

**Application by Horizon Nuclear Power for the Wylfa Newydd Nuclear Power Station Project**

**The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ2)**

**Issued on 30<sup>th</sup> January 2019**

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) written questions and requests for information - ExQ2. Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the Initial Assessment of Principal Issues provided as Appendix B to the Rule 6 letter of 25 September 2018. Questions have been added to the framework of issues set out there as they have arisen from representations and to address the assessment of the application against relevant policies.

Column 2 of the table indicates which Interested Parties (IPs) and other persons each question is directed to. The ExA would be grateful if all persons named could answer all questions directed to them, providing a substantive response, or indicating that the question is not relevant to them for a reason. This does not prevent an answer being provided to a question by a person to whom it is not directed, should the question be relevant to their interests.

Each question has a unique reference number which starts with 2 (indicating that it is from ExQ2) and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on air quality and emissions issues is identified as Q2.1.1. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

If you are responding to a small number of questions, answers in a letter will suffice. If you are answering a larger number of questions, it will assist the ExA if you use a table based on this one to set out your responses. An editable version of this table in Microsoft Word is available on request from the case team: please contact [Wyla@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Wyla@pins.gsi.gov.uk) and include 'Wylfa Newydd' in the subject line of your email.

**Unfortunately given the timescales, it has not been possible to publish a Welsh language version of the Further Written Questions simultaneously with the English language version. It is our intention to publish a full translation of all Further Written Questions in the Welsh language as soon as reasonably possible. We will advise as and when these are published via the banner on the project website.**

Responses are due by **Deadline 5, Tuesday, 12 February 2019**

## Abbreviations used

<b>PA2008</b>	<i>The Planning Act 2008</i>	<b>MP Order</b>	<i>The Infrastructure Planning (Model Provisions) Order 2009</i>
<b>Art</b>	<i>Article</i>	<b>NPS</b>	<i>National Policy Statement</i>
<b>ALA 1981</b>	<i>Acquisition of Land Act 1981</i>	<b>NSIP</b>	<i>Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project</i>
<b>BoR</b>	<i>Book of Reference</i>	<b>R</b>	<i>Requirement</i>
<b>CA</b>	<i>Compulsory Acquisition</i>	<b>RR</b>	<i>Relevant Representation</i>
<b>CPO</b>	<i>Compulsory purchase order</i>	<b>SI</b>	<i>Statutory Instrument</i>
<b>dDCO</b>	<i>Draft DCO</i>	<b>SoS</b>	<i>Secretary of State</i>
<b>EM</b>	<i>Explanatory Memorandum</i>	<b>SoCG</b>	<i>Statement of Common Ground</i>
<b>ES</b>	<i>Environmental Statement</i>	<b>SSSI</b>	<i>Site of Special Scientific Interest</i>
<b>ExA</b>	<i>Examining Authority</i>	<b>SoCG</b>	<i>Statement of Common Ground</i>
<b>LIR</b>	<i>Local Impact Report</i>	<b>TP</b>	<i>Temporary Possession</i>
<b>LPA</b>	<i>Local planning authority</i>	<b>TA</b>	<i>Transport Assessment</i>
<b>MP</b>	<i>Model Provision (in the MP Order)</i>		
<b>BCUHB</b>	<i>Bwrdd Lechyd Prifysgol Betsi Cadwaladr/Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board</i>		
<b>CBHG</b>	<i>Camaes Bay History Group</i>		
<b>DAP</b>	<i>Destination Anglesey Partnership</i>		
<b>DcFW</b>	<i>Comisiwn Dylunio Cymru/Design Commission for Wales</i>		
<b>DCWW</b>	<i>Dŵr Cymru/Welsh Water</i>		
<b>GAPS</b>	<i>Gwynedd Archaeological Planning Services</i>		
<b>GCC</b>	<i>Cygnor Gwynedd/Gwynedd County Council</i>		
<b>IACC</b>	<i>Cyngor Dir Ynys Môn/Isle of Anglesey County Council</i>		
<b>IP</b>	<i>Interested Party</i>		
<b>LbCC</b>	<i>Cygnor Cymuned</i>		

	<i>Llanbadrig/Llanbadrig Community Council</i>
<b>LdCC</b>	<i>Cygnor Cymuned Llanddona/Llandonna Community Council</i>
<b>LPCC</b>	<i>Cygnor Cymuned LLangoed a Penmon/LLangoed and Penmon Community Council</i>
<b>MCA</b>	<i>Maritime and Coastguard Agency</i>
<b>NAP</b>	<i>North Anglesey Partnership</i>
<b>NDA</b>	<i>Nuclear Decommissioning Authority</i>
<b>NG</b>	<i>National Grid</i>
<b>NRW</b>	<i>Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru/Natural Resources Wales</i>
<b>NWEAB</b>	<i>Bwrdd Uchelgais Economaidd Gogledd Cymru/North Wales Economic Ambition Board</i>
<b>NWFR</b>	<i>Tân ac Achub Gogledd Cymru/North Wales Fire and Rescue</i>
<b>NWP</b>	<i>Heddlu Gogledd Cymru/North Wales Police</i>
<b>NWWT</b>	<i>Ymddiriedolaeth Natur Gogledd Cymru/North Wales Wildlife Trust</i>
<b>NT</b>	<i>National Trust</i>
<b>PAWB</b>	<i>Pobol Atal Wylfa B/People Against Wylfa B</i>
<b>PHW</b>	<i>Lechyd Choeddus Cymru/Public Health Wales</i>
<b>TAG</b>	<i>Tregele Action Group</i>
<b>VCC</b>	<i>Cyngor Cymuned Fali/Valley Community Council</i>

**WG** Llywodraeth Cymru/Welsh Government  
**WHGT** Welsh Historic Gardens Trust

<b>Location</b>	<b>Reference</b>
<i>General question</i>	<b>Q</b>
<i>The NSIP</i>	
<i>Power station itself</i>	<b>WA</b>
<i>Other on site works at power station</i>	<b>WB</b>
<i>Permanent Marine Works</i>	<b>WC</b>
<i>Temporary Marine Works</i>	<b>WD</b>
<i>Off-site Power Station Facilities</i>	<b>WE</b>
<i>Wylfa Newydd Development Area</i>	<b>WF</b>
<i>Associated development</i>	
<i>Site campus</i>	<b>ADA</b>
<i>Park and Ride</i>	<b>ADB</b>
<i>Logistics Centre</i>	<b>ADC</b>
<i>A5025 Off-line highways</i>	<b>ADD</b>
<i>Improvements</i>	
<i>Ecological Compensation Sites</i>	<b>ADE</b>
<i>Code of Construction Practice</i>	<b>CoCP</b>
<i>Code of Operational Practice</i>	<b>CoOP</b>
<i>Main Power Station Site Sub Code of Construction Practice</i>	<b>MPSSCoOP</b>
<i>Workforce Accommodation</i>	<b>WAMS</b>
<i>Management Strategy</i>	

## **The Examination Library**

References in these questions set out in square brackets (eg [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library. The Examination Library can be obtained from the following link:

[The Examination Library](#)

It will be updated as the examination progresses.

## **Citation of Questions**

Questions in this table should be cited as follows:

Question reference: issue reference: question number, eg ExQ2.1.1 – refers to question 2 in this



Reference	Respondent:	Location:	Question:
<b>1.</b>	<b>Air Quality including Dust</b>		
<b>Q2.1.1</b>	NRW	WB	With reference to the NRW response to ExA First Written Question Q1.0.5, is the information in relation to permit application(s) still correct? If not, please provide an update.
<b>2.</b>	<b>Biodiversity</b>		
<b>Q2.2.1</b>	NWWT	WA	NWWT and the Applicant disagree over baseline data for fungi. In its WR [REP2-349] NWWT states that CHEG fungi cannot be recreated, how much CHEG does NWWT consider would be lost?
<b>Q2.2.2</b>	The Applicant	ADD	Mitigation measures at the A5025 are described in greater detail in Appendix G9-10 [APP-334] than in the A5025 sub-CoCP [REP2-036]. Can the Applicant explain why it has removed reference to ES Appendix G9-10 in the revised sub-CoCP (it was at para 11.2.1)?
<b>Q2.2.3</b>	The Applicant, NRW and RSPB	WA	While accepting the Applicant's response in [REP2-375] that they do not consider water level management at Cemlyn Lagoon as a required mitigation measure, the ExA would welcome the Applicant and NRW, the RSPB and other IPs views on the importance of such management to support conservation of the site.
<b>Q2.2.4</b>	The Applicant	Q	Working hours in para 4.3.2 of the MPSS sub-CoCP [REP2-032] do not include working hours for the site preparation works (it starts at 'earthworks' from 07:00-19:00). Can the Applicant include working hours similar to those in the TCPA site preparation permission application in the sub-CoCP?

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>Q2.2.5</b>	The Applicant	WF	<p>In the LHMS [REP2-037] 4.2.2 states that a detailed landscape and visual baseline assessment has been carried out and the landscape maintenance is described in 4.2.34.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) How has the assessment taken into account the time taken for the scheme to establish?</li> <li>2) Given the exposed/coastal nature of the environment, what assurances are there that planting will establish as quickly as the Applicant assumes?</li> </ol>
<b>Q2.2.6</b>	The Applicant	WF	<p>In [APP-128] para 9.4.53 there is the mention of oil separators as a protection measure for surface water drainage to the sea. However, there is no reference to oil separators in section 10.2 of the WNCoOP [REP2-037] which appears to be more related to the storage of fuel and chemicals, rather than surface water from car parks/roads. Can the Applicant clarify what pollution controls for surface water run-off would be implemented?</p>
<b>Q2.2.7</b>	The Applicant	WF	<p>ddCO requirements WN9 &amp; WN11 [REP2-020] require that landscape and habitat schemes for the WNDA must be submitted for approval 12 months prior to the anticipated Unit 2 Commissioning Date, but do not stipulate that the landscaping and habitat schemes must be undertaken prior to operation of Unit 2. Can the Applicant clarify when the schemes would be completed?</p>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Climate Change and Resilience</b>		
<b>Q2.3.1</b>	The Applicant	Q	<p>Climate change and adaptation is covered in Section 5.6 of the Sustainability Statement [APP-426], but the approach does not appear to fully comply with the requirements of EN-1 and EN-6. Section 5.6 explains how the project would help reduce climate change effects and mitigation</p>

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			during construction, but adaption is not so detailed. Can the Applicant demonstrate please how paras 4.8.6 - 4.8.8, 4.8.10 and 4.8.12 of EN1 would be satisfied?
<b>Q2.3.2</b>	The Applicant	ADA	In the Carbon and Energy report [APP-423] Carbon Footprinting Methodology, Figure 4-4 shows that Construction includes operation of the Campus but Table 4-1 only includes energy use for construction plant. Figure 5-5 does include the Campus. Can the Applicant clarify where the operational impacts of the Campus have been addressed?
<b>Q2.3.3</b>	The Applicant	WC	Can the Applicant explain how potential storm surges resulting from climate change have been addressed for the protection of the MOLF and Power Station?
<b>Q2.3.4</b>	The Applicant		The Applicant submitted a note [REP4-004] providing additional details regarding impacts on the tidal embankment, as part of the Off-line Highway Improvements at Valley, with additional compensation for any breach. Are IACC and NRW content with the outcomes? If not, why not?
<b>Q2.3.5</b>	The Applicant		Is NRW in agreement with the Applicant's additional modelling in its Flood Consequence Assessment (FCA) Addendum [REP2-371] for Dalar Hir? If not, what additional information would it require?
<b>Q2.3.6</b>	The Applicant		Can the Applicant and NRW provide an update on the position with the legal agreement with the relevant land owner at Llanfachraeth to "allow" additional flooding on its land, and NRW's position?
<b>Q2.3.7</b>	The Applicant		Can the Applicant explain why it is not providing into the Examination the actual design for flood risk mitigation required to offset the increases in flood risk to Nant Cemaes, Afon Cafnan and Nant Cemlyn, but is

Reference	Respondent:	Location:	Question:
			proposing an additional dDCO requirement to submit the mitigation details post-consent?
<b>4.</b>	<b>Development Consent Order</b>		
<b>Q2.4.1</b>	The Applicant		CoCP - Ensure that track change copies of the Control Documents and the draft s106 are submitted at Deadline 5.
<b>Q2.4.2</b>	The Applicant	All	Table 2-3 <i>Volume 8 'Other Documents'</i> of the <i>Guide to the Application Rev.2.0</i> [APP-421] notes the CoCP, Sub-CoCPs and CoOP to ' <b>Outline...</b> ' the framework of measures/the strategies, measures and standards to be adopted in relation to potential impacts. Within the framework/strategies that would create such an approach, how precise, enforceable and effective would associated DCO requirements be?
<b>Q2.4.3</b>	The Applicant and IACC		<b>Article 2 - Commence</b> Given the submissions at D4 by the Applicant and IACC, does either party wish to comment further in respect of the definition of Commence?
<b>Q2.4.4</b>	The Applicant and Other IPs		<b>Article 2 - Maintain</b> Alternative drafting has been proposed by IACC . Do IPs wish to comment?
<b>Q2.4.5</b>	The Applicant and IACC		<b>Article 10 - Defence to statutory nuisance</b> Could the level of controls/measures in the CoCPs be equated to the detailed controls which could be imposed by a s60 CoPA notice or s61 CoPA consent (which themselves can constitute a defence in proceedings)?
<b>Q2.4.6</b>	The Applicant		<b>Article 27</b> For clarity, should Article 29 be amended to make clear that compensation

