

Wylfa Newydd Project

**Horizon's Deadline 8 Responses to Written
Submissions of Oral Case relating to Open
Floor Hearings on 5 March 2019**

PINS Reference Number: EN010007

25 March 2019

Revision 1.0
Examination Deadline 8

Planning Act 2008
Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

[This page is intentionally blank]

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Purpose of this Report	1
2	Oral Submission: Dafydd Griffiths (on behalf of NACP)	3
3	Oral Submission: Roger Dobson	5
4	Oral Submission: Bob Wright	7
5	Oral Submission: People against Wylfa B (PAWB)	9
6	Oral submission: Mr Dean	11

[This page is intentionally blank]

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this Report

- 1.1.1 The second Open Floor Hearing (OFH) for the Wylfa Newydd Nuclear Power Station DCO examination took place on Tuesday 5th March 2019. This report summarises and provides Horizon responses to written submissions of oral case made by Interested Parties at the Open Floor Hearing held on 5th March 2019, chaired by the Examining Authority (ExA).
- 1.1.2 Having reviewed all written submission of oral case, the individual reports attached to this document provide a response from Horizon to those interested parties, only where it is considered necessary and appropriate; given past responses provided by Horizon to interested parties written representations and the Local Impact Report, in addition to Horizon's responses to the questions issued by the Examining Authority.
- 1.1.3 It is noted that the ExA requested that Interested Parties should submit submissions to the ExA at Deadline 7 (Thursday 14th March 2019) and Horizon would need to respond formally to the oral submissions by Deadline 8 (Monday 25th December 2019).

[This page is intentionally blank]

Wylfa Newydd Project

Horizon's Response to representations raised by Dafydd Griffiths and NACP

PINS Reference Number: EN010007

25 March 2019

Revision 1.0

Examination Deadline 8

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

[This page is intentionally blank]

Contents

1	Horizon's Response to the comments raised by Dafydd Griffiths and NACP ..	1
1.1	Introduction	1
2	Highway Sections	2
2.1	New Valley roundabout area	2
2.2	Valley Traffic Light Junction	3
2.3	Valley link to Llanyngchedl	3
2.4	Joint use footway / cycleway at Llanyngchedl	3
2.5	Llanyngchedl to Llanfachraeth	3
2.6	Llanfaethlu in the direction of Rhydwyn / Llanrhuddlad	4
2.7	Nanner Road to 23a/24 Junction at Bwlch	4
2.8	Bwlch Junction	4
2.9	Bwlch Turn Off (Junction 23a/24) to WNDA Roundabout	5
2.10	New WNDA Roundabout to Tregele and Cemaes	5
3	Local Labour Force (During Construction)	6
3.1	Local Labour Force (During Construction)	6

List of Tables

Table 3-1	Number of currently employed people in the most applicable categories matched against the employment categories at Wylfa Newydd	6
Table 3-2	JSA claimants seeking employment (July 2016)	6

[This page is intentionally blank]

1 Horizon's Response to the comments raised by Dafydd Griffiths and NACP

1.1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 Mr Griffiths, on behalf of the NACP, provided a detailed submission at Deadline 4 (17 January 2019) regarding provision for non-motorised users. Horizon has undertaken a detailed review of this submission and will respond to each of his points in turn.
- 1.1.2 Subsequently Mr Griffiths, on behalf of NACP, provided a detailed submission at Deadline 7 (14 March 2019), including a written summary of oral case, regarding provision for non-motorised users, the draft s.106 agreement and the local labour force. Horizon has undertaken a detailed review of this submission and provides responses, where relevant and appropriate, below.

2 Highway Sections

2.1 New Valley roundabout area

- 2.1.1 As noted by Mr Griffiths, the design of the roundabout at Valley junction was amended between PAC 2 and the final submission.
- 2.1.2 The original design of the Valley roundabout was for it to be off-line, located to the north of the existing A5. However, as a result of flood modelling it was necessary to re-design the roundabout junction and alignment of the A5025 to -minimise the impact on the flood plain. On this basis, the ability to provide a segregated footway / cycleway to the south of the roundabout was no longer able to be accommodated as the construction of the roundabout moved onto the existing A5 alignment.
- 2.1.3 The section of shared use path between the Caergeiliog Junction from the A5 towards the proposed roundabout runs to the south of the existing highway. This path would be widened from its existing 1.4 – 1.8 metres (as measured by Mr Griffiths) to 2.0 metres. There is a straight length of approximately 150 metres where this will be below the preferred design standard; however, it is considered suitable for this location due to the low numbers of cyclists using the path, which would reduce the likelihood that cyclists would have to pass each other on the path and the alignment of the road, which is straight, providing good visibility.
- 2.1.4 As referenced by Mr Griffiths, DMRB Volume 6, Section 3, Part 5, 7.16, a 2m wide cycleway can satisfactorily operate with combined pedestrian and cycle use of up to 200 per hour. As noted in table C3-3 of Chapter C3 of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.3.3) the average daily number of cyclists on this section of road (combined eastbound and westbound) was 17 in August/September 2014 and 8 in November 2014. There is no reason to suppose that cycle numbers have increased dramatically at this location over the intervening years.
- 2.1.5 There are a number of constraints along this section of highway between the proposed roundabout and the A5/A55 dumbell roundabout, including a culvert. There is also a stone wall which provides an attractive landscape feature, which will have a width of footpath below the preferred design standard.
- 2.1.6 Horizon had to consider not just the desirability of improved cycle / pedestrian provision but also the justification for the compulsory purchase of third-party land. At this location it is not considered to be justifiable to acquire additional land in order to widen the existing footway beyond that achievable within the existing highway boundary.
- 2.1.7 Providing a 3 metre wide cycleway/footway at this location would require Horizon obtaining approx. 5 to 6 metres strip of additional land south of the A5 to allow for both the extension of an existing culvert and watercourse and to tie any footpath levels into the existing ground. Furthermore, this would result in a loss of existing floodplain which would need to be mitigated for by potential provision of additional land for flood storage.

