

CWCC’s written response to CAH1 and ISH2 Action points (5 March 2026)

Table 1: CAH1 Action Points

Extracts from the CAH Agenda/Actions points are provided in blue

CAH1 Agenda	Action Point	CWCC comments
3 d)		Protective Provisions
	4 i)	<p>In respect of the Runcorn Spur planning application:</p> <p>i. are there any joint working arrangements or a protocol with Halton BC for the handling of the cross-boundary planning application?</p>
		<p>Note: the following answers in relation to the Runcorn Spur planning application questions have been shared with Halton Borough Council – any further comment from Halton BC will be provided at Deadline 5.</p> <p>There are two applications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25/00293/FULEIA (Halton BC) - Proposed construction of a new carbon dioxide spur pipeline, an Above Ground Installation (AGI), plus ancillary works and equipment to serve Viridor Energy from Waste (EfW) Facility Carbon Capture Plant at Runcorn Carbon Dioxide Spur Pipeline (Application validated 8 July 2025); and • 25/02108/FUL (CWCC) - Construction of a new Carbon Dioxide Spur Pipeline and Above Ground Installation (AGI) and ancillary equipment to serve the Viridor Energy from Waste (Efw) Facility Carbon Capture Plant (Application validated 15 Aug 2025). There is no Planning Performance Agreement for this application. <p>The approach taken has been for two applications, one to each local planning authority, seeking planning permission for the development of land falling within each local planning authority’s respective administrative area. The relevant parcel of land for each local planning authority’s area will be identified on a site plan to accompany any decision.</p> <p>There has been joint working throughout the pre-application and formal application process, including joint meetings with the applicant.</p>

		The Councils' respective planning case officers are liaising over the processing of the cross-boundary applications. Each local planning authority will issue a decision, it is expected that Halton BC's application will be determined under officer delegation, and Cheshire West and Chester Council's application is expected to be determined by its Planning Committee.
	4 ii)	ii. what would be the approach to planning conditions – would identical conditions need to be agreed by both authorities?
		Draft planning conditions would be shared with the Applicant for comment prior to issuing a decision. Planning conditions would be aligned across the two decisions as far as practical, although some conditions may only be applicable to development on one side of the boundary, e.g. in relation to works within the non-breeding bird mitigation area (works within Cheshire West and Chester Council's boundary) and/or the AGI works (within Halton BC's area). Further discussion is expected with the Applicant in relation to the need for Section 106 planning obligations, e.g. in relation to dealing with Biodiversity Net Gain and associated monitoring.
	4 iii)	iii. has a mechanism been discussed or agreed with Halton BC in respect of the approach to be taken to non-breeding bird mitigation area and the issue relating to the assessment of effects depending on the timing of implementation the respective schemes?
		No detailed discussions have taken place with Halton BC regarding the mechanism/approach to the non-breeding bird mitigation area etc.
	4 iv)	iv. what are each authority's timescales for the consideration / determination of the Runcorn Spur applications (insofar as the timing is known at this stage)? Are they likely to be determined during the examination (closes 30 April 2026) or reporting (three months following the close of the examination) periods of this DCO application?
		The application to CWCC is not expected to go to Planning Committee before 30 April 2026. It is likely that the application would be determined in the three months following close of the examination. An extension of time for determination of the CWCC's application (25/02108/FUL) has been agreed until 10 May 2026, although it may be necessary to further extend this depending on progress. The Applicant provided further information in response to

		<p>Natural England’s initial comments on the application, and Natural England’s further response is expected shortly. Currently awaited comments from the Council’s Natural Environment Officer are expected to raise a number of matters that will require further consideration and response by the Applicant.</p> <p>The application to Halton BC is expected to be determined within a similar timeframe.</p>
--	--	---

