

The Planning Inspectorate

By 'make a submission tab'

**Our Ref: Michael Reynolds  
Your Ref: EN020024**

**Date: 6 September 2023**

Michael Reynolds  
Business and Environmental Services  
East Block  
County Hall  
Racecourse Lane  
Northallerton  
DL7 8AD

**Tel:** [REDACTED]

**Email:**

[REDACTED]@northyorks.gov.uk

Dear Sirs

**National Grid – Yorkshire Green Project  
Procedural Deadline 7**

The Authority wishes to make the following points against the deadline 7 submission items.

Statement of Common Ground

The Authority understands that the Applicant will be submitting the signed SOCG at this deadline.

S106

The Authority understands that the Applicant will be submitting the signed S106 Agreement at this deadline.

Discharge of Requirements

One of the elements of the S106 agreement relates to the potential Service Level Agreements between the parties that would regulate the discharge of requirements. Whilst the Authority has been happy to commit to the obligation in the s106 it should be noted that the SLA's have not been finalised and that there is still disagreement between the parties as to the time scales for discharge of requirements in relation to the local planning authority.

The parties will continue to discuss the matter. In the meantime the Authority must continue to request that the DCO allow for 8 weeks for the discharge of requirements and in particular refer to the times set out in Para 18.2 of our Local Impact Report:

- a) Article 1(1) – change 35 days to 8 weeks.
- b) Article 1(3) – change 7 business days to 21 working days.
- c) Article 1(4) – change 3 working days to 5 working days.

- |   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>d) Article 1(5) – Request removal.</li><li>e) Article 2(b) – change 35 days to 8 weeks and add in, unless a longer period of time for determination has been agreed with the undertaker in accordance with (1)(1)(c).</li></ul> |
|---|

Green Belt

We understand the applicant will submit the positions statement on this matter.

Working Hours

We understand the applicant will submit the positions statement on this matter.

HGVs through the Village of Lumby

The Authority has been assured that discussions with the landowner to identify an alternative route for HGVs other than through the village of Lumby are progressing but that the applicant will not be in a position to finalise the agreement before the end of the examination. The Authority is encouraged by this progress.

We attach at Appendix A further comment on the unsuitability of the village of Lumby which has been provided by the Local Highway Authority.

Compulsory Purchase

The Authority understands that agreement has been reached between the Applicant and Highways England on the issue of compulsory purchase. We have been contacted to continue discussions in the same vein and with update the ExA at deadline 8.

Yours faithfully

**Michael Reynolds**  
**Senior Policy Officer (Infrastructure)**  
**North Yorkshire Council**

## Appendix A – Statement of the suitability of HGVs in Lumby

In my opinion Lumby is unsuitable for construction HGVs for the following reasons/constraints.

### Weight Restrictions.

- Lumby village forms part of a zonal weight restriction with the villages of South Milford and Sherburn in Elmet. The reason for the implementation of the Order was for environmental reasons, narrow roads within the village environs that are unsuitable for large vehicles.
- Protect residents from the nuisance caused by HGVs such as noise and vibration issues due to the close proximity of residential buildings to the carriageway. As shown on the google image below, showing part of the proposed local route.



### Road layout

The part of Butts Lane which has been proposed as a local route is an unclassified road single track road, the narrowest part is 3.8m wide, as shown on the above image. Majority of residential properties front directly on to the highway and in some places the position of these properties and the series of bends along Butts Lane restricts forward visibility as shown on the below images.



In conclusion the local highways team considers that Butts Lane is not suitable as a local HGV route reason outlined above. In addition to the above, over the years local team have had many complaints from residents of noise intrusion/vibration caused by HGV's, that have in the past, used Lumby village as a rat run when congestion occurs at the roundabout with the B1222/A63.

Personally I can not think of any potential mitigation measures that could be used throughout the village rather than the alternative haul road. The local team must consider the residents and what impact the works will have on them. We will be the ones who will have to deal with the complaints and justify why Lumby is being used as a construction route for HGV's.

