

## Response to relevant Written Questions and Requests for Information issued by Examining Authority on 30 January 2019

Ref	Respondent	Question	Comments
<b>9. Noise and Vibration</b>			
Q2.9.1	IACC	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 of the scheme.	<p>Land and Lakes has already drawn the ExA's attention to deficiencies in the assessment of noise and vibration effects experienced by users of the proposed TWA in its Deadline 2 submissions (in particular at Appendix 9 to those submissions [REP/-261]).</p> <p>In summary, the methodology employed by HNP for the assessment of noise effects experienced by users of the Site Campus is flawed in terms of the baseline data gathered, the assessment methodology used and the mitigation measures proposed.</p>
Q2.9.2	The Applicant	Respond to matters raised within the Land and Lakes representation [REP2-261] regarding noise impacts, or alternatively, highlight where you consider the matters to be already addressed within your evidence.	L&L looks forward to receiving HNP's comments on its Deadline 2 submissions [REP2-261] and we would welcome the opportunity to respond in turn at future deadlines.

## Response to relevant Written Questions and Requests for Information issued by Examining Authority on 30 January 2019

Ref	Respondent	Question	Comments
<b>10. Socio Economic</b>			
<b>Accommodation</b>			
Q2.10.1	The Applicant	<p>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 Accommodation (TWA)</p>	<p>Land &amp; Lakes delivery programme ensures that the amenity facilities would all be completed, commissioned and operational at day 1 of the workers accommodation being occupied.</p> <p>At <b>Cae Glas</b> this includes the Main Central Hub – indoor sports, canteen and bars followed by a Lakeside Hub – indoor sports, restaurant and bars which will also service <b>Kingsland</b>. It should be noted that these facilities are permanent structures as they have legacy uses following worker accommodation use.</p> <p>In addition to the above, a Temporary Canteen and Transport Hub is proposed to be delivered on first occupation at <b>Kingsland</b>, subject to planning permission.</p>

**Response to relevant Written Questions and Requests for Information issued by Examining Authority on 30 January 2019**

Ref	Respondent	Question	Comments
Q2.10.2	The Applicant	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.	Once again we would draw the ExA's attention to the noise and vibration report submitted at appendix 9 to Land and Lakes' Deadline 2 submissions [REP2-261] and our response to Q2.9.1 above
Q2.10.3	The Applicant	How would the TWA become the accommodation of choice for the majority of the construction workforce	<p>We would draw the ExA's attention to the report prepared by David Seaton submitted as appendix 7 to the Land and Lakes Deadline 2 submissions [REP2-254].</p> <p>The report sets out a number of observations drawn by Mr Seaton from his extensive experience managing similar facilities.</p> <p>In particular, the report notes the following points of relevance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Workers find on-site accommodation proposals generally less attractive due to having a strong desire to compartmentalise work from their social lives - as evidenced by the slow uptake of on-site accommodation at Hinkley;</li> </ul>

## Response to relevant Written Questions and Requests for Information issued by Examining Authority on 30 January 2019

Ref	Respondent	Question	Comments
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Very large facilities bring significant logistical challenges which are further exacerbated when the facility is situated in a remote location;</li> <li>- By contrast off-site facilities near a main conurbation can be delivered at a lower cost and run more efficiently through the use of off-site security screening. Such facilities offer the benefit of enabling integration by workers as well as access to a wider range of existing facilities in the nearby settlement.</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the above, the serious adverse noise impacts that will be suffered by residents of the Site Campus will almost certainly act as a deterrent. The likelihood is that this will either put workers off from the outset, coupled with the "behind the fence" location. Alternatively, once workers have had experience of the Site Campus they are likely to look for alternative accommodation quickly. If no other TWA</p>

## Response to relevant Written Questions and Requests for Information issued by Examining Authority on 30 January 2019

Ref	Respondent	Question	Comments
			exists, this will push workers into the private rented sector or into tourist accommodation to the detriment of those sectors.
Q2.10.4	The Applicant	Given the cost of accommodation on Ynys Mon, how would the TWA be priced to ensure that it would be affordable and the first choice for the majority of workers?	<p>It should be noted that the Land and Lakes scheme has always been costed as equivalent to the prevailing NAEI subsistence rate<sup>1</sup> for a <i>fully serviced bed night</i> (subject to receiving a contract for minimum number of bed nights across the project).</p> <p>In practice this means that the cost to workers is nil as their received NAEI allowance would be equivalent to the cost of their accommodation at L&amp;L. No information has been provided by HNP as to the cost to workers of residing at the Site Campus.</p> <p>The cost to HNP remains static, save for transport, as all non-home workers are</p>

<sup>1</sup> An employee who, by agreement with his/her employer, lives away from home shall be entitled to an accommodation allowance as set by NAEI (National Agreement for the Engineering Construction Industry), subject to satisfactory completion of the approved application form which may be found on the NJC website ([www.njceci.org.uk](http://www.njceci.org.uk)). This daily / weekly tax free sum shall cover board & lodging and include breakfast and evening meal.