2.2 Valley Traffic Light Junction

- 2.2.1 Mr Griffiths has requested further information regarding the phasing of the traffic lights at the existing Valley junction once the Valley roundabout has been constructed and the bypass is opened. It is acknowledged that changes to the phasing of the traffic lights will be required as traffic from and to the A5025 would be re-routed. Additionally, the existing footpath and highway layout at the valley junction will require amending. IACC will be responsible for the reconfiguration of the footpath and junction layout as part of any improvement works to the Valley Junction.

2.3 Valley link to Llanyngchedl

- 2.3.1 The design of the highway between Valley and Llanyngchedl has been consented under the Town and Country Planning Application for the A5025 On-Line Highway Improvement Works (Online TCPA). There is no provision for a cycle/footway along this section of highway. To accommodate a footway/cycleway along this length would require an additional linear 5-6 metres of land to be compulsory purchased along one side of the highway, to reduce the introduction of additional crossing points for the A5025.

2.4 Joint use footway / cycleway at Llanyngchedl

- 2.4.1 The design of the crossing of NCN Route 5 to the south of Llanyngchedl falls within section 2 of the Online TCPA. There are two pinch points to accommodate two existing electricity poles which have been granted a Departure from Standard by IACC for a reduction in width to 1.2 metres for a short length.
- 2.4.2 Horizon have considered the pinch points and are now discussing with Scottish Power Electricity Networks (SPEN) the possibility of repositioning the electricity poles which currently form the two “pinch points” and are shown on the TCPA application drawing WN02.05-ACM-S2-00-DRG-003 to increase the width of the cycle path. This would result in a varying width of between 2 and 3 metres consistent width cycle path for the entire length of this crossing over the A5025.
- 2.4.3 In line with the Horizon project progressing, Horizon will undertake further discussions with SPEN on this issue.

2.5 Llanyngchedl to Llanfachraeth

- 2.5.1 It is acknowledged that Llanfachraeth is within cycling distance of both Valley and Holyhead and that it is possible that this route is used for active travel purposes.
- 2.5.2 Bodedern is off-set from the A5025 to the east and it is not considered necessary to improve provision for cyclists along the B5109.
- 2.5.3 The low numbers of cyclists using the A5025 between Llanyngchedl and Llanfachraeth is not considered to be sufficiently large to justify the compulsory acquisition of a 5-6 metre linear strip of land on one side of the A5025 over and above that required for the A5025 On-line Highway

Improvements. This assessment has taken into account people from Llanyngchedl and Bodedern potentially using Llanfachraeth as a service centre.

- 2.5.4 The bypass at Llanfachraeth does not include provision for cyclists as it is considered more likely that cyclists would be travelling to / from the village of Llanfachraeth rather than passing through. The routeing of recreational cyclists through the village would have a more beneficial effect on the village than routeing them along the bypass. Further, by removing the through traffic from the village the existing A5025 would become a more attractive cycling experience.
- 2.5.5 Again, even providing a footway requires HNP to acquire 3-4 metres of land.

2.6 Llanfaethlu in the direction of Rhydwyn / Llanrhuddlad

- 2.6.1 Horizon considers it unlikely that a compulsory purchase order would be granted in order to provide a footway/cycleway based on the need argument for highway improvements associated with the construction of the Power Station.
- 2.6.2 Due to the proximity of Ysgol Rhyd y Llan, Horizon considers it to be appropriate to maintain the pedestrian access north out of the village of Llanfaethlu on to the A5025 as a gate. On this basis, the gate will be designed to be suitable for use by cyclists too, though they will be required to dismount.
- 2.6.3 The A5025 between the Rhydwyn turn off (north of Llanfeathlu) and Llanrhuddlad is a straight section of road with good visibility. In August / September 2015 the average number of cyclists per day were recorded. There were 29 cyclists using the A5025 within Llanfaethlu with 25 using the A5025 near Llarhyddlad. Horizon does not consider the number of cyclists using the highway to warrant the compulsory acquisition of third party land.

2.7 Nanner Road to 23a/24 Junction at Bwlch

- 2.7.1 This section of cycleway / footway is being provided as part of the A5025 Online Highway Improvements. It will have been completed prior to the closure of Cemlyn Road.

2.8 Bwlch Junction

- 2.8.1 The design of the Crossing point at Bwlch Junction for the NCN566 has been consented under the Online TCPA. As shown on the TCPA application drawing WN02.05-ACM-S8-00-DRG-002, the IACC have granted a departure from Standard for a reduction in visibility splay from 160metres to 110 metres with the introduction of a “jug handle” NMU crossing. Various options were considered regarding the alignment of this crossing and Horizon considers the proposed crossing to be the most suitable.
- 2.8.2 There is also a safety requirement for the IACC to maintain the visibility splays which are currently overgrown

- 2.8.3 National Cycle Network Route 566 (Copper Trail) will be diverted to allow for the closure of Cemlyn Road in accordance with the DCO. This diversion will apply both during construction and operation of the Power Station.

2.9 Bwlch Turn Off (Junction 23a/24) to WNDA Roundabout

- 2.9.1 Included in the Online TCPA is the provision to create the construction area alongside the A5025 for the future provision of a combined Cycleway/footway to link NCN566 (Copper Trail) with the new WNDA Power Station Access. The construction of this section of footway will be undertaken and completed as part of the A5025 Off-line Highway Improvements Works within the DCO.