Table 2: ISH2 Action Points

Extracts from the ISH2 Agenda/Actions points are provided in blue

ISH2 Agenda	Action Point	CWCC comments
3 a)		Human Health, Fire Risk, Safety and Security
	3	Submit evidence of approved control mechanism which is in place in respect of ice build-up on the nearby wind turbines (condition 42 of the wind farm permission).
		<p>In relation to the risk of ice throw from nearby wind turbines, this was considered at the time of the Frodsham Wind Farm (FWF) consent. Condition 42 of the consent required a scheme to mitigate the risk identified in term of residents/walkers. The scheme identified that ice throw is three times more likely than blade failure. Ice throw would usually be less than 140m, with a worst-case distance of 250m. distance. The scheme incorporates rotor imbalance detection with auto shut off. There is also a risk of ice drop as well as ice throw.</p> <p>The FWF Inspector’s report (July 2012): covered the issue noting the following:</p> <p>“Any risk associated with the proposed development’s proximity to the existing COMAH regulated sites, GrowHow UK Ltd and Ineos ChlorVinyls [158-160, 214, 382-385]</p> <p>595. The concerns of the local community that insufficient information has been made available to reassure them that risk has been adequately addressed is perhaps understandable. On the other hand there is unequivocal agreement from the Health and Safety Executive that risk has been adequately considered. The local community should be able to take comfort from that. The</p>

ISH2 Agenda	Action Point	CWCC comments
		<p>proximity to the COMAH regulated sites has been fully taken into account.</p> <p>596. Of course risk of some sort associated with this proposal cannot be entirely eliminated unless development is not permitted. Local residents referred to matters such as fire, blade throw and ice throw. Each of these matters is rare, though has occurred at other sites. However, the likelihood of that happening here is very small and insufficient to weigh against the development.”</p> <p>Condition 42 of the FWF consent provides:</p> <p>“(42) Prior to the commencement of the Development, a scheme for mitigating risk of ice throw from the turbines shall be submitted to approved in writing by the LPA and thereafter implemented in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the safety of residents and walkers.”</p> <p>The following scheme was submitted and approved under reference 14/05180/DIS.</p> <p>Frodsham Wind Farm Planning Condition 42: Ice Throw (Parsons Brinckerhoff November 2014).</p> <p>A copy of the approved scheme is appended (Appendix A).</p>
3 b)		Traffic, Transport and Navigation
	8	To respond to the most recent edits to the CTMP, thus potentially resolving the issue regarding the construction access traffic plan for HGVs
		<p>At paragraph 4.1.6 the CTMP [REP3-019] it refers to the detailed CTMP including an illustrative plan or map showing the construction traffic access route, including routes that are not to be provided.</p> <p>Whilst it would be preferable to have a plan to accompany the oCTMP, the commitment to provide one with the detailed CTMP is considered sufficient.</p> <p>CWCC recommends that the oCTMP paragraph 4.1.6 be amended to omit the term ‘illustrative’ and add that the plan will be accompanied by a scheme of HGV and construction traffic route signage.</p>

ISH2 Agenda	Action Point	CWCC comments
		Any further comments from Highway/PRoW will be provided at Deadline 5 .
3 c)		Non-motorised users and public rights of way (PRoW)
	14	To explore the FWF planning permission for any emergency response plan and fire access, then to give details of any restrictive weight signage that might deter fire appliances from crossing.
		<p>Cheshire Fire & Rescue Services comments on the of the application for FWF were summarised in the report to Planning Committee as follows:</p> <p>“The Applicant should be advised that means of escape should be provided in accordance with Building Regulations. Should the premises be subject to Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005, then the responsible person who will occupy the building will need to carry out a fire safety risk assessment. In which case further fire safety measures may be necessary. Access and facilities for the fire service should be in accordance with guidance in Approved Document B of the Building Regulations 2000.”</p> <p>There does not appear to be any emergency response plan and fire access submitted as part of the FWF submission. It is understood that FWF have an emergency response plan. The Joint Emergency Planning team were consulted and made comments on the plan, but they do not hold the plan. FWF may be able to provide a copy of the updated plan.</p> <p>The issue of restrictive weight signage will need to be checked, and any further information will be provided at Deadline 5.</p>
3 d)		Landscape and Visual effects (including historic environment and glint and glare)
	27	<p>In respect of the historic environment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="507 1608 1465 1753">i. provide a response to the December 2025 draft NPPF and any implications this might have in respect of the applicant’s conclusions (action for the applicant but CWCC may comment if it wishes to); and <li data-bbox="507 1783 1465 1939">ii. provide a tabulated summary or ‘read across’ of the applicant’s and CWCC’s conclusions in relation to the effects of the development using the same terminology as NPS EN -1 and the NPPF. (Deadline 5 item)