## Response to relevant Written Questions and Requests for Information issued by Examining Authority on 30 January 2019

Ref	Respondent	Question	Comments
			entitled to the same NAECI rate.
Q2.10.5	The Applicant	Given the concerns raised by 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?	<p>Land and Lakes' scheme has a clear benefit in this regard in that it is subject to a restriction in the Section 106 Agreement [REP2-247] which provides that it shall be occupied by Wylfa Newydd construction workers (and for no other purpose) throughout the period of construction of Wylfa Newydd.</p> <p>The Agreement further provides that the accommodation shall not be converted for its legacy use until (in the reasonable opinion of IACC) construction of Wylfa Newydd has reached the stage where use of the units as nuclear worker accommodation has decreased sufficiently and it is appropriate for the legacy uses to commence.</p> <p>L&amp;L's scheme has further benefits from a health and safety perspective in that it is situated a sufficient distance from the Wylfa Newydd Development Site that it can continue to be occupied after parts of the</p>

## Response to relevant Written Questions and Requests for Information issued by Examining Authority on 30 January 2019

Ref	Respondent	Question	Comments
			<p>development become operational. The L&amp;L scheme can therefore be retained until such a time as it is genuinely no longer needed to house workers. Further, due to the fact that the lodges proposed by L&amp;L are smaller in scale than the blocks being proposed by HNP<sup>2</sup>, it would be possible to convert the L&amp;L site gradually to its legacy use as and when the TWA demand falls.</p> <p>L&amp;L acknowledges that some on-site accommodation is required, however by retaining a maximum of 500-1,000 onsite bed spaces, supported by a further 3,500 bed_spaces delivered on Cae Glas and Kingsland, a number of the concerns raised by IAACC, GCC and WG would be addressed.</p>
Q2.10.6	The Applicant	Explain why procurement, design and construction issues would delay timescale for delivery of the TWA – please provide further detail.	<p>We would draw the ExA's attention to the report prepared by Arcadis submitted as appendix 5 to the Land and Lakes Deadline 2 submissions [REP2-249].</p> <p>The report clearly demonstrates that L&amp;L would be in a position to deliver the</p>

<sup>2</sup> The units themselves are of a similar size, however L&L's proposals consists of lodges of 4 and 8 beds, whereas HNP's proposals are for 5 to 7 storey blocks.

## Response to relevant Written Questions and Requests for Information issued by Examining Authority on 30 January 2019

Ref	Respondent	Question	Comments
			proposed scheme within the required time period.
Q.2.10.7	The Applicant, IACC, GCC and WG	What should the minimum occupancy levels for the TWA be and how should they be secured?	L&L has always been concerned that occupancy levels are critical to manage impact on existing tourist & PRS accommodation. A more attractive landscaped housing / lodge accommodation that is permanent and near the main conurbation will always be more attractive than 5 & 7 storey temporary blocks of accommodation on Wylfa site itself.
Q.2.10.8	L&L	The sites held by L&L are not within the order limits. However at the ISH it was suggested that the 'Grampian' style requirement could potentially be used. Provide further explanation including an example of appropriate drafting of a provision for the dDCO.	Section 4 of L&L's DL4 submissions sets out an explanation as to how and why the dDCO may be amended to include an effective Grampian style requirement. The ExA is respectfully requested to read paragraphs 4 - 4.23 in full [REP4-036].
Q2.10.9	L&L	(1) Could/would you implement your planning permission without a commercial agreement with the Applicant being in place?	(1) It is not possible to implement the planning permission for the temporary worker accommodation elements of the approved scheme without a contract in place with