2.10 New WNDA Roundabout to Tregele and Cemaes

- 2.10.1 Within the Wylfa Newydd Code of Construction Practice reference 8.6 Paragraph 6.2.11, is a commitment to provide a dedicated cycleway/footpath between the existing NCN566 (Copper Trail) at Cemaes and Nanner Road Crossing. This section of Cycleway/footpath will follow the route of the diverted North Wales Coastal path, south to the Power Station Access Roundabout, completing the connection to the diverted NCN566 from the Bwlch Junction. Horizon is required to comply with the Wylfa Newydd Code of Construction Practice throughout construction of the authorised development (Requirement PW7) and so would be obliged to construct this dedicated cycleway/footpath.

3 Local Labour Force (During Construction)

3.1 Local Labour Force (During Construction)

- 3.1.1 Mr Griffiths notes that the available workforce with nuclear relevant skills is set out at the level of the DCCZ, but requests data for smaller geographical areas is made available to support potential recruitment estimates for local workers.
- 3.1.2 Table 3-1 shows Census 2011 data on the number of people employed in roles most similar to the Wylfa Newydd employment categories of Site Services, Security and Clerical Staff; Professional (Managerial); Mechanical and Electrical Operatives; Civil Engineering Operatives; and Operations. This provides information on the potential supply of workers in these areas.

Table 3-1 Number of currently employed people in the most applicable categories matched against the employment categories at Wylfa Newydd

Sub-region	Site Services, Security and Clerical Staff	Professional (Managerial)	Mechanical and Electrical Operatives	Civil Engineering Operatives	Total
Anglesey North	540	491	1,189	505	2,725
Anglesey South	1,476	1,446	2,206	902	6,030
Anglesey West	996	1,031	1,697	887	4,611
Anglesey	3,012	2,968	5,092	2,294	13,366
60 minute drive time	7,062	6,826	10,461	4,979	29,328

Source: Census 2011

- 3.1.3 Table 3-2 shows JSA claimants seeking employment data from Office for National Statistics (ONS)/Nomis. July 2016 data is used to be consistent with the information in the Technical appendix C1-2 (6.3.9).

Table 3-2 JSA claimants seeking employment (July 2016)

Sub-region	Site Services, Security and Clerical Staff	Professional (Managerial)	Mechanical and Electrical Operatives	Civil Engineering Operatives	Total
Anglesey North	5	25	20	10	60

Sub-region	Site Services, Security and Clerical Staff	Professional (Managerial)	Mechanical and Electrical Operatives	Civil Engineering Operatives	Total
Anglesey South	15	10	15	15	55
Anglesey West	20	20	25	30	95
Anglesey	40	55	65	55	215
60 minute drive time	90	140	105	105	440

Source: ONS/Nomis

- 3.1.4 These answers are broad in terms of the occupational groups. The challenge with analysing data at a more granular geographic level is that there are so few data points for the areas, that when attempting to undertake more detailed analysis of the types of workers in the area yields blank cells. This is because the ONS does not provide figures for below a certain level due to confidentiality. This means that using the data for 90-minute DCCZ geographic level, that is provided in Table 2-4 in Appendix C1-2 (6.3.9), is more useful for assessing the supply of labour because there is more data and is more appropriate for travel to work distances associated with a project of this size.

[This page is intentionally blank]

Wylfa Newydd Project

Horizon's Response to representations raised by Roger Dobson

PINS Reference Number: EN010007

25 March 2019

Revision 1.0

Examination Deadline 8

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

[This page is intentionally blank]

Contents

1	Horizon's Response to representations raised by Roger Dobson.....	1
1.1	Introduction	1

List of Tables

Table 1-1	Issues raised at the OFH.....	2
-----------	-------------------------------	---

[This page is intentionally blank]

1 Horizon's Response to representations raised by Roger Dobson

1.1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 Roger Dobson submitted an Oral submission at the Open Floor Hearing on 05/03/2019. Horizon has already responded to the majority of the issues raised at the previous Open Floor Hearing at Deadline 2 (4 December 2018) [REP2-006]. New issues raised are addressed in table 1-1 below.

Table 1-1 Issues raised at the OFH in 4-8 March 2019

Interested Party	Issue	Horizon Response
	<p>Consultation</p> <p>There was some criticism about consultation yesterday. Horizon will rightly point out the considerable resources they have devoted to communication and consultation with communities' stakeholders. The day after the devastating suspension announcement I attended a Horizon drop in session at Cemaes Village Hall and another on the 18th March. I was struck by the remarkable commitment and professionalism of Horizon's people in the face of adversity. Overall, I would score Horizon 9 out of ten for effort. Unfortunately, the score on meaningful consultation is more like 5 out of ten. On many issues it has been very slow in providing information essential for us to engage effectively in the DCO process. But that is in the past. We now have a good understanding of the picture and there is still time to work through to a successful conclusion.</p>	<p>Horizon considers that it has meaningfully consulted on all aspects of the project through the Pre-Application process. The responses received during these consultations have been used to inform the content of the final DCO application. In particular, consultation on Temporary Workers Accommodation considered multiple alternative locations and permutations. Horizon considers that the benefits offered by the onsite TWA location have been fully communicated and that the advantages and disadvantages of other sites such as Rhosgoch were fully considered in the process.</p>