ISH2 Agenda	Action Point	CWCC comments
		The ExA's request for completion of the Historic Environment table by the Applicant and CWCC is being prepared and will be provided at Deadline 5 along with CWCC's comments on the draft 2025 NPPF.
3 e)		Green Belt
	28	Provide: i. an updated Green Belt Assessment (Appendix A of the Planning Statement [APP -128]); and ii. a tabulated summary or 'read across' of the applicant's and CWCC's conclusions in relation to harms and benefits of the that the parties considered should be weighed in the 'green belt balance', taking account of CWCC's comment that it considers some of the benefits listed by the applicant to be mitigation. (Deadline 5 item)
		The ExA's request under ii) for completion of the Green Belt table by the Applicant and CWCC is being prepared and will be provided at Deadline 5 .
		Update on Council's Green Belt assessment for the Local Plan.
		The Council's draft Green Belt Assessment being carried out in connection with the emerging Local Plan is expected to be published towards the end of April 2026 (for consideration by Scrutiny Committee on 27 April 2026).
3 f)		Biodiversity and Ecology (including Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) aspects
	33	CWCC to provide response on mitigation and compensation case law from the applicant. (Deadline 5 item)
		CWCC will respond to the Applicant's Deadline 4 submission at Deadline 5 .
	39	Make any further submissions in respect of the interaction between any DCO and any permission for the Runcorn spur in respect of the concern relating to the NBBMA. Set out a logical and reasonable solution for resolving the differences (including Liverpool Bay CCS Ltd commentary as applicable) and for assessing the impacts if the

ISH2 Agenda	Action Point	CWCC comments
		<p>Runcorn Spur Pipeline was to be delivered after the NBBMA had been established.</p> <p>Provide views on the logistics, pros and cons of imposing a Grampian-style requirement on the DCO preventing work beginning on the NBBMA unless and until the pipeline was laid and/ or the potential for a section of pipeline to be laid by the applicant. Also set out what powers the applicant, as landowner, would have on timing of the works of the Runcorn Spur (if approved).</p> <p>(Deadline 4 and 5 item)</p>
		<p>The following comprise the Council’s initial comments pending receipt of any comments from the Applicant (or Liverpool Bay CCS Ltd), and the Council reserves its position to provide further comments at Deadline 5.</p> <p>It appears to be common ground between the Applicant and the Council that construction of the pipeline following establishment of the NBBMA (which is Scenario 3 at page 176 of PD2-027) would need to be controlled to avoid an adverse impact on the integrity of the European site.</p> <p>At present the assessment of cumulative impacts is awaited, but uncontrolled it appears likely that there would be adverse impacts, associated with habitat loss, disturbance and degradation of functionally linked land used by non-breeding SPA qualifying features. In terms of Scenario 3 in particular, the NBBMA concentrates the FWF / Frodsham Solar mitigation/ compensation into a smaller area, and disturbance is liable to have greater impact than other scenarios. The potential hydrological impacts (including the operational stage) in relation to the pipeline (as raised by Natural England) are noted too (see Appendix B).</p> <p>It also appears to be common ground between the Applicant, Liverpool Bay CCS Ltd and the Council, that the intention is to construct the pipeline before the NBBMA is functional. However, the mechanism for controlling the timing of the two projects to avoid an adverse cumulative impact has not as yet been agreed.</p> <p>The Council’s suggestion of a legal agreement has been resisted by the Applicant. The Applicant is understood to be in control of the land in terms of an option and needing to provide consent for the pipeline to be constructed. In the SoCG REP1-039 (point 7) the applicant “already holds an Option over the relevant land meaning that LBCCS’s project will only be able to proceed if the Applicant grants consent to an additional option being granted to LBCCS over the same land, even if that is agreed by Peel NRE.”</p> <p>The Council considers that a legal agreement between the three main parties (and any other interested party such as Peel NRE)</p>

