

From: [Eifion Bibby](#)
To: [AwelyMor](#)
Subject: Re-;EN010112- EXQ1 DEADLINE 24th OCTOBER 2022 - Proposed Development- Awel y Mor Offshore Wind Farm Scheme Our Clients-: Mr JB & Mrs E Evans [REDACTED] Our Ref-: AWE..EVA.J.-1-C
Date: 24 October 2022 17:21:42
Attachments: [EN010112-000711-AYMO - ExO1 Final - English.pdf](#)
[Option Plan.pdf](#)
[DCO Land Plan \(Offshore\).pdf](#)
Importance: High

RR-038

REGISTRATION NO-: **20031650**

Dear Sirs,

In respect of the Examining Authority's written questions and request for information (ExQ1), please find the following response to Question 9.3 of the attachment -:

a. **Viability of the existing agricultural enterprise(s)**

- i) Faenol Bropor farm extends to 149.5 acres or thereabouts .The proposed scheme will have an inevitable devastating impact on the viability of the agricultural unit and accordingly the associated livestock enterprise, given it is proposed that in excess of 54% (up to 83.01acres /33.59ha) of 'prime' agricultural land is to be acquired to locate a substation (together with 'mitigation/ bio diversity enhancement ') and a further 6% (9.55 Acres/3.86 ha) is earmarked for 'temporary occupation and use'(potentially ,it is currently anticipated ,up to 2030) in respect of the intended cable corridor and outfall pipe (in aggregate extending to over 60% of the farm). The farm business will no longer be able to sustain two households and the aspirations for the subsequent generation to succeed will, undoubtedly, be significantly hampered . The total owned 'property' applicable to Faenol Bropor is shown for identification purposes only edged in red on the accompanying 'option plan'. The extent proposed to be acquired is tinted red (Plot Nos 416 & 417 on the appended DCO land plan extract) , with the area earmarked for temporary occupation and use, being Plots 402 & 405 to 415 , shown in blue thereon .

b. **Proposed mitigation measures, including reinstatement methods**

- i. It is understood from the Category 4 Publication of the 'book of reference' that '*mitigation measures are commitments made by the project to reduce and/or eliminate the potential for significant effects to arise as a result of the project. Mitigation measures can be embedded (part of the project design) or secondarily added to reduce impacts in the case of potentially significant effects*'. Given that the land required for the permanent substation is understood to be 12.36 acres (5.00 ha),and bio diversity net gain of 10% is perceived to be the 'norm'(whilst effective screening of the proposed development is regarded as imperative), it is considered that the total area of land allocated for acquisition is excessive (bearing in mind that a significant proportion of the subject area is classified as Grade 3a and therefore bio-diversity enhancements disproportionately compete with effective land needed for food production).Moreover whilst item 8 (Schedule 2) of the Draft DCO is noted there is concern that information on location and type of permanent screening from Faenol Bropor homestead against adverse visual impact as well as noise and light pollution (during construction and post development) together with vibration management (during scheme operations) is principally regarded as somewhat non-specific . Requests to arrange a site meeting and for further comprehensive information in order to duly to address associated concerns (and for inclusion of coniferous species as part of the proposed woodland mixture-so as to enhance screening during the winter) are not being accommodated .
- ii) Regarding reinstatement it is vital that topsoil and subsoil together with any boulder clay are kept separate and are not removed from our clients land .In addition it is important that the top soil is duly protected from contamination (including measures carried out in respect of routine weed control) and reinstated in sequence of builder clay, subsoil followed by top soil together with surface stones removed . Then subsoiling will be considered necessary with the aim of addressing compaction (for the benefit of natural drainage) and the land cultivated (together with lime applied -if a soil analysis deems appropriate) and seeded (with a grass seed mixture approved in advance by our client) and

relevant compound fertilizer applied with the affected land being protected by temporary livestock (cattle & sheep) proof fencing until the new sward is duly established . As regards to damaging the viability of retained land (**being all the property excluding that tinted red on the accompanying 'option plan'**) , laying infrastructure (such as cables) at a depth of 0.75m below ground level will limit the ability to effectively subsoil and/or mole-plough ,when needed to address compaction. Such apparatus should therefore be installed at a minimum of 0.9 m below surface level (to accord with, what is regarded as 'established standard practice with such schemes ') to mitigate impact on productive capacity . Also, in the event of any land being severed it will be fundamental for any retained portion to remain suitable for modern agricultural use in respect of field size and alignment , with the provision for water and appropriate access together with boundaries duly reinstated to our clients reasonable satisfaction. Moreover , for completeness , whilst not ideal , it would be considered beneficial for our client to retain ownership of the proposed severed field to the west of points D to E (as indicated on the appended Option land) in order to maintain a watercourse on the basis that suitable access and provision of right of way is available via the existing trackway (if acquired) from A-B & B to C.

Please let us know should we be able to assist regarding any further questions ,and such circumstances we would be obliged if detail of the same could please be relayed directly to the writer (in addition to being posted on the National Infrastructure Planning Awel y Mor Offshore Wind Farm website) .

Yours faithfully,

Eifion Bibby

J Eifion Bibby MRICS FAAV

Director & RICS Registered Valuer

For and on behalf of :

Davis Meade Property Consultants, Plas Eirias Business Centre, Abergele Road, Colwyn Bay, Conwy, LL29 8BF.

[REDACTED]

This email and any files transmitted with it are privileged and confidential information and intended solely for the use of the addressee. Neither the confidentiality nor any privilege in this email is waived, lost or destroyed by reason that it has been transmitted other than to the addressee. If you are not the intended recipient you are hereby notified that you must not disseminate, copy or take any action in reliance on it. If you have received a message in error you must notify us immediately by return email to the sender and delete the original message and any copies. Davis Meade Property Consultants accepts no liability for any damages caused in the transmission of this email.

Davis Meade Property Consultants is the trading name of Davis Meade Property Consultants Limited a company incorporated in England No. 6897243. Registered Office 103 Beatrice Street, Oswestry, Shropshire, SY11 1HL

PRIVACY NOTICE: [click here:](#)

[REDACTED]

Application by Awel y Môr Offshore Wind Farm Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Awel y Môr Offshore Wind Farm project

The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1) Issued on 27 September 2022

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA) written questions and requests for information – ExQ1. If necessary, the Examination timetables enable the ExA to issue further rounds of written questions in due course. If this is done, the further rounds of questions will be referred to as ExQs with a number to denote the number of the round.

Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the Initial Assessment of Principal Issues provided as Annex C to the Rule 6 letter of 23 August 2022. Questions have been added to the framework of issues set out there as they have arisen from representations and to address the assessment of each application against relevant policies.

Column 2 of the table indicates who each question is directed to. The ExA would be grateful if all persons named could answer all questions directed to them, either providing a substantive response or explaining why the question is not relevant to them. 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 a number (indicating that it is from an ExQs round of that number) and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on 'General and cross topic issues' in this round of questions is identified as ExQ1.0.1. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

Responses should be sent to the [mailbox](#) for the Examination. If you are responding to a small number of questions, answers in an email or 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.

Responses are due by **Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022.**

Abbreviations used

A	Article
AIS	Air Insulated Substation
ALC	Agricultural Land Classification
AONB	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
ATR	Active Travel Routes
AyM	Awel y Môr
BEIS	Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy
BoR	Book of Reference
CA	Compulsory Acquisition
CCBC	Conwy County Borough Council
CEA	Cumulative Effects Assessment
Cefas	Centre for the Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Sciences
CSIP	Cable Specification and Installation Plan
DAERANI	Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs, Northern Ireland
dDCO	Draft Development Consent Order
DCC	Denbighshire County Council
DCO	Development Consent Order
ECC	Export Cable Corridor
ECoW	Ecological Clerk of Works
EDR	Effective Deterrent Radius
EM	Explanatory Memorandum
EPR	Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016
ES	Environmental Statement
ExA	Examining Authority
FCA	Flood Consequence Assessment



FCC	Flintshire County Council
FMfP	Flood Map for Planning
FRAP	Flood Risk Activity Permit
FS	Funding Statement
FTE	Full Time Equivalent
FWNP	Future Wales – The National Plan 2040
GC	Gwynedd Council
GCN	Great Crested Newts
GIS	Gas Insulated Substation
GyM	Gwynt y Môr
HDD	Horizontal Directional Drilling
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment
INNS	Invasive Non-Native Species
IoACC	Isle of Anglesey County Council
JNCC	Joint Nature Conservation Committee
km	kilometres
LIR	Local Impact Report
LPA	Local Planning Authority
LWS	Local Wildlife Site
LVIA	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
m	metres
MDS	Maximum Design Scenario
MHWS	Mean High Water Springs
NATS	National Air Traffic Services
NE	Natural England
NS	NatureScot



NHWF	North Hoyle Wind Farm
NO_x	Nitrogen Oxides
NPS	National Policy Statement
NRW	Natural Resources Wales
NRMM	Non-Road Mobile Machinery
NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
NT	National Trust
NWWT	North Wales Wildlife Trust
oACMP	outline Air Quality Management Plan
oCCP	outline Construction Communications Plan
oCoCP	outline Code of Construction Practice
oCMS	outline Construction Method Statement
oNVMP	outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan
oLEMP	outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan
oPPEIRP	outline Pollution Prevention and Emergency Incident Response Plan
oPAMP	outline Public Access Management Plan
oSWMP	outline Site Waste Management Plan
oSMP	outline Soil Management Plan
OnSS	Onshore Substation
oPPIERP	outline Pollution Prevention and Emergency Incident Response Plan
PA2008	Planning Act 2008
PAH	Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons
PPG	Planning Practice Guidance
PPW	Planning Policy Wales
PRoW	Public Rights of Way
PTS	Permanent Threshold Shift



R	Requirement
RFWF	Rhyl Flats Wind Farm
RIAA	Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment
RR	Relevant Representation
RSPB	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
Sch	Schedule
SGLP	Special Category Land Plans
SLVIA	Seascape, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
SoCG	Statement(s) of Common Ground
SoS	Secretary of State
SoR	Statement of Reasons
SNP	Snowdonia National Park
SuDS	Sustainable Drainage Systems
TAN	Technical Advice Note
TP	Temporary Possession
TPO	Tree Preservation Order
TSUPRoW	Temporary Stopping Up of Public Rights of Way Plan
TTS	Temporary Threshold Shift
UKCP18	UK Climate Projections 2018
UXO	Unexploded Ordnance
VP	Viewpoint
WBGW	The Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015
WTG	Wind Turbine Generator

The Examination Library

References in these questions set out in square brackets (e.g. [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library. The Examination Library can be found [here](#).

The Examination Library will be updated as the examination progresses.

Index

0.	General and Cross Topic Questions	8
1.	Aviation	12
2.	Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment	13
3.	Compulsory Acquisition (CA) and Temporary Possession (TP)	40
4.	Construction	51
5.	Design	55
6.	Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)	59
7.	Flood Risk and Water Quality	69
8.	Historic Environment	77
9.	Land Use	84
10.	Landscape and Visual	87
11.	Marine and Coastal Physical Processes	96
12.	Marine – Commercial Fisheries, Shipping and Navigation	98
13.	Marine – Natural	102
14.	Public Health and Nuisance	104
15.	Other Projects and Proposals	108
16.	Project Description and Site Selection	108



The Planning Inspectorate
Yr Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

17.	Seascape, Landscape and Visual.....	111
18.	Socio-Economic	119
19.	Tourism and Recreation	124
20.	Traffic and Transport	128

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question
0. General and Cross Topic Questions		
0.1	The Applicant	Plans and documents Please provide a list of all plans and other documents that will require Secretary of State (SoS) certification (including plan / document references). This should be updated throughout the examination process for ease of tracking document versions and a final list supplied to the Examining Authority (ExA) before the close of the examination.
0.2	The Applicant, DCC, IoACC, CCBC, GC, FCC, SNP	The Development Plan Please provide full copies of any relevant Development Plan policies (or other documents e.g. management plans, supplementary guidance) that you have referred to in any of your submissions. Should you refer to any additional Development Plan policies at any time in your future submissions (for example in a Local Impact Report) then, if they have not already been provided, please also submit copies of these into the Examination. a) Have there been any relevant updates to the statutory Development Plan since the compilation of the application documents? b) Are local planning authorities content with the Applicant's policy analysis?
0.3	The Applicant, Any Interested Party	National Policy Are you aware of any updates or changes to UK or Welsh Government Policy or Guidance relevant to the determination of this application that have occurred since it was submitted? If yes, what are these changes and what are the implications, if any, for the application?
0.4	The Applicant, DCC, CCBC	Planning applications Please provide an update on any planning applications that have been submitted, or consents that have been granted, since the Application was submitted that could either affect the Proposed Development or be affected by the Proposed Development and whether these would affect the conclusions reached in the ES (e.g. Rhyl and Prestatyn sea defence schemes).

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

0.5	DCC	National Park progression Please provide an update on progress and likely timescales for the potential new National Park for the Clwydian Range and Dee Valley Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
0.6	The Applicant	Gwynt y Môr Noting paragraph 121 of ES Chapter 1: Offshore Project Description [APP-047], please further clarify why Gwynt y Môr's (GyM) transmission network is not sufficient to allow full export from the Proposed Development (or vice versa)? Has the potential to upgrade the GyM transmission network to allow for this been considered?
0.7	The Applicant	National Grid substation Please fully justify the reasons in detail for including land within the Order limits relating to the extension of the National Grid substation, given that the extension would be determined under a separate application. Has any progress been made on this application?
0.8	The Applicant	Operational period The assessments in the ES assume an operational period of 25 years for the Proposed Development before it is to be decommissioned. Therefore, should this period of time be specified and secured as a requirement of the dDCO? If not, might this allow for a longer operation period to occur and what implications might this have for the assessments of the ES?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

0.9	The Applicant	Carbon Assessment Draft NPS EN-1 section 5.3.4 sets out that all proposals for energy infrastructure projects should include a carbon assessment as part of their ES, along with the type of information which should be included within the assessment. Section 4.2 of draft NPS EN-1 makes reference to the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 which refer to, amongst other things, climate. In addition, during consultation for the redetermination of the Norfolk Vanguard project, the Secretary of State (SoS) highlighted the desirability of a carbon footprint and impact assessment that considered embedded carbon and greenhouse gases from the extraction, refinement and manufacture of elements of the project, along with the emissions from the construction (including trenching and excavation of arable land and loss of greenhouse gas absorption capacity from farming, plants and trees), operation, maintenance and decommissioning. Could the Applicant signpost any assessment work of this nature that has been undertaken and does the Applicant intend to provide anything further in this respect? If so, by what deadline will be this be submitted by?
0.10	The Applicant	Offshore transmission network review a) Has the Applicant considered the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) / Ofgem Offshore Transmission Network Review? If not, why not? b) If it did, has it influenced the design of the Proposed Development in any way? c) Has the Applicant identified any opportunities for a more co-ordinated approach to the design and delivery of the transmission infrastructure of this Proposed Development and other projects in the same region? d) Are any of the Secretary of State's observations on the offshore transmission network review in DCO decision letters relating to other offshore wind farms relevant in this respect?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

0.11	The Applicant	Other consents and licences Application document [APP-037] confirms that other consents, licences and permits would be required for the Proposed Development. Please provide an update on any progress with obtaining these consents, licences and permits include a section providing an update on these consents, licences and permits in any emerging Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) that are being drafted with the relevant consenting authorities.
0.12	The Applicant	Significant effects Please provide a summary table listing the likely significant residual effects identified within the ES Chapters.
0.13	The Applicant	Mitigation Please can you provide copies of the mitigation measures prescribed in the EIA and referenced in the schedule of mitigation [APP-310]. The following list is not exhaustive, Project Environmental Management Plan, Marine Pollution Contingency Plan, UXO specific Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol, Dropped Object Plan, Scour Protection Management Plan etc.
0.14	The Applicant	General review Please can you review the application documents and address any inconsistencies particularly those attributed to the MDS; For instance, the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment – Paragraph 44 [APP-027] “The onshore cable corridor will be approximately 14 km in length”, whilst ES Volume 3, Chapter 1, Onshore Project Description Para 30 [APP-062] states that the onshore cable corridor will be approximately 12 km in length.
0.15	The Applicant	General climate change and policy issues In relation to NPS EN-1, paragraph 4.8.8, please explain how the ES demonstrates that there would be no critical features of the scheme which might be seriously affected by more radical changes to the climate beyond that projected in the latest set of UK climate projections?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

0.16	NRW, CCBC, DCC, FCC, GC, IoACC, SNP	Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) The CoCP would be an important part of the mitigation strategy for dealing with and controlling potentially adverse effects from the various construction activities. Do you consider that as drafted it is sufficiently robust and precise and consequently enforceable?
0.17	Natural England	Participation The ExA thank you for your letter dated 19 August 2022 stating that you have not registered as an Interested Party for the Examination and that you will not be attending the Preliminary Meeting [AS-037]. For the avoidance of doubt, please could you confirm that you have no concerns with the environmental effects of the proposed development. If you do have concerns, please provide details.
0.18	The Applicant	Cumulative effects The proposed offshore wind farms of Mona and Morgan appear in various places within the ES. Provide updates, if necessary, on the progress of these proposals since the ES was written and any changes this may make to the assessment of the proposed development.
0.19	All Interested Parties	Other Projects and Proposals Are there any other projects that are not documented in the ES that are relevant and need to be considered by the ExA? If so, please identify these projects and the public information source(s) from which you have made your assessment that they are relevant.
1. Aviation		
1.1	The Applicant	The 'Environmental assessment: cumulative effects' (13.13) section of Volume 2, Chapter 13 of the ES (Aviation) [APP-059] does not refer to either the proposed Mona or Morgan offshore wind farms, both of which appear on the National Infrastructure Planning website, to varying levels of detail. Please update the chapter to refer to these proposals or provide justification for not doing so.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

1.2	The Applicant, NATS	Please provide an update on the proposed commercial agreement to mitigate the identified required mitigation of the Great Dun Fell and St Anne's Primary Surveillance Radars.
2. Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment		
2.1	The Applicant	General a) Can you please confirm when the word 'may' is used as in Schedule of Mitigation [APP-310] and also within the ES such as "A PAMS may be used" Paragraph 31 [APP-107], whether the resulting conclusions on the impacts following mitigation is based on all or just some of the mitigation measures being employed. b) Can you please confirm when the words 'if required' within mitigation measures is used as in ES Volume 3, Chapter 5 [APP-066] and also statements such as "If an ADD is chosen as part of the suite of mitigation measures set out in the final MMMP" paragraph 32 [APP-107] , whether the resulting conclusions on the impacts following mitigation is based on all or just some of the mitigation measures being employed.
2.2	The Applicant	General The application references to professional EIA guidance documents: Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland: Terrestrial, Freshwater and Coastal (CIEEM, 2016) within [APP-041]; and Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) (2019). 'Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland: Terrestrial, Freshwater, Coastal and Marine version 1.1' within [APP-066]. Please can you explain and describe the effect upon the EIA as a result of the latest version Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland: Terrestrial, Freshwater and Coastal (CIEEM, September 2018, version 1.2 updated April 2022).

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

2.3	The Applicant	General Please can you advise and explain your approach to UK Habitat Classifications (UKHabLtd) intending to release a version 2.0 of the UK Habitat Classification in early 2023.
2.4	The Applicant	General Please can you explain how the application considers Future Wales (the nation plan 2040), policy 9 – resilient ecological networks and green infrastructure references to safeguarding ecological networks and securing biodiversity enhancements (net benefit).
2.5	The Applicant, NRW, DCC	General Paragraph 5.3.4 of NPS EN-1 states that the Applicant should show how the project has taken advantage of opportunities to conserve and enhance biodiversity and geological conservation interests. Please can you outline if and how does the application take advantage of opportunities to enhance biodiversity?
2.6	The Applicant	General Please can you identify if there is a recognised biodiversity metric tool (such as Natural England current biodiversity metric or similar) to calculate biodiversity net gain (or loss) for the project and whether you would be able to use it for the project. If no, please explain and describe how biodiversity net gain or loss of the project would be determined.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

2.7	The Applicant	General Statutory / Non-statutory Nature Conservation Sites Plan [AS-010] Please can you address the following points: a) Sheet 1 of 11 - The legend does not reflect all hatch colours shown and the extents of SPA hatch appears to be different on sheets 2 and 3; b) Sheet 2 of 11 –does the drawn shape and extent of Local Wildlife Sites at western edge reflects y Ffrith D011; c) differentiate the woodland area to help identify other ancient semi-natural woodland, plantation on ancient woodland site and local other woodland; d) label the name of the other nature reserves on the relevant sheet.
2.8	NRW, JNCC, RSPB, NWWT	Offshore – General Are you satisfied that there is no disturbance assessment available to assess other construction activities such as drilling, dredging, vessel activity? If no, please explain your reasons and provide evidence justification.
2.9	The Applicant	Offshore – General Please can you describe your approach to the marine environment and marine net gains principles.
2.10	The Applicant	Offshore – definition of MDS In relation to piling for pin-piled multi-leg turbine foundations, Table 18, ES Chapter 7: Marine Mammals [AS-026] specifies a maximum of 200 legs in total. The ExA notes that the parameters set out in the draft outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol [APP-107] (Table 3) specify 400 pin piles. Can the Applicant explain this apparent discrepancy and confirm the correct figure?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

2.11	NRW, JNCC, NWWT	Offshore - Baseline data and modelling Are you satisfied with: a) the information contained in table 22, ES Volume 4 [APP-106] with the listed species, mu size and density estimates recommended for use in the quantitative impact assessment; b) the two modelling locations northwest & southeast of the array area represent the locations closest to important marine mammal areas; c) the swimming speeds per mammal assumed in the impact assessment. If no to any of the above points, please explain reasons and provide evidence justification.
2.12	The Applicant	Offshore - Baseline data and modelling Please confirm SCANS II Block O common dolphin/km2 coverage. Is it 0.018km ² or 0.0081 km ² ? [APP-106]
2.13	NRW, JNCC, NWWT	Offshore – Marine Mammal Are you satisfied that as there is no threshold for temporary threshold shift (TTS) onset (that would indicate a biological significant amount of TTS), it is not possible to carry out a quantitative assessment of magnitude or significance of the impact of TTS on marine mammals? [AS-026]. If no, please explain you reason and provide evidence justification.
2.14	NRW, JNCC, NWWT	Offshore – Marine Mammal To assess potential for behaviour disturbance in marine mammals from unexploded ordnance (UXO) detonations the Applicant has presented impact assessment for 26km effective deterrence range (EDR) for high-order detonations; 5km EDR for low-order detonations; and TTS-onset thresholds for high-order detonations in [AS-026]. Are you satisfied with these assessments? If no, please explain the reasons and provide evidence justification.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