Interested Party	Issue	Horizon Response
	<p>Working Hours</p> <p>October I expressed concern that the applicant proposed to operate a regime of shift working that could result in excessive hours and be unsafe. There could be a risk of accidents at work and travel to and from work. Accidents that could result in serious injuries or fatalities. My judgment on this is borne out of experience of organisations where excessive hours were the norm and my direct involvement in reducing working hours and delivering improved health and safety as well as organisational performance, since October I have carried out further research on long hours working. I referenced this in my post January Hearing note.</p> <p>There is extensive evidence that the consequences of working excessive hours are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • poor productivity and quality • a high incidence of accidents at work and when commuting • poor health and high absenteeism 	<p>Horizon notes Mr Dobson's further representations which provide detailed comments on Horizon's response REP2 006.</p> <p>Horizon has considered the issues raised in the Oral submission by Mr Dobson on behalf of the North Anglesey Councils Partnership, Llanbadrig Community Council during the Wylfa Newydd Examining Authority Hearing – Open Forum held on the 5th March 2019. In response, Horizon maintains that the detailed response contained in REP2-006 relating to these matters fully considers all of the points iterated by Mr Dobson.</p> <p>Indeed Mr Dobson appeared to acknowledge that he is encouraged by Horizon's response and acceptance of its "Duty of Care ", although he expresses ongoing worries regarding what is proposed.</p> <p>In response, Horizon reiterates that all Contractors employed on the project shall be required to comply with Horizon's General Terms and Conditions of Contract otherwise referred to as the Project Specific Requirements. These shall include a requirement on all of the Supply Chain employed on the project to comply with UK working time regulations as set out in the National Agreement for the Engineering Construction Industry (NAECI) Clause 7.6 and the Working Rule Agreement for the Construction Industry CIJC – Clause WR3, sub-clause 3.2.</p>

Interested Party	Issue	Horizon Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • social issues such as family break down • a high incidence of chronic disease drug abuse and • alcohol abuse <p>The key messages I have inferred from Horizon's response REP2 006 EN010007 - 002501 are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Horizon takes its duty of care to its workforce very seriously. • Shift patterns will be compliant to The Working Time Regulations (1998) • Horizon interprets WTR as average of 48 hours per week over a control period of 52 weeks • Horizon will monitor individuals who may wish to exercise their right to 'opt out' of WTR • Horizon will ensure that everyone takes the required number of holidays annually • The Project Management Contractor organisation has experience of the UK Rail and construction industries and will introduce management arrangements that meet with HSE guidance on managing shift working. 	<p>Horizon wishes to assure Mr Dobson that it fully intends to comply with all legal requirements for monitoring and recording working hours on the project and will introduce Construction Industry Key Performance Indicators relating to accident and incident statistics. If these records indicate that working practices are impacting safety Horizon would expect contractors to implement immediate corrective actions required to remedy safety performance shortfalls. More importantly Horizon is committed to delivering "exemplar" Nuclear and Conventional of health, safety, environment and quality standards and considers that the application of the controls outlined in the earlier response to Mr Dobson demonstrates our commitment to this.</p> <p>Horizon notes the particular safety accidents referenced and in response can advise that Horizon makes use of such information to inform Lessons Learned Reporting and staff training. This process is applied thorough a formal corrective action process which is a recognised Nuclear Industry standard.</p>

Interested Party	Issue	Horizon Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Shift patterns will be subjected to the HSE Fatigue calculator to determine the fatigue and error risk of workers and ensure that, at the end of their last shift, it is within acceptable limits for safety critical work on a construction site and that they are fit for their commute home.Horizon helpfully refers to the report "The development of a fatigue / risk index for shift workers". <p>Horizon's position is encouraging. However, I continue to worry about what they propose. Whilst my principal concern has been excessive working hours, I have looked at the HSE report on fatigue. The Health and Safety Laboratory cite fatigue as the root cause of many significant accidents including the Clapham Junction rail disaster, Chernobyl, the Texas City oil refinery explosion, the Exxon Valdez oil spill and the loss of the Challenger space shuttle. I shall return to the Clapham Junction disaster later.</p> <p>The HSE report draws on extensive research into shift working. They report</p>	

Interested Party	Issue	Horizon Response
	<p>many factors contribute to fatigue: the length of shift, the length and frequency of breaks, the nature of work, the length of wakefulness and the quality and length of sleep. Nightshift carries more risk. Risk increases exponentially with the length of shift. There is a cumulative effect of the number of consecutive shifts.</p> <p>Horizon's plan is for shifts of 10 or 10.5 hours shifts in a sequence of 11 consecutive shifts working followed by 3 days rest. This combination will raise the Fatigue and Risk indices. If Horizon hasn't already conducted a desk exercise to assess the fatigue index of planned shifts it should do so and share those results.</p> <p>Turning to workers hours specifically, Horizon management has informed me that for 10 hour shifts they plan a one-hour meal break and two ten-minute breaks. I calculate that for a 10-hour shift this equates to 8.67 hours working time per shift or an average 47.7 hours per week. This is very close to but under the 48-hour WTR limit. I have not received data from Horizon on breaks for 10.5-</p>	

Interested Party	Issue	Horizon Response
	<p>hour shifts, but breaks would have to be more than one hour 46 minutes per day to average less than 48 hours per week. The Clapham Junction accident of 12th December 1988 resulted in 35 fatalities and almost 500 injuries. The enquiry into the accident was conducted by Anthony Hidden QC whose recommendations had a profound effect upon safety in the railway industry – I believe that the 'Hidden Rules' adopted by the Railway Industry resulted in the Fatigue index we see today.</p> <p>Chapter 17 of the Hidden report was titled: Where things went wrong - The Lessons to be learned.</p> <p>The vital importance of this concept of absolute safety was acknowledged time and again in the evidence which the Court heard. This was perfectly understandable because it is so self-evident.</p> <p>The evidence showed the sincerity of the concern for safety. Sadly, however, it also showed the reality of the failure to carry that concern through into action. It</p>	

Interested Party	Issue	Horizon Response
	<p>has to be said that a concern for safety which is sincerely held and repeatedly expressed but, nevertheless, is not carried through into action, is as much protection from danger as no concern at all.</p> <p>Now I know that Horizon management's concern for safety at least matches or surpasses that of British Rail in 1988. I believe we saw an example of this commitment to safety in action during the accompanied site inspection. But there will be a challenge to manage safely, large numbers through a complex organisation structure working at times 24 hours a day. How might Horizon Management be helped to carry their concern for safety into action?</p> <p>The shift cycle of 11 days on 3 days off is more demanding than an ordinary five-day week. However, given that thousands of workers will live away from home and want to return to their families regularly the 11 & 3 pattern seems sensible. However, this arrangement of long shifts means that workers will be at the upper end of what is reasonable and</p>	