ISH2 Agenda	Action Point	CWCC comments
		<p>would remain the preferred mechanism to co—ordinate the two projects, but in the absence of this, alternative mechanisms need to be considered.</p> <p>The Applicant has suggested that control be exercised by CWCC to impose conditions on the pipeline application 25/02108/FUL. It is understood that this would be to the effect that if the DCO is granted and the NBBMA is provided before the pipeline is installed, then the pipeline could not proceed, or at least it could not proceed without further Habitat Regulations assessment and appropriate mitigation being presented.</p> <p>It would not be appropriate for the Council to fetter its determination of that application by committing to a position under the DCO process. However, there are reservations about applying such conditions, particularly in advance of determination of the application for development consent.</p> <p>At ISH2, the ExA suggested consideration be given to the potential for conditions relating to the state of the land at the time of implementation of the pipeline (as opposed to specifically the NBBMA under the DCO).</p> <p>Further consideration will be given to controls appropriate for the pipeline application outside of the DCO process.</p> <p>The option of imposing a planning condition to achieve control via a two-stage process, and further HRA if appropriate at the condition discharge stage, appears unlikely to satisfy the requirements of the Habitat Regulations.</p> <p>In terms of Frodsham Solar, the potential for additional / exacerbated adverse impacts on the European site associated with sequential phasing of the pipeline project shortly after the NBBMA being established is a situation already identified and should be addressed at this stage of assessment.</p> <p>It is also noted that LBCCS have questioned the appropriateness of using a planning condition to control programming of another scheme (point 4 in the SoCG REP1-039).</p> <p>The timetable for determination of the Runcorn CO2 spur pipeline remains uncertain. There is an extension of time on application 25/02108/FUL until 10 May 2026. The earliest consideration of the application by CWCC’s Planning Committee would be May 2026, and this is not only pending Natural England’s response to the CO2 spur applicant’s submission of further information to address the points raised by Natural England in their letter of 18 December 2025 [REP1-048 CWCC Written Representations - Appendix D], but also being able to resolve any other comments from consultees, notably National Highways and</p>

ISH2 Agenda	Action Point	CWCC comments
		<p>the Natural Environment Officer of CWCC. Whilst the Council would make efforts to determine the application as expeditiously as possible, there remains a realistic possibility that a decision on 25/02108/FUL would not be made before the ExA's recommendation report to the SoS on the draft DCO has been issued.</p> <p>Turning to the controls via the draft DCO (as opposed to whatever separate conditions might be applied on the TCPA application), and in the absence of a legal agreement, the Council considers that one option may be to introduce a requirement in the DCO to restrict any further development, works or activities within the NBBMA, other than those permitted as part of the adaptive management under the oNBBMS [REP3-032], for a given period following the NBBMA being notified/accepted to the Council as being functional. The period would need to be informed by the HRA which the Applicant is currently updating. It is envisaged that this would in the order of 24 months from the NBBMA being established as functional.</p> <p>The above restriction would also apply to development, works and activities not associated with the authorised development in Cell 1 and those parts of Cell 2 comprised in the SADA.</p> <p>In addition to concerns over the cumulative impacts over phasing of the pipeline within the NBBMA, works in Cell 2 close to the NBBMA could have similar impacts, and works at the 'tip' of Cell 1, where the pipeline crosses the River Weaver, has additional potential for cumulative impacts that have not been assessed. Restricting works for a period of [24] months would be consistent with a precautionary approach advocated in connection with HRA.</p> <p>The above additional requirement and article 38 'Planning permission etc' of the draft DCO [REP2-002] would need to be drafted/amended to ensure the temporary restriction on development being carried out in the NBBMA would be enforceable. This would need to restrict development being carried out during the relevant period under planning permissions granted before the coming into force of the Order, as well as those coming in after.</p> <p>The additional requirement referred to above, could be drafted to dis-apply the temporary restriction and allow specified works to be carried out in the period subject to approval by the Council.</p> <p>The use of a Grampian style requirement in the DCO preventing work on the NBBMA until the pipeline was laid and/ or the potential for a section of pipeline to be laid is understood to be not acceptable to the Applicant. It would have the advantage of addressing the apparently worst-case scenario of the pipeline being installed shortly after the NBBMA is provided, and the resultant</p>