2.15	The Applicant	Offshore – Marine Mammal Please can you confirm the assessment for Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS)-onset from unmitigated pile driving for Bottlenose dolphin, Common dolphin and Risso's dolphin? Paragraph 132 (page 128) concludes medium significance whilst table 25 (page 133) states significance is minor adverse significance [AS-026].
2.16	The Applicant	Offshore – Marine Mammal Please can you explain and describe the residual effects and any mitigation measures for marine mammals if jack-up barges are required in the shallow sub-tidal. (ES Volume 2, Chapter 1, paragraph 143 [APP-047]).
2.17	The Applicant	Offshore- Marine Mammals Please can you explain and provide evidence justification to address the NRW Relevant Representation [RR-015] that: a) The justification for the absence of Cumulative Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS) in the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) is inadequate and as such the assessment is incomplete; b) There are insufficient grounds to conclude that PTS-onset risk has a negligible impact on harbour porpoise when cumulative PTS-onset has been excluded from the Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol; c) That further modelling is required to inform the assessments of underwater noise and PTS onset; and d) There is insufficient justification to support a conclusion of no Likely Significant Effect from vessel collision for bottlenose dolphin, grey seal, or harbour porpoise features of relevant SACs.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

2.18	NRW	Offshore – Marine Mammals With reference to your Relevant Representation [RR-015] please can you explain with evidence justification: a) What is meant by “<i>area-based assessment should be carried out where the extent of habitat that is insonified to a level that might produce significant disturbance is determined</i>”; b) the alternative to the “<i>use of dose/response curves to conduct an area-based assessment to estimate area of harbour porpoise habitat disturbed</i>”; and c) your reasons for “<i>insufficient justification to support a conclusion of no Likely Significant Effect from vessel collision for bottlenose dolphin, grey seal or harbour porpoise features of relevant SACs</i>”.
2.19	NRW, JNCC, NWWT	Offshore – Marine Mammals Draft Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol - Paragraph 20 [APP-107] states “ <i>Given these levels of uncertainty and over-precaution, and given that this is an evolving field of research, the Project does not consider it necessary to commit to mitigating cumulative PTS-onset at this stage</i> ”. Please can you respond to this statement and provide evidence justification.
2.20	The Applicant	Offshore - Marine Mammals Please can you explain the reason for residual effects for Bottlenose dolphin, Common dolphin and Risso’s dolphin in table 6 [AS-028] (being all minor adverse) whilst significance in table 5 [APP-107] for bottlenose dolphin, common dolphin and Risso’s dolphin are all negligible adverse significance.
2.21	The Applicant	Offshore - Marine Mammals Please can you explain and provide evidence for the marine mammal underwater noise impact assessment approach for offshore archaeological works and residual effects?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

2.22	The Applicant	Offshore – Marine Mammals Please can you explain and describe the marine mammals impact assessment to the works associated with the WTC Array that overlaps with the Liverpool Bay Sludge B site?
2.23	NRW, JNCC, NWWT	Offshore – Marine Mammals Are you satisfied with the list of projects in [AS-026] screened into the marine cumulative effects assessment (CEA) for disturbance from underwater noise? If not, please explain your reasons and provide evidence justification.
2.24	The Applicant	Offshore – Marine Mammals Please can you provide a definition of WCS. (Paragraph 9 [APP-107])
2.25	The Applicant	Offshore – Marine Mammals Please explain why ES Volume 2 Chapter 7 assessment of disturbance from piling includes the use of the interim PCOD modelling for bottlenose dolphins and grey seals but not for harbour porpoise.
2.26	NRW, JNCC, NWWT	Offshore – Marine Mammals Are you satisfied with: a) The impact magnitude definitions given in Table 9, [AS-026]; and b) The description/reason in Table 10 Sensitivity/importance of the environment? [AS-026]. If not, please explain your reasons and provide evidence justification.
2.27	The Applicant	Offshore – Marine Mammals Paragraph 55 [APP-026] states “ <i>the magnitude of potential impacts is defined by a series of factors including the spatial extent of any interaction, the likelihood, duration, frequency and reversibility of a potential impact</i> ”. Please can you list any other factors that have been considered.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

2.28	The Applicant	Offshore – Marine Mammals For inter-related effects [APP-060] please can you confirm: a) If the interaction of underwater noise, vessel interactions, and effects on prey species during construction may lead to effects of greater significance on marine mammals; b) The significance of effects pre mitigation and post mitigation.
2.29	The Applicant	Offshore – Marine Mammals Please can you confirm if the noise levels per construction activity source as listed in Table 39, [AS-026] will be validated and monitored during the works. If no, please explain your reasons and provide evidence justification.
2.30	The Applicant	Offshore – Mitigation Please can you advise on key competencies (such as skills, knowledge, experience, qualification, and behaviour) to undertake specialist role of marine mammal observer (MMOb) and how it is secured in the dDCO [AS-014]?
2.31	The Applicant, NRW	Offshore – Mitigation [AS-026] (Table 3) states that “ <i>NRW agreed with the proposed approach to incorporation of ADDs [acoustic deterrent devices] into the MMMP</i> ”. The draft outline Marine Management Mitigation Protocol (MMMP) suggests some uncertainty as to whether an ADD is to be delivered – for example, paragraph 32 states “ <i>If an ADD is chosen as part of the suite of mitigation measures set out in the final MMMP...</i> ”. a) Can the Applicant explain what factors would affect the decision on whether to select an ADD as part of the suite of mitigation measures set out in the final MMMP? b) Can the Applicant and NRW comment on whether it is necessary to secure provision of an ADD through the DCO?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

2.32	The Applicant	Offshore – Mitigation Sections 1.11 and 1.12 of [APP-107] describe proposed monitoring for marine mammals, pre-piling and during the soft-start period. Should any unexpected changes in animal behaviour be noted during the soft-start period, what (if any) actions would be undertaken in response?
2.33	The Applicant	Offshore – Marine Management Mitigation Protocol Table 18 of [AS-026] specifies MDS parameters in respect of piling for the cofferdam. Can the Applicant update the draft outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol [APP-107] to include these parameters?
2.34	The Applicant	Offshore – Mitigation The Cable Specification and Installation Plan (CSIP) (anticipated to be secured as a Marine Licence condition) would also ensure that cable crossings are appropriately designed to mitigate environmental effects. Please can you explain with evidence justification of appropriate design to mitigate environmental effects.
2.35	The Applicant	Offshore – Mitigation Table 63: Summary of effects in Offshore ornithology [APP-050] states N/A but [APP-310] states the following mitigation measures for Offshore Ornithology, a minimum blade clearance of 22m above mean high water springs, a Project Environmental Management Plan (that will include a Marine Pollution Contingency Plan), and a Scour Protection Management Plan. Please can you confirm the mitigation measures (if any) used to determine the range of residual effects for offshore ornithology.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

2.36	The Applicant	Offshore – Mitigation [APP-310] states a scour protection management plan would be secured through the Marine Licence. The Marine Licence principles [AS-023] references to scour protection management plan and swath bathymetric survey on sample of turbines and says that is not anticipated to be needed given minimal scour predictions. Please can you confirm whether the scour protection management plan is a mitigation measure.
2.37	NRW	Offshore – Monitoring Could NRW comment on the scope of the proposed monitoring during piling procedures, as described in Volume 4: Annex 7.2: Draft Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol [APP-107]?
2.38	RSPB	Offshore – Ornithology Are you satisfied with the applicant's approach to Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies Interim Advice on The Treatment of Displacement for Red-Throated Diver (2022)? If not, please explain your reasons and provide evidence in justification.
2.39	NRW, JNCC, RSPB, NWWT	Offshore – Ornithology Are you satisfied with the existing baseline data and for a future baseline to be informed by extrapolation of the currently available data by reference to policy and plans, other proposal applications and expert judgement? (Paragraph 40, [APP-050]). If not, please explain your reasons and provide evidence justification.
2.40	The Applicant	Offshore – Ornithology Table 1 turbine and array parameters used to inform Collision Risk Models (CRM) [APP-097] references to mean, minimum and maximum rotor radius of 125m. Please can you explain the reason and describe the effects of a different rotor radius in the collision risk model if the rotor radius was 153m (to reflect table 16 design envelope for WTS's of larger WTG rotor diameter of 306m) [APP-047].

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

2.41	NRW, JNCC, RSPB, NWWT	Offshore – Ornithology Are you satisfied: a) That the site-specific baseline surveys and sample sizes could not be used to accurately calculate site-specific flight heights for the four species selected for CRM, and consequently band 2 and 3 were applied and presented in the report? Paragraph 2.1 [APP-097]; b) With the list of migratory birds screened in for modelling migropath and broad front modelling in table 1 in ES Volume 4 [APP-098]; c) With the worked example for apportioning gannet collision mortalities to colonies during migration free breeding season (April to August) table 1 [APP-032]; and d) With the potential likely significant effects listed within the Matrixes? ES Report 5.2 [APP-033]. If not, please explain your reasons and provide evidence justification.
2.42	The Applicant	Offshore – Ornithology It is referenced in paragraph 441 [APP-050] that there would be likely temporal overlap within the operational phases of some of the Irish offshore renewable energy projects and that consideration of potential transboundary effects is limited by the data available upon which to base the assessment. Please can you explain the reasons for not including offshore ornithology monitoring [APP-311].
2.43	The Applicant	Onshore – General Please can you check paragraph 115, reference to habitat survey report application ref: 6.5.5.3 (should it be 6.5.5.2?) [APP-066].
2.44	The Applicant	Onshore – General Please can you review and cross check the information in the following 3 tables and address any inconsistencies: ES Volume 3, Chapter 13, Table 5 [APP-074], Table 15 and Table 21 [APP-066].

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

2.45	The Applicant	Onshore – General Please can you confirm the reference for the results of wintering bird surveys? ES Volume 3, Chapter 5 paragraph 148 appears to refer to ES Volume 5, Annex 5.2 application ref: 5.5.5.2 rather than ES Volume 5, Annex 5.3 application ref 6.5.5.3.
2.46	The Applicant	Onshore – General a) Please can you confirm definition of “ <i>All important ecological features</i> ” - under operation heading Table 5, section 13.3.5 [APP-074] b) Should this definition be added to the dDCO?
2.47	The Applicant	Onshore – General Under decommissioning heading in Table 5, section 13.3.5 [APP-074] please can you explain and describe which cases would be similar in impact magnitude and which cases would be much lower during construction.
2.48	The Applicant	Onshore – General Please can you provide a plan drawing identifying the areas deemed a) Temporary; and b) Permanent mitigation and compensation works. to help clarify and address Work No. 41 – Access roads to provide operational access from the public highways to Work Nos. 4 to 40 and any associated development, and in connection with Work Nos. 4 to 41 provision of temporary and permanent ecological and environmental mitigation and compensation works [AS-014].
2.49	The Applicant	Onshore – General Please can you provide or draw attention to a plan drawing labelling the main woodlands as referenced in table 3-2 main woodlands within survey area in the Habitat and Hedgerow Survey Report [APP-125].

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

2.50	The Applicant	Onshore – Mitigation - Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [APP-305] Please could you: a) Identify the type of habitat creation and ecological measures deemed to be potential temporary mitigation area as shown on Figures 3-7; b) Identify wildlife corridor connectivity, sheltering, foraging habitats during construction and operation; c) Explain and describe habitat management and monitoring regimes including any habitats and species targets; d) Explain and describe the methodologies including any established best practices/ guidelines employed for creating the habitats; e) Explain if all of the “if required” mitigation measures are to be shown on the Figures 3-7 as Potential Temporary Mitigation Areas. For example, ES Volume 3, Chapter 5 [APP-066], mentions that a mitigation measure for HDD pits and other working areas at the landfall and River Clwyd crossing would be screened if required, however this potential temporary mitigation area does not seem to be indicated on the relevant figure; f) Confirm the survey area for preconstruction surveys for Bats i.e. DOL or OL; and g) Table 1: Pre-Construction Surveys states the survey timings during the season prior to construction commencing. Confirm the survey timings for Preliminary works.
2.51	The Applicant	Onshore – Mitigation The Outline Invasive Non-Native Species Management Plan [APP-323] references to general control measures, biosecurity and monitoring. Please can you explain and describe your approach to treatment and removal of INNS required as a result of the works and the environmental impact assessment.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

2.52	The Applicant	Onshore – Mitigation Please can you advise on key competencies (such as skills, knowledge, experience, qualification, and behaviour) to undertake specialist roles of Ecological Clerk of works (ECoW) and how it is secured in the dDCO [AS-014]?
2.53	The Applicant	Onshore – Mitigation Please can you describe what the reasonable avoidance measures to minimise impact for other S7 Mammals would be? [APP-066].
2.54	The Applicant	Onshore – Mitigation [APP-066] states that additional reasonable avoidance measures for badger, otter and reptiles will be implemented. Please can you explain and describe what these would consist of.
2.55	The Applicant	Onshore – Mitigation Please can you explain and describe the range of measures to mitigate the temporary loss of 11ha of coastal and Flood plain grazing marsh, Clwyd estuary and adjacent LWS (Table 5, section 13.3.5 [APP-074]).
2.56	The Applicant	Onshore – Mitigation Please can you explain and describe how the remaining area of S7 habitat: Lowland Fen (Route Section C) would be protected from damage during the construction works (Table 15 [APP-066]).
2.57	The Applicant	Onshore – Mitigation Please can you advise how trenching work at smaller water courses and ditches will not take place at night (mitigation for eels) is secured within the dDCO (Table 5, section 13.3.5 [APP-074]).

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

2.58	The Applicant	Onshore – Mitigation Please can you explain and describe the mitigation measures for: a) invertebrates present within the coastal dune habitat being affected by the works; and b) for the common toad found within the habitats affected by the works.
2.59	The Applicant	Onshore – Mitigation Please can you explain and describe: a) translocation and receptor sites methodology (including timeframes) for any reptiles found within the habitats affected by the works; and b) translocation and receptor sites methodology (including timeframes) for any water voles found within the habitats affected by the works.
2.60	The Applicant	Onshore – Mitigation Please can you describe the range of measures for breeding birds at the OnSS relating to: a) Vegetation clearance; b) Other construction works; and c) Habitat creation and management. (Table 5, section 13.3.5 [APP-074])
2.61	The Applicant	Onshore – Mitigation For non-breeding birds a temporary loss of up to 2.4 ha of intertidal habitat at Y Ffrith is stated. Please can you explain and describe mitigation measures for light, noise and visual related to construction works within the shallow sub-tidal, the intertidal zone and landfall (Table 5, section 13.3.5 [APP-074]).
2.62	The Applicant	Onshore – Mitigation Please can you confirm how piling (if required at the landfall) would take place outside the winter period (October to March) or the use of vibro-piling technology is secured in the dDCO [AS-014]?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

2.63	The Applicant	Onshore – Mitigation The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [APP-305] outlines the Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) key duties and the Outline Code of Construction Practice – Appendix 1 [APP-313] states that the ECoW will be employed for the duration of the project to ensure species specific mitigation, method statements and plans are implemented effectively. Please describe how the ECoW fulfil their duties if the onshore works are constructed in two or more stages and /or during 24hr works.
2.64	The Applicant	Onshore – Mitigation Please can you explain and describe your client environmental role with the ECoW during preliminary works and construction works.
2.65	NRW, DCC, NWWT, Envirowatch.EU, Sustainable Cymru	Onshore – Mitigation Are you satisfied the following provide sufficient mitigation measure details and are adequate for preparing future detailed versions: a) outline Code of Construction practice [APP-312]; b) outline Construction Method Statement [APP-313]; c) outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [APP-305]. If not for any of the above points please explain reasons and provide evidence justification.
2.66	The Applicant	Onshore – Mitigation Please can you explain and describe the relationship (including duty holder) between the Outline Construction Method Statement [APP-313] with a Construction Phase Plan and Construction Environmental Management Plan.
2.67	The Applicant	Onshore- Mitigation Please can you confirm how all pre-construction surveys are to be secured in the dDCO [AS-014].

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

2.68	The Applicant	Onshore – Mitigation Measures to mitigate for temporary loss/fragmentation of flight lines and foraging habitat include the use of “dead hedges” at discrete locations during construction. Please: a) Provide longitudinal section and cross sections showing how a dead hedge fills temporary hedgerow gaps overnight; b) Explain and describe what happens to the dead hedge during dawn and dusk, and also during the day; and c) Explain and describe how the dead hedge is monitored and maintained during construction and post construction and how is this secured in the dDCO [AS-014].
2.69	The Applicant	Onshore – Mitigation The mitigation measures consist of pre-construction surveys and reasonable avoidance measures for temporary loss of foraging habitat along the onshore ECC, the permanent loss of c. 5ha of foraging habitat at the OnSS for Badgers, but the Proposed Development is not predicted to significantly adversely affect the local population due to the abundance of adjacent unaffected agricultural grassland [APP-074]. Please can you explain and describe how the abundance of adjacent unaffected agricultural grassland as foraging habitat is secured in the dDCO [AS-014].
2.70	The Applicant	Onshore – Mitigation The Outline Code of Construction references to: a) Screening and fencing - please can you provide typical layout drawing showing the size and type of screens and fence considered in the MDS and describe how the layout will interact with bat and other wildlife corridors to relevant habitats. b) Lighting and visual intrusion – please can you describe how lighting of the construction site will be designed and positioned to minimise the effects upon ecological receptors. c) Noise and vibration – please can you explain and describe any effects of noise and vibration on species and any proposed mitigation.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

2.71	The Applicant	Onshore – Mitigation and Residual Effects Please can you confirm the significance of residual effects for important ecological features? For example, invertebrates using coastal dune habitat: is it potentially significant, temporary adverse at a county level in the short term and in the mid-term? The additional " <i>until the proposed mitigation is sufficiently mature and become established</i> " implies that the conclusion is temporary adverse at a county level until a time where the proposed mitigation is sufficiently mature and become established (which may not be until the long term). Note – Other important ecological features have similar wording, and it would be appreciated if these could be clarified e.g. S7 habitat: Hedgerows (Route Sections B-G); Plant species (at coastal dune habitat) (Table 5, section 13.3.5 [APP-074]).
2.72	The Applicant	Onshore – Mitigation and Residual Effects It is stated in Table 5, section 13.3.5 [APP-074] that significance of residual effects confirmation requires further development of mitigation/compensation measures. Please can you confirm the significance of residual effect conclusion for: a) S7 habitat: coastal sand dune (Route Section B) mid-term and the proposed mitigation/compensation measure(s). b) S7 habitat: Lowland Fen (Route Section C) short term, and the proposed mitigation/compensation measure(s).

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

2.73	The Applicant	Onshore – Enhancements a) Paragraph 131 of [APP-305] refers to biodiversity enhancements and states that they will be subject to an initial aftercare period of up to three years. Please can you explain and describe the biodiversity enhancements that would be subject to less than three years. b) Paragraph 134 references to the initial proposals for additional biodiversity enhancements at the OnSS and creation of five additional ponds/ pools located to the southeast of the OnSS and ongoing management of the new ponds. Please can you confirm if the ongoing management of the new ponds includes pools. c) Please confirm the type of bird species able to use the bird boxes that would be erected at the OnSS. d) Please can you explain and describe any biodiversity enhancements to provide net gain beyond the OnSS and within the OL.
2.74	The Applicant	Onshore - Bat Please can you quantify the permanent loss of flight lines and foraging habitat at the OnSS area for bat population (Table 5, section 13.3.5 [APP-074]).
2.75	The Applicant	Onshore - Bat Please can you confirm the significance of residual effect due to permanent loss of habitat for bat populations at: a) The OnSS, b) The onshore ECC. (Table 5, section 13.3.5 [APP-074]).
2.76	The Applicant	Onshore - Bat Please can you confirm compensatory measures for bat populations along Onshore ECC including any bat boxes and quantity proposed (Table 5, section 13.3.5 [APP-074]).

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

2.77	The Applicant	Onshore – GCN & Common toad Please can you confirm the significance of residual effects short term and mid-term for GCN and common toad? [APP-066].
2.78	The Applicant	Onshore – Hedgerow Hedgerows north of the A525 were scoped out, due to lack of suitable structure, foodplants and/or connectivity. As the A525 is generally a north south route from Rhyl to St Asaph please can you provide further information as to the location of the hedgerows scoped out north of the A525 [APP-066].
2.79	The Applicant, NRW, NWWT, Envirowatch.EU	Onshore – Hedgerow Please can you advise on the recovery time of a hedgerow to ecological function for use per species?
2.80	The Applicant	Onshore – Hedgerow Please can you confirm the following referenced in Table 5, section 13.3.5) [APP-074]: a) The temporary loss in metres of the parts of the 128 other hedgerows; b) The length of hedgerow that is important under the Hedgerow Regulations that would be lost within the OnSS and would be lost Onshore ECC; c) The significance of residual effect due to permanent loss of hedgerow.
2.81	The Applicant	Onshore – Dormouse Please can you check paragraph 178, reference to dormouse survey report Application reference 6.5.7 (should it be 6.5.5.7?) [APP-066].
2.82	The Applicant	Onshore – Trees Please can you confirm how disturbed trees have been identified [APP-066].