Reference	Respondent:	Location:	Question:
			is available for CA of private rights?
<b>Q2.4.7</b>	The Applicant		<p><b>Article 29</b>          Should the following works underlined be added to Article 29 (4)  <i>(4) Any person who suffers loss.... under this article <u>and article 27</u> is entitled to compensation....</i></p>
<b>Q2.4.8</b>	IACC		<p><b>Article 31 – Acquisition of Subsoil</b>          IACC refers to the Applicants response to this article as disingenuous “as the notices referred to will not be served until acquisition is to be taken some time after any DCO is granted” IACC argues that landowners should be given as much detail as possible in the Book of Reference (BoR) as to what rights will be acquired so that landowners can participate fully in the examination. IACC argues that Applicant should be restricting powers to only those rights required. D3 response.</p> <p>The Applicant response at REP4-027 states that “Horizon therefore wholly disagrees with the comments made by IACC. The approach adopted achieves the outcome suggested by IAAC in that right sought to be required are restricted to solely those necessary.”</p> <p>Does IACC wish to comment further?</p>
<b>Q2.4.9</b>	The Applicant		<p><b>Article 74</b>          Given the submissions at D4 by the Applicant and IACC, does either party wish to comment further in respect of this Article?</p>
<b>Q2.4.10</b>	The Applicant WG		<p><b>Article 82 Crown Rights</b>          Responses at D2 [REP2-375] and D3 [REP3-063] indicate that Applicant and WG are still in discussion regarding the approach to land identified in</p>

Reference	Respondent:	Location:	Question:
			<p>the B of Ref (National Assembly for Wales, Welsh Ministers and Secretary of State for Wales). At REP4-053, WG confirm that it has engaged with Horizon in regard to the matter of Welsh Government's land interests within the Order Limits and that it welcomes the recent amendment to the Book of Reference, which now identifies Welsh Government's interest under the Crown Land Section. 7.1.2</p> <p>However, Welsh Government state "<i>no formal approach has yet been made under S135 Planning Act 2008 seeking Welsh Government consent, and to date no consent has been given by Welsh Government. The position of the Welsh Government has been consistent in respect of Crown Land and this is set out in detail in the Welsh Government's Written Representation (section 2.2) submitted at Deadline 2. This section includes the reason why the land vested in the name of National Assembly for Wales is to be treated as vested in Welsh Ministers (2.2.5) and comprises Crown Land....</i>"</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Does the Applicant continue disagree with the need to obtain consent for each identified plot pursuant to s35 of PA2008?</li> <li>2) What is required to enable these differences of opinion to be overcome?</li> </ol>
<b>Q2.4.11</b>	The Applicant		<p><b>Schedule 1 - Work No 1L and 1N and Requirement WN16</b>  It's noted that this change is to rectify an error in the Planning Statement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Is this simply correcting a typographical error?</li> <li>2) Are there any other planning implications of changing the car parking provision?</li> <li>3) Are there any environmental/traffic impact issues?</li> </ol>
<b>Q2.4.12</b>	The Applicant,		<b>PW2 – Wylfa Newydd CoCP</b>

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
	IACC, WG, NRW and NWP		<p>Many IPs have raised concerns that should the detail of the CoCP not be agreed prior to the end of examination, than existing CoCPS and sub codes are treated as statements of principle/parameters and that further detail would need to be approved by IACC using pre-commencement requirements.</p> <p>1) Could this approach create the possibility of an uncertain scheme which hasn't been properly assessed?</p> <p>2) Would this approach to requirements be lawful, given Rochdale principles, and is reasonably intended to fix 'finalised aspects' at a later date?</p> <p>In responding to this question, attention is drawn to paras 103 and 104 or pre-application guidance.</p>
<b>Q2.4.13</b>	The Applicant		<p><b>PW2 – Wylfa Newydd CoCP</b></p> <p>In the event that agreement is not reached between the parties over the necessary level of details to be provided in the CoCP and sub-CoCPs, provide the drafting of new requirement(s) or an amended PW2 that would enable approval of Outline documents with approval later by the LPA in consultation with named relevant stakeholders.</p>
<b>Q2.4.14</b>	The Applicant, IACC, WG and NRW		<p>IPs have expressed concern in relation to their ability to keep track of progress with the proposed development and any changes. Should a Register of Requirements be included in the DCO as for example, was included in the A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvement Scheme Development Consent Order as per text below:</p> <p><i>Register of requirements 22.— (1) The undertaker must, as soon as practicable following the making of</i></p>

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			<p><i>this Order, establish and maintain in an electronic form suitable for inspection by members of the public a register of those requirements contained in Part 1 of this Schedule that provide for further approvals to be given by the Secretary of State.</i></p> <p><i>(2) The register must set out in relation to each such requirement the status of the requirement, in terms of whether any approval to be given by the Secretary of State has been applied for or given, providing an electronic link to any document containing any approved details.</i></p> <p><i>(3) The register must be maintained by the undertaker for a period of 3 years following completion of the authorised development.</i></p>
<b>Q2.4.15</b>	The Applicant		<p><b>PW2 – Wylfa Newydd CoCP</b>  NWP are concerned that the CoCP only refers to Key Mitigation which in the Interpretation (Schedule 3 (1)) does not refer to the Power Station and delivery of that within timeframe set out in ES and that delivery as set out in the Construction Method Statement and the Phasing Strategy must be included or a new requirement.</p> <p>Does the Applicant wish to comment?</p>
<b>Q2.4.16</b>	IACC		<p><b>PW7 – Wylfa Newydd CoCP</b>  The Remediation Strategy identifies that there are further measures and plans that are required for its delivery in particular those to address unexpected contamination, implementation of the remediation and verification.</p> <p>IACC consider that minimal detail on how land contamination is to be managed is provided.</p> <p>Is IACC requesting that the Remediation Strategy as set out in the Main</p>

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			Power Station Site sub-CoCP is amended further to address the concerns it has set out? Or is IACC proposing the introduction of a new requirement?
<b>Q2.4.17</b>	The Applicant, IACC, WG and NWP		<p><b>PW8 – Code of Conduct</b></p> <p>IACC, WG, NWP, and others want this to be part of DCO and not 'for information'. WG states "Fundamental importance that the DCO requires all mitigation strategies and control documents to be submitted for approval by the relevant body in consultation with any other relevant body specified so that it covers the right detail to secure mitigation and to be implemented and enforced." It proposes that approval should be via IACC in consultation with GCC and CCBC on basis that some of the mitigation will fall within responsibility of those authorities in addition to IACC.</p> <p>The Applicants position is that this would be prepared in accordance with the Workforce Management Strategy which would be a certified doc.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Why does this approach not satisfy IACC, WG, NWP and others?</li> <li>2) Or should PW8 provide details of how the Code of Conduct should be approved, monitored and enforced including in consultation with North Wales Police?</li> </ol>
<b>Q2.4.18</b>	The Applicant and IACC		<p><b>PW9 – Date of commissioning and cessation</b></p> <p>Applicant states it has provided one month and three months. IACC states that the amended drafting does not do this and that in any event, five working days would be appropriate given that the obligation is only to notify IACC.</p> <p>Would the Applicant set out what its intention is and whether five working days as proposed would be appropriate?</p>

Reference	Respondent:	Location:	Question:
<b>Q2.4.19</b>	IACC and NWP		<p><b>PW11 – Community Safety Management Strategy (CSMS)</b></p> <p>NWP proposes an amendment to the requirement so that NWP is the body who approves the document and that this needs to be done within 2 months of receiving the draft document.</p> <p>An alternative approach would be that IACC approves the document in consultation with NWP.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Would IACC and NWP resist this proposal?</li> <li>2) Should the CSMS be included as a Certified document under Schedule 18?</li> </ol>
<b>Q2.4.20</b>	The Applicant, NWP and IACC		<p>In light of the comments made by IPs with respect to the dDCO s.106, particularly IACC's strong opposition to the current allocation structure for contingency funds, the Applicant stated at the second DCO hearing that the dDCO may require amendments to establish the necessary allocation body to allocate contingency funds provided for in the dDCO s.106.</p> <p>NWP request the inclusion of a new Article which would define the structure, governance and role of the WNMPOP (if it is to apply and exist).</p> <p>It refers to Article 66 of the Silvertown Tunnel made Order as providing precedent for this approach.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Can the Applicant provide an update as to whether it is proposing amendments to the dDCO to establish an 'allocation body'</li> <li>2) What are the Applicants comments in respect of the proposal made by NWP?</li> <li>3) Does IACC or any other party wish to comment?</li> </ol>

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>Q2.4.21</b>	The Applicant and IACC		Given section 120(2) (b) PA2008 what are your comments in respect of Appendix 2 of REP4-043?
<b>Q2.4.22</b>	The Applicant and NRIL		<b>NRIL</b> want a new requirement which requires a construction management plan to be approved by local highway authority before commencement of the highway improvement works where it affects freight facility [REP2-331]. What is the Applicants view?
<b>Q2.4.23</b>	The Applicant and NRIL		<b>NRIL</b> are also considering a requirement in relation to any increase in users of the level crossing at Valley arising from the construction and operation of the proposed development. What is the latest position and what is the Applicants view?
<b>Q2.4.24</b>	The Applicant		<b>Site Preparation and Clearance Works – Work No 12</b> Should SPC be in full in the title of this section?
<b>Q2.4.25</b>	The Applicant		<b>SPC5</b> It is not clear how the Main Power Station Site has been updated to include a corresponding control and why this requirement is no longer necessary. Please provide further justification and explanation.
<b>Q2.4.26</b>	The Applicant		<b>SPC10 Drainage Scheme</b> Provide detail of the drafting of the new drainage requirement proposed at REP2-004.
<b>Q2.4.27</b>	The Applicant NWP		<b>SPC12- Access</b> NWP expressed concern that 8 meters set back may not be sufficient to allow safe access to main site [REP2-345 para7.12 vii].  Are discussions now concluded between the two parties and has agreement

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			been reached? If so, please signpost where in the documentation.
<b>Q2.4.28</b>	The Applicant		<p><b>WN4 – Buildings and Structures</b>            Applicant has only provided maximum height of the building in metres Above Ordnance Datum (AOD). IACC request that minimum height is also provided for clarity.</p> <p>Does the Applicant resist?</p>
<b>Q2.4.29</b>	The Applicant		<p><b>WN10 – Wylfa Newydd CoOP and OPSF4</b>            IPs argue that the detail in the CoOP is lacking.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) In the event that agreement is not reached between the parties over the necessary level of details to be provided in the CoOP, provide the drafting of a new requirement that would enable approval of Outline documents with approval later by the LPA in consultation with named relevant stakeholders.</li> <li>2) How would the CoOP be monitored and enforced?</li> </ol>
<b>Q2.4.30</b>	The Applicant and NWP		<p>NWP requests a new requirement for an Operational Travel Strategy (currently secured by forming part of the CoOP) and that this should be prepared prior to 'operation of the power station' but which accords with the CoOP.</p> <p>What are the Applicant's views?</p>
<b>Q2.4.31</b>	The Applicant, IACC and WG		<p><b>WN15 and WN 16 Construction and Operational Car Parking</b>            WG want Dalar Hir to be operational before construction commences and have 1,900 spaces by 2022.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Should a new requirement be introduced, to provide minimum</li> </ol>

Reference	Respondent:	Location:	Question:
			<p>parking spaces linked either to phasing plan or increase in workers/ A specific maximum number /a commitment to a layout plan of the site allowing phased construction /and earlier occupation rather than waiting 18 months /EV charge points and various vehicle types</p> <p>2) Should parking provision be more precisely defined?</p> <p>3) Should design drawings be submitted for construction parking irrespective of whether these would be temporary facilities?</p>
<b>Q2.4.32</b>	The Applicant		<p><b>SITE CAMPUS WORKS (PREFIXED "WN" 17-25)</b> Should Schedule 3 5.(1) be amended to read WN17-WN23 and not WN17-WN25?</p>
<b>Q2.4.33</b>	The Applicant and IACC		<p><b>WN20 Site Campus finished parameter plans and maximum finished dimension of buildings and other structures</b> Maximum heights – Schedule 3 para 1(8) of Rev 2 now includes maximum height from above finished ground level. REP1-004 DCO revision WG view that Accommodation Block height would not be 32meter but would be 21meter total height as the maximum number of storeys would be 7.</p> <p>IACC wants both heights to be included for more clarity.</p> <p>Has this been resolved and if so, where in the documentation?</p>
<b>Q2.4.34</b>	The Applicant and IACC		<p>Should there be a specific requirement for the LPA to approve proposals for sports and leisure facilities at the WNDA including details of the fencing, lighting, and drainage and surfacing?</p>
<b>Q2.4.35</b>	The Applicant and Land and Lakes		<p><b>WN23 – Site Campus Decommissioning Plan</b> Land and Lakes want a trigger either in 9 years from commencement or after occupation falls to a certain level.</p>