ISH2 Agenda	Action Point	CWCC comments
		adverse impacts associated with such prolonged and intense disturbance over a relatively short period of time. However, it may not meet the tests, in particular in being precise (as there is currently no pipeline scheme approved), it may be difficult to conclude that it is a necessary requirement (again as there is no approved pipeline scheme, and whilst it may be argued as necessary in order to avoid otherwise adverse impacts, it does not appear to be relevant to the development proposed in the DCO application. It would appear to be enforceable and relevant to planning but also may not be regarded as reasonable in all other respects, given it would involve a forced co-ordination of two separate projects.
3 g)		Ground Conditions
	44	Respond to the applicant's chemical summary note and the representations from Cllr Mrs Sumner (watch recording of today's event for details), and whether the risks are appropriately scoped and can be managed. (Deadline 5 item)
		<p>A response to the applicant's chemical summary note will be provided at Deadline 5.</p> <p>In response to Cllr Mrs Sumner's representations, any further comments will be provided at Deadline 5. However, CWCC's Environmental Protection team advise that fire safety is not a matter that they have expertise on and either the Health and Safety Executive, or UK Health Security Agency, may provide further guidance.</p>
3 h)		The Water Environment
	49	To respond in writing to confirm the finished floor level of 6.52m AOD is acceptable for the refuge area.
		The Joint Cheshire Emergency Planning Team note that the Environment Agency (EA) are the lead flood agency and therefore the experts when it comes to the modelling. The EA's original recommendation [REP1-050 (EA019)] was for the finished floor level of safe refuge areas to be raised to the H++ tidal scenario (+ 1.9m of seal level rise, with a maximum water level of 8.57m AOD estimated). The Applicant considered the H++ scenario for sensitivity testing rather than to inform design requirements, The Applicant's design proposal is based on 630mm freeboard above the 0.5% AEP plus

ISH2 Agenda	Action Point	CWCC comments
		<p>upper end CC (2075) defended tidal flood level, to arrive at the refuge level of 6.52m AOD. Given the Environment Agency has not objected to the Applicant's proposal but defers to the Council/Joint Emergency Planning team, on this matter the Council's Lead Local Flood Authority has advised that the Applicant's modelling to arrive at 6.52m AOD is reasonable in the circumstances.</p> <p>The Joint Cheshire Emergency Planning team have not been part of the modelling and rely on the expertise of the flood authorities. On the basis of no objection from either the EA or LLFA, Joint Cheshire Emergency Planning accept 6.52m AOD as the minimum design level for the refuge areas.</p> <p>The Council also recommend that reference to the use of the inverters / transformer substations as safe refuges at a minimum level of 6.52m AOD be included in the Design Parameters Statement [REP3-012].</p>
3 i)		Any other matters that the ExA wishes to raise including but not limited to:
	53	To update on the planning status of both traveller sites and the timescale for handling any related planning matters
		<p>For the southern traveller site, the period for compliance with the enforcement notice expired on 26 July 2025. Only the southern site is subject to the enforcement notice.</p> <p>The two pending planning applications, one for each of the traveller sites, are not expected to be determined before 30 April 2026. However, it is likely that the applications would be determined in the three months following close of the examination.</p>
	56	Confirm position regarding noise nuisance and issues with article 8.
		<p>As noted at ISH2 the Council accepts that such defence to proceedings provisions are contained in other DCO's and as such withdraws its concerns to the inclusion of article 8 covering matters such as decommissioning.</p> <p>CWCC welcomes the suggestion of reviewing the wording of the provision to potentially omit reference to operation and use, whilst allowing for such defence to continue to cover replacement activities</p>