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

2.83	The Applicant	Onshore – Ornithology Please can you confirm the significance of residual effects on disturbance to wintering birds at the landfall and River Clwyd crossing as it appears that it has not been determined if further mitigation for visual and acoustic is needed.
2.84	The Applicant	Onshore – Ornithology Please can you confirm the temporary loss of habitat in ha for onshore breeding birds (Table 5, section 13.3.5 [APP-074]).
2.85	The Applicant	Onshore – Trees Please can you clarify the 'including c.41 mature trees' statement (Table 5, section 13.3.5 [APP-074]). Is this in addition to the 8 mature trees lost at OnSS giving a total of 49? (With 41 mature trees being along the onshore ECC).
2.86	The Applicant	Onshore – Baseline Please can you explain how baseline conditions and important ecological features have been identified in areas where the draft order limit has changed? For example, Figure 1, page 5 of 13, habitat plan shows extents of habitat survey area near Aberkinsey curtailing rather than extending in an easterly/north easterly direction along the lane to its junction (ES Volume 5 – Annex 5.2 [APP-125]).
2.87	The Applicant	Onshore – Habitat and Species Please can you confirm the extents of lowland fen area at the Flash that could be affected by the works, the assumed re-growth rates and time taken for the fen habitat to re-establish from the unaffected areas.
2.88	The Applicant	Onshore – Habitat and Species Please can you explain and describe the approach to impact assessment for NO _x emissions and acid depositing from non-road mobile machinery ("NRMM") to Local Wildlife sites.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

2.89	The Applicant	Onshore – Habitat and Species Please can you confirm the potential impacts, preliminary mitigation/compensation and significance of residual effects for the common frog (<i>Rana temporaria</i>), smooth newt (<i>Lissotriton vulgaris</i>) and palmate newt (<i>Lissotriton helveticus</i>).
2.90	The Applicant	Onshore – INNS The spread of invasive non-native species (INNS) Table 12: MDS Key Parameters for EcIA [APP-066], column 'maximum adverse scenario assessed' lists the INNS known to be present within the OL. Please can you explain the reasons for the following (which seem to be within the vicinity of eastern survey area at Y Ffrith) not being included in the list Sea-buckthorn (<i>Hippophae rhamnoides</i>), Spanish Bluebell (<i>Hyacinthoides hispanica</i>), Pampas grass (<i>Cortaderia selloana</i>), White stonecrop (<i>Sedum album</i>).
2.91	NRW, DCC, RSPB	Onshore – Habitats and Species Are you satisfied with: a) The designated sites listed in Table 5: Designated Sites Scoped out of the Assessment ES Volume 3, Chapter 5 [APP-066]; b) The targeted scope of the wintering bird survey and that significant effects on other wintering bird species are unlikely and surveys for other species were not considered necessary (ES Volume 5 – Annex 5.3 [APP-126]); and c) That assessment of noise impact upon ecological receptors is not required for the cable route or OnSS (paragraph 105 of ES Volume 3, Chapter 10 [APP-071]). If not, please explain reasons and provide evidence justification.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

2.92	The Applicant	Onshore – Habitat and Species Please can you describe and explain how Habitats Regulations Annex 1 habitat H2130 dune grassland can successfully be re-established from turf salvaged from specific areas and created from native local provenance seed. Please confirm timeframe for both approaches for the habitat to be fully functional (Table 5, section 13.3.5 [APP-074]).
2.93	The Applicant	Onshore – Habitat and Species Please can you: a) Define the term “heavy standard trees” which appears within different ES chapters as a proposed mitigation measure; b) Explain source of 3:1 planting ratio and how this ratio is secured in the dDCO (Table 5, section 13.3.5 [APP-074]); and c) Explain source/location of locally appropriate native mixture for replanting and timeframe in the MDS to reach sufficient maturity to be utilised as a hedgerow.
2.94	The Applicant	Onshore – Habitat and Species For other S7 Mammal Species: hedgehog, brown hare, polecat please can you confirm permanent loss of habitat in hectares at the OnSS and explain and describe the habitat area earmarked for re-creation (Table 5, section 13.3.5 [APP-074]).
2.95	The Applicant	Onshore – Invertebrates Table 11 [APP-066] identifies invertebrates being a factor for importance of ecological features at coastal saltmarsh; coastal and floodplain grazing marsh, rivers; and ES Volume 5, Annex 7.4 [APP-140] identifies Bryn Cwnin Wetland LWS supporting a range of important invertebrates. Please can you confirm baseline invertebrate types identified at the habitats mentioned above and confirm significance of residual effects on invertebrates at the following habitats: Coastal saltmarsh; coastal and floodplain grazing marsh, rivers; and Bryn Cwnin Wetland LWS.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

2.96	The Applicant	Onshore – Invertebrates Please describe and explain how the proposed mitigation for coastal sand dune in Table 15 [APP-066] assists with the mitigation of invertebrates at the following habitats: Coastal saltmarsh; coastal and floodplain grazing marsh, rivers; and Bryn Cwnin Wetland LWS.
2.97	NRW, JNCC, RSPB, NWWT	RIAA Are you satisfied with: a) Table 57 and no adverse effect on integrity alone and in- combination? (ES Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment [APP-027]); b) Table 6 – summary of the screening conclusions for all receptors (excluding ornithology) (ES RIAA Annex 1 [APP-028]); and c) The minimum air gap of 21.9m referenced in table 1 turbine and array parameters used to inform Collision Risk Models [APP-097]. If no to any of the above points, please identify and explain your reasons and provide evidence justification.
2.98	NRW, JNCC, RSPB, NWWT	RIAA Are you satisfied with the potential impacts considered at designations within Table 1.1. If no, please identify the designation(s), explain your reasons, and provide evidence justification (ES Integrity Matrices [APP-034]).
2.99	The Applicant	RIAA Please can you respond to Janet Finch-Saunders MS [AS-036] and the statement that appears in [APP-032] the potential for offshore wind farms to have a negative effect on the integrity of Special Protection Areas within foraging range of the offshore wind farm site during the breeding season.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

2.100	The Applicant	RIAA Table 5 of the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment [APP-027] lists the features of the Special Protection Areas and Ramsar sites likely to experience significant effects from the Proposed Development. However, the features listed from some of the SPAs do not appear to match the features listed on the citations or conservation objectives for these features – for example the common tern feature of Liverpool Bay SPA is described as being breeding and on passage while the SPA citation refers to the common tern breeding population. The Applicant is requested to provide clarification on the features considered in Table 5 (and if necessary, a revised version of Table 5), notably in relation to the following SPAs/proposed SPAs/Ramsar sites: • Bae Lerpwl/Liverpool Bay; • The Dee Estuary; • Morwenoliad Ynys Môn/Anglesey Terns; • Ribble and Alt Estuaries; • Bowland Fells; • Ailsa Craig; • Copeland Islands; • Glannau Aberdaron ac Ynys Enlli/Aberdaron Coast and Bardsey Island; • Sgomer, Sgogwm a Moroedd Penfro /Skomer, Skokholm and the Seas off Pembrokeshire/; and • Morecambe Bay Ramsar site
2.101	NRW	RIAA The Applicant's assessment of LSE on European sites (Table 5 of [APP-027]) includes pintail, teal and ringed plover as features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. However, the ExA notes that these features are listed on the relevant Ramsar Information Site as identified for possible future consideration under criterion 6. Natural Resources Wales is requested to confirm if these features should be treated as listed Ramsar features. If so, what is the legal or policy basis for doing so?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

2.102	NRW, NS, DAERANI, Isle of Man Government, JNCC	RIAA Please confirm if there are any additional European/Ramsar sites or qualifying features which have not been included in [APP-027].
2.103	NRW, JNCC, DAERANI	RIAA Please confirm if the assessment in [APP-027] refers to the correct conservation objectives for the European/Ramsar sites under consideration.
2.104	NRW	RIAA In the assessment of potential adverse effects on the integrity of Liverpool Bay SPA, [APP-027] refers to the conservation objectives contained in the Regulation 35(3) Advice agreed by Natural Resources Wales (NRW) and Natural England (NE), despite the lack of reference in these objectives to several of the qualifying features (common tern, little tern and common scoter). Could NRW confirm if this approach is appropriate and how the Secretary of State can consider the implications for the conservation objectives of the SPA if the conservation objectives do not cover the full range of qualifying features?
2.105	The Applicant	RIAA Section 10.2 of [APP-027] states that the Isles of Scilly Complex Special Area of Conservation was included in the assessment of effects on grey seals. However, this SAC does not appear to have been identified in the LSE screening exercise was included in the assessment of effects on grey seals. However, this SAC does not appear to have been identified in the LSE screening exercise reported in the RIAA and supporting documents. The Applicant is requested to clarify whether it considers that LSE on this SAC could arise.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

2.106	The Applicant	RIAA Table 4 of [APP-027] identifies LSE on the Y Fenai a Bae Conwy/Menai Strait and Conwy Bay Special Area of Conservation from physical habitat loss/disturbance for all phases of the Proposed Development. However, this LSE is not addressed in the assessment of effects on the integrity of the SAC presented in section 10.1.1 of the RIAA. The Applicant is requested to provide an updated assessment which addresses effects from physical habitat loss/disturbance on the SAC.
2.107	The Applicant, NRW	RIAA The Examining Authority notes that the Applicant has relied on mitigation measures to avoid harm to the integrity of European/Ramsar sites in the marine environment. However, these mitigation measures, including the Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol and the Project Environmental Management Plan are not secured through the draft DCO but instead rely on suitable conditions being attached to the Marine Licences for the Proposed Development. The Applicant is requested to explain, with references to case law if appropriate, why the SoS should have confidence that such an approach would comply with the requirements of the Habitats Regulations. Do NRW agree with this approach to securing mitigation? If so, a justification should be provided, with reference to any relevant case law, as to why this approach is appropriate.
2.108	The Applicant	RIAA Please can you explain and describe how the RIAA and ES considers the impact of marine vessel emissions and the effect on designated sites?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

2.109	The Applicant	RIAA Please can you provide an additional figure (in addition to Figure 4 - All sites screened into the assessment) to show the French sites screened in as stated in table 4. Please also update paragraph 93 and statement "<i>Figure 4 shows all screened in sites in relation to AyM</i>". RIAA [APP-027]. Please also advise if European Site Information [AS-022] needs to be updated to include relevant French sites, and their conservation objectives and qualifying features.
3. Compulsory Acquisition (CA) and Temporary Possession (TP)		
The Book of Reference (BoR), Statement of Reasons (SoR), Land Plans, diligent enquiry and updates		
3.1	The Applicant	Please advise whether the BoR [AS-020a] is fully compliant with the Department of Communities and Local Government guidance 'Planning Act 2008: procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land' (September 2013) (DCLG guidance).
3.2	The Applicant	a) Please provide further detail / justification of how you have identified Category 3 parties for the purposes of the [AS-020a]. b) Are there any other persons who might be entitled to make a relevant claim if the DCO were to be made and fully implemented and should therefore be added as Category 3 parties to [AS-020a]? This could include, but not be limited to, those that have provided representations on, or have interests in: - noise, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke or artificial lighting; - the effect of construction or operation of the Proposed Development on property values or rental incomes; - concerns about subsidence or settlement; - claims that someone would need to be temporarily or permanently relocated; - impacts on a business; - loss of rights, e.g. to a parking space or access to a private property; - concerns about project financing; - claims that there are viable alternatives; or - blight.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

3.3	The Applicant	The Onshore Land Plans [AS-005] indicate pink and blue land would be subject to TP as well as either CA of land or rights. Where is this provided for in the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) [AS-014] and should this be reflected in the second column of the Part 1 table of [AS-020a]?
3.4	The Applicant	Noting paragraph 149 of the SoR [APP-021] and paragraph 35 of the Funding Statement (FS) [AS-018], further justify the conclusion that there would be no blight?
3.5	Affected Persons, Interested Parties	Are any Affected Persons or Interested Parties aware of any inaccuracies in [AS-020a], [APP-021] or [AS-005]? If so, please set out what these are and provide the correct details.
3.6	The Applicant	Please summarise where you have not yet been able to identify any persons having an interest in the land, including any rights over unregistered land? What further steps will you be taking to identify any unknown rights during the Examination?
3.7	The Applicant	Please provide further detail as to how diligent enquiry has been carried out, noting that there are a large number of 'unknown' interests in [AS-020a], for example, in respect of Plots 96, 97 and 98?
3.8	The Applicant	There appear to be some inconsistencies between information provided in some relevant representations (RR) and information in [AS-020a]. For example, the words 'Discretionary Trust' in [RR-037] do not appear in the relevant entry in [AS-020a] and the company name associated with [RR-017] does not appear as such in [AS-020a]. Please explore these inconsistencies, and any others, and provide clarification.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

3.9	The Applicant	Please ensure that [AS-020a], [APP-021], [AS-005] and Special Category Land Plans [AS-006] are: a) Kept fully up to date with any changes and the latest versions submitted at the deadlines shown in the Examination timetable together with an explanation of the reasons for each change; b) Supplied in two versions (clean and track changed) at each deadline; c) Supplied with unique revision numbers that are updated consecutively from the application versions, clearly indicated within the body of each document and included within the electronic filename; and d) [AS-014], including relevant Schedules, is updated accordingly.
3.10	The Applicant	What assurance and evidence can the Applicant provide of the accuracy of the land interests identified as submitted and can the Applicant indicate whether there are likely to be any changes to the land interests, including the identification of further owners / interests or monitoring and update of changes in interests?
3.11	The Applicant	Do you envisage any changes to the application which might engage The Infrastructure Planning (Compulsory Acquisition) Regulations 2010?
3.12	The Applicant	Schedule 1 of [APP-021] (Summary of status of negotiations with landowners) provides limited detail and it is unclear whether it relates to all landowners. Moreover, it provides no detail in respect of negotiations with other Category 1 parties, Category 2 parties or Category 3 parties. Please provide detailed information on the status of negotiations with all Affected Persons given that the ExA should be satisfied that the Applicant has engaged with all Affected Persons with a view to acquiring their land interests by agreement. Please also provide an update in respect of engagement with those affected parties as referred to in section 9 of [APP-021]. This information can be included in the Compulsory Acquisition Schedule and Statutory Undertakers Progress Schedule (see below).

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

3.13	The Applicant	Paragraph 7 of [AS-020a] sets out that the Applicant has taken a cautious approach to seeking CA / TP powers in respect of all plots of land even where it already holds an interest or presumes it holds an interest in land. Please list the plots the Applicant holds an interest or presumes it holds and interest in as it is not clear from [AS-020a] which these are.
How it is intended to use the land, whether reasonable alternatives have been explored and whether the rights sought are legitimate, proportionate and necessary		
3.14	The Applicant	To assist with the consideration of whether the extent of the land to be used temporarily is no more than is reasonably required for the purposes of the Proposed Development, please provide further details to justify the extent of the land sought to be used temporarily (including in respect of Rhyl Golf Club).
3.15	The Applicant	Article 27(8)(a) and (b) of [AS-014] appears to provide for the CA of rights over land / CA of subsoil in respect of plots identified for TP only (as set out in Schedule 6 of [AS-014] and as identified on the onshore Land Plans in yellow). Please justify such powers, clarify to what extent persons affected are likely to be aware of this and confirm whether the powers sought are reflected in the [AS-020a] and [APP-021]?
3.16	The Applicant	Please justify the width of the onshore ECC where trenchless techniques are proposed and explain why this is greater than where trenching would occur.
3.17	The Applicant	Given that the National Grid substation extension does not form part of the application, please justify the powers sought for CA of rights / TP of land associated with this and the inclusion of such land within the Order limits.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

3.18	The Applicant	Section 5 of [APP-021], states that there is a compelling case in the public interest for CA. Please address the following: a) What assessment, if any, has been made of the effect upon individual Affected Persons and their private loss that would result from the exercise of CA powers in each case; b) How has it been demonstrated within the application that the public benefits of the scheme outweigh any residual adverse effects including private loss suffered by individual landowners and occupiers; and c) Demonstrate how such a conclusion has been reached and how the balancing exercise between public benefit and private loss has been carried out?
3.19	The Applicant	Section 12 of [APP-021] addresses human rights. Can the Applicant: a) Provide a more detailed demonstration that interference with human rights in this case would be proportionate and justified; and b) Explain how the proportionality test has been undertaken and how this approach has been undertaken in relation to individual plots?
3.20	The Applicant	For the avoidance of doubt, please set out all the factors that are regarded as constituting evidence for a compelling case in the public interest for the CA and TP powers sought and where, giving specific paragraph references, are these set out in the submitted documentation?
Individual objections, issues and voluntary agreements		
3.21	All Affected Persons	Does any Affected Person have any concerns that they have not yet raised about the legitimacy, proportionality or necessity of the compulsory acquisition or temporary possession powers sought by the Applicant that would affect their land or their rights in land?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

3.22	The Applicant	Please complete the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) / Temporary Possession (TP) Objections Schedule (CA Schedule) (at Annex A of this document) and make any entries you believe would be appropriate, taking account of the positions expressed in RRs, and giving reasons for any additions. As the Examination progresses and at each successive deadline, please update the CA Schedule as necessary.
3.23	The Applicant	In the light of the DCLG guidance, in particular paragraph 8, please describe: a) How the ExA can be assured that all reasonable alternatives to CA (including modifications to the scheme) have been explored; and b) Set out in summary form, with document references where appropriate, what assessment / comparison has been made of the alternatives to the proposed acquisition of land or interests in each case.
Statutory Undertakers		
3.24	The Applicant, Statutory Undertakers (including SP Energy Networks on behalf of SP Manweb, National Grid Electricity Transmission Plc and Diamond Transmission Corporation)	[AS-020a] includes several Statutory Undertakers with interests in land and equipment that would be affected by CA / TP. The Applicant: a) Provide a progress report on negotiations with each of the Statutory Undertakers listed in [AS-020a], with an estimate of the timescale for securing agreement with them; b) Indicate whether there are any envisaged impediments to the securing of such agreements; and c) State whether any additional Statutory Undertakers have been identified since the submission of [AS-020a] with the application. Statutory Undertakers: Where Statutory Undertakers ([RR-013], [RR-014] and [RR-017]) have concerns regarding the current drafting of the Protective Provision within [AS-014], either provide copies of preferred wording or if you have provided it, signpost where it can be found and explain why you do not consider the wording as currently drafted to be appropriate.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

3.25	The Applicant	The Applicant is requested to review the RRs and subsequent Written Representations made by any Statutory Undertaker as the Examination progresses and at each successive deadline update, as necessary, a table identifying and responding to any representations made by Statutory Undertakers with land or rights to which PA2008 s127 and / or s138 of PA2008 applies (Statutory Undertakers Progress Schedule). Where such representations are identified, the Applicant is requested to identify: a) An up-to-date list of Statutory Undertakers; b) The nature of their undertakings; c) The Statutory Undertaker's land, rights or apparatus that would be affected and how it would be affected; d) The progress made in discussions with Statutory Undertakers since the last update in relation to the tests set out in s127(3)(a) or (b), s127(6)(a) or (b) and s138(4) of PA2008; and e) Any agreement or differences between the Applicant and the Statutory Undertaker about whether the tests have been met, the next steps to be taken, and the progress anticipated by the close of the Examination; f) In relation to these matters, whether any protective provisions and / or commercial agreement are anticipated, and if so: • whether these are already available to the ExA in draft or final form; • whether a new document describing them is attached to the response to this question or • whether further work is required before they can be documented; and g) In relation to a Statutory Undertaker named in an earlier version of the table but in respect of which a settlement has been reached: • whether the settlement has resulted in their representation(s) being withdrawn in whole or part; and • identifying any documents providing evidence or agreement and withdrawal. The above information will be published on the project page of the National Infrastructure website, so commercial and / or confidential details should not be given.
------	---------------	--

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

3.26	The Applicant, Statutory Undertakers (including EirGrid, North Hoyle Wind Farm (NHWF) Limited and Rhyl Flats Wind Farm (RFWF) Limited)	Several Statutory Undertakers with offshore land and equipment interests (not included the BoR) have submitted a RR ([RR-018], [RR-019] and [RR-020]). The Applicant: a) Provide a progress report on negotiations with each of these Statutory Undertakers, with an estimate of the timescale for securing agreement with them; b) Indicate whether there are any envisaged impediments to the securing of such agreements; and c) State whether any additional Statutory Undertakers with offshore interests have been identified since the submission of the application. Statutory Undertakers: Where Statutory Undertakers [RR-018, RR-019 and RR-020] have concerns regarding the current drafting of the Protective Provision within [AS-014], either provide copies of preferred wording or if you have provided it, signpost where it can be found and explain why you do not consider the wording as currently drafted to be appropriate.
3.27	The Applicant	Please comment on the concerns raised by RFWF Limited [RR-020] regarding: a) Work No.2 and implications for the operation of RFWF and its lease agreements; b) Necessary consents from RFWF (similar matter also raised by NHWF Limited [RR-019]); and c) The positioning of the Proposed Development and potential for a reduction in the energy output of RFWF from changes to wind speed and direction.
3.28	The Applicant	NHWF Limited [RR-019] refers to an alternative offshore cable route which would avoid its infrastructure. Please comment on this.
3.29	The Applicant	Does Schedule 9 (Protective Provisions) Part 1 (Protection for electricity, gas, water and sewage undertakers) of [AS-014] apply both onshore and offshore?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

Special Category Land		
3.30	The Applicant	Section 11.2 of [APP-021] addresses 'open space' and s132 of PA2008. However, please clarify the following: a) Whether s131 of PA2008 is relevant to the application; b) Whether there are any commons or fuel or field garden allotments relevant to the application; and c) Whether Rhyl Golf Club could be considered as open space, and if not, why it is referred to in section 11.2 of [APP-021]?
3.31	DCC	Section 11.2 of [APP-021] sets out that any granting of development consent would not be subject to special parliamentary procedure given that 'open space' within the Order land, when burdened with the order right, will be no less advantageous than it was before to (a) the persons in whom it is vested, (b) other persons, if any, entitled to rights of common or other rights, and (c) the public, in accordance with s132(3) of PA2008. Please confirm whether you are satisfied with this conclusion.
Crown Land		
3.32	The Applicant	Consent is required for any provision in the DCO which would relate to Crown land or rights benefiting the Crown in accordance with s135(2) of the PA2008. Among other things this includes consent for any TP sought over Crown land. Part 4 of [AS-020a] lists numerous plots where the Crown is the owner of the land. The description of each of these plots includes the tailpiece '(excluding all interests of the Crown)'. a) Please provide a further explanation for the inclusion of this wording and what it implies for the purposes of s135 of the PA2008? b) [APP-021] advises that you are in discussions with the appropriate Crown authorities in order to obtain their consent to the inclusion of these provisions as required under s135 of the PA2008. Please provide an update on where these discussions are (listing all relevant authorities) and confirm whether agreement will be reached before the close of the Examination? c) Please confirm whether any land that would be subject to escheat is included within the Order limits?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