Interested Party	Issue	Horizon Response
	<p>safe. I completely agree that Horizon's contractors should apply fatigue and risk processes.</p> <p>I do not agree with Horizon's position on the Working Time Regulations in two regards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The control period and the 'opt out'.• The control period for averaging hours in most organisations is 17 weeks. I cannot understand why this should not apply at Wylfa. The importance of the 17-week threshold is that unplanned extraordinary hours cannot be prolonged before compensatory time off is scheduled. <p>Horizon refers to the 'opt out' from the 48 hours limit as an individual's right. This is not correct. The European Council Directive 93/104/EC (1993) and the UK Working Time Regulations (1998) provide the right for the worker NOT to work more than an average 48 hours. In the UK regulations there is provision in regulation 5.— (1) That regulation 4 which covers the 48 hours average shall not apply in relation to a worker who has</p>	

Interested Party	Issue	Horizon Response
	<p>agreed with his employer in writing that it should not apply in his case.</p> <p>I can only recall workers and trade unions campaigning for shorter hours - not longer hours. In all my experience of being responsible for recruiting and employing thousands of workers I can never remember a single employee ever requesting the right to 'opt out'. I do not believe The UK Government who negotiated the 'opt out' envisaged an obligation upon employers to provide work beyond 48 hours. It is management that control working hours not workers. Horizon's stated commitment to safety should logically translate into workers not being asked, invited or encouraged to sign up to the 'opt out'.</p> <p>I would like to see a restriction placed upon the applicant not to enter into 'opt out' agreements. If this cannot be recommended by the panel to the Secretary of State, then Horizon should be required to apply a procedure for authorising extraordinary hours that flows down through all its contractors. A useful model could be the procedure I</p>	

Interested Party	Issue	Horizon Response
	<p>understand is in force at Sellafield where abnormal hours require consideration of alternates, fatigue risk assessment, proposal by the line manager and approval by a Duly Authorised person.</p>	
	<p>In my post hearing note I made the point that there is a perception that people impacted by the development are being treated less favourably than other members of the animal kingdom. This is a serious point. Yesterday we heard about choughs, terns, reptiles and that bats might be adversely affected by recreational lighting this compares with one modest plea from IACC about people. In looking at the Local Noise Mitigation Strategy (LNMS) perhaps we can redress the balance.</p> <p>I am going to comment on documents REP 03 – 50 & 51 PINS Reference Numbers: EN010007-002715 & 002716 It has taken over 4 years for Horizon to make good its promise to detail mitigation measures. and 6 months after application document 6.10.2 EN010007 – 001709 caused consternation with its reference to severe adverse effects, anxiety and</p>	<p>The main comments noted by Roger Dobson in his oral submission in relation to the LNMS noted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desire for the LNMS not to be considered voluntary • Desire for compensation to be available for people's time whilst surveys and eventual noise mitigation measures are installed. <p>In response to the comments made by Mr Dobson, it should be highlighted that the LNMS is a voluntary process in that Horizon cannot force landowners and occupiers to take up noise mitigation. However, Horizon would also highlight that the inclusion of the noise decibel levels included in the Wylfa Newydd CoCP [REP5-020] mean that Horizon must offer to put in place noise mitigation at houses that exceed this threshold as the Wylfa Newydd CoCP is a secured document under the Draft DCO [REP5-003].</p> <p>It is Horizon's intention to drive the installation of the LNMS measures forward and an application pack will be provided alongside the letter notifying the landowner/occupier of potential eligibility. For further information about how the</p>

Interested Party	Issue	Horizon Response
	<p>structural damage. My score on consultation on noise mitigation is one out of ten.</p> <p>My remarks will be directed at the impact on Tregele and Cemaes although they may well apply equally to properties along the A5025.</p> <p>The good news is that Horizon has reduced the decibel level for mitigation. The LNMS construction area is substantially increased and now includes part of Cemaes Village. In October I estimated that about 70 properties would be affected. This may now be of the order of 200 or more. Sensibly the properties located within the LNMS boundary will be included automatically for the mitigation provisions Horizon will carry out surveys of properties and then install as appropriate double or secondary glazing, upgraded doors and acoustic fencing. All this is good.</p> <p>However, we are unhappy with the process. Horizon states that this mitigation scheme is voluntary. Surely mitigating for impact on people should</p>	<p>LNMS will be implemented, please see the LNMS Companion Guide [REP3-051] submitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p>In relation to the request for compensation for the inconvenience of the LNMS, Horizon are committed to working with landowners/occupiers to make the installation of mitigation measures as convenient as possible and notes that they will be paying the cost of installation of the mitigation as outlined in the Wylfa Newydd CoCP [REP5-020] and the LNMS Companion Guide [REP3-051].</p> <p>Lastly, it should be noted that as the LNMS is in place to mitigate noise caused during the construction of the project, the securing mechanism of the Wylfa Newydd CoCP is more appropriate than the S106.</p>

Interested Party	Issue	Horizon Response
	<p>also be secured and not left to the discretion of the applicant.</p> <p>Horizon's process will be to write to people informing them that they will be affected and invite them to APPLY for mitigation. This smacks of arrogance. A sensitive empathetic approach would be to first contact the resident, second ask if they would like to take advantage of what is offered, seek agreement for a survey and then seek agreement for what is proposed.</p> <p>The driver for this should be Horizon and not the resident. And there is no recognition that mitigation will cause inconvenience. Some people will have to take time off from work to allow for the survey and then the work. Window ledges will have to be cleared and there will be cleaning after the event. It is conceivable that for larger properties installation might take more than a day.</p> <p>We believe that property owners should be paid some compensation for the inconvenience of accommodating disruption to their lives which is</p>	

Interested Party	Issue	Horizon Response
	completely outwith their control. If it is not part of the Panel's powers to rule on this then I wonder whether this should be part of the Section 106 given the concern for nearby residents expressed by IACC yesterday.	