Reference	Respondent:	Location:	Question:
			What is the Applicants view?
<b>Q2.4.36</b>	The Applicant and IACC		<p><b>OPSF5 – Operational car and cycle parking</b>  IACC wants cycle parking to be provided /it wants certainty that suitable levels of parking provision would be provided/and that electric charging points are provided.</p> <p>(Title still includes reference to cycle parking despite Applicants response at D2.)</p> <p>Has progress been made in reaching agreement between the parties?</p>
<b>Q2.4.37</b>	The Applicant and IACC		<p><b>PR5 - Operational car and cycle parking</b>  IACC wants certainty that suitable levels of parking provision would be provided. The Applicant refers to the CoCP para 5.10.1.</p> <p>Are the parties still in disagreement and if so, why?</p>
<b>Q2.4.38</b>	IACC		<p><b>PR6 – Park and Ride decommissioning strategy</b>  Is IACC content with the drafting of this provision? If not, what alternative wording would be acceptable?</p>
<b>Q2.4.39</b>	The Applicant and IACC		<p><b>LC3 (4) Maintenance of landscaping</b>  Applicant considers that it is not necessary to have a separate landscaping requirement or scheme given what it describes as "the relatively small size of the site".</p> <p>IACC disagrees and does not accept the site is small.</p>

Reference	Respondent:	Location:	Question:
			What would prevent a new requirement for a landscaping scheme to be submitted/approve to IACC for works at the Logistics Centre?
<b>Q2.4.40</b>	The Applicant		<p><b>LC6</b>  What is the Applicants response to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) WG drafting insert to include A55.</li> <li>2) L6(1) 100 HGVs should be a minimum.</li> <li>3) inclusion of a wider definition of emergency to hold vehicles at the Logistics Site or WN for example due to closure of Britannia Bridge as opposed to parking on the highway.</li> </ol>
<b>Q2.4.41</b>	The Applicant and IACC		<p><b>LC7</b>  Applicant has amended the drafting of this at D1.</p> <p>IACC does not consider that the amendments address the issues it set out at D2.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) What are the matters that are in dispute?</li> <li>2) How could these be overcome?</li> <li>3) What drafting would overcome the objections of IACC?</li> </ol>
<b>Q2.4.42</b>	The Applicant and WG		<p><b>Application of Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009</b>  WG propose a new article as below.</p> <p><i>"Application of Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009</i>  [43].—(1) This Order is subject to the provisions of Part 4 of the 2009 Act and any licence granted pursuant to that Part and is without prejudice to the powers of the Welsh Ministers under that Part.  (2) No provision of this Order obviates the need to obtain a marine licence</p>

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			<p><i>under Part 4 of the 2009 Act or to comply with the conditions of any marine licence and nothing in this Order in any way limits the enforcement powers in respect of a marine licence</i></p> <p><i>(3) In the event of any inconsistency between the provisions of this Order and a marine licence, then the terms of the marine licence shall take precedence."</i></p> <p>This goes further than the Swansea Bay DCO because it doesn't specifically identify the articles/powers/requirements relating to marine works and it deals with inconsistencies.</p> <p><b>Swansea Bay DCO</b></p> <p><b>Application of Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009</b></p> <p><b>16.</b>—(1) Articles 17 to 19 are subject to the provisions of Part 4 of the 2009 Act and any licence granted pursuant to that Part and are without prejudice to the powers of the Welsh Ministers under that Part.</p> <p>(2) No provision of this Order obviates the need to obtain a marine licence under Part 4 of the 2009 Act or to comply with the conditions of any marine licence.</p> <p>What are the Applicant's views regarding inclusion of this Article in the DCO?</p>
<b>Q2.4.43</b>	The Applicant and WG		<p><b>Schedule 19</b></p> <p>Does the Applicant wish to make any further comments regarding the proposal that the Welsh Government should be the appellate body as it is for planning applications?</p>
<b>Q2.4.44</b>	The Applicant, WG and IPs		<b>Historic Environment – requirement for recording/assessment</b>

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			<p>WG has proposed a new requirement. The following observations and comments are made as below:</p> <p>16 (2)"The scheme [submitted and approved - aren't these words redundant?] must be in accordance with .... "</p> <p>16 (5) "Any archaeological investigations [implemented – isn't this word redundant?] .."</p> <p>16 (5) (b) .."by Cadw in consultation with Cadw" [how does this work? clarify the different roles of Cadw here?]</p> <p>16(5) (b) ...“unless otherwise agreed with the IACC” [arguably if this tailpiece relates to the whole of the requirement this allows IACC to dispense with the need for the scheme altogether].</p> <p>Do IPs wish to comment?</p>
<b>Q2.4.45</b>	The Applicant and NRW		<p>Provide an update on progress re the charging of fees in relation to NRW's role as discharging authority for certain requirements; and provisions for developer contributions to NRW for monitoring and implementation during construction and operation (associated with its proposed role as discharging authority below Mean High Water Springs).</p>
<b>Q2.4.46</b>	The Applicant, NWP and NWFR		<p>Several IPs have expressed support for an Emergency Services Engagement Group.</p> <p>Do IPs wish to comment?</p> <p>If such a group were to be formed, how could this be secured in the DCO?</p>

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>Q2.4.47</b>	The Applicant		Please respond to the comments made by Trinity House at REP4-056 in response to First Written Questions.
<b>Q2.4.48</b>	The Applicant and IACC		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) When will the amended Protective Provisions be sent to IACC Highways?</li> <li>2) What would prevent IACC Highways reaching an agreed position by the next DCO hearing in March?</li> </ol>
<b>Q2.4.49</b>	The Applicant		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Please provide draft protective provisions proposed for Schedule 15 not currently included in the DCO in addition to the finalised Protective Provisions with Magnox.</li> <li>2) Please provide a further update on negotiations on the protective provisions and detail the proactive steps that are being taken to reach agreement during the Examination.</li> </ol>
	Part 1		<b>SECTION 106</b>
<b>Q2.4.50</b>	The Applicant, IACC, GCC and WG	Q	Provide an example of another project/S106 agreement where similar management mechanisms to the WNPOP have been used.
<b>Q2.4.51</b>	IACC, GCC, WG, BCUHB, NWP, NWFR and PHW	Q	In the long term there would be an increase in revenue from Council and Business Tax should the DCO be consented. Would this be used to fund additional services required as a result of the development? At the ISH on the 7 January it was indicated that this would be reflected in the S106 as a number of the contributions sought would be for short term and/or interim measures to cover any shortfall in service provision that might arise before the increase in revenue could be delivered. Indicate which contributions this would apply to. Where a contribution is being sought to cover an existing service long term, why would this be necessary?

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
	Part 2		<b>Compulsory Acquisition</b>
<b>Q2.4.52</b>	Applicant		In regard to the revised Book of Reference [REP2-026, REP2-027 & REP2-028], the Applicant is requested to provide a completed and updated Compulsory Acquisition Objections Schedule. (See the updated copy at Appendix 1 of this document, which has one additional entry to that previously returned by the Applicant as REP2-010)
<b>Q2.4.53</b>	The Applicant		<p>With reference to The Funding Statement [APP-033] explain the relationship between (a) Hitachi Ltd and Hitachi Nuclear Projects Development Europe Ltd and (b) Horizon Nuclear Power Ltd and Horizon Nuclear Power Wylfa Holdings Ltd and between the Hitachi companies and the Horizon Group in terms of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The constitution of the board of directors for each company.</li> <li>2) Corporate governance arrangements between the companies, including the decision-making hierarchy for the Wylfa Newydd project.</li> <li>3) Where does responsibility for signing off the Final Investment Decision rest?</li> <li>4) Financial resources and access to project finance and investment for each of the companies.</li> </ol>
<b>Q2.4.54</b>	The Applicant		The letter of the 21 January 2019 from Horizon Nuclear Power Ltd [AS-039] states that: 'the company will be moving towards a suspended state organisation by the end of March 2019'; and that: 'with respect to the Development Consent Order (DCO) currently in progress Horizon will continue with the on-going programme whilst it seeks opinion from Stakeholders and other interested parties on the best way forward'.

Reference	Respondent:	Location:	Question:
			<p>The following should be noted:</p> <p><b>Planning Act 2008</b></p> <p><b>105 [Decisions in cases where no national policy statement has effect]<sup>1</sup></b></p> <p>(1) This section applies in relation to an application for an order granting development consent [if section 104 does not apply in relation to the application]<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>(2) In deciding the application the Secretary of State must have regard to— .....</p> <p>(c) any other matters which the Secretary of State thinks are both important and relevant to the Secretary of State's decision.</p> <p><b>Statement on Energy Infrastructure: Written statement - HLWS316</b></p> <p><b>Planning Act 2008</b></p> <p><b>122 Purpose for which compulsory acquisition may be authorised</b></p> <p>(1) An order granting development consent may include provision authorising the compulsory acquisition of land only if the [Secretary of State]<sup>1</sup> is satisfied that the conditions in subsections (2) and (3) are met.</p> <p>(2) The condition is that the land—....</p> <p>(3) The condition is that <u>there is a compelling case in the public interest for the land to be acquired compulsorily.</u></p> <p><b>Planning Act 2008 - Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land</b></p> <p>Resource implications of the proposed scheme - paragraph 17:</p> <p><i>Any application for a consent order authorising compulsory acquisition must</i></p>

Reference	Respondent:	Location:	Question:
			<p><i>be accompanied by a statement explaining how it will be funded. This statement should provide as much information as possible about the resource implications of both acquiring the land and implementing the project for which the land is required. It may be that the project is not intended to be independently financially viable, or that the details cannot be finalised until there is certainty about the assembly of the necessary land. In such instances, the Applicant should provide an indication of how any potential shortfalls are intended to be met. This should include the degree to which other bodies (public or private sector) have agreed to make financial contributions or to underwrite the scheme, and on what basis such contributions or underwriting is to be made.</i></p> <p><i>Compelling case in the public interest: paragraphs 12 and 13:</i></p> <p><i>In addition to establishing the purpose for which compulsory acquisition is sought, section 122 requires the Secretary of State to be satisfied that there is a compelling case in the public interest for the land to be acquired compulsorily.</i></p> <p><i>For this condition to be met, the Secretary of State will need to be persuaded that there is compelling evidence that the public benefits that would be derived from the compulsory acquisition will outweigh the private loss that would be suffered by those whose land is to be acquired. Parliament has always taken the view that land should only be taken compulsorily where there is clear evidence that the public benefit will outweigh the private loss.</i></p> <p><i>Other matters – paragraph 19</i></p> <p><i>The high profile and potentially controversial nature of major infrastructure</i></p>

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			<p><i>projects means that they can potentially generate significant opposition and may be subject to legal challenge. .... In addition, Applicants will need to be able to demonstrate that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>any potential risks or impediments to implementation of the scheme have been properly managed;</i></li> </ul> <p>The Applicant should make reference as appropriate to the above legal and policy context in answering all the questions below.</p>
<b>Q2.4.55</b>	The Applicant	Q	<p>In view of the current uncertainties about deliverability and funding, and as necessary providing a supplement to the Statement of Reasons, what is the justification for the compulsory acquisition request?</p>
<b>Q2.4.56</b>	The Applicant	Q	<p>Without prejudice to any conclusions that the ExA may draw in making its recommendation, following responses to Q2.25.1 and Q2.25.2, and as necessary providing a supplement to the Funding Statement [APP-033]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) What is the current estimate of the cost of the Wylfa Newydd project?</li> <li>2) What is the current estimate of the cost of Compulsory Acquisition (CA), including compensation for Category 3 persons and repair of possible damage during construction?</li> <li>3) What is the current estimate for decommissioning costs?</li> <li>4) What is the source of project, CA and decommissioning funding and by what mechanism would it be secured and guaranteed through the dDCO and any planning obligations; noting that adequate funding should be available to enable the CA powers to be exercised within the statutory period following the order being made, as set out in Regulation 3(2) of the Infrastructure Planning (Miscellaneous</li> </ol>

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			<p>Prescribed Provisions) Regulations 2010.</p> <p>5) What financial contingency measures are in place to ensure that, should the project be abandoned during or following the Site Preparation and Clearance Works or during the construction period, resources would be available to restore and secure the Wylfa Newydd site?</p> <p>6) How would these contingency measures be secured; noting that Paragraph 1.2.14 of [REP – 024] states: the draft SPC s106 makes provision for a Parent Company Guarantee (PCG)/Escrow account and/or restoration bond to be secured in the event that the development consent is not implemented?</p>
<b>Q2.4.57</b>	The Applicant	Q	In addition to the Statement of Reasons and Funding Statement, what application documents and plans would need to be updated to respond to current circumstances (in the light of the letter dated 21 January 2019) and when would the Applicant consider that this information will be available?
<b>Q2.4.58</b>	The Applicant	Q	In view of the uncertainties and the additional information sought is the Applicant satisfied that the ExA will have sufficient evidence to reach conclusions and make findings within the statutory timetable, having regard to the ExA's duty under section 98 (1) and the Secretary of State's powers under section 98 (4) to extend the timetable?
<b>Q2.4.59</b>	The Applicant	All	Given the IACCs written representation in section 12.0 of REP2-218, and the response on Page 1-74 of REP3-019, should the County Council be included on the Compulsory Acquisitions Schedule [REP2-010 and/or REP2-011]?
<b>Q2.4.60</b>	IACC and the Applicant	All	With reference to paragraph 12.0.3 of the IACCs written representation [REP2-218] and the Applicant's response in REP3-019, please provide an

