub>, so whatever the outcome of the ABC assessment it's hard to ignore the fact that significant noise impacts are likely at nearby receptors, and I maintain that Sun/BH tranquillity should be safeguarded.</p> <p>It's difficult to put a value on such impacts occurring on alternate Sunday working arrangements and is a position we can probably all draw conclusion on regardless of acoustic knowledge. However, by way of compromise, this approach will serve to reduce the persistency of construction noise impacts which we know is an aggravating factor to its effects. There is an argument that such an approach could result in less frequent noise effects but over a longer period.</p> <p>The Council's preference would be to prohibit construction works in connection with the Monk Fryston substation on Sun/BH but will respect the ExA decision. You mention construction time pressures as the applicants' position and hopefully the ExA will be provided with clarity from the applicant in this regard in the context of prohibiting Sun/BH construction works in Monk Fryston.</p>
15	<p>Comment on the Applicant's proposed Saturday piling hours of 09:00 to 14:00, in</p>	<p>There are no objections to this approach and note that the threshold of significance for such works is 65dB L<sub>Aeq,5hr</sub> which is acceptable.</p>

	the context of the British Standard (08:00 to 13:00), under Requirement 7(2).	
<b>DRAFT DCO</b>		
21	To confirm withdrawal of objection to Article 13.	Confirmed
30	Respond to updated Requirement 18.	<p>North Yorkshire Council notes that the updated wording in requirement 18 has not gone as far as the wording suggested in our response to previous hearing's action points submitted at deadline 4.</p> <p>The concern of the council is predominately regarding the fencing. We have noted the applicants response on the matter but feel some detailed discussion will be required to resolve the matter.</p> <p>A concern of the Council is that the response submitted by the applicant particularly in relation to the fencing, relies heavily on the landscape mitigation. We would wish to avoid putting strain on the mitigation strategy having to deal with matters which could have been dealt with in the DASSI. This could result in delay to acceptance which neither party wants.</p> <p>We will commit to discussing the matter in more detail with the applicant before the final deadline.</p>
33	Confirm whether or not you are content with the drafting of Requirement 19 in light of the Council's public sector equality duty	Confirmed