| Topic | Question/Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|
| Acoustic Screening | The screening solutions proposed have a profound effect on the overall appearance and visual impact of the plant not least in respect of the 4m high concrete wall. | The proposed acoustic wall is being utilised for site security, being located on the alignment of the Power Plant security fence; it is 4m high compared to the proposed mesh fence which will be approx 3m high (though both will be likely to have barbed wire topping). The wall acts to screen the minor components of the plant, as well as vehicles and minor maintenance activities. The wall will not be seen from the South or the South West due to the landscaping which includes 20m deep wooded borders on site boundaries and even viewed directly from the runway the view of the wall will be partly screened and effectively broken up by the 5m deep borders on that edge; the wall acts as a screen and is, itself, screened. The wall may also utilise different colours in adjcacent panels to break up the uniform appearance, should this be required. |
| Acoustic Screening | You attributed the need for these measures to prescribed sound levels though you considered these levels to be based on a flawed calculation (repeated references were made to 'double-counting'). If this is your belief it seems inconceivable that you would not challenge the levels prescribed. | The proposed acoustic wall is a solution to the need to meet very challenging noise limits less than 1m from the site boundary; while, in retrospect this approach has proven to be flawed, these are the figures which we said we would meet and the use of the wall is a means of achieving these very low noise impacts while meeting other criteria such as security and screening. To challenge the noise levels now could take up to a year with no guarantee of success. |
| Acoustic Screening | Has such a challenge been made and if so, with what result? If you have not challenged, why not? | No challenge has been made at this point as we are looking for a technical solution which is, a more dependable solution. |
| Acoustic Screening | As well as the adverse visual impact of the station surely the construction costs are increased? | The issue is not just cost related, but also one of fundamantal plant design; one significant source of noise is the air intake, but installing silencers could increase height or reduce output. The proposed wall is a cost effective solution that doesn't lead to increased height or reduced efficiency. |
| Project Plan | There is a clear wish from the community representatives to be provided with a project plan highlighting key events/dates – in particular key planning applications. This is a simple request which, if met, would greatly increase the ability of community representatives to understand and explain to their constituents how the project will progress. | We have published on the website a table which sets out the key dates of when it is proposed that the discharge of requirements submissions will be made. A further update will be made at Workshop 2. |
| Community Engagement | You appeared to be labelling our meeting as the 'design group' and talked about convening a community liaison group at a later stage. I think the general community view is to keep the same group for both purposes. The group could be expanded if necessary but would have the same core membership. This would assist continuity and understanding. | The Design Workshops are a process under Requirement 3 (Detailed Design) and the Community Liaison Group is a separate requirement stipulation under Requirement 11 (Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)); Requirement 11 specifies that the CEMP should include '... the provision for setting up a Community Liaison Group'. The outline CEMP which accompanied the DCO submission (dated December 2014) included the commitment to setting up a Community Liaison Group to include '... members of the local community and councils' and it is suggested that the Group '...invite a member of the British Horse Society to be one if their number'. This is something that we are now working up within the CEMP that we will be using to discharge Requirement 11. We see the CLG as having a reporting/ information sharing remit and we will complement its role by ensuring that the Panel meetings and Project Updates are reported on the PPL website and transmitted via other communication channels, should this be deemed efficient. We are proposing that the number of representatives is limited for each organisation so that the Group can operate effectively, and allows for fair participation and contribution by all members. |
| 1st Design Workshop session format | My personnel preference would be to keep the session as one group so that we can all hear and consider the views of everybody and build upon these rather than having the possibility of divergent views being brought back from individual groups. | Experience of other design workshops has taught us that splitting into smaller groups allows a for better sharing of comments/ideas/views. In addition following the group discussions there will be plenary session where the smaller groups will feedback their views to the wider Workshop, so that the whole workshop is aware of all the views. In addition following the meeting we will invite members to make further comments within a set time period. |