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			update on the discussions referred to, and the matters included / outcomes from the discussions.
<b>Q2.4.61</b>	The Applicant	All	Please comment on the implications of the current halting/pausing of work on the Wylfa Newydd project for the case made within the Statement of Reasons [APP-032] in support of the proposed compulsory acquisition of land, and which addresses the need for the development. Also, provide any necessary update/clarification in regard to the answer provided in REP2-375 for First Written Question Q4.0.25.
<b>Q2.4.62</b>	The Applicant	WF	In relation to the Book of Reference 2/3 Rev. 3.0 [REP2-027] and the Schedule of Compulsory Acquisition Objections (a copy provided as REP2-010), should the people who have submitted REP4-050 be included in the Schedule of Compulsory Acquisition Objections?
<b>5.</b>	<b>Habitats Regulation Assessment</b>		
<b>Q2.5.1</b>	The Applicant	WF	In its response to the ExA's question 5.0.17 [PD-009] the Applicant advised that the assessment of decommissioning in the shadow HRA [APP-050] was to set out a series of assumptions in Table 5-6 regarding the nature of the works likely to be required during decommissioning. The assumptions in Table 5-6 are stated to be the anticipated main features and characteristics of the decommissioning works rather than additional measures to avoid or reduce effects. However, the measures listed in the table include measures such as the invasive Non-Native Species strategy and controls of the timing of works which have been treated as mitigation measures in the assessment of construction and operation works. Can the Applicant explain this apparent inconsistency in approach?
<b>Q2.5.2</b>	The Applicant	WF	Can the Applicant respond to NRW's advice [REP2-325, page 124] that the

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			Applicant should issue a note confirming that it has taken account of the CJEU's judgement in the Edel Grace, Peter Sweetman v An Bord Pleanala case?
<b>Q2.5.3</b>	NRW, NT, RSPB and NWWT		During the Issue Specific Hearing on 10 January 2019, the Applicant suggested that declines in productivity at the Cemlyn Bay Tern colony could be linked to density dependent effects resulting from the overall increase in Tern numbers, and that this might also be the reason for terns taking back several food items at once. What are your comments on these points?
<b>Q2.5.4</b>	NRW, NT, RSPB and NWWT		Sandwich Tern has been described as a species which is very sensitive to disturbance. Could the parties identify the sources of evidence which support this statement?
<b>Q2.5.5</b>	NRW, NT, RSPB and NWWT		During the Issue Specific Hearing on 10 January 2019, the Applicant described how noise from construction would be attenuated over the distance between the main power station site and the Tern colony at Cemlyn Bay and would be experienced as background at the colony. If you do not agree with this characterisation of the construction noise environment please could you explain why?
<b>Q2.5.6</b>	Applicant, NRW, RSPB, NWWT and NT		Could the parties provide references (including copies of abstracts where relevant) for any scientific literature that deals directly with the effects of construction disturbance on Sandwich Terns or closely related species?
<b>Q2.5.7</b>	Applicant		<p>In relation to the use of the 'red' and 'amber' noise levels described in REP3-048, could the Applicant:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) explain how the red and amber noise levels would be defined?</li> <li>2) How would the amber noise level be defined to ensure that there</li> </ol>

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			would be enough time to take action before the red noise levels are reached?
<b>Q2.5.8</b>	NRW, NWWT, RSPB and NT		With regard to disturbance from visual stimuli, the Applicant has stated that there would be no construction work undertaken within 500m of the nesting islands between 15 April and 15 May with no bulk earthworks undertaken within 500m of any known active Tern nests thereafter. Does this address any of the parties concerns? If not, what additional measures would be required?
<b>Q2.5.9</b>	NRW		The environmental NGOs have raised concerns about the potential effect of increased predation on the Tern colony as a result of predators being displaced by the main power station works [REP2-318, 2-348 and 2-360]; the RSPB has suggested that this represents an additional likely significant effect of the SPA [REP2-358]. What are NRW's views?
<b>Q2.5.10</b>	Applicant		Without prejudice to the ExA's final recommendation, please provide the following in relation to the Anglesey Terns SPA: i) The reasons that there would be no alternative solutions and imperative reasons of overriding public interest to carry out the proposed development. ii) An update on the development of compensatory measures for the SPA.
<b>Q2.5.11</b>	NRW		In response to the ExA's FWQ5.0.45, NRW provided links to the conservation objectives for the relevant European sites. Please provide the conservation objectives in full rather than as links.
<b>Q2.5.12</b>	The Applicant		What mechanism would be used to decide which site activities would stop to reduce noise levels?

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>Q2.5.13</b>	The Applicant		Could the Applicant advise if they are aware of other cases where a similar approach to the reactive noise monitoring proposed for WDNA has been used to mitigate effects on a breeding seabird colony?
<b>Q2.5.14</b>	The Applicant		As part of their Deadline 4 response, the Applicant has provided updated marine works noise modelling based on US National Marine Fisheries Services criteria. Does the submitted document address NRW's concerns?
<b>6.</b>	<b>Historic Environment</b>		
<b>Q2.6.1</b>	Applicant	WF	<p>Respond to the National Trust's further consideration at Deadline 3 of the heritage asset plans submitted in response to FWQ Q6.0.17 [REP3-056] and in particular to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The earthworks shown on Dwg 60PO80AS _ Q6.0.17_ 01b illustrative main construction activities and Dwg 60PO80AS _ Q6.0.17_ 02 illustrative operational layout.</li> <li>2) The use of the land immediately to the south of Cestyll Garden north of Cemlyn Road during the operational phase.</li> <li>3) The proposed access for Cestyll Garden during the operational period in relation to the historic access and, if this is not to be used, how the proposed use of the construction access during operation would affect the significance of the Garden.</li> <li>4) Access for National Trust to the east of Cestyll Garden, currently the subject of discussion between National Trust and Horizon.</li> <li>5) The planting programme addressed in paragraph 7 of [REP3-056].</li> <li>6) Details of the works planned for the area reserved for 'Laydown / Other construction activities' during site preparation and clearance and construction; including how it is envisaged the area would be surfaced during the construction period and the temporary surface removed at</li> </ol>

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			<p>the end of construction.</p> <p>7) The location and specification of boundary fences during construction on Dwg 60PO80AS _ Q6.0.17_ 01b illustrative main construction activities.</p> <p>8) The intention for HLT2 - Cestyll Garden - Kitchen Garden and former site of Cestyll House during the operational phase.</p> <p>9) The purpose of the dashed line that runs from the southernmost tip of Cestyll Garden initially south east and then south west which is not keyed.</p> <p>10) Whether woodland would be planted between Felin Gafnan Farmhouse and Cestyll Garden to mitigate views of the construction and operational activities for the residents of Felin Gafnan Farmhouse.</p>
<b>Q2.6.2</b>	Applicant	WF	<p>Provide an update at Deadline 6 on the following matters in relation to Cestyll Garden and nearby heritage assets addressed in Horizon's Response to the Welsh Government's WR [REP3-034]:</p> <p>1) The commitment for Horizon to work with the landowners and other interested parties to consider appropriate enhancement measures such as greater interpretation, including on-site interpretation boards at the valley garden, enhanced public access to the valley garden, regular maintenance and restoration of the valley garden. (Para. 1.15.4)</p> <p>2) The proposed a deed of covenant with NDC to develop and deliver a Conservation Management Plan for Cestyll Garden and whether agreement on heads of terms for acquisition of a number of land interests, including Cestyll Garden, has been reached.</p> <p>3) The proposed provision of enhanced interpretation in the form of an additional interpretation board at Felin Gafnan.</p> <p>4) The review of what could be practicably achieved in relation to the possible reinstatement of the kitchen garden to its former location or an alternative location; including the possibility of reconfiguring proposed</p>

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			<p>Mound D to the east of the Cestyll Garden driveway.</p> <p>5) How making good damage to the following listed buildings would be secured; the level of financial resource to be reserved for the work and the mechanism to ensure the work would be carried out in accordance with Cadw and IACC guidance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Grade II* Listed Felin Gafnan Corn Mill (Porth y Felin) (Asset 137);</li> <li>ii. Grade II Listed Corn-drying house at Felin Gafnan (Asset 141);</li> <li>iii. Grade II Listed Mill house at Felin Gafnan, Cylch-y-Garn (Asset 144); and</li> <li>iv. Grade II* Church of St Padrig (Llanbadrig) (Asset 26)</li> </ul>
<b>Q2.6.3</b>	WG; Cadw; IACC	WF	<p>Do the Applicant's responses to Historic Environment issues set out in Horizon's Response to the Welsh Government's WR [REP3-034] provide assurance that the technical and policy tests set out in EN1, EN6, Planning Policy Wales 10, Cadw's published Conservation Principles, Technical Advice Note (TAN) 24: Historic Environment and any other relevant legislation and guidance in respect of the Historic Environment and raised in the WR [REP2-367] have been met? Is the proposed additional mitigation adequate? With particular reference to:</p> <p>1) The substantial harm on Cestyll (Grade II) Registered Park and Gardens and Horizon's proposed mitigation strategy, including the request for a long term, secured and funded Conservation Management Plan covering the forthcoming statutory registered area boundary for Cestyll Gardens and including measures to mitigate impacts associated with the Grade II* Listed Felin Gafnan Corn Mill (Porth y Felin) (Asset 137), Grade II Listed Corn-drying house at Felin Gafnan (Asset 141), and Grade II Listed Mill house at Felin Gafnan, Cylch-y-Garn (Asset 144) to be</p>

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			<p>prepared with and approved by Cadw.</p> <p>2) Exclusion of the temporary sewerage treatment plant located within Essential Setting of Cestyll Gardens from the Environmental Impact Assessment.</p> <p>3) The potential impacts and mitigation strategy for buried archaeology within and around the WNDA?</p> <p>4) The mitigation and restoration strategy for historic buildings during construction and operation, including the Grade II* Listed Felin Gafnan Corn Mill (Porth y Felin) (Asset 137), Grade II* Church of St Padrig (Llanbadrig) (Asset 26) (where additional mitigation has been requested), Grade II corn drying house (Felin Gafnan) (Asset 141), Grade II Mill House (Felin Gafnan, Cylch-y-Garn) (Asset 144) and Cafnan House and associated outbuildings (Asset 181) and whether a commitment to restoring any historic buildings which are subject to damage during the construction activities has been made and secured?</p> <p>5) The setting impacts on Treliagnath Burial Chamber Scheduled Monument, including the scope and extent of any landscaping and planting measures undertaken and how they help screen the setting of the two scheduled monuments from the Logistics Centre and the long-term restoration plan for the site on completion of the project.</p> <p>If not, why not and what needs to be done to provide the assurance needed?</p>
<b>Q2.6.4</b>	Applicant	WF	Respond to the submission by the Welsh Historic Garden Trust [AS-037] or direct the ExA to any previous response.
<b>Q2.6.5</b>	Applicant	Q	When will the Cultural Heritage Mitigation Strategy referred to in Horizon's response to Interested Parties responses to ExAs First Written Questions [REP3-005] at FWQ6.0.8 be submitted to the Examination?

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>Q2.6.6</b>	Applicant	WF	Referring to drawing no. 60PO80AS – Plan of Heritage Assets and Public Access with Illustrative Operational Layout submitted at D2 [REP2-375]; provide cross-sections at 1:500 scale from Porth y Pistyll to the Main Power Station site transecting Cestyll Garden – Valley Garden at worst case and least worse case in terms of the proposed platform height for the Power Station site in the operational phase and show in each case how the transition from the level of the Garden to the Power Station level would be treated as an element in the landscape to minimise its impact on the setting of Cestyll (Grade II) Registered Park and Gardens, the Grade II* Listed Felin Gafnan Corn Mill (Porth y Felin) (Asset 137), Grade II corn drying house (Felin Gafnan) (Asset 141), and Grade II Mill House (Felin Gafnan, Cylch-y-Garn) (Asset 144)
<b>7.</b>	<b>Landscape and Visual</b>		
<b>Q2.7.1</b>	IACC		Comment on the Applicant's assertion in its response to FWQ 7.0.1 in Horizons response to Interested Parties responses to the ExA's First Round Written Questions [REP3-005] that:  'while the IACC claim that "the worst-case scenario has not always been assessed with regards to impacts on historic landscape, landscape character and designations (eg on the AONB, Cestyll Garden and Dame Sylvia Crowe's designed landscape)", this claim is not substantiated.'
<b>Q2.7.2</b>	Applicant	WF	In para. 7.19.4 of its Deadline 2 WR [REP2-325] NRW requests detailed proposals to confirm that the landscape and visual integration with the AONB of the WNDA, (including the Power Station, Site Campus, MOLF and breakwater) has been developed sufficiently and in particular that details of the proposed colour scheme illustrated with elevation drawings and

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			<p>photomontages are submitted. The response at para. 7.77.3 to 7.77.5 [REP3-035] explains the post-consent approval procedures set out in Requirements in the dDCO [REP2-020].</p> <p>In view of the importance of mitigating harm to the AONB by careful design of the appearance of the WNDA illustrate, by way of drawings and photomontages, how the power station might appear in the landscape during operational mode if Design Principles 31, 32 and 32 and the principles set out in paras. 4.1.22 to 4.1.31 of Volume 2 of the Design and Access Statement [REP4-017] are followed.</p>
<b>Q2.7.3</b>	Applicant	WF	<p>Explain how the following overarching landscape design and mitigation principles set out in the Landscape and Habitat Management Strategy [REP2-039] and particularly relevant to landscape and visual integration with the AONB, would be developed, consulted on, submitted to IACC and determined prior to the work taking place?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “A new landscape setting will be created that reflects the existing open, rolling, drumlin landscape character and sense of place, minimizing harm to the setting of the Anglesey Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and North Anglesey Heritage Coast.”</li> <li>• “An appropriate landscape setting will be provided to help integrate a major development through the use of large scale mounding and tree planting to soften views of the Power Station and reduce adverse visual impacts, screening low level buildings and maintaining a natural setting as close to the Power Station as possible.”</li> </ul>
<b>Q2.7.4</b>	Applicant	WF	Referring to NPS-EN1 paras. 5.9.9 to 5.9.11 and the statement in para. 7.77.7 of Horizon’s Response to the WR at Deadline 2 from NRW [REP3-035] that: ‘Horizon considers that in general landscape and visual