Wylfa Newydd Project

Horizon's Response to representations raised by Bob Wright

PINS Reference Number: EN010007

25 March 2019

Revision 1.0

Examination Deadline 8

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

[This page is intentionally blank]

Contents

1	Response to submission made by Bob Wright at Deadline 7	1
1.1	Previous commitments by Horizon concerning the delivery of the bypass	1
1.2	Summary of HGV numbers and their traffic impact.....	1
1.3	Noise and Vibration	4
	<i>Vibration</i>	4
	<i>Noise</i>	4
1.4	References	5

List of Tables

Table 1-1	Schedule of references	5
-----------	------------------------------	---

List of Figures

Figure 1-1	Non-Material Change no.3 Worker Shift Patterns	3
------------	--	---

[This page is intentionally blank]

1 Response to submission made by Bob Wright at Deadline 7

1.1 Previous commitments by Horizon concerning the delivery of the bypass

- 1.1.1 For many years, Horizon's position on the bypass for Llanfachraeth has been that the bypass will not be in place prior to construction of the Wylfa Newydd DCO Project but HGV vehicle numbers will be restricted until the bypass is open.
- 1.1.2 The PAC 1 Consultation addressed the routing options for the offline roads. At Llanfachraeth three options were put forward and a specific question raised seeking feedback on the proposals. This document does not mention when these works would be undertaken.
- 1.1.3 There is a timeline in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report that shows that the bypasses would not be completed before main works commence so this demonstrates that consultation at the earliest date showed that roads improvements would not be completed prior to Main Works starting.
- 1.1.4 In PAC 2 more information was issued and confirmation was provided of the final routes selected. Horizon undertook this work in conjunction with the relevant IACC technical officers, and this led to a further series of public information and engagement activities in July 2015. These activities updated the public on how the preferred options for the A5025 Off-line Highway Improvements had been determined to be taken forward.
- 1.1.5 The Project Update Consultation in January 2016 provided a further update on what the A5025 Off-line Highway Improvements would include.
- 1.1.6 The on-line roads consultation in May 2016 went on to share Horizon's proposals for the on-line improvements in more detail, including sharing detailed drawings. In addition, a series of meetings and workshops with landowners, statutory stakeholders, the IACC members, community councils along the route, the police, and other technical services within the IACC have been held during the preparation of the design of the scheme. Comments received also informed design changes.
- 1.1.7 In summary, the short-term environmental impacts of the HGV flows on the A5025 with the proposed restrictions in place have been assessed and are considered acceptable which means that a bypass is not considered necessary during the early years of the construction programme.

1.2 Summary of HGV numbers and their traffic impact

- 1.2.1 The traffic flows and their impact on the road network, including in Llanfachraeth, is provided in DCO Transport Assessment [APP-101] and Chapter C2-3 Traffic Flows of the Environmental Statement [APP-100]. Further analysis was provided in Horizon's Request for Non-Material Change no.5 HGV Delivery Window [REP4-013].

1.2.2 This analysis can be summarised as follows:

- baseline traffic flows are low;
- additional traffic generated by the Wylfa Newydd DCO Project is within the capacity of the A5025 through Llanfachraeth - even allowing for narrow sections of road;
- discussions with IACC as part of the Statement of Common Ground Process have shown that IACC consider that the number of HGVs is not a traffic capacity problem – rather they consider it to be an issue of public amenity and noise;
- minor highway improvement works are included in the latest version of the DCO s.106 agreement to improve the road surface e.g. refurbishment of man-holes, gulleys etc.
- the traffic impacts from HGV movements are temporary;
- the opening of A5025 Offline Highway Improvements will permanently reduce traffic flows through Llanfachraeth to near zero.

1.2.3 Horizon notes Mr Wright's comments on the existing layout of the road and its maintenance but notes that these existing issues are the responsibility of IACC as the local highway authority.

1.2.4 Mr Wright mentions that school buses travel on the A5025 through the village and that children crossing the road to get to and from the buses. There should be no interaction between HGVs associated with the Wylfa Neywdd DCO Project and school children as HGVs will not use the A5025 in the hour around school opening and closing times. This is secured as a firm commitment in paragraph 5.2.3 of the Wylfa Newydd Code of Construction Practice (version 3.0) [REP5-020] and as updated for Deadline 8 (25 March 2019).

1.2.5 Mr Wright mentions the potential impact of the increased traffic flows through Llanfachraeth on response times for the emergency services. Given the low baseline traffic flows no significant impact on journey times through the village is anticipated and this issue is further discussed in Horizon's response to the Examining Authority's Further Written Q2.11.10 [REP5-002]. This response is repeated below for ease of reference:

1.2.6 *"There is no guidance that suggests that blue light response times are required to be considered in Transport Assessments in the UK. This issue has though been raised previously by the Emergency Services through the Statement of Common Ground process and Horizon's position in the SoCGs is outlined below.*

The only area forecast to experience a substantial increase in journey times owing to Wylfa Newydd DCO Project traffic is over the Britannia Bridge in the peak hour of the peak year. The increased journey times over the Britannia Bridge in the peak hour of the peak year have been mitigated as far as practicable by the provision of the MOLF to remove up to 80% of construction material deliveries off the road, and by ensuring the worker shift start and end times do not coincide with AM and PM peak hours of traffic over Britannia

Bridge as far as practicable. Furthermore, the Britannia Bridge was originally designed as a 3-lane carriageway but currently operates as 2 lanes. Therefore, there is sufficient width (10 metres) to allow a blue light response vehicle to pass over the bridge in the middle of the carriageway with relative ease.