| 1st Design Workshop session format | If you still wish to split into smaller groups this should be no more than 3 and ideally only 2, with sufficient time allowed for a combined wash up session. | The number of groups will only be driven by the ultimately number of participants at the workshop. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1st Design | Workshop session format | Key to the group discussions will be input from your and National Grid's designers/landscape architects. Can you therefore aim to have sufficient design specialists available to be with each discussion group and just not circulating between the groups. | National Grid will have their landscape specilaist Tim Johns at the meeting. There will also be representatives from Drax, National Grid and it will be chaired by a third party. |
| 1st Design | Workshop session format | It would be helpful to have conceptual drawings of the infrastructure available with local reference features included so that individuals can gain some sense of scale while discussing the options, e.g. the adjacent power station stack, Roy Humphrey warehouses etc. | Visualisations on the structures "on location" will be provided. An ariel shot will be added to National Grids slide deck. |
| 1st Design | Workshop session format | It would be extremely helpful if the Design Principle Statement document could be circulated around the group prior to next Monday as some attending may not have seen this key document before. | We have already addressed this matter in our communication with the group. |
| 1st Design | Workshop aspects to cover | Progress Power's previous designers were keen and put forward a very strong argument for the use of recessive colours on some of the more dominant structures, particular the stack, to reflect the various backgrounds they will be seen against - ranging from the darker landscape to the lighter skyscape. | This will be achieved with the colour scheme we are proposing on both the inner structures and the wall itself. National Grid's presentation for the Substation will consider colours. |
| 1st Design | Workshop aspects to cover | The acoustic wall is a new introduction to the power plant post DCO approval and being of a significant height and extent will need careful consideration to its detrimental visual impact both long term but more importantly in the short term. | We do not consider the impact of the proposed wall to be detrimental for the reasons mentioned in point under "acoustic screening" above. However, we will also be proposing an option on the wall to match the surrounding foliage and we will be producing a cross section to show the relationship between perimeter fence, ground levels, landscaping and acoustic wall for Workshop 1. |
| 1st Design | Workshop aspects to cover | The ECC needs to be most sensitively considered in respect to the introduction of a significant structure in a very prominent and open setting. Therefore, as far as it can, it must be made to appear to sit comfortably within these constraints by taking every effort to reduce the extent of any large flat elevations/facades appearing to protrude out of the landscape. Key will be splitting up of the elements into more interesting shapes so that it appears less industrial, allowing elements (some of which may need to be false) to break up any significant flat facades and creating their own 'shadows' and changes in appearance of the structure as light and viewpoints change. | This is within the design principles that National Grid will be using to develop the substation. |
| 1st Design | Workshop aspects to cover | Cladding should be vertical and include strong detail features to further assist with breaking up of any flat elevations and the potential of them visually merging as one elevation. | National Grid will be presenting information on cladding and colours at the design workshop. |
| 1st Design | Workshop aspects to cover | The finish and treatment of the cladding and roofing must prevent unnecessary reflection and glare across the open countryside. | This is within the design principles that National Grid will be using to develop the substation. |
| 1st Design | Workshop aspects to cover | At the ECC structures with low flat roofing profiles should avoided to prevent the appearance of what could be perceived as industrial modular buildings, therefore more steeply pitched roof lines should be preferred. | A number of options for roof pitch/type will be illustrated. A steeper pitch will increase the overall height of structure. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Community Engagement | I believe some of the attendees at the last meeting were taken back by the inference that the purpose of these meetings was only to consider the plant's visual appearance. Those attending are the local community and do have a wider interest in making this project happen in the most acceptable way for all concerned and this grouping may well form part of the later 'Community Liaison Group' that meets post construction. I don't see any reason why Progress Power should not use this group as the start of the wider liaison group. | The DCO clearly differentiates between the Design Workshops and the CLG (as explained above), therefore this is why they are being kept separate. Mechanisms to communicate with the local community are therefore being set out within the CEMP in line with Requirement 11. |