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			<p>mitigation is most effectively provided 'at source'. Explain, in relation to the Isle of Anglesey AONB, how the tests of 'substantial weight' to be given to development proposed within nationally designated landscapes and the need to assess 'any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated' are met through the dDCO.</p> <p>Why aren't NRW's proposals in para. 7.19.6 of its Deadline 2 WR [REP2-325] including: 'that opportunities are required off-site within the AONB to mitigate/compensate for the development's significant visual effects' in order to 'support the area's conservation and enhancement policy requirements'; reasonable in the circumstances?</p> <p>Is a more positive response to NPS-EN1 paras 5.99 to 5.9.11 required?</p>
<b>Q2.7.5</b>	Applicant	FW	<p>In its response to IACC's answer to FWQ 7.0.5 Horizon state (it) 'is considering providing illustrative construction visualisations to supplement the current information on construction effects'. [REP3-005].</p> <p>The ExA would find visualisations of the construction phase helpful in understanding its landscape and visual impacts and the mitigation that is required and ask that these be submitted at Deadline 6.</p>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Marine Environment</b>		
<b>Q2.8.1</b>	NRW	WD	Is NRW content with the Applicant's approach to controlling marine noise impacts for operations other than piling, in the light of no guidance or best practice being available?
<b>Q2.8.2</b>	NRW	WD	What is NRW's view on adaptive mitigation in relation to the Water

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			Framework Directive Article 4(7) and the certainty of delivery of appropriate mitigation?
<b>Q2.8.3</b>	The Applicant		NRW advise [REP4-039, para 3.6.3] that the full Vessel Management Plan (VMP) should be included in the Marine Works Sub-Code of Construction Practice (MWSCoCP), rather than the principles, which the Applicant proposes. Is the Applicant willing to include the details of the VMP?
<b>Q2.8.4</b>			The Applicant provided an Ecological Enhancements Mitigation Report at D4 which includes an options appraisal for ecological enhancement and revised measures to reduce the effects on rocky reef habitat from a moderate adverse to minor adverse effect. Is NRW and NT content that the mitigation would reduce the effects to minor adverse?
<b>Q2.8.5</b>	The Applicant		In its D4 submission [REP4-039, para3.9.3] NRW states that there are still some gaps related to invasive non-native species (INNS) that need to be addressed in the final Biosecurity Risk Assessment which should be set out in the detailed MWSCoCP and approved by the discharging authority (in consultation with NRW) as a DCO Requirement. Can NRW explain what these gaps are and how they could be filled?  Is the Applicant willing to update the Risk Assessment to include NRW's requirements?
<b>Q2.8.6</b>	The Applicant		NRW [REP4-039, para3.9.4] requested clarification on the role of the Ecological Clerk of Works with respect to the marine environment and whether the role would be responsible for i) securing adequate environmental controls in the marine environment, and ii) ensuring compliance with risk assessments management plans and actions required to reduce risks around marine INNS. Can the Applicant and NRW agree on the role?

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>Q2.8.7</b>	The Applicant		For Anglesey North coastal water body, NRW requires modelling to show the impacts of cooling water discharge on hydrodynamic processes in the water body [REP4-039, para 3.7.6]. Can the Applicant provide this information?
<b>Q2.8.8</b>	The Applicant		NRW [REP4-039, para 3.7.10] advises that, given the remaining uncertainty about the risks to Tre'r Gôf Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystem if the groundwater level is altered, provision for monitoring and mitigation of groundwater around Tre'r Gôf should be in the Main Site Sub-CoCP. Is the Applicant willing to include this provision in the Sub-CoCP?
<b>Q2.8.9</b>	The Applicant		NRW advise [REP4-039, para 3.10.2] that for monitoring the entrapment of Section 7 fish, detailed monitoring proposals should be set out in a detailed Code of Operational Practice and approved by the discharging authority, in consultation with NRW, as a DCO Requirement. Is the Applicant willing to include this provision in a CoOP secured in the DCO?
<b>Q2.8.10</b>	The Applicant		Is NRW content with the conclusion drawn by the Applicant that as a result of the five requests for non-material changes, the cumulative assessment for marine mammals does not change?
<b>9.</b>	<b>Noise and Vibration</b>		
<b>Q2.9.1</b>	IACC	All	Are there any matters in relation to the noise and vibration associated with the proposed construction activities that would suggest there to be deficiencies in the assessment of the possible effects of noise and vibration across the differing parts (i.e. locations) of the scheme?
<b>Q2.9.2</b>	The Applicant	ADA	Respond to matters raised within the Land and Lakes representation [REP2-

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
	and IACC		261] regarding noise impacts, or alternatively, highlight where you consider the matters to be already addressed within your evidence.
<b>Q2.9.3</b>	IACC & NRW	All	Section 4.10 of NPS-EN-1 addresses pollution control and other environmental regulatory regimes. Would regulation during the construction and operational phases of the proposal be likely to adequately address any potential impacts associated with: waste and materials management; off-site flood risk, bathing water quality at Cemaes; dust and air quality; noise and vibration; and, on soils and geology?
<b>Q2.9.4</b>	The Applicant IACC & NRW	All	Paragraph 4.10.8 of NPS-EN-1 states that consent should not be refused on the basis of pollution impacts unless there is good reason to believe that any relevant necessary operational pollution control permits or licences or other consents will not subsequently be granted. Is there good reason to believe that the relevant regulators would be unlikely to grant pollution control permits or licences for the construction and operation of the proposed development?
<b>Q2.9.5</b>	The Applicant & NRW	WA	Section 2.5 of the Wylfa Newydd Code of Operational Practice Rev 2.0 [REP2-037] refers to the obtaining of an Environmental Permit for the operation of the Power Station. In relation to the Mitigation Route Map (Rev 2.0) [REP2-038], is the scope of NRW's role (and that of the ONR) in the regulation of emissions from the Power Station clearly set out?
<b>10.</b>	<b>Socio Economic</b>		
	<b>Accommodation</b>		
<b>Q2.10.1</b>	Applicant	ADA	At what phase would the central amenity block be delivered? If it is not in the first phase what would be the interim arrangements for medical, social and recreational functions at the Temporary Workers

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			Accommodation (TWA)?
<b>Q2.10.2</b>	Applicant	ADA	Provide further evidence of how high quality accommodation at the TWA would be provided, in particular reference to how concerns regarding noise and smell would be managed.
<b>Q2.10.3</b>	Applicant	ADA	How would the TWA become the 'accommodation of choice' for the majority of the construction workforce?
<b>Q2.10.4</b>	Applicant	ADA	Given the cost of accommodation on Ynys Môn, how would the TWA be priced to ensure that it would be affordable and the first choice for the majority of workers?
<b>Q2.10.5</b>	Applicant	ADA	Given the concerns raised by the IACC, GCC and the WG regarding demand on existing housing stock and tourist accommodation could the TWA be made bigger and/or be retained for longer?
<b>Q2.10.6</b>	Applicant	ADA	Explain why procurement, design and construction issues would delay the timescale for delivery of the TWA- please provide further detail.
<b>Q2.10.7</b>	Applicant, IACC GCC and WG	ADA	What should the minimum occupancy levels for the TWA be and how should they be secured?
<b>Q2.10.8</b>	L&L	ADA	The sites held by L&L are not within the order limits. However, at the ISH it was suggested that a 'Grampian' style requirement could potentially be used. Provide further explanation including an example of appropriate drafting or a provision for the dDCO.
<b>Q2.10.9</b>	L&L	ADA	1) Could/would you implement your planning permission without a commercial agreement with the Applicant being in place?

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			2) If your planning permission was not restricted by the need to be used for TWA what would prevent you building out your scheme?
<b>Q2.10.10</b>	Applicant and L&L	ADA	Can you each provide a table detailing what your scheme for TWA would physically deliver including but not limited to number and type of units proposed; facilities that would be provided on site (eg leisure, health and social) and number of parking spaces proposed. Example table provided at Appendix 2.
<b>Q2.10.11</b>	Applicant	ADA	At the ISH in October you indicated that the provision of TWA on-site would save HNP £30 million per 1,000 workers per year. Provide a further breakdown of how this figure was reached and the effect of this in relation to the financial viability of the application?
<b>Q2.10.12</b>	IACC	ADA	At the ISH on 7 January 2019 you indicated you considered the need for a Requirement limiting the number of workers on site until the TWA became available. Can you provide further detail, including suggested drafting of a relevant provision and an explanation regarding the proposed threshold levels?
<b>Q2.10.13</b>	IACC, GCC and WG	Q	At the ISH on 7 January 2019 you raised concerns regarding the actual turnover/availability of stock in the private rented sector indicating you thought it was less than that suggested by the Applicant. What evidence do you have to support this claim?
<b>Q2.10.14</b>	Applicant, IACC, GCC, NWP and WG	Q	At the ISH on 7 January 2019 it was suggested that a portal monitoring where workers lived would be needed. Can you provide further detail of how this would operate, how often it would need to be updated, how it could be secured and what it would enable?

Reference	Respondent:	Location:	Question:
<b>Q2.10.15</b>	Applicant, IACC and GCC	Q	<p>Applicant can you:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Provide further detail as to how the £10 million for the proposed Housing Fund was calculated.</li> <li>2) Indicate when and for how long the fund would be available.</li> <li>3) How would the Housing Fund enable the delivery of more empty homes than the current schemes run by the IACC and GCC?</li> <li>4) How could the Housing Fund be pro-active rather than re-active in enabling the delivery of housing?</li> </ol> <p>IACC and GCC can you:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Advise whether the £10 million proposed would be sufficient and if not why not.</li> <li>2) Indicate when you consider the fund should be available from and how long it should run for.</li> <li>3) Indicate how you think the fund could provide the 'capacity enhancement boost' suggested by the Applicant.</li> </ol>
<b>Q2.10.16</b>	IACC	Q	<p>Please outline the planning status of the Rhosgoch site. In particular can you advise whether the site was considered for TWA as part of the JLDP/SPG? Whether the site could be used for residential purposes? What constraints exist at the site eg are there issues with contamination/remediation?</p>
<b>Q2.10.17</b>	Applicant	Q	<p>A number of IPs [eg REP2-295] have suggested that the Workers Accommodation Management Strategy (WAMS) needs to be secured in the DCO – how and where could this be achieved?</p>
<b>Q2.10.18</b>	Applicant, IACC, GCC and WG		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) What could be the effect on accommodation availability on Ynys Mô if the provision of the TWA was delayed?</li> </ol>

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			<p>2) If the effect was thought to be negative would there be alternative arrangements or would there be a need for a Requirement to manage this situation?</p> <p>3) If a Requirement was considered necessary please provide suggested wording.</p>
	<b>Employment</b>		
<b>Q2.10.19</b>	Applicant, IACC, GCC and WG	Q	Would a Supply Chain Action plan be required? If so what could it deliver, when would it be needed and how should it be secured?
<b>Q2.10.20</b>	IACC	Q	<p>1) How many people are currently employed in tourism on Ynys Môn?</p> <p>2) How many are employed on a seasonal basis?</p> <p>3) Where do seasonal workers come from?</p> <p>4) What proportion speak Welsh?</p>
<b>Q2.10.21</b>	Applicant, IACC, GCC and WG	Q	<p>1) Provide a copy of the terms of reference for the Job Skills and Implementation Plan (JSIP).</p> <p>2) Explain how the plan would be secured and delivered.</p> <p>3) Explain who, given the integrated nature of the job market in the area and the extent of the DCCZ, would be involved with the delivery of the JSIP?</p>
<b>Q2.10.22</b>	Applicant, IACC, GCC and WG	Q	<p>Applicant can you:</p> <p>1) Provide further detail as to how the £10 million for the proposed Employment/Skills fund was calculated.</p> <p>2) Indicate when and for how long the fund could be available and what could it be used for.</p> <p>IACC, GCC and WG can you:</p>

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			<p>1) Advise whether the £10 million proposed would be sufficient and if not why not.</p> <p>2) Indicate when you consider the fund should be available from, how long it should run for and what it would be used for.</p>
<b>Q2.10.23</b>	WG and IACC	Q	<p>WG - At the ISH on 8 January 2019 you indicated that you would prefer the use of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) rather than targets for jobs and employment can you:</p> <p>1) Explain why you consider KPIs would be better than targets.</p> <p>2) Indicate what KPIs you consider would be appropriate and how they would need to be secured.</p> <p>3) Outline what would happen in the event of a KPI not being met?</p> <p>IACC can you:</p> <p>1) Explain why you prefer the use of targets.</p> <p>2) Indicate what targets you consider would be appropriate and how they need to be secured.</p> <p>3) Outline what would happen in the event of a target not being met?</p>
<b>Q2.10.24</b>	Applicant and IACC	Q	Should the early phases of construction have higher targets for the use of local labour and if so how could this be secured?
<b>Q2.10.25</b>	Applicant, IACC, GCC and WG	Q	Do 'local', 'visitor' and 'worker' need to be defined? If they do what and where should these definitions be located?
<b>Q2.10.26</b>	GCC	Q	In REP2-294 you raised a concern regarding third sector providers can you indicate who they are, what they would need and how this could be funded.