3.33	The Applicant	Please clarify / identify the relevant Crown authority for 'The Queen's Most Excellent Majesty In Right Of Her Crown' as identified in [AS-020a].
3.34	The Applicant	Paragraphs 16 and 110 of [APP-021] set out that an agreement for lease for the array area has already been finalised with the Crown Estate and a further agreement for lease for the cable area is being progressed. Please provide an update on this progress and confirm whether agreement will be reached before the close of the Examination, noting and addressing also that North Hoyle Wind Farm Limited [RR-019] and Rhyl Flats Wind Farm Limited [RR-020] indicate that their consent is also required.
Compensation provisions and adequacy of funds		
3.35	The Applicant	Paragraph 27 of [AS-018] sets out that the Applicant would ensure that the necessary funds relating to CA / TP / compensation (c.£11.2 million) would be available when they are due. How would this be achieved in practice, noting that the Applicant comprises a joint venture between three different companies?
3.36	The Applicant	Section 6 of [AS-018] sets out the estimated project cost and its components. Should this also include: a) TP costs; and b) Decommissioning costs? If not, why not? If so, would any increase in the project costs affect funding available for CA / TP / compensation?
3.37	The Applicant	Appendix 2 of [AS-018] sets out that the understanding of the likely impact on individual businesses is still incomplete due to minimal evidence being presented to date. Please confirm: a) Has any further evidence been presented since Appendix 2 was produced? b) If so, do any figures require updating?; and c) if not, how confident can the ExA be with regard to the accuracy of the figures?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

3.38	The Applicant	Appendix 2 of [AS-018] sets out that the valuation date is April 2022. Is the FS likely to need updating during the course of the examination given that it is due to run until March 2023?
Site Specific Questions		
3.39	The Applicant	[RR-030] and [RR-031] relate to the effect of the Proposed Development on the operation of the Denbighshire Memorial Park and Crematorium, including in respect of noise and visual disturbance / disruption. Please provide a response to the concerns raised.
3.40	The Applicant	Please address the points raised in [RR-037], including in respect of engagement and communication, alternatives and land rights provisions.
3.41	The Applicant	[RR-038] raises concerns around the acquisition of land and the viability of the affected agricultural enterprise. Please provide a response to this concern.
3.42	The Applicant	[RR-039] to [RR-041] cite concerns regarding impact on land and reinstatement standards. Please provide a response.
3.43	The Applicant	[RR-044] to [RR-051] raise concerns around noise, light and dust pollution from Cwybr Fawr compound, food security, effects on horse riding, highway safety and effects on local businesses. [RR-042] and [RR-043] also raise concerns around food security. Please respond to these concerns.
Other		
3.44	The Applicant	Please clarify how you have had regard to the Equality Act 2010 in relation to the powers sought? Have any Affected Persons been identified as having protected characteristics? If so, what regard has been given to them?
3.45	The Applicant	Are any land or rights acquisitions required in addition to those sought through the dDCO before the Proposed Development could become operational?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

4. Construction		
4.1	The Applicant	Indicative Construction Programme Please provide a revised indicative construction programme (Figure 2 of ES Volume 3, Chapter 1 [APP-062]) to include additional detail in respect of the high-level activities currently listed.
4.2	The Applicant	Cofferdam construction Please can you confirm the amount of contingency delay associated with the 81 days for cofferdam construction?
4.3	The Applicant	Offshore construction period Table 18 in ES Volume 2, Chapter 7 [AS-026] indicates the offshore construction dates as January 2028 to March 2030, whilst the indicative construction programme in Figure 2 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 1 [APP-047] shows offshore clearance works from Year 1 to Year 4 Q2, and foundation installation Year 2 to Year 4. Please can you clarify the offshore construction period undertaken for the impact assessment?
4.4	The Applicant	Export cable Please provide an explanatory note including an illustrative diagram (to include plan and section) showing trenchless installation works for the export cable beneath Rhyl Sea-defence.
4.5	The Applicant	Jack-up Barges Please provide an explanatory note and illustrative diagram of jack-up barges in the shallow sub-tidal zone.
4.6	The Applicant	Construction Base Please explain how the impact assessment for disturbance and displacement of vessel(s) navigating to/from an undefined construction base (port facility) location was undertaken?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

4.7	The Applicant	Piling Duration Please can you provide further information how the 201 piling days were randomly spread throughout the 12 months construction period. For example, were any weightings given to seasons to differentiate between low and high densities?
4.8	The Applicant	Onshore Substation (OnSS) Please provide an explanatory note and earthworks phasing drawings for the construction of the OnSS. Please include: a) location of topsoil and subsoil mounds; and b) drainage features such as ponds.
4.9	The Applicant	Excavated Material Please confirm if any of the excavated material for the OnSS is to be re-used as engineering material? If so, please provide the estimated quantity and type of material.
4.10	The Applicant	Waste Re-Use Table 17 of [APP-062] estimates the types of waste and quantities to be generated from the construction of the OnSS. The waste management option column references to reuse on site where possible which infers reprocessing and certainty of use in terms of planning. Please explain and describe the approach to reuse on site including likely permits, licences and exceptions required.
4.11	The Applicant	Outline Code of Construction Practice (oCoCP) Paragraph 9 of the oCoCP [APP-312] relates to the onshore elements of the Proposed Development only (i.e., landward of Mean High-Water Springs (MHWS)). Please provide a list of documents employed to manage the potential environmental impacts seaward of MHWS during preliminary works and construction works.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

4.12	The Applicant	Trenchless Crossings Please indicate likely construction duration for trenchless crossing works at the A55 and River Clwyd.
4.13	The Applicant	Cable Depths Please confirm maximum depth of cable trench that do not cross obstacles (is it 1.7m or 2.0m?)
4.14	The Applicant	Topsoil Stockpile Please confirm the maximum height of topsoil stockpile.
4.15	The Applicant	Subsoil Stockpile Please confirm the maximum height of subsoil stockpile.
4.16	The Applicant	Cable Installation and Drainage Please explain and describe including a plan layout of “ <i>pumped via appropriate means to remove sediment before being discharged into local ditches or drains via temporary interceptor drains</i> (paragraph 105 of [APP-062])”.
4.17	The Applicant	Waste Sites Please confirm name(s) and address(es) of conventional and hazardous waste sites including residual capacity to receive waste generated from the Proposed Development.
4.18	The Applicant	Demolition Activities Paragraph 131 of ES Volume 3, Chapter 3.11 [AS-030] states “ <i>No demolition activities are proposed as part of the onshore construction works. As such, impacts associated with demolition activities have therefore not been considered further and are screened out</i> ”. Please confirm if re-use of material won on site involves a demolition activity (such as stone being crushed and processed).

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

4.19	The Applicant	Array and Offshore Export Cables Please provide explanation with evidence justification for parameter statement 50% of sediment is fluidized and 50% re-suspended in the water column for a V shaped trench, as detailed in tables 21 and 22 of [APP-047].
4.20	The Applicant	Offshore Cable Burial Please confirm the critical gradient slope to prevent the burying of a cable (paragraph 38 of [APP-047]).
4.21	The Applicant	Anchor Handling Please explain and describe impact assessment approach for anchoring handling and deployment of anchors beyond the order limit from vessels.
4.22	NRW	Hazardous Waste and Emergency Incident Processes Are you satisfied with the content of the outline Site Waste Management Plan (oSWMP) [APP-317] and outline Pollution Prevention and Emergency Incident Response Plan (oPPEIRP) [APP-317] with specific regard to the proposed hazardous waste and emergency incident processes? If not, please explain your reasons.
4.23	The Applicant	Safety Zones Please can you confirm the 500 metres safety zones during construction are within the OL?
4.24	The Applicant	Safety Zones Please confirm the safety zone approach to Work No. 3A Temporary working area including use for cable installation vessel anchoring as it does not seem to have been included within Section 4 of the Safety Zone Statement [APP-297].
4.25	The Applicant	Onshore Trenching Plan Please can you provide a plan drawing showing location and length of onshore open trenching incorporated within the MDS.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022

Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022

5. Good Design		
5.1	The Applicant	Substation sizes Please provide details of the comparative sizes and design of the proposed OnSS and the existing Gwynt y Môr and Burbo Bank substations. If there is a significant difference (or likely difference), then why is this so?
5.2	The Applicant	Good Design - Policy EN-1 section 4.5 criteria for 'good design' for energy infrastructure states that applying good design to energy projects should produce infrastructure that is sustainable, sensitive to place, efficient in the use of natural resources and energy used in their construction and operation and be matched by an appearance that demonstrates good aesthetics as far as possible. Paragraph 4.5.3 of EN-1 requires applicants to take into account both functionality and aesthetics (including its contribution to the quality of the area in which it would be located) and encourages an applicant to take opportunities to demonstrate good design in terms of siting relative to existing landscape character, landform and vegetation. Paragraph 4.5.2 notes that good design is also a means by which many policy objectives in the NPS can be met, such as how the siting and use of appropriate technologies can help mitigate adverse impacts, for example noise. How would the Proposed Development: a) Achieve 'good design' in accordance with section 4.5 of NPS EN-1; and b) Accord with the National Infrastructure Commission's Design Principles for National Infrastructure (February 2020)?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

5.3	The Applicant	Good design - detail Please provide scale drawings (which may be referred to as outline design and landscape plans) showing the preferred option layouts and three-dimensional design of the OnSS to the maximum parameters within the Rochdale envelope and the requirements for design and sustainability set out in the dDCO, including, but not limited to, the proposed buildings, external electrical transmission equipment, roadways, storage areas, surface treatments, landscaping, attenuation ponds, sustainable drainage systems and fencing.
5.4	The Applicant	Design champion Do you have a design champion within your organisation designated to the project? If so, what are their qualifications for such a role and what is their hierarchical position within the project?
5.5	The Applicant, DCC	Design review panel Comment on the desirability of implementing a design review panel to provide an informed 'critical friend' comment on the developing proposals ensure that good quality sustainable design and integration of the proposed OnSS into the landscape is achieved in the detailed design, construction and operation of the project. How might they be secured?
5.6	The Applicant	Design Guide Should there be a Design Guide / Design Code (or similar) certified and secured in the DCO to provide the basis for ensuring good design standards would be met post-consent?
5.7	DCC	Good design Is DCC satisfied that it has sufficient design expertise to ensure good design of the OnSS when discharging Requirement 6 of the dDCO [AS-014]?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

5.8	The Applicant	Choice of substation insulation ES Volume 8, Document 8, Design Principles Document [APP-308] makes it clear that the choice of Air insulated or Gas Insulated switchgear (AIS or GIS) for the proposed OnSS will be made at the detailed design stage, post consent (if consent is granted). However, the choice of AIS or GIS can make a significant difference to the appearance and the visibility of the OnSS, and many recent applications have stipulated during the application stage the proposed option chosen as part of their commitment to good design. This can also aid all interested parties in gaining a better sense of what the proposed OnSS is likely to look like. a) Provide further justification for your decision not to stipulate your choice of design for the OnSS. b) In design terms, assess the difference and comparative advantages and disadvantages of the OnSS being an AIS or GIS substation, both in terms of scale and mass but also the visual effect of a more open or enclosed layout.
5.9	The Applicant	Good design - requirement Subsection (2) of Requirement 6 of the dDCO [AS-014] states that details submitted under the requirement must be "substantially in accordance with the submitted design principles document" What does "substantially in accordance" mean in this context?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

5.10	The Applicant, DCC	Good design - detail The ExA welcomes the submission of [APP-308]. However, design guides for recently approved offshore wind farms, such as Norfolk Boreas, East Anglia One North, and East Anglia Two have seemingly contained more detailed design requirements and supporting documents than appears to be contained within the Design Principles Document. Such documents include details such as: • Indicative onshore project characteristics • Brief details on site selection, to demonstrate where good design has played a part in such a process • Detailed design principles and recommendations • Details of proposed link boxes • Landscaping details • Amount, scale, layout, appearance, access, and lighting of the proposed OnSS • Details of future consultation and engagement with the host authority • Example photographs of agricultural style buildings to be considered for use in GIS solutions or other site buildings • A preliminary design report providing details of approach to design, proposed materials, colour palettes, zoning plan and site layout. Please provide your view on whether such information should and can be provided within a revised Design Principles Document (and if so, by which deadline the document will be provided by)
5.11	The Applicant	Good design and the National Grid substation Should [APP-308] apply to the proposed National Grid substation extension? If not, why not?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

6. Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)		
Note: Questions / comments refer to dDCO Revision E [AS-014] (clean) / [AS-015] (tracked)		
General		
6.1	The Applicant	Please add page numbers to reflect the contents page.
6.2	The Applicant	Page two, second, third and fourth paragraphs – please amend to reflect that the ExA is a Panel.
6.3	The Applicant	Second page, fourth paragraph: a) The “special category land plans” (SGLP) are not defined in Part 1, Article 2 – please rectify; b) Should the “land plans” be referred to here given it is the SCLP which show special category land? c) The phrase “acquisition of permanent new rights” does not appear on the SCLP and a variation of it appears on the land plans – please ensure consistency of terms.
6.4	The Applicant	The ‘street works access plan’ is referred to throughout. However, the plan is titled the ‘street works <i>and</i> access plan’. Please amend the dDCO to reflect this.
6.5	The Applicant	The assessments in the ES assume an operational period of 25 years for the Proposed Development before it is to be decommissioned. Therefore, should this period of time be specified and secured as a requirement of the dDCO? If not, might this allow for a longer operation period to occur and what implications might this have for the assessments of the ES?
6.6	The Applicant	Please can you address and correct any inconsistent document titles to be secured in the dDCO and/or Marine Licence if necessary. For example, the Marine Licence Principles [AS-023] references to a fisheries liaison and coexistence plan whilst the schedule of mitigation [APP-310] references to fisheries liaison plan.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

6.7	The Applicant	Please clarify the status of the Schedule of Mitigation [APP-310] and the Schedule of Monitoring [APP-311]. Should these be secured in the dDCO or listed as documents to be certified?
Questions / comments relating to Articles (A):		
6.8	The Applicant	A2, Interpretation – is it necessary to refer to “Good Friday” and “Christmas Day” specifically under the term “business day” given that bank holidays are referred to?
6.9	The Applicant	A2 - Please explain the purposes of a ‘temporary mitigation area’ as referred to in Schedule 6 and should this be defined in A2?
6.10	The Applicant	A2 – “commence” a) Please clarify what would be included in ‘onshore site preparation works’. b) If ‘onshore site preparation works’ are excluded from the term ‘commence’, might this have implications for protected species or archaeology if this could occur prior to satisfying / discharging Requirements 12 and 14? c) The Infrastructure Planning (Miscellaneous Prescribed Provisions Regulations) 2010 defines operations of a prescribed description which do not fall under the description of the term ‘material operation’. These regulations contain for Wales a much more extensive list of operations than that which applies to projects in England. Explain the implications and relevance (if any) of this.
6.11	The Applicant	A3(2) – would any works fall between “MHWS” and “MLWS” and if so, does this article need revising to reflect this?
6.12	The Applicant	A7 – Please explain and justify the extent of the provisions of this Article.
6.13	The Applicant	A10 – Please explain and justify the extent of the provisions of subsection (4) of this Article.
6.14	DCC	Is the local highway authority content with the provisions of Part 3 of the dDCO?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

6.15	The Applicant	A16 - Please explain and justify the extent of the provisions of this Article.
6.16	The Applicant	A24 – Should this provision apply to airspace as well?
6.17	The Applicant	A27 – a) A27(8)(a) and (b) appear to provide for the CA of rights over land / CA of subsoil in respect of land identified for TP only (as set out in Schedule 6). Please justify such powers and clarify to what extent persons affected are likely to be aware of this? b) The Land Plans indicate that land subject to outright CA and CA of rights would also be subject to TP. Where is this provided for in A27?
6.18	The Applicant	A31 – a) Should subsection (2) also refer to Article 26, Rights under or over streets? b) Subsection (4) has a full stop missing.
6.19	The Applicant, DCC	A34 – a) Are any trees subject to tree preservation orders (TPO) likely to be affected? b) Should this article make provision for some notification to be given to the relevant planning authority prior to any works to trees subject to TPOs? c) A34(2) omits a date for when TPOs were made after. Please also explain why such a date is necessary.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

6.20	The Applicant	A40 – a) Should this list be more extensive given that it does not specify all plans and documents submitted? b) Is reference to “(document number 6)” sufficient to describe the environmental statement? How does this reflect any amended ES documents? c) Please ensure this article is kept up to date with any revised documents. A separate Schedule within the draft Order may be more appropriate. This would be simpler to update with dates of submission of revised, amended, and new documents submitted during the Examination. The Schedule could be referred to via the Article.
6.21	The Applicant	A43 - Please explain and justify the extent of the provisions of this Article
Questions / comments relating to Requirements:		
6.22	The Applicant	R1 – Please justify the need for seven years for commencement (as opposed to five)
6.23	The Applicant	R2, Table 3 – this sets out the maximum parameters of Maximum Design Scenario (MDS) A and MDS B. Given this: a) Would it allow for the maximum parameters for each scenario to be constructed (e.g. 50 turbines at a height of 332 metres)? b) Should there instead be two tables with one setting out the maximum parameters of MDS A and the other setting out the maximum parameters of MDS B?
6.24	The Applicant, NATS	R3 – Given concerns over lighting provisions, could a separate subsection be added to this requirement stating that such lights will be operated at the lowest permissible lighting intensity level?
6.25	The Applicant	R5 – a) Please amend subsection (1) to read ‘...submitted to <i>and approved by</i> ...’. b) Please can you confirm if this requirement applies to pre-commencement work and preliminary works?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

6.26	The Applicant, DCC	R6 – should provision for details of ‘appearance’ be added?
6.27	The Applicant	R7, Table 4 sets out some of the maximum parameters of the GIS / AIS OnSS options. Given this: a) Would it allow for the maximum parameters for a GIS / AIS to be constructed (e.g. building height of 49.975m AOD in a 50,000m² fenced compound)? b) Should there instead be two tables with one setting out the maximum parameters of a GIS and the other setting out the maximum parameters of an AIS? c) Should other maximum dimensions of buildings / elements be specified (e.g. 1 x GIS building 50m long x 15m wide x 15m high, as set out in ES Chapter 1: Onshore Project Description [APP-062])? d) Should ‘AOD’, ‘m’ and ‘m2’ be defined in A2?
6.28	The Applicant	R7(2) – please remove erroneous comma at the end.
6.29	The Applicant, DCC	R8 – a) Please change ‘outline landscape and ecological management plan’ to ‘outline landscape and ecology management plan’ to reflect the correct document name. b) Should this requirement make provision for a plan to be provided as well as written details? c) Should it make provision for a scheme of maintenance? d) The requirement only appears to relate to landscape works around the OnSS site. Should it also apply to the ECC? e) If it only relates to the OnSS, how would details of landscape works (e.g. new hedgerow planting) be secured for the wider ECC? f) If it only relates to the OnSS, should it make provision for details of proposed ponds also?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

6.30	The Applicant, DCC	R9 – a) R9(1) – should this also refer to the ‘associated work programme’ specified in R8? b) R9(2) – is 5 years adequate time given that the ES assesses effects (including landscape and visual effects) at Year 15?
6.31	The Applicant	R10 – NRW has requested it is consulted on this requirement [RR-015]. Is the Applicant willing to make provision for this?
6.32	The Applicant	R12 – a) should this make provision for the publishing of findings and data? b) should this refer to the “onshore written scheme of investigation”? c) is the submitted onshore written scheme of investigation (titled ‘Onshore WSI’) an outline doc?
6.33	The Applicant	R13 – a) Please change ‘outline landscape and ecological management plan’ to ‘outline landscape and ecology management plan’ to reflect the correct document name. b) Does this requirement relate to management only or to details of planting (e.g. hedgerows, grassland, numbers, species, densities etc..) also?
6.34	The Applicant	R8, R9 and R13 – a) how does a ‘written landscaping scheme and associated work programme’ in accordance with the oLEMP in R8 differ from a ‘written landscape and ecological management plan’ in accordance with the oLEMP in R13. b) could R8, R9 and R13 be combined to form a single requirement?
6.35	The Applicant	R14 – Should this also relate to nationally protected species under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

6.36	The Applicant	R15 – a) This refers to “7 a.m. and 7 p.m.” whereas Art 4 refers to “2300-0700”. Please ensure consistency when showing times. b) Subsection (2)(d) refers to “other time critical elements of the onshore works”. Please advise which ‘other’ works not listed would be time critical. c) Subsection (4) - Are 24-hour workings for trenchless installation techniques likely? If so, in which locations?
6.37	The Applicant	R17 – a) Should this requirement require details to be submitted, specifying such details, and specify the timing of such submission of details (e.g. before works commence)? b) Should it also specify that land should be reinstated to the same quality / condition?
6.38	The Applicant	R18(2)(a) – should the British Standard be in inverted commas as in R4?
6.39	DCC	R18 specifies noise levels during the operation of the OnSS. Are you content with the details of this requirement?
6.40	The Applicant	R20 – a) should this specify for details to be approved by the SoS rather than just to be submitted to the SoS for approval? b) does it need an implementation clause? c) should it be more prescriptive in respect of details to be included within the written decommissioning programme?
6.41	The Applicant	R21 – Should this specify details to be included within the written scheme of decommissioning (e.g. buildings to be demolished, means of removal of material, land restorations works, timetable for implementation etc...)