Other than the Britannia Bridge, all other areas of the highway network are not substantially impacted by Wylfa Newydd DCO Project traffic and therefore this should not adversely impact blue light response times, except for when roadworks are in place to construct the A5025 On and Off-line Highway Improvements where typical arrangements will be in place to manage traffic. Highway working areas will be managed with temporary traffic management to limit potential impacts on blue light services. Standard practice for shuttle working arrangements will be followed. Traffic will be managed using a combination of temporary traffic signals or “stop / go” boards. Highway working areas will be a maximum of 300 metres in length. Two of the four highway working areas required for the A5025 On-line Highway Improvements would have the flexibility to expand to 600 metres (to allow for fewer joints in laying the surface course). A minimum separation distance of 0.5km between working areas will be maintained.”

- 1.2.7 Mr Wright made some further comments at the Open Floor Hearing on Tuesday 7 March concerning HGV delivery hours and the travel times of construction workers. Horizon makes the following response:

- Travel by construction workers around midnight is unlikely given the proposed shift patterns as shown by Table 2-2 of Horizon's Request for Non-Material Change no.3 Worker Shift Patterns [REP4-011] (repeated below for ease of reference).

Figure 1-1 Non-Material Change no.3 Worker Shift Patterns

Table 2-2 Primary shift patterns as submitted in the DCO application and the proposed changes to these

Shift	Primary shift start/end times/durations		
	DCO application	Proposed change (2020)	Proposed change (2023)
Day	07:00-17:00	07:00-17:30	07:00-17:30
	07:30-17:30	07:30-18:00	07:30-18:00
	08:00-18:00 (i.e. 10-hour shifts)	- (i.e. 10.5-hour shifts)	08:00-18:30 (i.e. 10.5-hour shifts)
Night	16:30-03:00	19:30-06:00	19:30-05:30
	17:00-03:30	-	20:00-06:00
	17:30-04:00 (i.e. 10.5-hour shifts)	- (i.e. 10.5-hour shifts)	- (i.e. 10-hour shifts)

- HGV movements are required to finish by 11pm in accordance with the controls provided in the Wylfa Newydd Code of Construction Practice [APP-414]

- Further, there is a cap of 20 HGVs deliveries between 7pm and 11pm which is also secured in the WN CoCP.
- The inclusion of additional hours for HGV movements does not change the total number of HGVs deliveries per day i.e. the same number of deliveries will occur but over a longer period.

1.3 Noise and Vibration

1.3.1 Horizon notes that the potential construction traffic noise and vibration effects in villages will be temporary. Once completed, the bypasses will move the source of noise and vibration out of villages and further away from properties. This will provide long-term benefits and improve the noise and vibration environment at village properties fronting the current A5025 alignment.

Vibration

1.3.2 Although damage to properties from ground-borne vibration caused by road traffic is raised as a concern, studies of properties fronting heavily trafficked roads with similar buildings in areas away from traffic have “failed to show any significant effect of traffic vibration on ordinary domestic dwellings or heritage buildings” [RD1].

1.3.3 Nonetheless, Horizon has committed in paragraph 6.2.1 of the DCO s106 agreement to reseating ironwork and repairing a limited number of defects in the existing road surfaces within villages that have been caused by the digging of multiple utilities trenches. Therefore increases in vibration peak particle velocity (PPV) are not expected along on-line sections of the A5025 for two reasons; first, the heaviest vehicle types in the traffic composition that will operate on the on-line sections with the Wylfa Newydd Project (during the year of opening, peak construction year and peak operation year) would be no different to those operating without the Wylfa Newydd Project, and second, the worst road surface defects will have been repaired. As such, no adverse effects on occupiers of buildings are expected from ground-borne vibration.

Noise

1.3.4 There is no low noise surface proposed in the village, as this only provides effective mitigation at higher speeds (75mph) and so there is no real benefit in the village (where the speed restriction is 30mph). However, several properties in the village are expected to qualify for a noise insulation package as part of the Local Noise Mitigation Strategy (LNMS), the criteria for which is set out in section 8.3 of the Wylfa Newydd Code of Construction Practice [REP5-020]. Horizon has submitted a companion guide about the LNMS [REP3-015]. Horizon will notify all owners/occupiers of potentially eligible buildings that they may be eligible to receive LNMS measures and Horizon will provide them with an application pack. The LNMS does not relate to vibration, as there is no evidence to support the assertion that traffic vibration has a significant damaging effect on buildings (new or historic).

1.3.5 Horizon will make representatives available to discuss the mitigation.

1.4 References

Table 1-1 Schedule of references

ID	Reference
RD1	G R Watts, "Traffic induced vibrations in buildings," Transport and Road Research Laboratory, Department of Transport, Crowthorne, Berkshire, UK, Research Report 246, 1990.

[This page is intentionally blank]

Wylfa Newydd Project

Horizon's Response to representations raised by People Against Wylfa B

PINS Reference Number: EN010007

25 March 2019

Revision 1.0

Examination Deadline 8

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

[This page is intentionally blank]

Contents

1	Horizon's Response to PAWB's Representation at the Open Floor Hearing / Written Submission at Deadline 7.....	1
1.1	Introduction.....	1
1.2	SPC works under the DCO	1
1.3	Landscaping options for waste stores.....	1
1.4	Seismic monitoring at the SPA	2
1.5	New National Policy Statement for nuclear power	2

[This page is intentionally blank]

1 Horizon's Response to PAWB's Representation at the Open Floor Hearing / Written Submission at Deadline 7

1.1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 People Against Wylfa B (PAWB) presented oral submissions at the Open Floor Hearings held on 5 March 2019 and submitted further written submissions reiterating the oral submissions at Deadline 7 (14 March 2019). This report provides Horizon's response to the matters addressed in those submissions.