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>Q2.10.27</b>	Applicant	Q	Can you indicate what specialist support you would provide for organisations to back fill positions in key worker roles such as health and social care, language specialists or the emergency services that could be created by the displacement of staff to work on the project?
<b>Q2.10.28</b>	Applicant	Q	Can you outline how you would work with/support NWFR to ensure that the fire service provision for Ynys Môn currently delivered through the retained fire crews could be maintained throughout the construction and operational phases of the scheme.
<b>Q2.10.29</b>	Applicant	Q	What support and/or training could be provided for adults and those already in work to enable them to reskill to access job opportunities particularly during the operational phase?
<b>Health</b>			
<b>Q2.10.30</b>	Applicant	ADA/Q	Confirm how, when and where health care provision would be provided at the site should the DCO be consented.
<b>Q2.10.31</b>	Applicant, BCUHB and PHW	ADA/Q	Is there an early year's strategy in place to ensure that current levels of local health service provision (including ambulance services) could be maintained in the absence of provision on site.
<b>Q2.10.32</b>	Applicant and BCUHB	ADA/Q	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Detail what health services would be provided on site and what would be out-sourced to local providers.</li> <li>2) What hours would the service operate, how would workers on night shifts access services and what provision would there be for out of hours emergencies?</li> <li>3) What number of health staff would be employed on site and would this be reflective of the NHS staff: patient ratios?</li> <li>4) Would health services be available in Welsh?</li> </ol>

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			5) How would the transfer between on-site and NHS services work?
<b>Q2.10.33</b>	Applicant	Q	At the ISH on 7 January 2019 you indicated that prescriptions would be filled for free through the on-site pharmacy. How and where would this be secured?
<b>Q2.10.34</b>	Applicant	Q	An on-site paramedic, ambulance and firefighting team are proposed at WNDA. Who would be responsible for responding to incidents off site (eg at the Park and Ride or the logistics centre)?
<b>Tourism</b>			
<b>Q2.10.35</b>	IACC and WG	Q	Provide details for the number of people who annually use the Welsh Costal Path (WCP) and what the WCP contributes to the economy of both Ynys Môn and North Wales.
<b>Welsh Language and Culture</b>			
<b>Q2.10.36</b>	IACC	Q	Provide a map of Ynys Môn showing of the percentage of Welsh speakers by ward.
<b>Q2.10.37</b>	IACC and WG	Q	<p>You have suggested the need for targets for the number of Welsh speakers that would be employed both during construction and operation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) How would this be secured?</li> <li>2) Should the target apply to homebased workers?</li> <li>3) If it is would be secured through a Requirement how would Welsh speaker be defined?</li> <li>4) What should happen if the target was not met?</li> </ol> <p>Operationally you have suggested a target of 100% Welsh speakers with a</p>

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			<p>minimum requirement of 85%.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Is this realistic?</li> <li>2) Can you provide an example of another business or organisation that is required to achieve a similar proportion of Welsh speaking staff and has it been achieved?</li> <li>3) What should happen if the target was not met?</li> </ol>
<b>Q2.10.38</b>	Applicant, IACC, GCC and WG	Q	<p>Applicant – please set out/signpost where it can be found, your proposed monitoring strategy for the Welsh language including how frequently monitoring would be undertaken; what area the monitoring would cover; who would review the monitoring; what actions would result from the monitoring and how the monitoring would be secured/funded.</p> <p>IACC, GCC and WG please set out how frequently you consider monitoring should be undertaken; what area should be monitored; who should review the monitoring; what actions should result from the monitoring and how you would want to see the monitoring secured/funded.</p>
<b>Q2.10.39</b>	Applicant	Q	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Provide details of which of the various proposed S106 funds would contribute funding towards Welsh language and culture.</li> <li>2) As the funding appears to be spread across a number of funds indicate the total amount that would be available to fund Welsh language and culture</li> </ol>
<b>Q2.10.40</b>	IACC, GCC and WG	Q	You have raised concerns regarding the robustness of the Welsh Language Impact Assessment (WLIA) – was the scope of the WLIA agreed with you prior to submission?
<b>Q2.10.41</b>	Applicant	Q	Have the possibilities of on-line training in the Welsh language been

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			considered?
<b>Q2.10.42</b>	IACC	Q	<p>As a destination for tourism, the population of the island fluctuates throughout the year:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) On average how many tourists visit the island at the peak of the season?</li> <li>2) How many of these tourists are Welsh speakers?</li> <li>3) Has there been any noted effect on the Welsh language as a result of this annual influx of visitors and the recent growth in tourism?</li> </ol>
<b>Q2.10.43</b>	IACC	Q	<p>You have referred to the fact that Ynys Môn has become a place that people retire to and that this is the largest growing section of the population:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) How many people retire to the island?</li> <li>2) Of these how many are Welsh speakers?</li> <li>3) Of the non-Welsh speakers what opportunities are provided for them to learn Welsh and how many do?</li> <li>4) Has there been any noted effect in the Welsh language as a result of this increase in the population?</li> </ol>
<b>11.</b>	<b>Traffic and Transport</b>		
<b>Q2.11.1</b>	IACC, GCC and WG	Q	<p>Provide further details of the proposed park and share sites including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Their location and capacity.</li> <li>2) Whether the sites already exist or are in the process of being consented/constructed?</li> <li>3) If sites are subject to consent/construction an indication of when they would be available for use.</li> </ol>

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			<p>4) Whether workers would be charged to use the facilities and if so what the rates would be.</p> <p>5) How would workers be encouraged/required to use these sites?</p> <p>6) Are the proposed sites to be used by workers car sharing or would they be directly connected to the WNDA?</p> <p>7) How would the park and share sites be linked to the current application?</p>
<b>Q2.11.2</b>	Applicant	Q	Planning permission has been granted for the on-line highways works – when would work commence on site?
<b>Q2.11.3</b>	IACC, GCC or WG	Q	What is the maximum vehicle size that could cross the Menai Bridge?
<b>Q2.11.4</b>	Applicant, IACC, GCC and WG	Q	What would be the stacking arrangements for HGVs on the mainland in the event of Britannia Bridge closing?
<b>Q2.11.5</b>	Applicant, WG and NWP	Q	<p>1) Are Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs) required by law to be escorted by Police in Wales?</p> <p>2) If they are not, is the Applicant proposing to use the Police or another organisation to escort the AILs?</p> <p>3) Would an AIL management plan be required?</p> <p>4) How would AILs be managed prior to the opening of the MOLF and the improvements to the A5025?</p>
<b>Q2.11.6</b>	Applicant, IACC, GCC, WG and NWP	Q	<p>Would an early year's strategy for highways movements, including any necessary arrangements that may arise if the MOLF or highways works were delayed, be required?</p> <p>If yes could this be delivered by a suitably worded requirement?</p>

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>Q2.11.7</b>	Applicant	Q	<p>The proposed road layout for accessing the Dalar Hir Park and Ride site would not currently comply with design guidance. Can you:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) agree an alternative layout with the relevant highways authority; and</li> <li>2) submit amended plans that would be within the DCO envelop showing the agreed layout.</li> </ol>
<b>Q2.11.8</b>	Applicant, IACC, GCC and WG	Q	<p>The proposed level and location of parking is predicated on a significant number of workers car sharing. However, the levels of car sharing at Hinkley Point C are below those originally estimated.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) How would the necessary levels of car sharing be secured?</li> <li>2) Should it be secured through a Requirement?</li> <li>3) What should happen if the necessary levels are not achieved?</li> </ol>
<b>Q2.11.9</b>	Applicant	Q	<p>Can you confirm whether the traffic modelling included or excluded the HGVs that would be generated by the decommissioning of Wylfa A and if they were included what effect their omission would have on the baseline model?</p>
<b>Q2.11.10</b>	Applicant	Q	<p>Can you confirm whether the traffic modelling/Transport Assessment considered blue light response times and if not, why not.</p>
<b>Q2.11.11</b>	GCC	Q	<p>You [REP2-297] have suggested that limits should be set for all construction vehicles not just HGVs. Can you:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) explain why you consider this would be necessary;</li> <li>2) advise what you consider the necessary thresholds should be;</li> </ol>

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			3) outline how you would want to see it secured, and 4) explain who it could be monitored
<b>Q2.11.12</b>	Applicant	Q	Can you explain whether the Active Travel (Wales) Act 2013 would need to be considered and if so what the implications for the proposal would be?
<b>Q2.11.13</b>	Applicant	Q	Has any work been undertaken to model the availability of the MOLF (such as historic wind strength and sea state data) and were the outputs of this modelling factored into the Transport Assessment/traffic modelling?
<b>Q2.11.14</b>	Applicant	Q	The IACC, GCC and WG have all raised concerns regarding the potential for 'fly parking'. How do you propose to deal with this matter?
<b>Q2.11.15</b>	Applicant	Q	Concerns have been raised regarding the age of the traffic and accident data used in the Transport Assessment/traffic modelling. Can you: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) explain why this data was used;</li> <li>2) advise whether there is any more recent data available; and</li> <li>3) if more recent data was to be used would this result in different outputs?</li> </ol>
<b>Q2.11.16</b>	Applicant, IACC, GCC and WG	Q	The pre-commencement works proposed would be quite wide ranging and would require a significant number of vehicle movements. Would these works need to be managed and if so how should this be secured?
<b>Q2.11.17</b>	Applicant, IACC, GCC and WG	Q	The traffic proposals are predicated on the basis that the majority of 'bulk materials' would be delivered by the MOLF. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Does 'bulk material' need to be defined and if so what should the definition be?</li> </ol>

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			<p>2) Explain whether the 60% target for bulk materials would be from day 1 of the opening of the MOLF or would this be cumulative across the construction period as a whole?</p> <p>3) How would this be monitored and what would happen if the target was not achieved?</p>
<b>Q2.11.18</b>	Applicant, IACC, GCC and WG	Q	<p>NWP advocate the need for a construction traffic management plan and an operational traffic management plan.</p> <p>1) Do you agree?</p> <p>2) If not, why not?</p> <p>3) If you do agree what should the plans control and how should they be secured?</p>
<b>Q2.11.19</b>	L&L	Q	Would the additional buses needed to transport workers from Cae Glas and Kingsland effect the outputs of the Transport Assessment/traffic modelling?
<b>12.</b>	<b>Costal Change</b>		
<b>Q2.12.1</b>	The Applicant		NRW [REP4-039 para 4.2.1] still has uncertainties about the reflected wave conditions and changes to hydromorphology in relation to sediments at Cemlyn Bay which it advises needs to be considered further. Can the Applicant and NRW come to an agreed position?
<b>Q2.12.2</b>	The Applicant		At the ISH on 11 January 2019, the Applicant [REP4-004, page 10] agreed to consider what additional detail can be included within the Construction Method Statement to provide further details on shoreline protection. At what stage will these details be available?
<b>Q2.12.3</b>	The Applicant		The Applicant [REP4-004, p8] stated that it would provide a monitoring

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			programme and adopt an adaptive management approach to coastal change hydrogeomorphology in response to the NTs concerns. At what stage will these details be available?.
<b>13.</b>	<b>Deadline 4 Change Requests</b>		
	<b>Worker Shift Patterns</b>		
<b>Q2.13.1</b>	Applicant	Q	Provide further explanation as to why the proposed change to workers shift patterns is required with particular reference as to why it is considered that the first three hours of shifts as currently proposed would be 'unproductive' (para 2.3.2 REP4-011).
<b>Q2.13.2</b>	Applicant	Q	If the proposed change to shift patterns would improve productivity how would this affect the timetable for the delivery of the proposed project?
<b>Q2.13.3</b>	Applicant	Q	It is unclear to whom the proposed change to shift patterns applies. Clarify whether it would be for all workers at all sites or just for those workers based at the WNDA?
<b>Q2.13.4</b>	Applicant	Q	<p>You refer (para 2.5.5 of REP4-011) to the fact that a 'minority' of staff (such as catering, security, cleaning and some specialist staff) would not follow the proposed shift pattern.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) How many workers would the proposed shift pattern apply to?</li> <li>2) How many is a 'minority' of staff?</li> <li>3) What would the shift pattern for this group be?</li> </ol>
<b>Q2.13.5</b>	Applicant	Q	Under the proposed change request for working hours some construction activity would operate at WNDA 24/7. However, under the proposed shift patterns there would be no staff (apart from the staff referred to in the question above) on site for an hour between 06:00 and 07:00 and for an

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			<p>hour/hour and a half between 18:00/18:30 and 19:30.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Which types of activities would require staffing 24/7?</li> <li>2) How many staff would be required to run these activities?</li> <li>3) Would they require a different shift pattern and if so what would this shift pattern need to be?</li> </ol>
<b>Q2.13.6</b>	Applicant	Q	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) When would a worker using the Park and Ride at Dalar Hir start their shift – when they reach Dalar Hir or when they reach the WNDA?</li> <li>2) If it is when they arrive at the WNDA what time would they need to be at the Park and Ride facility and has the need to arrive at the Park and Ride prior to the start of their shift been factored into the transport modelling?</li> </ol>
<b>Q2.13.7</b>	Applicant, IACC, GCC and WG	Q	Would the AM and PM peak for commuter traffic change/extend as a result of the proposed shift patterns for workers and if so what effect would this have on the conclusions of the Transport Assessment/traffic modelling, with particular reference to Britannia Bridge?
<b>Q2.13.8</b>	Interested Parties		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Any comments with regards to the proposed change to workers shift patterns?</li> <li>2) With regards to the proposed change would it result in a material or non-material change to the application? Please explain your reasoning.</li> </ol>
<b>HGV Movements</b>			
<b>Q2.13.9</b>	Applicant	Q	What would be the economic consequences and effects on the timeline for construction activities if the proposed increase in hours only became effective after the on and off-line highways works to the A5025 were completed?