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

6.42	The Applicant	Decommissioning R21 (1) refers to the onshore written scheme of decommissioning being submitted to and approve by the relevant planning authority at least six months prior to works commencing. In contrast, R20 remains silent in respect of a timescale. Please clarify why it isn't necessary for a timescale to be included within R20.
6.43	NATS, The Applicant	Is a requirement necessary to ensure that no wind turbine generator operates prior to the agreed resolution of a scheme to protect Great Dun Fell and St Anne's Primary Surveillance Radars?
Questions / comments relating to Schedules (Sch)		
6.44	The Applicant	Sch 1 – below " <i>Work No. 3</i> " and above Table 1 there is a reference to "co-ordinates shown on the works plan and listed in Table 1". However, the co-ordinates listed in Table 1 appear to be shown on the Location Plan rather than the Works Plan. Should this instead then refer to the Location Plan and should this plan be defined in A2?
6.45	The Applicant	Sch 3 – incorrect sheet numbers throughout – please amend

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

6.46	The Applicant	Sch 4 – a) this is titled 'Streets and rights of way to be temporarily stopped up or restricted'. However, no streets are identified – should they be? b) Sheet numbers are incorrect throughout. Please amend. c) Point Ca regarding Footpath DE/206/44 does not appear on the Temporary stopping up of public rights of way plan (TSUPRoW) [AS-009]. d) There are no points Ba and Bb relating Footpath DE/206/23 on the TSUPRoW plan – should this instead refer to points Fx and Fy? e) Footpath DE/206/46 does not appear to be labelled on the TSUPRoW plan. f) Points Fx and Fy regarding Footpath DE/206/4 appears inconsistent with the TSUPRoW plan. g) There appear to be two footpaths DE/206/4 on the TSUPRoW plan – one on Sheet 4 and one on Sheet 7 – is this correct? h) Are Points Ix and Iy regarding Bridleway DE/201/9 correct – the TSUPRoW plan indicates otherwise (Kx and Ky). i) Is Bridleway DE/201/9 and Footpath DE/201/9 the same stretch? j) Footpath DE/105/7 is not labelled on the TSUPRoW plan. k) Clarify whether Point Ly is accurately shown on the TSUPRoW plan?
6.47	The Applicant	Sch 5 – incorrect sheet numbers throughout – please amend.
6.48	The Applicant	Sch 10 – should this make reference to the Hedgerow and Protected Tree Plan, and should this plan be defined in A2?
6.49	The Applicant	Sch 11 – change 'specified' in the title to 'specified'.
6.50	The Applicant	Sch 12 2(1) – should this refer to "weekends <i>and</i> bank holidays"?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

Questions / comments relating to Explanatory Memorandum (EM)		
6.51	The Applicant	Section 3.5.10 (Article 27) – this refers to paragraph (1)(a)(iii) of A27. However, A27 does not appear to include such a paragraph. It also refers to paragraph (1)(d) of A27. However, the EM description does not appear to reflect A27(1)(d) of the dDCO. Please check and advise.
6.52	The Applicant	Please can you explain how the commitment to undertake a preconstruction survey beyond the OL will be fulfilled and secured? For example, all water courses within or immediately adjacent to the OL (250 m upstream/ downstream of OL) (Table 1: Pre-Construction Surveys, Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [APP-305], [APP-047], Anchor handling and deployment of anchors may be required outside of the Order Limits).
6.53	The Applicant	Please can you confirm the control measure in the dDCO to ensure that in the case of monopiles, piling will only occur at one location at a time with no simultaneous or concurrent piling, and in the case of pin-piled multi-leg jacket foundations, pin-piles may be installed concurrently, but only on adjacent legs of the same jacket foundation with no simultaneous or concurrent piling at two separate foundation locations. (Paragraph 71, Offshore Project Description [APP-047]).
6.54	The Applicant	Please can you explain and describe the control measure in the DCO to prevent the MDS of 5,000kJ hammer energy for monopiles & 3,000kJ for pin piles being exceeded at the construction stage given that such measures are identified in ES Volume 4, Annex 7.2 [APP-107]?
6.55	The Applicant	Please can you explain and describe the control measure in the dDCO for vibro-piling technology at landfall during the winter period (October-March) given that such preliminary mitigation measure for non-breeding birds is identified in ES Volume 3, Chapter 13, Table 5 [APP-074].

ExQ1: 27 September 2022

Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022

7. Flood Risk and Water Quality		
7.1	Envirowatch.EU	Water Bodies Please provide additional information regarding concerns in respect of the water bodies, as detailed in your relevant representation [RR-034]. Where relevant, please provide a plan identifying the location(s) of the water bodies.
7.2	NRW	Western Wales River Basin Management Plan Please provide a copy of the updated Western Wales River Basin Management Plan 2021-2027 as detailed in your relevant representation [RR-015].
7.3	NRW	Inter-relationships Further to your relevant representation [RR-015], please provide an explanation of which inter-relationships between marine water and sediment quality and other receptors you consider have been overlooked, in addition to elevated bacterial counts and human health.
7.4	The Applicant	Marine Water and Sediment Quality In their relevant representation [RR-015], NRW disagree with the conclusions made in relation to sediment bound contaminants, and further information is required to support the conclusion. Additionally, where data is available, NRW request that the Applicant reports all data in the context of Centre for the Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Sciences (Cefas) Action Levels. Once the above information has been updated and provided, NRW advise that the RIAA is updated to reflect this new information. Please provide a response in respect of these issues.
7.5	The Applicant	Phytoplankton and Dissolved Oxygen Assessments In their relevant representation [RR-015], NRW disagree with the approach to assessing impacts to phytoplankton and dissolved oxygen and disagree with the conclusions. Please provide a response in respect of these issues.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

7.6	The Applicant	Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment – Water Clarity In their relevant representation [RR-015], NRW disagree with the conclusions of the compliance assessment with respect to water clarity. Please provide a response in respect of this issue.
7.7	The Applicant	Trenchless Techniques and Outline Construction Method Statement (oCMS) In their relevant representation [RR-015], NRW request that any trenchless techniques employed should be deep enough to avoid the saltmarsh and minimise cable exposure, and that appropriate entry and exit pits are identified. It is requested that this information should be included in the oCMS. Please provide a response in respect of these issues.
7.8	The Applicant	Marine Water and Sediment Quality The Canadian Marine Sediment Quality Guidelines have been used to establish threshold effect levels for polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) within the sediment in ES Volume 2, Chapter 3 [APP-049]. Four PAHs recorded in the baseline do not have thresholds defined under the Canadian Guidelines. Please explain what alternative threshold has been used to contextualise these contaminants or otherwise explain why a threshold is not required?
7.9	NRW	Marine Water and Sediment Quality Please clarify the comments made in your relevant representation [RR-015] regarding the need for further information and reporting against Cefas Action Levels. What additional information is required beyond the information presented [APP-049], Tables 10 and 12?
7.10	The Applicant	Marine Water and Sediment Quality [APP-049] includes an assessment of effects on marine water and sediment quality during decommissioning of the Proposed Development. Please clarify if there is potential for likely significant effects arising from deterioration of water quality due to release of sediment-bound contaminants and accidental spills of materials or chemicals during the decommissioning phase, in the maximum design scenario, i.e. with removal of all infrastructure. It is noted that these impact pathways were assessed for the construction phase.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

7.11	The Applicant	Marine Water and Sediment Quality Please clarify the differences between the description of the maximum design scenario (MDS) for assessment of marine water and sediment quality effects in [APP-049] relative to the MDS described in ES Volume 1, Chapter 2 [APP-048] and explain any implications for the assessment: a) The greatest volume of sediment disturbed and released from drill arisings from foundation installation for the wind turbine generators (WTGs), stated to be 270,161 m³ (50 smaller WTGs with 60% of locations requiring drilling) in ES Volume 2, Chapter 3, Table 15 but showing as 276,862 m³ (34 larger WTGs at 100% of locations requiring drilling) in ES Volume 2, Chapter 1, Table 9; and b) The approach to buried cables, scour and cable protection during decommissioning, and whether these components would be left in situ (as stated in [APP-049]) or removed (as stated in ES Volume 2, Chapter 1 [APP-047] and section 3.12.1 of [APP-049]). It is noted that in each instance, reference is made to further consultation at the point of decommissioning to determine the approach.
7.12	The Applicant	Marine Water and Sediment Quality Table 17 of [APP-049] lists several projects as operational or active. These projects have been assigned 'Tier 1' status. Please explain why these projects have been included in the cumulative effects assessment and not the baseline for the assessment? It is noted that for example the operational offshore wind farms identified in Table 17 have been included in the baseline for the assessment of marine physical processes in [APP-048].

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

7.13	The Applicant	Marine Water and Sediment Quality Please explain why ES Volume 1, Annex 3.1 [APP-094] screens out planned offshore wind farms from the assessment of cumulative marine water and sediment quality effects in [APP-049], when a number of these are screened into the assessment of marine physical processes in [APP-048]. It is noted that scoping requests in respect of a number of these projects have been submitted during summer 2022. The Applicant is requested to comment on whether this affects the tier in which the project is categorised, in accordance with Table 4.4 in ES Volume 1, Annex 3.1 [APP-042] and provide commentary on the potential for cumulative effects.
7.14	The Applicant	Marine Water and Sediment Quality Paragraph 159 of [APP-049] states that the use of cofferdam(s) could reduce effects from release of drilling mud (bentonite) from minor adverse to negligible adverse. Please provide clarification as to whether it proposes to implement the measure as it does not appear to be referenced in the Schedule of Mitigation [APP-310].
7.15	The Applicant	Marine Water and Sediment Quality Geophysical monitoring across the area of offshore construction works is proposed to determine the effectiveness of cable burial and protection, as identified in the Schedule of Monitoring [APP-311]. Could the Applicant explain whether any discussion has taken place with NRW about the expected monitoring locations, frequency and likely measurable thresholds for remedial action, and confirm how the monitoring and any remedial action would be secured through the DCO, bearing in mind that it is proposed as a condition to the proposed Marine Licence(s)?
7.16	The Applicant	Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP) In their relevant representation [RR-015], NRW states that they do not consent to the Applicant's request for the disapplication of the FRAP. NRW considers that a FRAP application should be made for each main river crossing (and associated flood defences) in accordance with the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2016 (EPR 2016). Please provide a response in respect of this issue.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

7.17	The Applicant	Flood Consequence Assessment (FCA) In their relevant representation [RR-015], NRW states that the Flood Risk Assessment Wales maps should not be used for planning purposes. Instead, NRW advises the Flood Map for Planning (FMfP) represents more up-to-date information for assessing flood risk. Please confirm if the FMfP is to be utilised? If not, please provide reasoning.
7.18	The Applicant	Flood Consequence Assessment (FCA) In their relevant representation [RR-015], NRW states that there are works in Flood Zone C2 which are not assessed in the Flood Consequence Assessment and that such works should be subject to a bespoke FRAP. Please confirm: a) Whether such works have omitted from the FCA? b) If works have been omitted, please give reasoning and confirm whether it is necessary to include such works; and c) Is a bespoke FRPA is to be submitted? If not, please provide reasoning.
7.19	DCC	Flood Consequence Assessment – Onshore Export Cable Corridor and Onshore Substation Are you satisfied within the approach and conclusions as detailed in both FCAs ([APP-137] and [APP-138])? If not, please detail any matters of concern.
7.20	The Applicant	Outline Pollution Prevention and Emergency Incident Response Plan (oPPEIRP) In their relevant representation [RR-015], NRW requests that minor amendments are made to the oPPEIRP to strengthen the final version. Please confirm whether such amendments are to be made? If not, please provide reasoning.
7.21	The Applicant	Schedule of Mitigation Please review row 12 on electronic page 8 of the [APP-310] and complete missing information. Please submit an updated version of [APP-310] at Deadline 1.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022

Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022

7.22	The Applicant	Climate Change Allowances Neither FCA uses the most recent climate change allowances to reflect UK Climate Projections 2018 (UKCP18) as recommended by the Welsh Government. Please confirm: a) Whether the updated climate change allowances are likely to affect the conclusions on the vulnerability of the substation to flooding; and b) Whether, considering the most up to date information, a revision to the sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) proposals is necessary? Additionally, there is also no reference to NRW guidance from 2021 (Adapting to Climate Change: Guidance for Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Authorities in Wales) which considers the most recent UKCIP climate predictions. Please explain why reference to this document is not necessary.
	The Applicant	Flood Risk Zones [APP-137] only assesses the impacts on the sections of the onshore cable route within Flood Zone C1. However, Figure 2 and section 2.1 of [APP-137] also refer to sections of the cable route which cross Flood Zones B and C2. It is noted that the section of the Proposed Development within Flood Zone C2 is Work No. 41 (haul road) and that as a worst case it may need to remain in place throughout the entire cable route construction period. As such, please expand on why [APP-137] does not assess works in Flood Zone C2.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

7.23	The Applicant	East Rhyl Flood Defence Scheme Paragraph 68 of Es Volume 3 Chapter 1[APP-062] states that there will be a temporary removal of a flood defence gate and section of embankment to enable access. This paragraph also states that this work will be carried out after the completion of the East Rhyl Flood Defence scheme by DCC and that this flood defence gate will no longer form part of the sea defences. Please clarify the progress of the East Rhyl Flood Defence works and whether it will be complete before the temporary works are required?
7.24	The Applicant	Onshore Substation Figure 1.1 of [APP-138] indicates that there is a waterbody to the west of the proposed substation location at Felyn Y Gors Mill, but this is not referred to in the FCA. Please clarify why this has been omitted from the assessment?
7.25	The Applicant	Onshore Substation Figure 1.1 of Appendix 1 in [APP-138] depicts a larger/different red line area than considered in the main substation FCA report. Please explain why the red line areas are different.
7.26	The Applicant	Onshore Substation Section 1.2 of [APP-138] describes a 2.5-year construction programme and an estimated lifetime of 40 years for the substation. This differs from the timescales given in the ES which are three years from inception to operation and a 25-year operational life. Please clarify.
7.27	The Applicant	Cumulative Effects Section 7.13 of [APP-068] discusses the cumulative effects assessment. However, Table 7 of [APP-074] makes no reference to cumulative effects. Please update and provide a revised version of [APP-074] at Deadline 1.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

7.28	DCC	Ordinary Watercourse Consent In [APP-037] the Applicant has confirmed that they are seeking to disapply the Land Drainage Act 1991 as the dDCO provides for works to be undertaken on Ordinary Watercourses and the requisite information has been provided within the ES and associate documentation, such as the CoCP. Are you satisfied with this approach? If not, please expand on your reasoning.
7.29	The Applicant	Location of Watercourse Crossings on the Onshore ECC Please provide a more detailed version of Figure 3 of [APP-094] to fully identify the location of individual watercourses and associated crossings.
7.30	The Applicant	Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations (EPR) 2016 Section 100 of [APP-094] states that " <i>Consent would be required for the works...affecting the sea defence structures, main rivers, non-main rivers and ordinary watercourses in accordance with the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016</i> ". However, [APP-310] (row 4, electronic page 8) confirms that the EPR is to be disapplied. Please clarify this discrepancy.
7.31	NRW, DCC	Outline Code of Construction Practice Are you satisfied that the measures contained within [APP-312] and associated outline environmental plans would be sufficient to effectively control the below during construction: a) Turbid run-off into rivers; b) Accidental spillages; and c) Run-off from HDD If not, please expand on your reasoning and detail additional required mitigation.
7.32	The Applicant	Hydromorphological Designation Mitigation Measures Paragraph 138 of [APP-094] states that the 2019 mitigation measures may have changed since the last update. Please confirm whether the measures have been updated? If so, does this affect the assessment?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

7.33	DCC	Flood Defence Works Paragraph 93 of [APP-068] states coastal defence improvement schemes at both Rhyl and Prestatyn are being investigated and implemented by DCC. Please confirm progress in terms of such schemes, including the Central Prestatyn Coastal Defence Scheme.
7.34	The Applicant	Draft Development Consent Order Subsection (1) of R16 of the dDCO [AS-014] states that the surface and foul water drainage plan must be " <i>substantially in accordance with the principles set out in the outline drainage strategy</i> ". Please confirm what " <i>substantially in accordance</i> " means in this context?
7.35	The Applicant	Assessment The PPG on Flood Risk and Coastal Change was updated on 25 August 2022. The changes are a significant refresh to the guidance and brings the PPG up to date and in line with the latest policy position on flood risk introduced in the updates to the NPPF in 2018 and 2021. Please advise whether the update affects the assessment undertaken.
8. Historic Environment		
8.1	The Applicant	Offshore Archaeology Paragraph 45 of ES Volume 2 Chapter 11 Offshore Archaeology [APP-057] is blank. Please confirm is this is a typographical error or if there is a missing paragraph. If the latter, please supply the relevant text.
8.2	The Applicant	Survey data Please elaborate on the approach taken when dealing with the partial lack of geophysical survey data for the proposed interlink area between AyM and GyM (paras 51 and 11.10.4 of [APP-057] consider).

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

8.3	Cadw, Gwynedd Archaeological Planning Services, DCC	Offshore Archaeology Please confirm whether you are satisfied with the approach to offshore archaeology as outlined within [APP-057] and whether you have been consulted (or would expect to be) on the draft offshore Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI).
8.4	The Applicant	Archaeology – trial trenching ES Volume 3 Chapter 8 [APP-069] states that targeted trial trenching to provide ground truthing was attempted between December 2021 and February 2022 but that these were not possible due to poor weather and ground conditions, and that agreement was made with Clwyd Powys Archaeological Trust (CPAT) that this could be undertaken post consent (if consent were to be granted). Please explain why trenching was not attempted at alternative times of the year where weather conditions were likely to be more conducive to trenching.
8.5	The Applicant	Archaeology – trial trenching [APP-069] acknowledges that one principal area of uncertainty within the Chapter relates to the nature of the archaeological baseline, being largely derived from desk-based studies. In conjunction with the lack of targeted trial trenching, quantify any risk which may arise from archaeological assets being discovered during construction works (if consent is granted). Is there an opportunity for micro siting to avoid any such assets within the proposed ECC (and OnSS)?
8.6	The Applicant	Archaeology – mitigation [APP-069] notes that Denbighshire County Council state that archaeological investigation and recording would provide a partial mitigation of the loss of archaeological interest and would be less preferable to conservation of a historic asset in situ. Would pre-consent trial trenching provide an opportunity to achieve the latter which may not be possible post -consent? (should consent be granted)

ExQ1: 27 September 2022

Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022

8.7	The Applicant, DCC	Foreshore historic assets Paragraph 142 of [APP-069] concerns foreshore historic assets and states that a major to moderate adverse effect prior to mitigation would arise. Following the proposed mitigation by 'preservation by record' this risk is stated to reduce to minor adverse. Denbighshire County Council (page 141) note that archaeological investigation and recording are a partial mitigation. To the Applicant: Provide further justification for this reduction of effect for the Disturbance or loss of historic and archaeological assets during construction – Foreshore assets. To DCC: Do you agree with the conclusions of the Applicant in this regard?
8.8	The Applicant	Survey data [APP-069] states that 95.4% of the proposed cable route has been covered by a Geophysical Survey. Are there any plans to survey the remaining 4.6% during the examination period?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

8.9	The Applicant	Historic Heritage - Policy [APP-069] contains a summary of the key provisions of NPS EN-1 (Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy) and of the draft EN-1 (September 2021). However, the reference to EN-1 (page 20) in relation to 'harm to designated heritage assets of less than substantial magnitude' does not appear to have come from EN-1. Furthermore, the precis of Draft EN-1 appears to repeat the same text (page 24) yet draft EN-1 appears to contain significantly more information on matters of less than substantial harm to heritage assets than EN-1 does. Please could you: a) Provide justification for the above, or provide an amended version of [APP-069] b) Provide an assessment of which heritage assets you consider the proposed development would cause less than substantial harm to, and why. For instance, would this cover all heritage assets identified as having some level of harm (from negligible to moderate adverse)?
8.10	The Applicant	Historic Heritage - Policy Table 3 of [APP-069] describes the importance of heritage receptors. Please provide further justification as to why designated special historic landscapes of special historic interest (including Grade II registered historic parks and gardens) fall within the category of 'Medium' Heritage Significance, as opposed to 'High'

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

8.11	The Applicant	Church of St Margaret, St Asaph The ExA noted during their Unaccompanied Site Visit 2 (USI2) [EV-003, EV-004] the prominence in the local landscape of the Grade II* listed Church of St Margaret in St Asaph. This heritage asset appeared to be sited relatively closely to the proposed ECC and the OnSS and appeared in various views around such. Assessment of the Church and any effects upon it does not appear in [APP-069]. Please provide justification for the above, or an assessment of effects upon this designated heritage asset.
8.12	The Applicant	Bodelwyddan Castle Paragraphs 192 and 193 of [APP-069] consider the effect of the constructed OnSS upon Bodelwyddan Castle. The ExA noticed during their USI1 [EV-001], [EV-002] the proximity of the proposed OnSS to the boundary walls of the Castle estate. However, the justification for the adverse effect found in paragraphs 192 and 193 appears very limited, and it is unclear whether assessment is made of the effect on the Grade II listed Registered Park and Garden of Bodelwyddan Castle during operation of the OnSS. Please provide your views on this observation and provide further assessment if necessary.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022

Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022

8.13	The Applicant	Penrhyn Castle Paragraphs 206 to 215 of [APP-069] consider the effect of the proposed array upon the Grade I listed Penrhyn Castle. The ExA noticed during their USI1 [EV-001], [EV-002] the extensive views from the terrace of the Castle (and from various points within the Grade II* listed Park and Garden) that such views encompass well framed and far-reaching views out to the sea. It is also noted that the listing for the Park describes the setting and relationship of the Castle with the park and surrounding landscape as outstanding and notes that the best views can be found at the entrance to the Castle and from the 'barbican' terrace on the east side of the property. The submitted visualisation [APP-246] shows how the proposed array would be perceived from this terrace. Such views are described in the ES as 'glimpsed'. Cadw [RR-028] and the National Trust [RR-029] also raise concerns over the effect of the proposal upon the Castle and it's Park and Garden. Provide further justification for your view that the effect of the Proposed Development upon Penrhyn Castle and the registered park and garden would be negligible, given the above.
------	---------------	---

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

8.14	The Applicant	Puffin Island Paragraphs 236 to 240 of [APP-069] consider the effect of the proposed array upon the scheduled monument of the Tower & Remains of Church and Monastic Settlement on Puffin Island and the Grade I listed Remains of monastic settlement including tower and walls. The text notes that “The selection of this location for the monastic settlement may well have been chosen deliberately for this sense of isolation and being physically cut off from the world, so the wider maritime setting and in particular the waters separating the Island from the coast at Penmon is a contributor to understanding the significance of the monument” (para 238), going on to consider that the current views from the island are not untouched by development, including the turbines of the Gwynt y Môr windfarm. However, the representative viewpoint [APP-278] shows the proposed array to be significantly more visible from the island and within the setting of the designated heritage assets upon Puffin Island than the existing wind farms, due to the location and scale of the proposed turbines. Please provide further justification for your findings of a negligible impact upon such heritage assets.
8.15	The Applicant	Cumulative effects Paragraph 319 of [APP-069] states that in no case are the proposed AyM turbines considered to cause additional or cumulative indirect harm to the specific heritage interest or value of any asset. The ExA noticed during their USI1 [EV-001], [EV-002] and USI2 [EV-003], [EV-004] that in some cases the effect of the proposed array may, in some instances, add to the effect of existing offshore windfarms and ‘fill’ more of existing vistas with offshore wind farms. Examples of this could be found for instance potentially in the setting of the Llandudno Conservation Area, Llandudno Pier and Pen y Dinas Hillfort. Please provide further justification for your views as outlined in Section 8.13.2 of [APP-069].