## Response to relevant Written Questions and Requests for Information issued by Examining Authority on 30 January 2019

Ref	Respondent	Question	Comments
		<p>(2) If your planning permission was not restricted by the need to be used for TWA what would prevent you building out your scheme?</p>	<p>Horizon. This is set out at Schedule 9 paragraph 5.2 of the L&amp;L section 106 agreement [REP2-247] which states:</p> <p><i>"The Owner covenants with the Council that Commencement of Construction of Cae Glas Phase 1 or Kingsland Phase 1 shall not occur unless and until the Nuclear Worker Agreement has been completed and a copy (suitably redacted if appropriate to reflect any commercially confidential information) has been provided to the Council by the Owner or Developer."</i></p> <p>(2) The L&amp;L scheme is entirely contingent upon the TWA element being delivered prior to any residual use. This remains the case even if, hypothetically, the s.106 agreement was varied to remove this restriction. It should be noted that there is nothing to suggest that IACC</p>

## Response to relevant Written Questions and Requests for Information issued by Examining Authority on 30 January 2019

Ref	Respondent	Question	Comments
			<p>would agree to such a variation.</p> <p>There are two key reasons that would prevent L&amp;L building out the scheme. Firstly, the proposed on-Site Campus would have a severe detrimental effect on the local tourism sector. The lack of attractiveness of the Site Campus as a residential location will mean that workers choose to reside in tourism accommodation instead, to the detriment of this sector. The effect on the tourism sector will be long term and L&amp;L consider that this would severely undermine the legacy benefits which L&amp;L's development would otherwise provide to the point where the legacy scheme would no longer be credible. Secondly, in order to be viable, the number of bedspaces to be created for the leisure and residential legacy uses would require financial support from Horizon.</p>

**Response to relevant Written Questions and Requests for Information issued by Examining Authority on 30 January 2019**

Ref	Respondent	Question	Comments
Q.2.10.10	The Applicant and L&L	<p>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 proposed in appendix.</p>	<p>See table attached at Appendix 1</p>
WQ.2.10.11	The Applicant	<p>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.</p>	<p>L&amp;L would also welcome this information and, indeed, this is something that was requested in Section 2 of the Report prepared by Arcadis and submitted as appendix 5 to the Land and Lakes Deadline 2 submissions [REP2-249].</p> <p>We would also note that no consideration appears to have been given to the potential for additional costs arising out of HNP's on-site TWA proposals, for example additional costs associated with as yet unknown and un-costed sound attenuation works to attempt to mitigate adverse noise impacts on residents of the Site Campus; the potential need for habitats mitigation required as a result of the impacts caused</p>

## Response to relevant Written Questions and Requests for Information issued by Examining Authority on 30 January 2019

Ref	Respondent	Question	Comments
			by the Campus and costs incurred as a result of increased churn (see paragraph 4.10 of the report prepared by David Seaton at appendix 7 to L&L's Deadline 2 Submissions [REP2-254]).
Q2.10.14	The Applicant, IACC, GCC, NWP and WG	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.	<p>L&amp;L awaits details of how the Portal monitoring would operate but considers that its scheme will be very suited to the portal. In particular, the L&amp;L scheme can be delivered in 5 distinct phases as opposed to HNP's 3 phases.</p> <p>If the L&amp;L scheme is linked to the portal it would give the Authorities greater confidence in the delivery of accommodation to meet demand and HNP prefunding accommodation which would remain vacant in the earlier stages of the project. Conversely after the peak demand for the workers' accommodation, the L&amp;L sites lend themselves to a phased conversion to their legacy uses, therefore delivering the legacy benefits in a staged, managed programme, whilst ensuring availability of accommodation should HNP</p>

## Response to relevant Written Questions and Requests for Information issued by Examining Authority on 30 January 2019

Ref	Respondent	Question	Comments
			<p>experience delays on the second reactor when the first reactor is operational.</p> <p>We can provide a further note on how the L&amp;L scheme fits in with the Portal once the detail is provided by HNP.</p> <p>We would also note in respect of HNP's Phasing of the TWA that they appear to be triggering the Phases prior to the exceedance of non-home based worker numbers. On this basis, it raises questions as to how it can be accurately tracked and more importantly be responded to through the TWA construction process to provide the required beds</p>
<b>11. Traffic and Transport</b>			
Q2.11.19	L&L	Would the additional buses needed to transport workers from Cae Glas and Kingsland affect the outputs of the Transport Assessment/traffic modelling?	L&L have fully assessed the transport impacts of the L&L scheme in combination with the DCO proposals and there is no material worsening of effects. The ExA is referred to L&L's assessment by Curtins at [REP2-248] and most recent explanatory note by Curtins at [REP4-036 Technical Note