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>Q2.13.10</b>	Applicant	Q	The explanation provided for the proposed change is to ensure that HGV deliveries to the WNDA would be maintained in the event of unforeseen delays such as the MOLF being unable to operate due to bad weather. Yet, the proposed number of HGV movements overall would remain unchanged. Explain the reasoning further and how this would be achieved?
<b>Q2.13.11</b>	Applicant	Q	<p>In paragraph 2.3.5 of the change request [REP4-013] improving the frequency of HGV deliveries is said to enable acceleration of the construction programme.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) How would the proposed change enable this?</li> <li>2) How would this be possible if the overall number of HGV movements on a daily/monthly/annual basis would remain the same?</li> <li>3) Provide a visual aid which illustrates the difference in the two scenarios- with and without the change request.</li> </ol>
<b>Q2.13.12</b>	Applicant	Q	Can you explain why all the properties which would suffer a significant adverse effect (325) would not be eligible for mitigation such as noise insulation?
<b>Q2.13.13</b>	IACC	Q	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) How should the use of a low noise road surface referred to in the Design and Access Statement Volume 3 [REP4-018 and 019] be secured?</li> <li>2) Given the limited reduction in noise that it would achieve would it be necessary?</li> <li>3) What consideration has been given to the use of a Very Low Noise Surfacing in those areas that would be subject to increased noise?</li> </ol>
<b>Q2.13.14</b>	Applicant	Q	1) What is the dB L <sub>Aeq T</sub> World Health Organisation's Night Noise

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			<p>Guidelines for Europe for the night time period and what is the definition of night time?</p> <p>2) What would be the effect if this, rather than the daytime criteria, was applied to the 19:00 to 23:00 period with specific reference to properties that would experience a significant adverse effect?</p>
<b>Q2.13.15</b>	Applicant and IACC	Q	How should the proposed change be secured in the dDCO?
<b>Q2.13.16</b>	Interested Parties	Q	<p>1) Any comments with regards to the proposed change to workers HGV movements?</p> <p>2) With regards to the proposed change would it result in a material or non-material change to the application? Please explain your reasoning.</p>
<b>Working Hours</b>			
<b>Q2.13.17</b>	Applicant	Q	<p>1) Explain why a proposed change in the working hours on site would give rise to the need for additional internal haul roads.</p> <p>2) Provide a plan showing the route of the additional internal haul roads.</p>
<b>Q2.13.18</b>	Applicant	Q	Explain why it is more appropriate to assess the effect of the proposed change against the qualified residual effects set out in the change request rather than through the Environmental Statement? [Para 2.5.5 of REP4-012].
<b>Q2.13.19</b>	Applicant	Q	How many residential receptors is the 25% referred to in paragraph 2.5.44 [REP4-012] that would no longer experience major adverse significant effects compared to the current application?
<b>Q2.13.20</b>	Applicant	Q	1) How would the proposed change to working hours affect occupants of

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			<p>the TWA?</p> <p>2) What measures are proposed to mitigate the effect on the living conditions of the occupants of the TWA?</p>
<b>Q2.13.21</b>	Applicant	Q	By reference to the construction timeline, explain at what periods of time the works to which the change request refers would take place and the duration over which these works would occur.
<b>Q2.13.22</b>	Interested Parties	Q	<p>1) Any comments with regards to the proposed change to working hours?</p> <p>2) With regards to the proposed change would it result in a material or non-material change to the application? Please explain your reasoning.</p>
<b>General Question on Change Requests</b>			
<b>Q2.13.23</b>	Applicant	Q	The dDCO, CoCP and other control documents would need to be amended if the change requests [REP4-011, 012 and 013] were to be accepted into the Examination. Provide a list for each change request of the documents that would require to be updated?
<b>14.</b>	<b>General Questions</b>		
<b>Q2.14.1</b>	The Applicant (and NRW & IACC)	All	Paragraph 1.1.1 of the Mitigation Route Map Rev. 2.0 [REP2-038] refers to the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010. However, other parts of the Mitigation Route Map refer to the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016. Given the scope of the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 (and the Revocations set out in Schedule 28 of the 2016 Regulations), should paragraph 1.1.1 refer to the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016?

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>Q2.14.2</b>	Applicant	Q	Will the delay in the Site Preparation and Clearance Works resulting from the application being called in: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) affect the overall phasing/programme?</li> <li>2) Do any of the documents need to be updated/revised to reflect this change?</li> </ol>
<b>Q2.14.3</b>	Applicant	Q	Have the effects (traffic movements, number of workers, construction period etc) of the construction of the spent fuel storage facility which would only be started after the main construction has been completed been modelled and how would they be managed?
<b>Q2.14.4</b>	Applicant and IACC	Q	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Could the port of Holyhead be used for moving bulk goods prior to the opening of the MOLF?</li> <li>2) Was this considered and if so why was it not included as an option?</li> </ol>
<b>Q2.14.5</b>	NACP	Q	You refer [REP2-333] to the potential for a scheme for 200 houses at Madyn Farm, Amlwch to be used by workers. Please provide further details including how many workers the scheme could accommodate.
<b>Q2.14.6</b>	Applicant	Q	Would the proposed Community Infrastructure Fund bridge gaps in the resourcing of public services (eg community policing) where further unanticipated impacts arise or would this be the subject of a separate contingency fund?
<b>Q2.14.7</b>	WG	Q	You [REP2-367] are seeking a contribution to the proposed third Menai crossing. Can you: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Explain on what basis a contribution is being sought?</li> <li>2) Explain how such a contribution would meet the S106 tests?</li> </ol>

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			3) Detail how much the contribution would be.
<b>Q2.14.8</b>	Applicant and IACC	Q	Could/should the Trywydd Corpr/Copper Trail revert back to its original route (ie away from the A5025) after the construction period?
<b>Q2.14.9</b>	Applicant	All	Should the General Glossary [APP-006] include a definition of 'power island'?
<b>Q2.14.10</b>	Applicant and all Interested Parties	All	<p>The ISHs in March will consider the proposed WNDA and its constituent spatial elements in particular what is proposed for the site; what mitigation would be required and how this would be secured through the dDCO, CoCP and subCoCPs or the S106.</p> <p>The ExA propose to consider the WNDA as a whole but also propose on an individual basis to address the Marine Off Loading Facility and Breakwater; the Main Power Island Site; the Site Campus/Temporary Workers Accommodation and the other on-site developments.</p> <p>In considering these elements particular attention will be paid to issues in relation, but not limited, to the following effects individually and in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape and visual;</li> <li>• Historic environment;</li> <li>• Good design;</li> <li>• Lighting;</li> <li>• Noise and Vibration;</li> <li>• Air Quality and Dust; and</li> <li>• Waste management and radioactive waste management.</li> </ul>

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			<p>A second ISH on 'Other Sites' will consider the same range of issues on a similar basis for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Off Site Power Station Facilities site;</li> <li>• Dalar Hir Park and Ride site;</li> <li>• Parc Cybi Logistics Centre;</li> <li>• A5025 Off-line Highways Improvements; and</li> <li>• Ecological Compensation sites.</li> </ul> <p>With reference to the emerging SoCG are there any areas/topics in relation to the WNDA or the Other Sites where you consider agreement may not be reached before the end of the examination, bearing in mind the evidence both oral and written that has been submitted to date, and which you would wish the ExA to consider at these ISHs?</p>
<b>15.</b>	<b>Good Design</b>		
<b>Q2.15.1</b>	Applicant; IACC; WG		<p>In relation to the Spent Fuel Storage Facility (Building no 9-201) and the Intermediate Level Waste Storage Facility (Building no 9-202) explain:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The phasing of construction in relation to the Main Power Station site construction programme and how the development site would be accessed and serviced?</li> <li>2) The maximum potential length of time these buildings would be required?</li> <li>3) How, in the event of the two buildings being required beyond the operational and, potentially, decommissioning phases of the project, <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the size and boundaries of the site they would occupy;</li> <li>b. how they would be accessed, serviced and provided with car and cycle parking; and</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			<p>c. how they would appear in the landscape from a visual perspective – using illustrative plans if possible;</p> <p>4) Is the proposed design of these buildings, which may become 'stand alone' buildings in the wider landscape, of a high enough quality in relation to their location close to both the AONB and Cestyll (Grade II) Registered Park and Garden and would the materials used for their construction be sufficiently robust to stand for the period of time required?</p> <p>5) In the potential circumstances of a requirement for a very long operational life, would a different design approach be required and if so how might it be achieved?</p>
<b>Q2.15.2</b>	Applicant	Q	<p>NPS EN-1 states at paragraph 4.5.1 that "applying 'good design' to energy projects should produce sustainable infrastructure sensitive to place, efficient in the use of natural resources and energy used in their construction and operation, matched by an appearance that demonstrates good aesthetic as far as possible".</p> <p>TAN12: Design (2016) sets out a series of 'Design pointers' including 10 bullet points for environmental sustainability.</p> <p>One of the Wylfa Newydd Project-wide Objectives is to: 'develop a green and sustainable approach in the development and management of the buildings and operational activities' Design and Access Statement Vol. 1 para. 2.3.1 [REP4-016].</p> <p>Explain in the light of these policy objectives and in relation to the following buildings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WNDA development other than the Main Power Station – including the</li> </ul>

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			<p>Outage, Administration, Simulator and Training, Gatehouse and Search buildings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Off-Site Power Station Facilities;</li> <li>• Site Campus;</li> <li>• Park and Ride facility at Dalar Hir;</li> <li>• Logistics Centre at Parc Cybi.</li> </ul> <p>1) the sustainable technologies that would be applied to the buildings' design to achieve a low carbon footprint including materials, renewable energy, thermal insulation, natural ventilation to combat solar heat gain, rainwater harvesting; and</p> <p>2) the materials (including natural local materials) to be used for elevations and roofs that will be used to achieve a good aesthetic, visual appearance, scale and relationship to surroundings and context?</p>
<b>Q2.15.3</b>	Applicant; IACC; WG		<p>In response to FWQ14.0.3(b) the Applicant stated: 'Horizon's internal management arrangements will ensure that design of configured structures, systems and components follows a robust multi-disciplinary design review process as the project progresses'. [REP2-375]; however best practice in achieving good design in all the devolved nations emphasises the use of design codes and the value of independent expert external design advice</p> <p>Would there be merit in establishing:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Design codes that build on the Design and Access Statement; and</li> <li>2) A Design Quality Review Panel (using the auspices of the Design Commission for Wales) to provide advice on design quality and sustainability through the detailed design and construction phases of the project?</li> </ol>

Reference	Respondent:	Location:	Question:
			If so how might these initiatives be secured through the dDCO?
<b>16.</b>	<b>Need for the development</b>		
<b>Q2.16.1</b>	The Applicant	Q	<p>1) How would the suspended state affect the delivery of the project?</p> <p>2) If this would result in a delay to the delivery of the project please indicate how long you think this delay might be and how, if the project was to be delayed, the proposal could address the urgent need for energy infrastructure identified in EN-1 and the requirement that the decision maker should give substantial weight to the contribution which projects would make towards satisfying that need when considering applications for development consent under the Planning Act 2008? [EN-1 para. 3.1]?</p>
<b>17.</b>	<b>Policy Context</b>		
<b>Q2.17.1</b>	IACC	Q	Confirm the status of Wylfa Newydd Supplementary Planning Guidance, May 2018 and whether it is to be submitted into the Examination.
<b>Q2.17.2</b>	Applicant	Q	<p>Respond in general to J Chanay's submission at D4 [REP4-035] and in particular:</p> <p>1) Sections 4.2 to 4.5 in relation to section 105 of PA 2008, NPS EN-1, NPS EN-6, the consultation and government response on new nuclear siting and the Ministerial Statement - referencing case law (as appropriate) on material considerations (and Government policy as a material consideration) and weight.</p> <p>2) The weight, if any, to be given to the 2008 White Paper on Nuclear Power.</p> <p>3) Section 4.4 in relation to additional evidence on need for Wylfa Newydd beyond 2025.</p> <p>4) Section 4.7 in relation to continuing DCO evidence deficit.</p>

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
			<p>5) Section 4.8 in relation to the draft DCO s.106 Agreement.</p> <p>6) Section 4.9 in relation to Devolved jurisdiction matters and the DCO including the status of the proposed interim nuclear active waste storage facilities.</p>
<b>18.</b>	<b>Waste Management and Radioactive Waste Management</b>		
<b>Q2.18.1</b>	Applicant	All	How should the Waste and Materials Management Strategy (WMMS) and Site Waste Management Plans (SWMPs) be amended to include the adoption and implementation of sustainable waste management practices?
<b>Q2.18.2</b>	IACC	All	<p>Has the Applicant's explanation of waste matters, provided in section 11 of REP3-004, addressed your concerns as set out in the Local Impact Report on Waste Management [REP2-071]?</p> <p>If not, which of your concerns regarding waste management remain unresolved?</p>