ExQ1: 27 September 2022

Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022

8.16	The Applicant	Assessment Table 14 of [APP-069] has a heading title of 'Sensitivity of Receptor', whereas Tables 3, 4 and 5 appears to show the same category as 'Heritage Significance'. For consistency please confirm which wording should be used.
9. Land Use		
9.1	The Applicant	Best and Most Versatile Land NPS EN1 (paragraph 5.1.080) states " <i>Applicants should seek to minimise impacts on the best and most versatile agricultural land (defined as land in grades 1,2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification and preferably use land in areas of poorer quality (grades 3b, 4 and 5).</i> " Please explain how the test in paragraph 5.10.8 of NPS EN-1 is satisfied in respect of the Proposed Development?
9.2	The Applicant	Effect on Business Operations What consideration has been given to the effect on the health and wellbeing of animals housed or grazing close to the Proposed Development i.e. effects due to noise and dust? What, if any, measures are necessary to mitigate effects and how will these be secured?
9.3	DMPC	Effect on Agricultural Enterprises In respect of relevant representations made on behalf of your clients ([RR-038] to [RR-041]), please provide additional detail relating to the following concerns: a) Viability of the existing agricultural enterprise(s); and b) Proposed mitigation measures, including reinstatement methods Please annotate on a map area(s) of holding to be affected and percentage of the holding this represents.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

9.4	Rostons	Effect on Agricultural Enterprises In respect of relevant representations made on behalf of your clients ([RR-042] to [RR-051]), please provide additional detail relating to the following concerns: a) Food production and security, and b) Proposed mitigation measures, including reinstatement methods. Please annotate on a map area(s) of holding to be affected and percentage of the holding this represents.
9.5	Sustainable Cymru	Agricultural Land Please provide further detail in respect of the concern raised in your relevant representation [RR-036] that " <i>The proposed site is currently on food producing agricultural green land</i> ".
9.6	The Applicant	Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Please provide a percentage breakdown of agricultural land quality for Route Section A as detailed within Table 7 of ES Volume 3, Chapter 6 [APP-067]. Additionally, Route Section G within Table 7 states " <i>limited grade 3b (good to moderate) (10%)</i> ". Please confirm whether the ALC classification is referring to grade 3a or 3b land?
9.7	The Applicant	Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) In respect of Table 7 of [APP-067], please provide the name of holding, size and ALC by route section.
9.8	The Applicant	Grade 3a and 3b Soil Resources In respect of the proposed OnSS, the permanent loss of Grade 3a soil resource is stated as 0.38ha (paragraph 137 of [APP-067]). In terms of landfall infrastructure, the loss of soil resource is stated to be 20 square metres (paragraph 140 of [APP-067]). In both instances, it is stated that the losses are small in comparison to the remaining available Grade 3a and Grade 3b soil resources. Please confirm the overall amount of Grade 3a and 3b soil resources within the region.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

9.9	CBBC, DCC, NRW	Outline Code of Construction Practice (oCoCP) and Soil Resources Are you satisfied with the approach and content of the oCoCP [APP-312] and associated appendices (e.g. the outline Soil Management Plan (oSMP) [APP-316]) in respect of the management of potential effects on soil resources? If not, please detail additional methods and/or mitigation measures considered necessary within the oSMP. In addition, please confirm whether you are satisfied that soils would be suitable for the required end use and the appropriateness of the proposed soil restoration methods.
9.10	CBBC, DCC, NRW	Outline Code of Construction Practice (oCoCP) and Ground Conditions Are you satisfied with the approach and content of the oCoCP [APP-312] and associated appendices (e.g. the Outline Pollution Prevention and Emergency Incident Response Plan (oPPEIRP) [APP-318]) in respect of the management of potential effects on ground conditions? If not, please detail additional methods and/or mitigation measures considered necessary within the oPPEIRP.
9.11	The Applicant	Soil Storage The oSMP confirms that soils shall be categorised based on their origin, and stockpiles/stored accordingly (paragraph 23 of [APP-316]). What documentation and physical control measures will be put in place to prevent accidental mixing? How will these be secured?
9.12	The Applicant	Soil Management The oSMP confirms that where soil is to be stored for over 6 months it will be covered to minimise erosion or allowed to re-vegetate naturally to minimise soil run off (paragraph 4.6.2 of [APP-316]). For stockpiles stored under 6 months, will they be seeded to maintain slope stability and prevent erosion and/or dust generation? Additionally, section 2.1.1 of the outline Air Quality Management Plan (oAQMP) [APP-315] states that the use of Hessian, mulches or trackifiers will be utilised where it is not possible to re-vegetate or cover stored soil. Please confirm if this mitigation measure is to be contained within the oSMP and if not, explain why? Please explain why this mitigation measure is considered a " <i>desirable</i> " measure rather than a " <i>highly recommended</i> " measure in the oAQMP?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

9.13	The Applicant	Soil Management Will stored soils be tested for plasticity? If so, please detail the proposed methodology. If no testing is proposed, please explain your reasons.
9.14	The Applicant	Soil Management How will the transmission of information contained within the final SMP be disseminated on site? Is the use of 'toolbox' talks envisaged? If so, how will this be secured?
9.15	The Applicant	Soil Restoration Methods How will the suitability of soil stockpiles for restoration be assessed? Please confirm whether the final SMP will include a restoration methodology?
9.16	The Applicant	Internal Compliance Please confirm whether the final SMP be subject to any internal compliance audits? If so, will be SMP be reviewed and updated as necessary? Please provide detail in respect of this process.
9.17	The Applicant	Decommissioning The oSMP [APP-316] does not refer to the decommissioning phase. Please confirm why this isn't necessary and whether consideration of this phase this will be included in the final SMP? If not, please explain your reasons.
10. Landscape and Visual		
10.1	DCC, NRW	Assessment Please confirm whether you are satisfied with: a) the ECC and OnSS study areas; and b) the OnSS viewpoint locations selected, as identified within ES Chapter 2: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) [AS-029]. If not, please explain the reasons for this.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

10.2	DCC, NRW	Assessment Please confirm whether you are in agreement with: a) the Applicant's LVIA methodology; and b) its assessment of effects in respect of landscape features, landscape character and visual amenity. If not, please explain the reasons for this.
10.3	DCC, NRW, The Applicant	Assessment The LVIA methodology provides for moderate adverse effects to be classified as either 'significant' or 'not significant' based on professional judgement. DCC / NRW - Please confirm you are satisfied with this approach? The Applicant - Please further justify the instances where moderate adverse effects are considered 'not significant' in Tables 8, 10, 13 and 14, as the precise reasons for this are not clear to the ExA.
10.4	DCC	Assessment The photograph taken from Viewpoint (VP) 6 (Bodelwyddan Castle) [APP-186] shows summer views towards the OnSS site. Are you satisfied this is sufficient for the purposes of the assessment?
10.5	The Applicant	Assessment There is no public access in respect of VP 6 (Bodelwyddan Castle). Please explain the reason for including it within the assessment.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

10.6	The Applicant	Assessment [AS-029] notes that photography was captured when trees and hedgerows were not in leaf and that this represents a worst-case scenario in relation to potential visual effects. Given this, please: a) justify the reason for the operational Year 15 photomontages showing proposed planting in leaf; and b) clarify whether and to what extent the assessment of visual effects takes into account seasonal variations.
10.7	The Applicant	Above Ground Installations Other than features associated with the OnSS, would there be any other permanent above ground installations associated with the onshore elements of the Proposed Development?
10.8	The Applicant	Onshore Substation Please explain: a) how the site for the OnSS (Work Nos. 31 and 31A), including its shape and orientation, has been determined; b) to what extent it reflects and is sensitive to surrounding landscape character, landform and field and hedgerow patterns; and c) why is it necessary for the OnSS to be on a level platform rather than following existing land profiles?
10.9	The Applicant	Mitigation Section 2.9 of [AS-029] relates to mitigation. However, it does not appear to address to what extent the design of the OnSS and its elements might assist with reducing adverse landscape and visual effects. Requirement 6 of the dDCO [AS-014] relates to the detailed design of the OnSS. Please explain how the detailed design of the OnSS, having regard to the provisions of Requirement 6 (i.e. (1)(a) to (e)) of the dDCO, might assist with mitigating adverse landscape and visual effects?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

10.10	The Applicant	Onshore Substation The Year 15 photomontages from VP 1 [APP-181], where residual significant effects are predicted, illustrate that a large part of the OnSS would still be visible through a wide gap between new woodland planting. Please explain: a) whether there is scope to extend the woodland planting in this area to further minimise views of the OnSS from VP 1; and b) if there is scope, whether you would be willing to provide additional planting in this area.
10.11	The Applicant	Access Impacts Article 13 of [AS-014] makes provisions to allow the undertaker to form and lay out means of access, or improve existing means of access, including as part of Work No. 41. Might such works impact on any landscape features, such as trees and hedgerows, and if so, has this been considered as part of the assessment?
10.12	The Applicant	Onshore Substation How well does the site of the OnSS relate to existing development within the St Asaph Business Park and the Gwynt y Môr and Burbo Bank substations? Why could the OnSS not be located to the south of St Asaph Business Park in the vicinity of these substations e.g. to the immediate west of the Gwynt y Môr and National Grid substations?
10.13	The Applicant	Onshore Substation During an unaccompanied site inspection [EV-001], [EV-002], the ExA observed views towards the OnSS site from within the publicly accessible Glascoed Nature Reserve. Please comment on the likely use of this nature reserve by the public, including workers associated with St Asaph Business Park, and provide an assessment of visual effects for its users.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

10.14	The Applicant	Assessment Noting paragraph 5.10.8 of draft NPS EN-1 as referred to in [AS-029], has the assessment considered how noise from construction and operational activities on residential amenity, sensitive locations, receptors and views, would be minimised? If not, please explain how this would be achieved.
10.15	The Applicant	Onshore Substation [AS-029] notes that, depending on levels of surplus soil and excavation material associated with the OnSS site, there is potential for the creation of landscape bunding in areas of proposed woodland which would further limit views of the OnSS and which would provide further landscape and visual mitigation. Please identify: a) where this is secured; and b) whether this has been assessed in terms of effects on landscape character?
10.16	DCC, NRW	Clwydian Range and Dee Valley Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty VP 9 [APP-189] is located within the Clwydian Range and Dee Valley Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Are you satisfied that: a) the OnSS would give rise to no significant effects from this viewpoint (and the AONB as a whole); and b) that this would also be the case should the AONB change to National Park status (albeit boundaries might differ)?
10.17	The Applicant	Onshore Substation [AS-029] identifies potential for some woodland planting during the early phases of the OnSS construction to ensure robust screening as quickly as possible. Please define 'as quickly as possible'. In addition, please confirm where is this secured and how would this be approved?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

10.18	The Applicant	Assessment No tree survey or arboricultural impact assessment (AIA) has been submitted with the application. However, it is indicated in [AS-029] and the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-305] that around 20-26 trees associated with the OnSS site and around area 33 trees associated with the ECC would need to be removed. Without a tree survey or AIA, how can the ExA be certain: a) Whether any other trees might be affected; b) The value of the affected trees; c) Whether any affected trees display characteristic which might categorise them as either ancient or veteran; and d) Whether works, for example, Work No. 30A, lie outside the root protection area of trees, including those associated with areas of woodland, including ancient woodland.
10.19	The Applicant	Tree Protection The oLEMP [APP-305] refers to the need for tree protection in accordance with BS 5837:2012 – Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction. Where is this secured? Should it be specified in the Schedules of Mitigation [APP-310] and Monitoring [APP-311] or secured as a requirement of the dDCO?
10.20	DCC	Woodland Planting Are you satisfied with the suggested growth rates of woodland planting (7-10m over 15 years) as set out in [AS-029] and the 8.5 metres height (as an average) of woodland planting shown on the Year 15 photomontages?
10.21	The Applicant	Temporary Mitigation Areas What would be the purposes of the 'Temporary Mitigation Areas' as shown on the Works Plans and in the oLEMP [APP-305]? Where are these defined?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

10.22	The Applicant, DCC	Onshore Substation Table 6 of [AS-029] identifies maximum dimensions for buildings associated with the OnSS. Should all these dimensions be reflected in Table 4 of R7 of [AS-014] and if not, how would it be ensured that the dimensions of buildings did not exceed that considered in the assessment?
10.23	The Applicant	Assessment [AS-029] considers 'Individual properties' as a visual receptor. Is this specifically relating to the occupiers / residents of these properties? Please explain how including an assessment of the private views of these receptors as part of the LVIA accords with paragraphs 6.16 and 6.17 of the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Third Edition?
10.24	The Applicant	Onshore Export Cable Corridor [AS-029] concludes that "...the LVIA has assessed that there would be no residual significant effects to the landscape and visual resource as a result of the onshore ECC". Please clarify whether this would be the case for all relevant receptors (shown in Table 17), including "taller hedgerows and hedgerow trees".
10.25	The Applicant	Onshore Substation Visual effects for the residents of the Faenol Bropor have been assessed during construction of the ECC. Please clarify whether visual effects have also been assessed for this receptor with regard to the construction and operation of the OnSS (e.g. does VP1 represent effects from this property as well as for footpath / bridleway users?). If not, please provide such an assessment or justify why this is not required, noting the contents of [RR-038].
10.26	DCC	Woodland Species Selection Please confirm you are satisfied with the suggested woodland species selection as set out in paragraph 168 of [AS-029]? If not, please provide reasoning.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

10.27	The Applicant	Onshore Substation Table 8 of [AS-029] provides an assessment of physical landscape effects during construction. With regard to the OnSS site, such effects appear to have been considered in respect of trees only. Please clarify: a) whether mitigation for effects on these trees includes the proposed woodland planting or if it relies on new tree planting after decommissioning, or both; and b) whether agricultural land, hedgerows and taller hedgerows should form part of the assessment of physical landscape effects for the OnSS site as they do for the ECC?
10.28	The Applicant	Planting Page 22 of the Schedule of Mitigation [APP-310] states "<i>All habitats will be reinstated as soon as possible after construction. Hedgerows along the onshore cable ECC will be reinstated using a species rich, locally appropriate native mixture including heavy standard trees at a 3:1 ratio for any lost.</i>" Paragraph 68 of the oLEMP [APP-305] also suggests heavy standard trees would be planted in hedgerows. Please clarify: a) whether heavy standard trees would be included in replacement hedgerow planting given elsewhere in the application documents (including [AS-209] and [APP-305]) it suggests trees cannot be planted along the onshore ECC; and b) whether all hedgerows would be replaced, given the second bullet point of paragraph 172 of [AS-029] uses the term '<i>where practical</i>'.
10.29	The Applicant	Trees Noting the width of cable trenches when compared to the total width of the onshore ECC in combination with the depth that cables would be buried (as shown on Figure 24 of ES Chapter 1: Onshore Project Description [APP-062]), please clarify: a) any operational restrictions regarding tree planting along the onshore ECC; and b) any risk to cables from the roots of trees over a 25-year period.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

10.30	The Applicant	Final Landscape and Ecological Management Plan Paragraph 8 of [APP-035] says the final LEMP would be a working document subject to regular review and updates. How would this work in practice and would R13 of [AS-014] make provision for this?
10.31	The Applicant	Planting Given that landscape and visual effects are considered at Year 15 as part of the LVIA please confirm: a) is 3 years aftercare as set out in [APP-035] sufficient and how would it be identified and secured if this needed extending; b) is a five-year period as specified in R9 of [AS-014] for replacement planting sufficient; and c) how would any necessary maintenance and replacement planting be ensured once land is handed back to landowners?
10.32	The Applicant	Ancient Woodland The area for Work No. 35 includes an area of ancient woodland. What are the implications for this woodland given the description of Work No. 35 in Schedule 1 of [AS-014]?
10.33	The Applicant	Assessment [AS-029] refers to 'Year 1' whereas the photomontages refer to 'Year 0'. What is the reason for this, and does it have any bearing on the assessment?
10.34	The Applicant	Assessment Please confirm whether the direction of photography shown for VP 9 (in Figure 2.26a of [APP-189]) is correct?
10.35	The Applicant	Assessment Please confirm whether the maximum parameter extent line in the visualisations for VP 5 [APP-185] is correct?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

10.36	DCC, NRW	Cumulative Assessment Are you satisfied with the list of developments for cumulative assessment purposes as shown in Table 15 of ES Chapter 2 [AS-029] and with the conclusions that no significant cumulative landscape and visual effects would arise?
10.37	DCC, NRW, The Applicant	Cumulative Assessment DCC / NRW - [AS-029] sets out that the cumulative assessment excludes the consideration of the necessary extension to the National Grid substation on the basis of insufficient detail known of it at the time of the assessment. However, it goes on to suggest that the effects of the extension would be localised and would therefore be unlikely to lead to a significant cumulative effect. Are you in agreement with this? The Applicant - Has there been any progression in respect of the National Grid substation extension which might assist with a more detailed consideration of cumulative effects?
10.38	The Applicant	Cumulative Assessment Please explain the reason for the numerous blank boxes under the relevant topic areas, including 'Landscape and Visual Impact', in the onshore cumulative effects assessment matrix in the Cumulative Effects Assessment Methodology [APP-042] (e.g. planning ref 40/2018/1036 – power plant, ref 44/2018/0855 / 44/2015/1075 – 99 dwellings, etc.)
11. Marine and Coastal Physical Processes		
11.1	The Applicant	Impact on Coastal Processes In light of paragraphs 5.5.7 and 5.5.10 of NPS EN-1, please demonstrate how the decision-maker can be satisfied: a) That any potential impacts would be minimised; and b) The Proposed Development would be resilient to coastal erosion and deposition, taking account of climate change, during the project's operational life and any decommissioning period.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

11.2	The Applicant	Secondary Scour NRW [RR-105] notes that the local dimensions of secondary scour are highly dependent upon the specific shape, design and placement of the scour protection. Additionally, NRW further state that the parameters are highly variable and so there is no clear quantitative method or evidence base for accurately predicting the dimensions of secondary scour. NRW advise that given the uncertainty regarding the spatial extent and volume of secondary scour, post-construction monitoring should be considered. Please respond to these specific matters and confirm how such monitoring would be secured?
11.3	The Applicant	Cable Burial Risk Assessment Please confirm when the Cable Burial Risk Assessment is to be completed and provide a high-level overview in respect of content.
11.4	The Applicant	Cable Specification and Installation Plan and Cable Route Burial Protocol Noting that this plan and protocol are to be produced post consent, please confirm how they are to be secured and provide a high-level overview in respect of content.
11.5	The Applicant, NRW	Assessment of Change to Pathways Paragraph 43 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 2 [APP-048] confirms that the assessment of potential change to pathways will not, at this stage, be accompanied by a conclusion regarding the significance of effects. Applicant – Please confirm why it isn't necessary to include significance of effect conclusions in respect of this matter? Are they to be provided at a later date? NRW – Do you consider such conclusions necessary?
11.6	The Applicant	Settlement Thickness Please provide further detail as to why an overview of the likely shape and thickness of the seabed deposit resulting from the release of material from the dredger at the water surface cannot be estimated (paragraph 61 of [APP-048])? Does the MDS take into consideration that such deposits are likely to vary?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

11.7	The Applicant	HDD Exit Pits Please confirm whether the excavated material for the HDD exit pits is to be stored in the intertidal zone? If so, will this be directly adjacent to the exit pits?
11.8	The Applicant	HDD Exit Pits Paragraph 114 of [APP-048] states that any morphological response due to the spoil mounds located in the intertidal zone would be highly localised and any onward propagation would be limited by the presence of the groynes. Does this statement consider the possible 10-month period when gaps of up to 5 metres in the groynes would occur? If not, please explain why.
11.9	The Applicant	Nearshore Cable Protection A commitment has been made to the utilisation of cable mattresses in the nearshore areas, if required (paragraph 131 of [APP-048]). How is such a commitment to be secured?
12. Marine – Commercial Fisheries, Shipping and Navigation		
12.1	The Applicant	Commercial Fisheries – Mitigation With reference to the Fishing Liaison and Co-existence Plan (FLCEP) [APP-306] please can you: a) Confirm the wind farm/project operation period. The FLCEP states the “wind farm is due to operate for a period of 20 years”, whilst the ES Volume 2 Chapter 1 [APP-047] states “operational lifetime of the project is anticipated to be approximately 25 years”; b) confirm the criteria to identify specialists able to undertake cooperation payment assessment; c) outline timeframe for each key step in the cooperation payment process in paragraph 3.2; d) describe and confirm the dispute resolution method for cooperation payment; e) confirm how the cooperation payment is secured in the dDCO [AS-014].