1.2 SPC works under the DCO

- 1.2.1 The Site Preparation and Clearance (SPC) Works (Work No.12) are an integral aspect of the DCO application. Horizon's separate and parallel application for planning permission authorising the SPC works (38C310/F/EIA/ECON) was submitted under the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (TCPA) in pursuit of flexibility in the scheduling of these works. This approach of twin-tracking early works through the DCO and TCPA processes is not unusual for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects.
- 1.2.2 However, in light of the Welsh Government's decision to Call-in the TCPA application and Hitachi, Ltd.'s decision to suspend the Wylfa Newydd DCO Project, the flexibility and potential schedule benefits afforded by a separate TCPA permission are no longer relevant. Horizon has withdrawn the TCPA application accordingly.
- 1.2.3 Nevertheless, the SPC Works remain the subject of Horizon's DCO application and must be considered by the Examining Authority and the Secretary of State pursuant to the DCO examination process, irrespective of the submission and withdrawal of the associated TCPA application.
- 1.2.4 Appropriate controls and financial contributions associated with the SPC Works are in place. The commitments in the draft agreed s.106 agreement that were agreed with IACC in respect of the TCPA application, have been reflected in the DCO s.106 agreement or are otherwise appropriately provided for in the draft DCO.

1.3 Landscaping options for waste stores

- 1.3.1 The Examining Authority issued Action point 30 following the Issue Specific Hearing on Monday 4 March 2019 requesting:
- “Applicant to provide an illustrative drawing of Spent Fuel Store and Intermediate Level Waste Storage buildings to show how they would sit in the landscape, be accessed and how Public Right of Ways (PRoWs) would relate to the site in the very long-term post decommissioning.”
- 1.3.2 A Post Hearing Note has been prepared [HEA-ORA-MAR-003] and is being submitted at Deadline 8 (25 March 2019) which provides an overarching

response on how the Wylfa Newydd Development Area is likely to appear post-decommissioning with an illustrative reference point drawing.

1.4 Seismic monitoring at the SPA

- 1.4.1 The predicted ground vibration level at the tern nesting islands within Cemlyn Bay lagoon (part of the Anglesey Terns / Morwenoliaid Ynys Môn Special Protection Area) is low, being below the threshold at which complaints might be expected (human beings are known to be very sensitive to vibration). For this reason, no vibration monitoring is specified at the tern nesting islands. However, there will be a vibration monitoring location nearby (at the Grade II Listed Corn Mill near Felin Cafnan) that is closer to the deep excavations, from which vibration levels at the tern nesting islands may be extrapolated if needed [REP5-022].
- 1.4.2 Furthermore, during the tern breeding period the colony will be continuously observed by trained observers, who will be professional, independent ornithologists with a detailed knowledge of terns [REP5-022]. If the observers determine that 'fly up' responses appear to be associated with Wylfa Newydd DCO Project activities, then the sequence of mitigation actions set out in section 11.4.10 of the Main Power Station Site sub-CoCP [REP5-022] will be undertaken (even if the noise thresholds have not been exceeded).

1.5 New National Policy Statement for nuclear power

- 1.5.1 For completeness, Horizon notes that PAWB also submitted a written submission at Deadline 5 [REP5-082]. In it, PAWB raised concerns about the submission of Appendix 16a to [REP5-002]. Horizon confirms that Appendix 16a of [REP5-002], Horizon's submission on the proposed new National Policy Statement (NPS) for nuclear power was submitted in support of Horizon's response to the Examining Authority's Q.16.0.1 and was therefore appropriate.

Wylfa Newydd Project

Horizon's Response to representations raised by Mr Dean

PINS Reference Number: EN010007

25 March 2019

Revision 1.0

Examination Deadline 8

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

[This page is intentionally blank]

Contents

1	Horizon's Response to representations raised by Mr Dean	1
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Grid Connection.....	1

[This page is intentionally blank]

1 Horizon's Response to representations raised by Mr Dean

1.1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 Dr Jonathan Dean submitted a series of written submissions relating to the proposed grid connection for the Wylfa Newydd DCO Project at Deadline 7 (14 March 2019). This report provides Horizon's response to the matters addressed in those submissions.
- 1.1.2 Dr Dean's concerns included:
- The withdrawal by National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) of the 'North Wales Connection' DCO application;
 - The need for any future developer of the Wylfa Newydd DCO Project to work with NGET on an appropriate grid connection;
 - The nature of any future grid connection application; and
 - Wylfa Newydd DCO application document updates arising from the withdrawal of the North Wales Connection DCO application.

1.2 Grid Connection

- 1.2.1 Horizon's decision to suspend UK nuclear projects means it no longer needs the Grid Connection to Wylfa Newydd at present. Accordingly, Horizon terminated the Grid Connection contract with NGET. In response, on 20 February 2019, NGET withdrew the North Wales Connection DCO application for a new electricity connection across Anglesey and North Gwynedd, which would have provided the consent for the construction of the connection from the existing substation at Wylfa to the national electricity network.
- 1.2.2 NGET states on its project website (<http://www.northwalesconnection.com/>) that: "if Horizon or another developer brings forward plans for new nuclear development at Wylfa, we will work closely with them to ensure that there's a strong and secure electrical connection. As always, local communities would be able to have their say on any future proposals". Similarly, if Horizon is able to proceed with development of the Wylfa Newydd Project, it expects that it will reengage with NGET to recommence work on the Grid Connection. However, without knowing the detail or timing of any future progress with the Wylfa Newydd DCO Project, it is not possible to predict the nature or content of that work.
- 1.2.3 Precedent is well established in granting development consent for generating stations in advance of their grid connection (e.g. Swansea Bay Tidal Lagoon, the Brechfa Forest West Wind Farm DCO and the Brechfa Forest Connection DCO, Hinkley Nuclear DCO and the Hinkley Point C Connection). At present, the viability (or otherwise) of Wylfa Newydd's Grid Connection is not a relevant consideration before the ExA. Horizon therefore considers that the Wylfa Newydd DCO application can be determined as

submitted irrespective of the withdrawal of the corresponding North Wales Connection DCO application.