## APPENDIX A – Compulsory Acquisition Schedule

Ob j No. i	Name/ Organisat ion	IP/AP Ref No. <sup>ii</sup>	RR Ref No. <sup>iii</sup>	WR Ref No. <sup>iv</sup>	Other Doc Ref Nov	Interest <sup>vi</sup>	Permane nt/ Tempora ry <sup>vii</sup>	Plot(s)	CA <sup>viii</sup>	Status of objection
1	Ann Tooze	200103 02	2			N/A	N/A	N/A	No	Not identified in the Book of Reference.
2	Roger Dobson	200102 95	7			Part 2 (Main site)	N/A	N/A	No	Discussions are ongoing with Mr Dobson regarding his property in Tregele.
3	Magnox Ltd	200103 87	13			Part 1 - Categories 1 and 2, and Part 3 (Main site)	Permanen t Class 1	69, 72, 74, 76, 79, 81, 83, 87, 89	Yes	Discussions with Magnox are ongoing regarding Horizon entering into a LC3 lease to initially carry out the works followed by an agreement to acquire the land from the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority following designation of the site.
							Permanen t Class 2	71, 73, 80, 82, 88		
							Temporar y Class 3	70, 75, 77, 84		
							Permanen t Class 4	64, 133, 137		

							Land not subject to powers of acquisition Class 6	78, 86		
4	SP Energy Networks	200103 86	14			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Discussions are ongoing to develop necessary protective provisions.
5	Gwawr Jones	200116 43	42			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not identified in the Book of Reference.
6	Davis Meade Property Consultants on behalf of MW, EW & M Harper	WYLF-AP045	48			Part 1 (Highways 3)	Permanent Class 1	579, 520, 519	Yes	Horizon is in discussions with Messrs Harpers via their agent about entering into a voluntary agreement in respect of their land.
							Permanent Class 2	517, 577, 578, 516, 575		
7	Humphreys Waste Recycling Ltd	200109 71	50			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not identified in the Book of Reference.
8	National Trust	200109 95	53			Part 1 Categories 1 and 2, Part 3, Part 5 (Main Site)	Permanent Class 1	63, 65	Yes	Horizon and National Trust have agreed to enter into a voluntary agreement regarding plots 63, 64 and 64 to provide for a private right of access in favour of National Trust that would ensure access across these plots is maintained following compulsory acquisition. Details of this

										private right of access including the final route are still to be finalised.
										Permanent Class 4
										Land not subject to powers of acquisition Class 6
9	Coed Cottages	200110 89	58			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not identified in the Book of Reference.
10	Mark Bennet <i>on behalf of</i> residents of Plas Ellen	200111 65	63			Part 1 and Part 2 (Highways 3)	Temporary Class 5	572	Yes	This property is identified in Part 1 of the Book of Reference. This Part 1 interest relates to subsoil and as such no voluntary agreement has been sought.

										The property is also identified in Part 2 of the Book of Reference. Horizon has engaged with the residents of this property on this basis and will continue to keep the objector informed throughout the process.
11	SP Energy Networks on behalf of SP Manweb	200115 63	80		Part 1 Cat 2, Part 3 (Main Site)	Permanent Class 1	1 2 3 4 5 13 14 15 26 42 43 45 46 47 48 49 50 59 63 65 67 69 74 76 79 81 83 85 87 89 93 94 100 105 116 119 132 142 144 150	Yes	Discussions are ongoing to develop the necessary protective provisions.	



								113 114 117 118 122 124 125 127 128 129 130 131 133 134 135 137 138 140 141 146 147 149		
							Temporar y Class 5	52 53 54 55 56 143 148 168 169 170 171 172 173		

							Land not subject to powers of acquisition Class 6	78 86		
							Part 1 Cat 2, Part 3 (Parc Cybi)	Permanent Class 1	207 209 210 213	
								Temporary Class 3	203	
								Temporary Class 5	202	
							Part 1 Cat 2, Part 3 (Dalar Hir )	Permanent Class 4	312	
								Temporary Class 5	302 304 305 309	
							Part 1 Cat 2, Part 3 (Highways 5)	Permanent Class 1	601 603 617 638 642 652 655 672 674 675	
								Permanent Class 2	628 640	

							673		
						Temporar y Class 3	602 618 620 622 641 644 645		
						Temporar y Class 5	604 606 607 610 632 635 656 657		
						Land not subject to powers of acquisitio n Class 6	658		
					Part 1 Cat 2, Part 3 (Highways 1)	Permanen t Class 1	407 408 411 423 427		
						Permanen t Class 2	421		
						Temporar y Class 3	409 424 426		



12	The Representative Body of The Church in Wales	WYLF-AP140	81			Part 1 Cat 2, Part 3 (Main Site)	Permanent Class 4	64 135	Yes	Horizon is considering the objector's interest and will engage with them directly to seek to resolve any issues.
						Part 1 Cat 2, Part 3 (Highways 1)	Permanent Class 1	427		
						Temporary Class 3	425 426			
13	Caroline Bateson	20011594	85			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not identified in the Book of Reference.
14	Addleshaw Goddard LLP on behalf of Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd	20011596	89			Highways 1	Permanent Class 1	407 408	Yes	Discussions are ongoing to develop the necessary voluntary agreement and protective provisions.
							Temporary Class 3	409		
15	Welsh Government	20011597	92			Part 1 Categories 1 and 2, Part 3 (Parc Cybi)	Permanent Class 1	200 207 209 210 211 212 213	Yes	Discussions are ongoing between Horizon and Welsh Government regarding the nature of Welsh Government's interest and rights in land, as detailed in the Crown Land Schedule submitted at Deadline 2.
							Permanent Class 2	201		

						Temporary Class 3	203 204 215		
						Temporary Class 5	202 208 214		
						Part 1 Categories 1 and 2	Permanent Class 1	303 327	
						Part 3 (Dalar Hir)	Permanent Class 4	310 312	
							Temporary Class 5	300 304 306 308 309 322 323 324 326	
						Part 1 Cat 1 (Highways 1)	Temporary Class 5	400 401	
16	Bryngwran Cymunedol Ltd	WYLF-SP004	93			N/A	N/A	N/A	Not identified in the Book of Reference.
17	Andrew Robert Patience	20011626	98			N/A	N/A	N/A	Not identified in the Book of Reference.
18	Brian Horsey	20011640	103			N/A	N/A	N/A	Not identified in the Book of Reference.
19	Dafydd Owen	20011651	106			N/A	N/A	N/A	Not identified in the Book of Reference.

20	Dr Isabel Hargreaves	200116 52	111			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not identified in the Book of Reference.	
21	Dwr Cymru Cyfyngedig	WYLF-AP157	112			Part 1 Categories 1 and 2, Part 3 (Main Site)	Permanent Class 1  13 14 43 59 63 65 67 69 74 76 79 81 83 85 87 89 93 94 105 151 152 153 154 158 159 160 163 165 166 167	Permanent Class 2  71 72 73 80 82 88	Temporary Class 3  70 75 77 84	Yes	Discussions are ongoing to develop the necessary protective provisions.

							Permanent t Class 4	32 33 39 40 64 68 95 96 97 102 107 108 109 110 112 114 118 122 123 124 125 126 133 134 135 137 138 140 141 146 148 149 150 176 179 183 184		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

							Temporar y Class 5	168 169 170 171 173		
							Land not subject to powers of acquisitio n Class 6	78 86 90 92		
							Part 1 Cat 2, Part 3 (Parc Cybi)	Permanent t Class 1	205 207 209 210 213	
								Temporar y Class 3	203	
								Temporar y Class 5	202 206 208	
							Part 1 Cat 2, Part 3 (Dalar Hir)	Permanent t Class 4	310 312	
								Temporar y Class 5	300 301 309 322 324 325 326	
								Part 1 Categories 1 and 2, Part 3	Permanent t Class 1	603 617 638 652



							654		
						Permanent t Class 2	624 668 670 671 676 681		
						Part 1 Cat 2, Part 3 (Highways 1)	Temporar y Class 5	400 401 403 413 414 415 416 417 418 437 441 442	
							Permanent t Class 1	406 407 410 420 423 427 435	
							Permanent t Class 2	419 421 422	
							Temporar y Class 3	424 425 434	

					Part 1 Cat 2, Part 3 (Highways 3)	Permanent Class 1	500 527 530 531 352 539 555 566	
						Permanent Class 2	511 557	
						Temporary Class 3	526 543 561 562	
						Temporary Class 5	507 508 538 544 545 546 547 548 549 563 564 570 571 572 573	
					Part 1 Cat 2, Part 3 (Highways	Temporary Class 5	700 711 728	

						7)	Temporary Class 3	701 702 705 707 708 710			
							Permanent Class 1	704 709 730 732			
							Permanent Class 2	706			
							Permanent Class 4	723			
22	Ellen Menai Jones	200116 38	113			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not identified in the Book of Reference.	
23	Ieuan Jones	200116 64	116			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not identified in the Book of Reference.	
24	Karin White	200116 71	117			Part 2 (Main Site)	N/A	N/A	N/A	The objector is identified in the Book of Reference as a Category 3 Persons With Interests In Land (PWIL). Horizon has engaged on this basis and will continue to keep the objector informed throughout the process. Horizon is not seeking any compulsory acquisition powers in respect of any land or interests in land held by this objector.	

25	Kevin Barnett	200116 75	118			Part 2 (Main Site)	N/A	N/A	N/A	The objector is identified in the Book of Reference as a Category 3 PWIL. Horizon has engaged on this basis and will continue to keep the objector informed throughout the process. Horizon is not seeking any compulsory acquisition powers in respect of any land or interests in land held by this objector.
26	Davis Meade Property Consultants <i>on behalf of</i> Messers G + I Hughes	200116 60	122			Part 1 Cat 1 (Highways 1)	Permanent Class 1	435	Yes	Horizon is in discussions with Messrs Hughes via their agent about entering into a voluntary agreement in respect of their land.
27	National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC	200116 65	123			Part 1 Categories 1 and 2, Part 3 (Main Site)	Permanent Class 1	46 47 63 65 67 69 74 76 79 81 83 85 87 89 93 94 105 144 175 176	Yes	Discussions are ongoing to develop the necessary voluntary agreement and protective provisions.

							181	
						Permanent t Class 2	71 72 73 80 82 88	
						Temporar y Class 3	70 75 77 84	
						Permanent t Class 4	39 40 41 64 68 94 107 108 109 110 111 130 131 133 134 135 137 138 140 141 146 147 150	
						Temporar y Class 5	148	

							Class 6 Land not subject to powers of acquisition	78 86		
28	North Wales Wildlife Trust	200116 39	125			N/A	N/A	N/A	No	Not identified in the Book of Reference.
29	Keep It Green	200116 82	133			N/A	N/A	N/A	No	Not identified in the Book of Reference.
30	Katie Hayward on behalf of Felin Honeybees Ltd	WPN- 002			WPN-002 PD-005	Part 2 (Main Site)	N/A	N/A	N/A	The objector is identified in the Book of Reference as a Category 3 PWIL. Horizon has engaged on this basis and will continue to keep the objector informed throughout the process. Horizon is not seeking any compulsory acquisition powers in respect of any land or interests in land held by this objector.
31	Wendy Vidler	WPN- 003			WPN-003 PD-006	Part 2 (Main Site)	N/A	N/A	N/A	The objector is identified in the Book of Reference as a Category 3 PWIL. Horizon has engaged on this basis and will continue to keep the objector informed throughout the process. Horizon is not

										seeking any compulsory acquisition powers in respect of any land or interests in land held by this objector.
32	Ken Vidler	WPN-004			WPN-004 PD-007	Part 2 (Main Site)	N/A	N/A	N/A	The objector is identified in the Book of Reference as a Category 3 PWIL. Horizon has engaged on this basis and will continue to keep the objector informed throughout the process. Horizon is not seeking any compulsory acquisition powers in respect of any land or interests in land held by this objector.
33	Royal Mail	WYLF-SP067			AS-002	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	Not identified in the Book of Reference.
34	Shan Williams <i>on behalf of</i> Grwp Cynefin	WYLF-OP002			AS-005	Part 2 (Highways 3)	N/A	N/A	N/A	The objector is identified in the Book of Reference as a Category 3 PWIL. Horizon has engaged on this basis and will continue to keep the objector informed throughout the process. Horizon is not seeking any compulsory acquisition powers in

										respect of any land or interests in land held by this objector.
35	Mr Sayle on behalf of Jobe Developments Limited	WPN-003			REP2-306	Part 1 Categories 1 and 2, Part 3 (Main Site)	Permanent Class 1 Temporary Class 5 Land not subject to powers of acquisition Class 6	58 52 57	Yes	As a result of discussions that have taken place to date, no compulsory acquisition rights are now being sought in respect of the freehold of this land.
36	Rostons on behalf of Emlyn, Joyce and Huw Roberts t/a R E & J A Roberts	294390 16 / WYLF 18-10-18			AS-036		553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568,			

								569, 570, 571		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---------------------	--	--

## **APPENDIX B – Worker Accommodation Question Table**

Suggested table in relation to question 2.10.10 asking for a comparison table for what would be delivered by the proposed Temporary Worker Accommodation on site and the consented Land and Lakes scheme at Cae Glas, Kingsland and Penros. Please feel free to add additional rows to the table to include any other elements of the schemes that are not currently included.

	<b>Onsite Temporary Workers Accommodation</b>	<b>Land and Lakes Scheme</b>
Number of units/workers to be accommodated		
Date when units would be available		
Number of parking spaces proposed		
Indoor sports and recreation facilities proposed onsite		
Indoor sports and recreation facilities proposed offsite		
External sports and recreation facilities proposed onsite		
External sports and recreation facilities proposed offsite		

Health and wellbeing facilities proposed onsite		
Health and wellbeing facilities proposed offsite		
Social facilities proposed onsite		
Social facilities proposed offsite		
Ancillary facilities proposed onsite		
Ancillary facilities proposed offsite		