## Response to relevant Written Questions and Requests for Information issued by Examining Authority on 30 January 2019

Ref	Respondent	Question	Comments
			<p>01 dated 17 January 2019].</p> <p>HNP's response to L&amp;L's transport case is inaccurate and is based upon an obvious misreading of L&amp;L's report.</p> <p>Section 1.2.3 of appendix 1-3 to the HNP's Response to actions set in the ISH on 8 Januarys 2019 [REP4-008] states:</p> <p><i>'Transport analysis provided in the Curtins report at paragraph 1.5.6 states that a total of 21 coaches would be required to move the construction workers each day from the Land and Lakes sites on Holy Island to the WNDA.'</i></p> <p>This is not correct. Para 1.56 of appendix 4 to the Land and Lakes Deadline 2 submissions [REP2-249] states:</p> <p><i>'Morning Peak Hour Impacts: The HNP forecast per 1000 workers is for 230 staff to attend each morning shift. If using a 45 seater coach, this equates</i></p>

## Response to relevant Written Questions and Requests for Information issued by Examining Authority on 30 January 2019

Ref	Respondent	Question	Comments
			<p><i>to 21 coaches per morning shift for a TWA facility comprising 4000 workers.'</i></p> <p><i>'Evening Peak Hour Impacts: The HNP forecast per 1000 workers is for 103 staff to attend each night shift. If using a 45 seater coach, this equates to 10 coaches per night shift for at TWA facility comprising 4000 workers.'</i></p> <p>Curtins has no reason to doubt the accuracy of the above statements as the calculations are based on information provided by HNP.</p> <p>It is clear from the above HNP has misinterpreted the relevant bullet at paragraph 1.56 of Curtins' report. The reference to 21 coaches is a reference to the number of coaches required for each morning shift, of which there are three. It is therefore wholly incorrect to state that L&amp;L estimated that only 21 coaches would be required for the entire day, this is a simple mistake made by HNP.</p> <p>The following bullet point within the Curtins</p>

## Response to relevant Written Questions and Requests for Information issued by Examining Authority on 30 January 2019

Ref	Respondent	Question	Comments
			<p>report (also set out above) sets out the potential movements associated with the night shift.</p> <p>The response from HNP goes on to state in Section 1.2.8 that:</p> <p><i>'If a bus or coach carries 45 people then this means that 54 buses would be required to transport all the workers from Holy Island to the WNDL every day at the start of the day shift and 54 buses would be needed again at the end of the day shift.'</i></p> <p>It is not clear what the basis for these numbers is and we are therefore unable to confirm their accuracy. However, in response to the ExA's question, an increase of 33 coaches is not considered to be significant for the reasons already set out in Para 1.5.7 to 1.5.15 of appendix 4 to the Land and Lakes Deadline 2 submissions [REP2-249].</p>

## Response to relevant Written Questions and Requests for Information issued by Examining Authority on 30 January 2019

Ref	Respondent	Question	Comments
<b>13. Deadline 4 Change Requests</b>			
<b>Working Hours</b>			
Q2.13.20	The Applicant	<p>(1) How would the proposed change to working hours affect occupants of the TWA?</p> <p>(2) What measures are proposed to mitigate the effect on the living conditions of the occupants of the TWA?</p>	L&L would note that changes to blasting scheduling may improve vibration conditions at certain times of the day or night but this becomes irrelevant if night shift workers are expected to sleep during blasting works in very close proximity to the Site Campus. This is particularly the case if, as shown on the phasing strategy plan for delivery of the Site Campus, the first phase of TWA is being delivered immediately adjacent to the blasting area, giving night shift workers no alternative accommodation options further from this zone.
<b>14. General Questions</b>			
Q2.14.10	Applicant and all Interested Parties	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	L&L would cite a specific concern in respect of the 'on site' TWA proposed by HNP. The proposals are not appropriate to actually attract and retain a workforce that will be in demand for up to 9 years. In particular :-

## Response to relevant Written Questions and Requests for Information issued by Examining Authority on 30 January 2019

Ref	Respondent	Question	Comments
		<p>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> <p>A second ISH on 'Other Sites' will consider the same range of issues on a similar basis</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The scale of workforce proposed to be attracted to live 'on site' is not feasible</li> <li>2. 5 &amp; 7 storey blocks close to the main working site with associated noise &amp; vibration issues will not be attractive enough</li> <li>3. Limited social cohesion for scale of workforce</li> </ol> <p>The risk to Anglesey is too great that workers will simply not take up this on site accommodation. L&amp;L offer more attractive 'low rise' permanent accommodation on consented sites that address these concerns.</p>