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

12.2	The Applicant	Commercial Fisheries – General Please can you confirm how fishing métiers (such as tangle or gill netting) compatibility in the presence of wind turbines would be assessed?
12.3	The Applicant	Commercial Fisheries – Mitigation Please can you confirm if arbitration would be the process to resolve adverse impacts on other commercial offshore activities and if it is secured in the dDCO. If not, please explain your reasons and provide evidence justification.
12.4	The Applicant	Commercial Fisheries – Baseline Please can you confirm the potential reduction or increase in fish stocks that would result from the presence of the proposed development.
12.5	Isle of Man Government (Territorial Sea Committee), Captain Haddock's Seafood, Manx Fish Producers Organisation	Commercial Fisheries – General Are you satisfied with ES volume 2, chapter 8 [APP-054] and: a) potting fleet, netting fleet and dredging fleet being the three receptors requiring assessment for commercial fisheries; b) data sources in table 5 to inform the commercial fisheries environmental statement assessment; c) applicant's pro-rata annual landings value approach to define magnitude of impact - paragraphs 73-78; d) that all relevant projects and associated tiers considered within the commercial fisheries cumulative effect assessment in table 13. If no to any of the above points, please explain your reasons and provide evidence justification.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

12.6	Isle of Man Government (Territorial Sea Committee)	Commercial Fisheries – General Are you satisfied issues raised during consultation have been captured in table 2-3 in the Commercial Fisheries Baseline Report [APP-109]? If not, please explain your reasons and provide evidence justification.
12.7	The Applicant	Commercial Fisheries – General Please can you check the reference chapter and application reference for the following statement in ES Volume 2, Chapter 14 page 13 [APP-060] and statement "... <i>drawing on the assessment in Volume 2, Chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries; application ref: 6.2.6</i> ".
12.8	The Applicant	Commercial Fisheries – Baseline Please can you explain and describe if any important fishing grounds have been identified a) within the OL, b) adjacent and beyond the OL.
12.9	The Applicant	Commercial Fisheries – Mitigation Reference is made within [APP-054] of localised loss of access to fishing grounds fleets over a short-term (less than 5 years). The impact is predicted to be intermittent with localised exclusion surrounding construction activities and would be mitigated through sufficient notice of planned construction activity supported by a fisheries liaison officer where appropriate. Please can you explain and describe the planning and scheduling construction approach to identify these intermittent and localised exclusion zones, and the timeframe given to fishing receptor groups to be deemed sufficient notice of planned construction activity?
12.10	The Applicant	Commercial Fisheries – Mitigation Please can you describe the options being considered to encourage co-existence with the fishing industry.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

12.11	The Applicant	Commercial Fisheries – Relevant Representation Please can you respond to the issue of 12m and under vessels and possible missing vessel location and data set, and vessel monitoring system data available to the applicant does not include vessels <15m length by Janet Finch-Saunders MS [AS-036] point 8.
12.12	MCA, Trinity House, UK Chamber of Shipping	Shipping and Navigation – General Are you satisfied with the ES volume 2, chapter 9 [APP-055] and: a) that the maximum design scenario for safety zones of 500 metres around structures during construction, 50 metres around structures which are installed but awaiting further works or commissioning, and 500 metres from structures undergoing major maintenance works are not significant to impede your activities; b) that the maximum design scenario minimum spacing of 830 metres between structures is not significant to not impede your activities; c) that all main routes (17 in number) have been identified and are as shown on Figure 6; d) that the proposed development does not interfere with the use of recognised sea lanes essential to international navigation; and e) that any negative impacts on non-international navigation sea lanes are as low as reasonably practicable; If you have any issues on the above, please explain your reasons and provide evidence justification.
12.13	The Applicant	Shipping and Navigation – General Marine Licence Principles [AS-023] refers to depth reductions from cable protection stating that this must not compromise safe navigation and must not result in a x% reduction in surrounding depth, unless otherwise agreed with NRW. Please can you explain and describe: a) your consultation and engagement approach to depth reductions with MCA, Trinity House and UK Chamber of Shipping; b) the x% reduction in surrounding depth criteria within the MDS.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

12.14	The Applicant	Shipping and Navigation – Mitigation Please can you confirm: a) how the Search and Rescue Response Assessment (prior to commencement of construction) is secured in the dDCO [AS-014]; b) if there are any public right of navigation being extinguished and if so, what provisions are made in the dDCO [AS-014] c) safety zones secured in the dDCO and safety zone distances implemented and monitored on site [APP-055].
13. Marine – Natural		
13.1	The Applicant	Benthic Ecology – Noise Table 4 of ES Volume 2 Chapter 5 [APP-051] notes that noise impacts on benthic ecology have been scoped out and are not assessed in the Chapter. However, the summary of 'Consultation and Key Issues raised' states "noise pollution on benthic ecology during foundation installation during construction" with no mention of scoping out. The Inspectorate notes that the Scoping Opinion requested at ID 4.3.1 in Table 4.3 states that 'The ES should include information to explain the extent of the likely impact and assess any likely significant effects. The ES should also assess impacts on benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology from noise produced during other construction activities, including installation of the offshore ECR.' Can the Applicant provide this information or justify its omission?
13.2	The Applicant	Scour protection The MDS makes no reference to the volume of scour protection assumed in the assessment. The Applicant is requested to provide this information and explain how this has informed the benthic ecology assessment.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

13.3	The Applicant	Mitigation Table 12 of [APP-051] states that pre-commencement "A geophysical survey will be undertaken to facilitate the micro-siting around sensitive habitats such as Sabellaria". The Schedule of Mitigation [APP-310] does not reference geophysical surveys. Can the Applicant confirm how delivery of this mitigation measure would be secured?
13.4	JNCC	Benthic Ecology Please confirm or otherwise if you are content with the content and conclusions of [APP-051].
13.5	The Applicant	Non-native species Natural Resources Wales [RR-015] state that they consider that the magnitude of impact from the potential introduction of marine invasive non-native species should be presented as low and not negligible. Please respond to this view and adjust [APP-051] if necessary.
13.6	The Applicant	Biosecurity risk assessment Natural Resources Wales [RR-015] note the commitment of the Applicant to produce a biosecurity risk assessment to be conditioned within the Marine Licence but recommend that a marine biosecurity plan is kept free standing and separate. Provide your views on this proposal and on the most appropriate regulatory mechanism needed to secure it.
13.7	JNCC	Fish and Shellfish Ecology Please confirm or otherwise if you are content with the content and conclusions of ES Volume 2 Chapter 6, Fish and Shellfish Ecology [APP-052].
13.8	The Applicant	Fish Ecology Natural Resources Wales [RR-015] highlight discrepancies within Table 18 of [APP-052] and also consider that the swim speed for spawning fish fleeing receptors is overstated, leading to unrealistic scenarios for sole, plaice, cod, and whiting. Please comment on these observations and provide an updated Chapter if necessary.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

13.9	The Applicant	Fish Ecology Natural Resources Wales [RR-015] would wish to see further information on how the cumulative impacts to fish populations over multiple spawning seasons from underwater noise arising from consecutive construction activity from several offshore windfarm projects in Liverpool Bay has been considered. Please respond to this request.
13.10	North Wales Wildlife Trust	Fish and Shellfish Ecology Table 4 of [APP-052] summarises comments from yourselves and provides comments from the Applicant (pages 63-65) on the following matters: a) Noise impacts on herring; b) Precautionary principle for herring for work in potential herring spawning grounds; and c) Fishing activities within the baseline. Please provide your comments on the Applicant's responses contained within column 3 of Table 4.
13.11	The Applicant	Fish and Shellfish Ecology - Noise Please confirm the reasoning for the choice of the noise modelling locations for underwater noise (fleeing and stationery) as shown in Figures 8 and 9 of [APP-052].
13.12	NRW, JNCC, RSPB, NWWT	Offshore – General Are you satisfied that there is no disturbance assessment available to assess other construction activities such as drilling, dredging, vessel activity? If no, please explain your reasons and provide evidence justification.
14. Public Health and Nuisance		
14.1	The Applicant	Noise and Soundscape Action Plan and Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act How have you taken into account the Noise and Soundscape Action Plan Wales 2018 to 2023 and the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

14.2	DCC, CCBC	Assessment Are you satisfied with the assessment of operational noise from the turbines and its conclusion in Section 10.5.2 of ES Volume 3 Chapter 10: Noise and Vibration [APP-071]?
14.3	DCC	Assessment Are you satisfied with the Applicant's decision not to undertake an operational vibration assessment of the OnSS, based on the evidence provided in Section 10.12.5 of [APP-071]?
14.4	DCC	Assessment Are you satisfied that baseline noise monitoring Location CR1, the location of which is provided by Table 56 and Figure 5 of [APP-071], is representative of the residential buildings both in Rhydwen Farm Mews and the New Pines Holiday Home Park?
14.5	DCC	Assessment Are you content with the use of a tonal penalty approach in the assessment of operational noise levels from the OnSS in lieu of 1/3 octave band data and the defined noise rating level limits arising from the OnSS, specified in Requirement 18 of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) [AS-014]?
14.6	DCC	Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan Are you satisfied that the outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan [APP-314], will adequately control noise and vibration during onshore construction? If not, what amendments would you like to see?
14.7	DCC	Draft Development Consent Order Are you satisfied with the proposed working hours in Requirement 15 of the dDCO [AS-014] and the proposed process for agreeing location specific variations? If not, what amendments would you like to see?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

14.8	DCC	Outline Construction Communication Plan Are you satisfied with the outline Construction Communication Plan [APP-324]?
14.9	CCBC, DCC	Assessment and Controls Are you satisfied with the assessment of noise from offshore construction provided in [APP-071] and the provisions to monitor and control it in Requirement 4 of the dDCO [AS-014]?
14.10	Sustainable Cymru	Asbestos Pipe In your Relevant Representation [RR-036], you make reference to an asbestos pipe. Please provide further information on its exact location and how the effect of the project on it may raise concerns for public health.
14.11	Glyndwr University (on behalf of Glyndwr Innovations Limited)	Vibration a) Please provide the details of the duration, nature/ type and magnitude of vibration that would adversely affect Glyndwr Innovations Limited's operations. b) On their site visit [EV-001], [EV-002] the EXA noted the proximity of the A55 dual carriageway to Glyndwr Innovations Limited. Does this create any issues in terms of vibration to your operations?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

14.12	DCC, NRW	Assessment Are you satisfied: a) That a project specific air quality monitoring survey has not been carried out? b) With the approach adopted for the consideration of cumulative construction dust impacts in Section 11.13 of ES Volume 3 Chapter 11: Air Quality [AS -030]? c) That all relevant receptors have been identified? d) With the Applicant's assessment of road traffic effects and that there is no proposal to use dispersion modelling to quantify the resultant impact on critical loads and/ or critical levels? e) With the assessment of construction dust impacts on ecological sites? f) That the screening of traffic trips is in accordance with current guidelines and legal judgements? And g) With the assessment of the potential health impacts from PM10 of NRMM in Section 11.10.1 of ES Volume 3 Chapter 11: Air Quality [AS-030]?
14.13	DCC	Ancient Woodland Are you satisfied that the proposed works will not have a detrimental effect on Ancient Woodland?
14.14	DCC	Mitigation and Requirements Are you satisfied with the draft dust management plan, which is part of the outline Air Quality Management Plan [APP-315] and that the draft requirements in the dDCO [AS-014] on this matter are sufficient?
14.15	The Applicant	Onshore Substation The ExA note the potential for the OnSS to be gas insulated (GIS). Are there any proposals to use sulphur hexafluoride (SF6) gas? If so, how will it be controlled to avoid a risk to public health or damaging the environment?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022

Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022

14.16	The Applicant	Onshore Substation Lighting What lighting is proposed for the OnSS during its operation? Which areas would be permanently lit and which only when required? Please provide the reasons for each. What assessment has been made of the impact of the proposed lighting regime on receptors?
14.17	PHW, DCC	Assessment Are you content with the assessment of the potential impacts of the project on health due to electromagnetic radiation during operation set out in Section 12.10 of ES Volume 3 Chapter 12: Public Health [APP-073]?
15. Other Projects and Proposals		
Questions relating to this topic area can be found in Section 1.1, General and Cross Topic questions		
16. Project Description and Site Selection		
16.1	The Applicant	Project Description The project overview indicates construction surveys and works in 2024 and 2025, and the indicative construction programme shows offshore preconstruction works (survey/clearance etc) commencing at Year 1 Q1. Please can you confirm the year(s) for the preconstruction works impact assessment and define the scope of "etc" statement.
16.2	The Applicant	Project Description For the indicative construction programme (Onshore) works please confirm activity and duration at i) land fall, ii) onshore ECC and iii) OnSS for: a) Pre-commencement work b) Preliminary works c) Reinstatement

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

16.3	The Applicant	Project Description Please provide indicative temporary construction compound annotated plan layout with dimensions for areas of: a) 10,000m ² ; b) 22,500m ² ; and c) 37,500m ² .
16.4	The Applicant	Project Description For the Onshore Sub Station construction area please provide annotated indicative drawings of: a) cross sections along northern and southern points of platform (in a generally east-west direction) showing existing and proposed features, levels and tie-ins; b) longitudinal section (in a generally north -south direction) showing existing and proposed features, levels and tie-ins.
16.5	The Applicant	Project Description Please confirm or define the proposed electrical output of the project
16.6	The Applicant	Project Description Please supplement Figure 30: Indicative AIS Substation Layout and Figure 31: Indicative GIS Substation Layout Onshore [APP-062] with an annotated draft plan drawing of each substation layout with buildings and structures labelled and key dimensions noted.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

16.7	The Applicant	Site Selection Table 2 of ES Vol 1 Chapter 4, Site Selection and Alternatives [APP-044] notes in a summary of Crown Estate extensions criteria that "Other than the existing wind farm, the proposed extension must not encroach within a radius of 5km of any other wind farm unless the tenant of any such wind farm confirms its agreement in writing to The Crown Estate". The proposed development compliance states in response that "the nearest wind farm to the...project is the Rhyl Flats offshore wind farm, which is greater than 5km away and is also operated by RWE" [RR-020] from DLA Piper on behalf of Rhyl Flats Wind Farm Limited effectively objects to the proposed development. Please confirm: a) the distance between the proposed development and Rhyl Flats b) whether Rhyl Flats is operated by RWE.
16.8	The Applicant	Site Selection Figure 10 of [APP-044] show the area of search for the proposed OnSS. This figure shows as a block the proposed extension to the existing National Grid substation on the west side of the existing substation. Did the location of this extension have an impact on the proposed location of the OnSS?
16.9	The Applicant	Site Selection Table 10 of [APP-044] details the long list of proposed cable corridor options. Cable corridor option 5c is noted but this option does not seem to appear on the associated Figure 19 of the same document. Please provide further details and an updated Figure 19 if necessary.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

16.10	The Applicant	Site Selection Table 10 of [APP-044] details the long list of proposed cable corridor options. The summary of analysis for Cable corridor proposal 5b states that “option not progressed following parallel analysis screening this route from further consideration” Please expand on this reasoning/analysis.
16.11	The Applicant	Site Selection Table 11 of [APP-044] details stakeholder feedback on various proposed cable routes, including options 5a and 5c. Subsequent paragraphs contain the reasoning for the selection of route 5a for the purposes of the PEIR. However, route 5c does not appear to be mentioned at all within such reasoning. Please explain and expand if necessary on why route 5c was not progressed.
17. Seascape, Landscape and Visual		
17.1	DCC, IoACC, CCBC, GC, FCC, SNP, NRW	Assessment Please confirm whether you are satisfied with: a) the study area; b) the Zone of Theoretical Visibility; c) the viewpoint locations selected; and d) the extent of assessment of these viewpoints, as identified within ES Chapter 10: Seascape, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (SLVIA) [AS-027]. If not, please explain the reasons for this.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

17.2	DCC, IoACC, CCBC GC, FCC, SNP, NRW	Assessment Please confirm whether you are satisfied with: a) the Applicant's SLVIA methodology; and b) its assessment of effects on seascape character, landscape character and visual amenity. If not, please explain the reasons for this.
17.3	DCC, IoACC, CCBC, GC FCC, SNP, NRW	Assessment The SLVIA methodology provides for moderate adverse effects to be classified as either 'significant' or 'not significant' based on professional judgement. DCC/IoACC/CCBC/GC/FCC/SNP/NRW - Please confirm you are satisfied with this approach? The Applicant - Please further justify the instances where moderate adverse effects are considered 'not significant' as the precise reasons for this are not clear to the ExA.
17.4	The Applicant	Assessment [AS-027] notes on numerous occasions that the susceptibility to change of receptors is moderated by distance from the array area. Please further justify this noting that 'distance' does not appear to be a factor for 'susceptibility to change' in Annex 10.1: SLVIA Methodology [APP-112].
17.5	SNP, NRW	Assessment SNP [RR-006] and NRW [RR-015] raise concerns around under-reporting of significant effects. Please identify specifically where your concerns lie, with supporting reasons for this.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

17.6	SNP	Assessment SNP's RR [RR-006] makes reference to visual impacts from specific points within the National Park, such as from Carnedd Llywelyn and the Carneddau as a whole. Noting that VP 10 [APP-239] is from Carnedd Llywelyn and VP 38 [APP-267] is from Foel Fras: a) is SNP satisfied that these viewpoints are representative of this part of the National Park (ie the Carneddau); b) does SNP agree with the Applicant's assessment that residual effects from these viewpoints would be moderate adverse and significant; and c) does SNP agree with the Applicant's assessment that residual effects on the SNP Landscape Character Area (LCA) 02: Carneddau Range would be minor-moderate adverse and not significant?
17.7	SNP, NRW, GC (if relevant), CCBC (if relevant)	Assessment Please confirm: a) whether you agree that the relevant special qualities of the National Park are limited to 'Diverse landscapes' and 'Tranquillity and solitude – Peaceful areas' as defined in the Cynllun Eryri The Snowdonia National Park Partnership Plan 2020 (SNPPP); b) the status of the SNPPP, noting [AS-027] indicates it is currently draft and under consultation; and c) whether you agree with the Applicant's assessment of effects in respect of these special qualities (Table 10) and its overall conclusion that any harm would not be to such a degree as to affect the integrity and inherent natural beauty of the National Park (paragraph 806).
17.8	NRW	Assessment [AS-027] reports no significant effects on landscape character areas within the National Park, including for SNP LCA 01: Northern Uplands and SNP LCA 02: Carneddau Range. It also reports no significant effects on the identified special qualities of the National Park. NRW [RR-015] (paragraphs 3.1.2 and 3.1.5) appears to suggest otherwise. Please explain your reasons for this.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

17.9	NRW, National Trust, The Applicant	Assessment NRW and National Trust - NRW [RR-015] and National Trust [RR-029] suggest that enhancement of designated landscapes should be considered. Please explain what is meant by this and how you envisage this might be achieved? The Applicant - Is this something that you have considered or are willing to consider?
17.10	The Applicant	Assessment [AS-027] identifies 'Diverse landscapes' and 'Tranquillity and solitude – Peaceful areas' as special qualities of the National Park, including in Table 10. However, paragraphs 798 and 806 suggested that 'Diverse Views' are special qualities. Please clarify.
17.11	NRW, IoACC	Assessment Do you agree that the relevant special qualities of the Ynys Môn (Anglesey) Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) include 'Expansive views'; 'Peace and tranquillity'; and 'Islands around Anglesey' as reported in [AS-027]? Following on from this, do you agree with the conclusions in Table 7 relating to these and the overall conclusion in paragraph 562 that harm would not occur to such a degree that it would affect the overall integrity of the Ynys Môn (Anglesey) AONB or its inherent natural beauty? Please provide reasons if there is any disagreement.
17.12	DCC, FCC, NRW	Assessment Do you agree that the relevant special qualities of the Clwydian Range and Dee Valley AONB include 'Tranquillity'; and 'Remoteness and Wildness' as reported in [AS-027]? Following on from this, do you agree with the conclusions in Table 13 relating to these? Please provide reasons if there is any disagreement.
17.13	The Applicant	Assessment Please confirm whether viewpoint numbers 46, 47, 48 and 51 are omitted purposefully.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

17.14	The Applicant	Assessment [AS-027] uses the terms 'minor-moderate' / 'moderate-minor' and 'moderate-major' / 'major-moderate' interchangeably. Please clarify whether these terms mean the same effect.
17.15	The Applicant	Assessment [AS-027] reports some significant and non-significant effects on parts of Seascape Character Area (SCA) 28: Northeast of Anglesey. What would be the effect on SCA 28 as a whole?
17.16	The Applicant	Assessment Please explain why no photographs have been provided for some viewpoints (including VP 3 (Puffin Island), VP 26 (Bryn-Ilwyn), VP 30 (Hilbre Point), VP 31 (Crosby), VP 32 (Formby Point), VP 33 (Southport Pier), VP 35 (Blackpool Tower), VP 39 (North Wales Path), VP 54 (Y Foel), VP 55 (footpath above Cilgwyn Mawr), VP 56 (Pen-y-corddyn-mawr) and VP 57 (Moelfre Isaf)).
17.17	The Applicant	Assessment Paragraph 2.35.9 of draft NPS EN-3 states that "... <i>the layout of the turbines should be designed appropriately to minimise harm...</i> ". [AS-027] states that a north-south grid formation layout reflects the worst case in seascape, landscape and visual terms. To what degree would alternative layouts reduce / minimise harmful effects and have these been considered?
17.18	DCC, IoACC, CCBC, GC FCC, SNP, NRW	Assessment Do you agree that MDS A and MDS B would have similar effects in seascape, landscape and visual terms, as indicated in paragraph 138 of [AS-027]?
17.19	The Applicant	Siting Having regard to Figures 2a [APP-191] and 2b [APP-192], would there be any scope for relocating some or all of the westernmost turbines into other parts of the array area? If not, please explain the reasons for this.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

17.20	The Applicant	Colour Finish Clarify what colour the wind turbines would be and provide justification for this.
17.21	The Applicant	Landscaping Having regard to paragraph 5.9.23 of NPS EN-1, has the Applicant had regard to potential for off-site landscaping to mitigate adverse effects from more distant vistas?
17.22	The Applicant	Turbine Visibility Please explain why existing turbines associated with other wind farms are not visible in some of the baseline visualisations but appear in the photomontages (e.g. VP 17 (Penrhyn Castle Terrace) [APP-246])?
17.23	The Applicant	Viewpoint Numbering Viewpoint numbering on Figure 11 [APP-204] is not clear and is on occasion hidden by other viewpoint numbers, especially around the Llandudno area. Also, the underlying map is not particularly clear. Can these matters be resolved in the interests of clarity?
17.24	The Applicant	Assessment Table 2 of [AS-027] identifies that VP 43 (Mynydd y Garn) is a representative viewpoint but no further assessment appears to have been made in respect of it and it is not included in Table 20. Please provide a reason for this or provide an assessment of effects from this viewpoint.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

17.25	The Applicant	Mitigation The ExA recognises that the scale of the Proposed Development has been reduced since pre-application consultations. [AS-027] reports that this is a form of mitigation. As the ExA is considering the Proposed Development as applied for, please: a) justify how and to what extent pre-application changes can represent mitigation for the current scheme being assessed; and b) having regard to paragraph 5.9.2.1 of NPS EN-1, what scope is there to reduce the scale of the Proposed Development to mitigate seascape, landscape and visual effects (with very significant benefits in this regard) with only a small reduction in function (e.g. electricity generation output)?
17.26	The Applicant	Lighting [AS-027] identifies that mitigation for night-time effects would include reducing aviation lights to 200 candela when visibility is greater than 5km. How would this be secured?
17.27	The Applicant	Lighting Table 16 of [AS-027] sets out further options for mitigation of night-time visual effect. Please provide an update on the feasibility of such mitigation, noting that night-time lighting has been raised as a concern in some RRs (including [RR-015] and [RR-029]).
17.28	The Applicant	Lighting Paragraph 1407 of [AS-027] states that "<i>The night-time photomontages shown in these figures have been produced to show 2,00cd lighting, to inform the assessment of worst-case effects assessed [...]</i>". Given the presence of the comma, is this figure 200 or should it be 2000?
17.29	The Applicant	Night-time Effects Paragraph 1559, section 10.17.6 of [AS-027], relates to a summary of night-time effects and refers to significant effects in this regard in respect of Anglesey AONB. However, such effects do not appear to be reported elsewhere in the chapter. Please clarify.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

17.30	DCC, IoACC, CCBC, GC FCC, SNP, NRW	Cumulative and Inter-Relationship Assessments Are you satisfied with the assessment of cumulative and inter-relationship effects in sections 10.13 and 10.14 of [AS-027]?
17.31	The Applicant	Cumulative Assessment Has there been any progression of the Mona, Morgan or Morecambe wind farm projects which might affect the cumulative assessment set out in section 10.13 of [AS-027]?
17.32	The Applicant	Assessment Table 20 of [AS-027] cites " <i>VP 30: Snowdon Summit</i> ". Please confirm that this should read " <i>VP 34: Snowdon Summit</i> "?
17.33	The Applicant	Assessment Paragraph 678 of [AS-027] refers to Penrhyn Castle in respect of Wales Coast Path Section I. Is this correct?
17.34	The Applicant	Assessment [AS-027] refers to " <i>Figure 18.1 (Annex 10.5)</i> " at paragraphs 598, 613, 1055, 1074, 1268, 1273 and 1351, " <i>Figure 10.1</i> " in paragraph 1271 and " <i>Annex 10.6</i> " throughout. Are these references correct? Please check and correct these as necessary and as well as any other inaccuracies.
17.35	The Applicant	Assessment Please correct the subheading for 'Denbighshire' between paragraphs 1232 and 1233 of [AS-027].