**Response to relevant Written Questions and Requests for Information issued by Examining Authority on 30 January 2019**

Ref	Respondent	Question	Comments
		<p>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>- Park Cybi Logistics Centre;</li> <li>- A5025 Off-Line Highway 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>	
Q2.15.2	The Applicant	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	L&L's scheme at Cae Glas & Kingsland is to provide permanent accommodation with legacy in the most appropriate location, developed in close consultation with IACC. In particular the L&L scheme meets the criteria as follows:

## Response to relevant Written Questions and Requests for Information issued by Examining Authority on 30 January 2019

Ref	Respondent	Question	Comments
		<p>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 light of these policy objectives and in relation to the following buildings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- WNA development other than the Main Power Station – including the Outage, Administration, Simulator and Training, Gatehouse and Search Buildings;</li> <li>- Off-Site Power Station Facilities;</li> <li>- Site Campus;</li> <li>- Park and Ride facility at Dala Hir;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Design;</b> must adopt exemplar 'landscape led' permanent development, informed by the local vernacular, which is 'sensitive to place'.</p> <p><b>Performance;</b> all buildings must meet high energy performance criteria for all phases of use; BREEAM 'excellent' to non-residential buildings; Sustainable Code for Housing levels 4 and 5 to residential lodges and houses, 10% betterment of building regulations at time of all construction.</p> <p><b>Sustainable construction;</b> all accommodation will be delivered using modern methods of construction (MMC) to minimise waste and embedded energy, by 'off-site' modular fabrication. MMC allows highly insulated lightweight building fabric, minimising impact on site and maximising efficient performance.</p> <p><b>Sustainability;</b> at least 10% of energy used will be created by on-site renewable sources, from integrated equipment installed within the building envelope during factory</p>

## Response to relevant Written Questions and Requests for Information issued by Examining Authority on 30 January 2019

Ref	Respondent	Question	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Logistics Centre at Parc Cybi.</li> </ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> <li>2. the materials (including natural local materials) to be used for elevations and roofs that will be used to achieve a good aesthetic and visual appearance, scale and relation to surroundings and context.</li> </ol>	<p>fabrication; Air Sourced Heat Pumps, Solar Thermal and Photovoltaic.</p> <p><b>Efficiency:</b> as not a temporary proposal, the Land and Lakes development will maximise the use of all construction, highways and service infrastructure for the lifetime of legacy use, beyond initial short term worker occupation.</p>

## Response to relevant Written Questions and Requests for Information issued by Examining Authority on 30 January 2019

## APPENDIX 1

## 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 Penrhos. Please feel free to add additional rows to the table to include any other elements of the scheme that are not currently included.

	Land and Lakes Scheme - Cae Glas	Land and Lakes Scheme - Kingsland
<b>Number of units/workers to be accommodated</b>	Up to maximum of 315 lodges to accommodate a maximum of 2000 workers	Up to 320 houses to accommodate up to a maximum of 1500 workers
<b>Date when units would be available</b>	Number of months following receipt of order from Horizon:-  Phase 1 : 141 lodges (980 beds) - 18 months  Phase 2 : 74 lodges (502 beds) - 19 months  Phase 3 : 76 lodges (518 beds) - 24 months	Number of months following receipt of order from Horizon:-  Phase 1 : 220 houses (1000 beds) - 19 months  Phase 2 : 99 houses (500 beds) - 22 months

## Response to relevant Written Questions and Requests for Information issued by Examining Authority on 30 January 2019

	Land and Lakes Scheme - Cae Glas	Land and Lakes Scheme - Kingsland
<b>Number of parking spaces proposed</b>	1380 approved car park spaces	640 approved car park spaces
<b>Indoor sports and recreation facilities proposed onsite</b>	<p>Main central hub facility - indoor sports (850m<sup>2</sup>), canteen and bars - total 6575m<sup>2</sup> approved</p> <p>Lakeside hub facility - indoor sports (490m<sup>2</sup>), restaurant &amp; bars - total 1280m<sup>2</sup> approved</p>	As linked with Cae Glas, serviced by Main Central hub and Lakeside hub facilities. Temporary canteen & transport hub also proposed of 1000m <sup>2</sup> (subject to planning)
<b>Indoor sports and recreation facilities proposed offsite</b>	s106 contribution to indoor sports, leisure & swimming facilities in impact area (see [REP2-246] for further detail)	s106 contribution to indoor sports, leisure & swimming facilities in impact area (see [REP2-246] for further detail)
<b>External sports and recreation facilities proposed onsite</b>	2 No 5 -a-side football pitches - 3500m <sup>2</sup>	
<b>External, sports and recreation facilities proposed offsite</b>	Penrhos/Cae Glas Cricket and football pitches plus s106 Contribution to outdoor 4G multi use pitches (if not provided on site) (see [REP2-246] for further detail)	As linked with Cae Glas - Penrhos/Cae Glas Cricket pitch, new football pitch and s106 Contribution to outdoor 4G multi use pitches (if

## Response to relevant Written Questions and Requests for Information issued by Examining Authority on 30 January 2019

	<b>Land and Lakes Scheme - Cae Glas</b>	<b>Land and Lakes Scheme - Kingsland</b>
		not provided on site) (see [REP2-246] for further detail)
<b>Health and wellbeing facilities proposed onsite</b>	2 indoor Gyms (500m2) with New 100 acre nature reserve & visitor centre	Urban woodland
<b>Health and wellbeing facilities proposed offsite</b>	s106 - Police contribution, Ambulance contribution, Fire service contribution, Health capital & revenue contribution, social services contribution. Provision of new heritage interpretation centre (see [REP2-246] for further detail). Proximity to main conurbation of Holyhead	Links to adjoining Holyhead Hotspurs football ground & s106 contributions as Cae Glas (see [REP2-246] for further detail). Proximity to main conurbation of Holyhead.
<b>Social facilities proposed onsite</b>	2850m2 of Indoor social facilities within central & lakeside hubs that could be publicly accessible	As linked with Cae Glas, serviced by Main Central hub and Lakeside hub facilities. Temporary restaurant and bars in central hub (subject to planning)
<b>Social facilities proposed offsite</b>	s106 Contribution of £400,000 (based on 3500 workers accommodated) to	As linked with Cae Glas - s106 Contribution to Holyhead library &

## Response to relevant Written Questions and Requests for Information issued by Examining Authority on 30 January 2019

	<b>Land and Lakes Scheme - Cae Glas</b>	<b>Land and Lakes Scheme - Kingsland</b>
	Holyhead library & social community centre (see [REP2-246] for further detail). Proximity to main conurbation of Holyhead	social community centre (see [REP2-246] for further detail). Proximity to main conurbation of Holyhead
<b>Ancillary facilities proposed onsite</b>	Shop and Laundry of 400m2	Temporary shop and laundry collection/delivery (subject to planning)
<b>Ancillary facilities proposed offsite</b>	Proximity to main conurbation of Holyhead	Proximity to main conurbation of Holyhead
<b>Distance to main transport infrastructure</b>	1.5 mile to Holyhead Railway station, 1.8 mile to Ferry terminal and 0.5 mile to A55	1.1 mile to Holyhead Railway station, 1.4 mile to Ferry terminal and 0.5 mile to A55
<b>Distance to main conurbation</b>	1.5 miles to Holyhead centre	1.1 mile to Holyhead centre
<b>Legacy Proposals</b>	Following use by nuclear workers - All lodges and facilities to be utilised as year round holiday accommodation to improve Anglesey tourist accommodation and provide 575 FTE	50% of all housing built to be 'affordable' following use by workers

## Response to relevant Written Questions and Requests for Information issued by Examining Authority on 30 January 2019

	Land and Lakes Scheme - Cae Glas	Land and Lakes Scheme - Kingsland
	employment for the long term.	
<b>Total On-Site Facility Proposals</b>	<p><b>Main central hub facility</b> – indoor sports (850m<sup>2</sup>), dining and social areas, shop, gyms, changing rooms and toilets, kitchens, laundry and ancillary facilities – total 6575m<sup>2</sup> approved.</p> <p><b>Lakeside Hub facility</b> – indoor sports (490m<sup>2</sup>), restaurant and social areas, gyms, toilets and changing rooms, kitchens and ancillary facilities – total 1280m<sup>2</sup> approved.</p>	<p>As linked with Cae Glas, serviced by Main Central hub and Lakeside hub facilities.</p> <p>Temporary canteen dining and transport hub also proposed of 1,000m<sup>2</sup> (subject to planning).</p>