ExQ1: 27 September 2022

Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022

18. Socio-Economic		
18.1	The Applicant	The Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act (WBFGW) 2015 In line with the objectives of WBFGW Act 2015, please detail how the Proposed Development seeks to improve the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of both the North Wales regional level and the Wales national level. Please provide a response in line with the seven well-being goals as detailed within the Act.
18.2	CCBC, DCC, FCC, GC, IoACC, SNP	Future Wales – The National Plan (FWNP)2040 Are you satisfied that the design of the Proposed Development contributes to the objectives of FWNP in respect of sustaining and developing a vibrant economy and improving the health and well-being of communities? If not, please explain your reasons.
18.3	CCBC, DCC, FCC, GC, IoACC, SNP	Planning Policy Wales 11 (PPW-11) Are you satisfied that the design of the Proposed Development contributes to the objectives of PPW-11 in respect of improving the social, economic, and cultural wellbeing of North Wales? If not, please explain your reasons.
18.4	CCBC, DCC, FCC, GC, IoACC, SNP	Technical Advice Note (TAN) 23: Economic Development Are you satisfied that the design of the Proposed Development contributes to the objectives of TAN 23 in respect of the generation of wealth, jobs, and income? If not, please explain your reasons.
18.5	Betws yn Rhos and Llanellian yn Rhos Community Council	Compensatory Grant In your relevant representation [RR-008], reference is made to the provision of a compensatory grant to the Community Council area. Please expand on the purpose and need for such a grant.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

18.6	Rostons	Commercial Operations In respect of relevant representations made on behalf of your clients ([RR-045] to [RR-051]), please provide additional detail in respect of their concerns on the diversified commercial operations at Cwybr Fawr.
18.7	Captain Haddock's Seafood	Commercial Operations Please provide more detail in respect of your concern raised in your relevant representation [RR-032] on the effect that the Proposed Development would have on your commercial operations.
18.8	Carl Davies	Commercial Operations Please provide more detail in respect of your concern raised in your relevant representation [RR-060] on the effect that the Proposed Development would have on your commercial operations.
18.9	The Applicant	Effects on Local Businesses Several relevant representations make reference to the potential for adverse effects on their businesses: a) [RR-030] and [RR-031] – harm to operations; b) [RR-044] to [RR-051] – effect on wider economy; and c) [RR-035] – effects due to noise Please respond to these concerns and set out how, if justified, mitigation could be provided for each of the businesses.
18.10	The Applicant	Manx Vessel Data [RR-027] and [RR-033] both raise queries as to whether Manx vessel data has not been fully included in the presented datasets. Please confirm whether Manx vessel data has been taken into consideration and if not, explain your position in this regard.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

18.11	The Applicant	Skills and Employment Strategy [RR-004] suggests that the dDCO is lacking a suitably worded requirement in respect of the approval of a 'Skills and Employment Strategy' and that it is best practice to prepare and submit an outline of such a plan. Please explain your position in this respect.
18.12	CCBC, DCC, FCC, GC, IoACC, SNP	Community Linguistic Statement Are you satisfied with the content of the Community Linguistic Statement [APP-325] and the conclusion that the Proposed Development would not result in negative impacts on the linguistic, social character and locality? Additionally, are you content that the Proposed Development would not impede the ability to achieve the relevant national and local Welsh language policy objectives? If not, please explain your position in this respect.
18.13	The Applicant	Community Linguistic Statement Paragraph 57 of [APP-325] confirms that all non-technical visual elements of the Proposed Development will be produced in either Welsh or bilingually in Welsh and English. Please confirm how this will be secured? Additionally, contractors and all supply chain companies will need to comply with RWE's Welsh Language Policy. Please provide a copy of this policy.
18.14	The Applicant	Assessment Please provide a revised plan of 'Figure 1: Study areas used in the socio-economic assessment' and 'Figure 4: Overall deprivation along the North Wales coast' at a scale of 1:50,000 (ES Volume 3, Chapter 3 [AS-034]).
18.15	The Applicant	Maximum Design Scenario Please provide further justification for the maximum adverse scenario assessed in relation to disruption to community facilities as the justification provided in Table 23 of [AS-034] is unclear.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

18.16	The Applicant	Construction Employment Paragraph 219 of [AS-034] states that the Proposed Development has the potential to support 150 FTE jobs per annum, which relates to the 'No Local Port Scenario'. It is further confirmed that the figure of 150 FTE jobs is likely to consist of 30 jobs relating to onshore installation and commissioning, with the remaining 120 involved in offshore construction. Please provide a similar breakdown of job types for the 'Local Port Scenario' FTE figures.
18.17	The Applicant	Construction Employment Paragraph 291 of [AS-034] refers to an additional 210 FTE jobs which are likely to be required to support offshore construction. It is stated that these roles are likely to be held by non-UK based workers, although they will reside in the UK during construction. Have these additional 210 FTE roles been included in the assessment of the effect of construction on community facilities, the economy and employment? If not, please explain your position in this respect.
18.18	The Applicant	Construction Employment Are the employment sectors listed at paragraph 192 of [AS-034] for the Wales national level, the same for the North Wales level? If not, please list the relevant sectors.
18.19	The Applicant	Apprenticeships Will the Proposed Development provide additional apprenticeship opportunities and training partnerships with Coleg Llandrillo? If so, how will these be secured?
18.20	The Applicant	Healthcare Services Paragraph 224 of [AS-034] states that the Applicant will provide healthcare services. Please confirm: a) What healthcare services are to be provided by the Applicant? b) Will the services only be available to non-UK-based workers? c) How will such services be secured?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

18.21	The Applicant	Healthcare Services Paragraph 223 of [AS-034] refers to the possibility of the capacity of the Proposed Development being greater than 576MW. One implication of an increase in capacity may be that if the workforce increases, the level of additional patients for GP services could result in the number of registered patients exceeding the recommended benchmark of 1,800 patients per GP. Please explain what other effects an increase in capacity above 576MW would have on the outcome of the socio-economic assessments.
18.22	The Applicant	Healthcare Services Paragraph 98 of [AS-034] states that the in respect of the demand for healthcare services the assessment is based on the wider North Wales area but that the impact has the potential to be concentrated locally, around areas of construction or port activity. As a decision hasn't yet been reached in respect of the port, how does the assessment reflect the possible geographical variation in the labour catchment area?
18.23	The Applicant	Housing Given the operational lifespan of the Proposed Development, are those workers who relocate to the area for the operational phase classified as 'temporarily' moving to the area or permanently relocating to the area?
18.24	The Applicant	UK Lifetime Expenditure Paragraph 119 of [AS-034] states that the Applicant intends to work with local, regional and national stakeholders to achieve higher UK content than the base case assumed. Please confirm: a) What measures will be employed to achieve a higher content? b) How will such measures be secured?
18.25	The Applicant	Operations Base Please provide any update in respect of the selection of an operations base for the Proposed Development.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

18.26	The Applicant	Supply Chain Strategy Is there a commitment to a proportion of contracts to be provided through local suppliers? If so, how would this be secured, monitored and delivered?
18.27	CCBC, DCC, FCC, GC, IoACC, SNP	Mitigation Measures Are you satisfied with the proposed embedded and applied mitigation measures in respect of socio-economic effects of the Proposed Development?
18.28	The Applicant	Inter-relationship Effects Have any inter-related effects between offshore and onshore parts of the Proposed Development been identified in terms of socio-economics?
19. Tourism and Recreation		
19.1	The Applicant	Green Infrastructure Please confirm how the Proposed Development complies with paragraph 5.10.20 of NPS EN-1 in respect of the connectivity of green infrastructure?
19.2	CCBC, DCC, FCC, GC, IoACC, SNP	Planning Policy Wales 11 (PPW-11) Are you satisfied that the design of the Proposed Development contributes to the objectives of PPW-11 in respect of improving the cultural wellbeing of North Wales? If not, please explain your reasons.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

19.3	DCC	Denbighshire Adopted Local Development Plan Both Garford Road and Ferguson Avenue are located within Coastal Tourism Protection Zones as detailed in Policy PSE 11 of the Adopted Local Development Plan. Due to the proposed Temporary Construction Compound and access arrangements in both locations, temporary adverse effects are anticipated. However, the Applicant states that these will be managed to ensure such effects are minimised (paragraph 34 of ES Volume 3, Chapter 4 [APP-065]). Please confirm whether you are satisfied with the management of such effects and are content that this would not result in any permanent loss of tourism facilities? If not, please explain your reasons.
19.4	The Applicant	St Asaph Bridleway In response to [RR-036], please confirm whether the access to St Asaph bridleway will be blocked during any phase of the Proposed Development? If access is to be restricted, please detail reasons and anticipated duration.
19.5	Jodi Cook	Tourism Effects Please provide additional detail in respect of your concern raised in relevant representation [RR-057] regarding the effect that the Proposed Development would have on tourism in Llandudno.
19.6	Rostons	Recreation Effects In respect of relevant representations made on behalf of your clients ([RR-044] to [RR-051]), please provide additional detail regarding concerns relating to the Proposed Development and horse riding during the construction phase.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

19.7	The Applicant	Tourism Sector Benefits Please respond to the concern raised by the National Trust in respect of the potential effect on tourism [RR-029]. Specifically, please provide a response to the statement that " <i>No specific implementation mechanisms appear to be brought forward within the submission, nor the extension of this commitment to operational impacts, nor detailed exploration of this potential benefit</i> ".
19.8	The Applicant	Assessment Table 4 of ES Volume 3, Chapter 13 [APP-074] identifies a significant residual effect on Rhyl Golf Club during decommissioning. However, such an effect does not appear to be reported in [APP-065]. Please clarify this discrepancy.
19.9	The Applicant	Assessment Please provide an additional plan of 'Study Areas Used in the Tourism and Recreation Assessment' [APP-065] at a scale of 1:50,000 which clearly depicts the Local Area of Influence.
19.10	CCBC, DCC	Outline Public Access Management Plan (oPAMP) Are you satisfied with the approach and content of the oPAMP [APP-320]? If not, please details what additional measures are required to supplement the oPAMP.
19.11	The Applicant	Outline Public Access Management Plan (oPAMP) Section 2.2.3 of the oPAMP [APP-320] discusses the need for temporary closures without a diversion. The title of this section relates to Public Rights of Way (PRoW) only. However, text in paragraph 21 of [APP-320] also refers to Active Travel Routes (ATR). Please provide clarification as to which of the routes listed in Table 1 of the oPAMP are PRoW, ATR or both?
19.12	The Applicant	Outline Public Access Management Plan (oPAMP) Please review Table 1 of the oPAMP [APP-320] and confirm all PRoWs are detailed within Schedule 4 of the dDCO [AS-014].

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

19.13	The Applicant	Scottish Power Renewables Tourism Study Please provide a copy of the study by Scottish Power Renewables (2020), as detailed at paragraph 247 of [APP-065].
19.14	The Applicant	Replacement Effects It is stated that where there is the risk of some holiday and day visitors from being discouraged from visiting, there is the potential for discouraged visitors to be replaced by other visitors as the local tourism sector and market adapts (paragraph 299 and Table 33 of [APP-065]). What evidence exists to support this statement and who are the 'other' visitors considered to be?
19.15	The Applicant	Tourism Sector Benefits Paragraphs 257 and 301 of [APP-065] states that there are opportunities during both the construction and operational phases for AyM to support and engage with local stakeholders to promote and realise potential positive benefits to the tourism sector within Llandudno and Great Orme. Please confirm: a) What benefits are predicted to the tourism sector from such measures? b) How they would be secured? And c) Are such measures considered mitigation or enhancement?
19.16	The Applicant	Recreational Fishing Further to the 2020/2021 vessel type survey data detailed in Figures 3, 4 and 5 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 9 [APP-055], please provide isolated survey data for the winter and summer periods which illustrates fishing and recreational vessels only.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

19.17	The Applicant	Recreational Fishing Paragraph 112 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 12 [APP-058] confirms that any disturbed fish species will return immediately following the construction phase so recoverability will be high. Please confirm: a) Whether this statement relates to all the main species of importance listed; and b) On what evidence is the statement based on?
19.18	Isle of Man Government (Territorial Sea Committee), Carl Davies	Charter Angling Are you satisfied the issues raised during consultation have been captured in table 2-2 in the Charter Angling Baseline Report [APP-118]? If not, please explain reasons and provide evidence justification.
19.19	The Applicant	Inter-relationship Effects Have any inter-related effects between offshore and onshore parts of the Proposed Development been identified in terms of tourism and recreation? If so, please detail.
20. Traffic and Transport		
20.1	The Applicant	Wales Transport Strategy 2021 Please set out how the project aligns with the Welsh Government's priorities and objectives for transport contained in Llwybr Newydd: the Wales Transport Strategy 2021. In particular, how will the project promote the use of sustainable forms of transport and maintain and enhance provision for active travel?
20.2	The Applicant	Construction Port Would you please provide an update on the port of origin for delivery of substation transformers and other large components. If a port has now been identified, what is the proposed AIL route to the substation construction site? Are any changes required to road infrastructure along the route?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

20.3	The Applicant	Construction Port Would you please provide an update on the port that will be used for the offshore works. If a port has now been identified, please provide an assessment of the effect of increased traffic movements on the local highway and transport network.
20.4	The Applicant	Construction Plant ES Volume 5, Annex 10.3: Construction Plant [APP-153] suggests that some of the plant to be used in the construction of the onshore cable route and OnSS will require delivery by low loader: a) Have all access routes been checked to ensure they can accommodate the swept path of such vehicles? b) What modifications, if any, are required to the highway infrastructure on each of the routes to accommodate such vehicles? And c) Are there any sub-standard bridges with respect to height or load carrying capacity on any of the access routes that will require special measures to negotiate?
20.5	DCC	Assessment As highway authority, do you agree with the methodology, baseline data and predicted traffic movements used to assess traffic and transport impacts in ES Chapter 9: Traffic and Transport [APP-070]? Please identify any outstanding issues and how you would like them to be addressed.
20.6	DCC	Assessment In ES Volume 5, Annex 9.1 [APP-148], a 15% uplift has been added to new traffic data collected in April 2021 to account for the effects of Covid-19. Are you satisfied with this approach?
20.7	DCC	Assessment Are you satisfied that only a qualitative assessment has been carried out with regard to traffic and transport impacts for the de-commissioning phase of the project?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

20.8	DCC	Draft Development Consent Order As Highway Authority are you content with the proposed powers contained in Articles 9 to 13, Part 3, Streets, of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) [AS-014]? If not, how would you like them to be amended, why and to what effect?
20.9	The Applicant	Outline Travel Plan An outline Travel Plan is provided in Appendix 9 of the outline Construction Code of Practice (oCoCP) [APP-321]: a) What is the likely effect of the proposed package of measures on reducing private car use? b) How will the effect of the Plan be monitored? c) How will corrective action be identified and agreed with the LPA? d) Over what timescales will corrective action be initiated? and e) How will the provisions of the Outline Travel Plan be secured in the dDCO?
20.10	DCC	Outline Code of Construction Practice – Associated Appendices Are you satisfied with Appendices 7, 8 & 9 of the oCoCP, the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan, [APP-319], outline Public Access Management Plan [APP-320] and outline Travel Plan [APP-321] respectively? Are you content that their provisions are adequately secured by the dDCO [AS-014]? If not, what changes would you like to see and why?
20.11	Royal Mail	Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan Are you content with proposals in the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-319] to consult on potential traffic disruption during the construction phase of the project and mitigate its effects?
20.12	Network Rail	Horizontal Directional Drilling Are you satisfied that proposals to use Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) under the North Wales Mainline are feasible and will not result in any significant effect on rail infrastructure or services?

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022**

20.13	Network Rail	Draft Development Consent Order Are you satisfied with the protective provisions in Part 6, Schedule 9 of the dDCO [AS-014]? What changes, if any, would you like made and why?
20.14	Welsh Government	Horizontal Directional Drilling Are you satisfied that proposals to use Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) under the A55 Trunk Road are feasible and will not result in any significant effect on its infrastructure or main line and junction traffic flows?
20.15	Welsh Government	Draft Development Consent Order What protective provisions for the A55 Trunk Road, if any, would you like to see included in Part 6, Schedule 9 of the dDCO [AS-014]?
20.16	The Applicant	Onshore Substation Access What other routes were considered for accessing the OnSS site which do not include Glascoed Road (e.g. from the north or east via St. Asaph Business Park)? Why were these alternative routes discounted? Please demonstrate that on balance, the route selected has the least adverse impact.
20.17	The Applicant	Maintenance Access Route A maintenance access route is proposed adjacent to the western boundary of Denbighshire Memorial Park and Crematorium [plot 436, Land Plan (Onshore) [AS-005] and Book of Reference [AS-020a]]. Please provide details of: a) How frequently it is likely to be used; b) The plant and machinery that will be using it; c) The operations that will be carried out; and d) Alternative access routes that were considered and why they were discounted.

ExQ1: 27 September 2022**Responses due by Deadline 1: Monday 24 October 2022****ANNEX A: Awel y Môr Offshore Wind Farm project - Compulsory Acquisition / Temporary Possession Objections Schedule**

In the event of a new interest in the land, or Category 3 person, being identified the Applicant should inform those persons of their right to apply to become an Interested Party under s102A PA2008.

Obj No.ⁱ	Name/ Organisation	IP/AP Ref Noⁱⁱ	RR Ref Noⁱⁱⁱ	WR Ref No^{iv}	Other Doc Ref No^v	Interest^{vi}	Permanent/ Temporary^{vii}	Plot(s)	CA?^{viii}	Status of objection

i Obj No = objection number. All objections listed in this table should be given a unique number in sequence

ii Reference number assigned to each Interested Party (IP) and Affected Person (AP)

iii Reference number assigned to each Relevant Representation (RR) in the Examination library

iv Reference number assigned to each Written Representation (WR) in the Examination library

v Reference number assigned to any other document in the Examination library

vi This refers to parts 1 to 3 of the Book of Reference:

Part 1, containing the names and addresses of the owners, lessees, tenants, and occupiers of, and others with an interest in, or power to sell and convey, or release, each parcel of Order land;


Part 2, containing the names and addresses of any persons whose land is not directly affected under the Order, but who “would or might” be entitled to make a claim under section 10 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965, as a result of the Order being implemented, or Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973, as a result of the use of the land once the Order has been implemented;

Part 3, containing the names and addresses of any persons who are entitled to easements or other private rights over the Order land that may be extinguished, suspended or interfered with under the Order.

vii This column indicates whether the applicant is seeking compulsory acquisition or temporary possession of land / rights

viii CA = compulsory acquisition. The answer is ‘yes’ if the land is in parts 1 or 3 of the Book of Reference and the Applicant is seeking compulsory acquisition of land / rights.





Key:

- The Property
- Extended Area
- Core Option Area
- Retained Land

Coordinate System: British National Grid
Projection: Transverse Mercator
Datum: OSGB 1936

Interest:
John Berwyn Evans & Eirian Evans

Location:
Land south of St Asaph Road, St Asaph,
Denbighshire, LL18 5UY

Coords: 301,041 374,521

Scheme Name:
Awel y Môr Offshore Wind Farm

Drawing Name:
Substation Option Plan

Drawing No: 197212_PLN_OP_1.1_A

Rev	Date	Description
-	09.03.2022	First Issue
-	07.09.2022	Updated Option Area Extents

Drawn:	AL
Approved:	GE
Sheet No:	1 of 1
Sheet Size:	A3




The information contained in this document is confidential and protected by copyright. The use, copying or disclosure to a third party, other than as in fact, except with the written permission of the copyright owner, is prohibited. Dalcoeur Maclaren does not warrant that this document is, or will be, free of error and gives no accepted liability for any loss caused or arising from reliance upon information provided herein. Although our best efforts have been made to ensure the accuracy of these plans, all measurements must be confirmed on the ground prior to the construction of the proposed works. This document is reproduced from the Ordnance Survey map with the sanction of the Controller of H.M. Stationery Office. Crown Copyright Reserved. © OS Licence No. 100048814

REPRODUCED FROM THE ORDNANCE SURVEY MAP
WITH PERMISSION OF THE CONTROLLER
OF H.M. STATIONERY OFFICE
CROWN COPYRIGHT RESERVED
LICENCE NO: 100048814


Drawing Location: C:\Users\andrew.lamb\Documents\Awel y Môr Offshore Wind Farm - Geomatics\102 Working Data\Option Plans\197212_PLN_OP_1.1.mxd





Inset Scale : 1 : 500





[Continues on Sheet 8]



Inset Scale : 1 : 750




Inset Scale : 1 : 750




[Continues on Sheet 10]

REPRODUCED FROM THE ORDNANCE SURVEY MAP
WITH PERMISSION OF THE CONTROLLER
OF H.M. STATIONERY OFFICE
CROWN COPYRIGHT RESERVED
LICENCE NO: 100048814



- LEGEND
- Order Limits
 - Land Subject to Temporary Occupation and Use and Freehold Acquisition
 - Land Subject to Temporary Occupation and Use and Acquisition of Permanent Rights
 - Land Subject to Temporary Occupation and Use



ORDNANCE SURVEY

Land Plans - Onshore

DATE	BY	REVISION	STATUS	DESCRIPTION
1	2020/02/20	Final	CD	RE

PROJECT TITLE: 1921212_LP-002

Sheet No: 9 of 10

AWEL Y MŌR