ISH2 Agenda	Action Point	CWCC comments
		and other maintenance activities. CWCC will work with the Applicant to agree wording for Deadline 5 .
	58	Council to confirm when the needs assessment for waste would come in and the weight the ExA should give to that document. Also to reflect on the waste policy position and the proposal's acceptability in respect of NPS EN-1 para 5.18.8.
		<p>The updated Waste Needs Assessment is expected to be available mid-April. It is expected that details will be provided to the ExA prior to the close of the Examination.</p> <p>In terms of weight to be given to the Waste Needs Assessment, the updates to the assessment support the managing waste policies in the development plan (Policy ENV8 of LP1 and Policies DM54 'Waste management facilities' and DM55 'Sites for replacement household waste recycling facilities' of LP2). The update also supports the development of the new Local Plan and will be used when preparing the Regulation 19 stage waste policies. The Waste Needs assessment has been updated previously, since the 2012/2013 and 2016 versions referred to respectively in LP1 and LP2 above, and the replacement of the current 2023 version with the new version provides an more up to date base on which to consider waste issues, whether under the TCPA and local plan policies or under the DCO process and EN-1.</p> <p>There is a policy expectation for waste to be driven up the waste hierarchy and a need to intensify recycling to reach the Government's expectations regarding residual waste reduction by 2042.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that waste arisings from the development would have a significant adverse effect on the capacity of existing waste management facilities to deal with other waste arisings in the area. The Waste Needs Assessment 2023 identifies that there is sufficient waste management capacity in existing sites and sites with planning permission to meet the projected waste management requirements up to 2045. The Waste Needs Assessment update will confirm whether net self-sufficiency in waste management is still expected to be achieved.</p>

ISH2 Agenda	Action Point	CWCC comments
		<p>In relation to the circular economy objectives, the Applicant's clarification that replacement of solar panels is expected once (plus 10% for damages etc) during the operational life is welcome.</p> <p>Comments from CWCC's response to Q9.7.3 [REP2-005] continue to apply:-</p> <p>Table 5-11 states compliance with the waste hierarchy but doesn't state what that will mean in practice. All waste holders need to demonstrate they are complying with the waste hierarchy in priority order i.e. from the top down. This means that any maintenance and decommissioning plan should set out clearly how the panels will be assessed to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • they are checked for suitability for reuse (following repair or refurbishment if needed), failing that; • the receiving recycling sites are maximising the amount of materials recovered for recycling and achieving high quality recycling with those materials (rather than downcycling); • minimising the amount of materials that end up managed as residual waste (intact panels should be handled as WEEE - see below). 3. Table 5-11 refers to the panels being dismantled and being sent to specialist PV recycling facilities, but it is not clear what such facilities exist. <p>It would be useful for the applicant to commit to inclusion of relevant points above in the Waste Management Plan (referred to in Table 5-11 of the oOEMP [REP3-023]; the regular audits referred to in the table should assist in driving waste up the hierarchy; and a commitment to review the audits not just for compliance, but with an adaptive management philosophy to improve on existing arrangement would be welcome/expected for the detailed WMP.</p>

Appendix A – Frodsham Wind Farm Planning Condition 42: Ice Throw (Parsons Brinckerhoff November 2014) - 14/05180/DIS.

Appendix B - Extract from Natural England letter 18 December 2025 ((25/02108/FUL) (Ref: 524950) [REP1-048 Appendix D]

Appendix A – Frodsham Wind Farm Planning Condition 42: Ice Throw (Parsons Brinckerhoff November 2014) - 14/05180/DIS.

Insert Appendix A here.

Appendix B – Extract from Natural England letter 18 December 2025 (25/02108/FUL) (Ref: 524950) [REP1-048 Appendix D]

Proposed construction of a new carbon dioxide spur pipeline, an Above Ground Installation (AGI), plus ancillary works and equipment to serve Viridor Energy from Waste (EfW) Facility Carbon Capture Plant at Runcorn Carbon Dioxide Spur Pipeline

Additional information required Natural England's main concerns regarding this development relate to the potential for operational impacts of the section of pipeline that is planned within Cell 3 of the Frodsham dredging lagoons, this area is secured as mitigation land for SPA birds under the permission for the Frodsham Wind Farm (Cheshire West and Chester Council ref. 14/02525/DIS).

The HRA does not consider the operational impacts of the pipeline on the existing mitigation land or the habitats within the mitigation area that are being proposed by the Frodsham Solar Farm development which will overlap with the pipeline and therefore also has the potential for incombination impacts. The extent of the in-combination issues needs to be fully considered within the HRA.

There is potential for the pipeline to impact on the hydrology of the mitigation area and so impact on the existing and planned wetland habitats which will secure alternative supporting habitat for SPA birds which are displaced due to a loss of functionally linked land as a result of the wind farm and the solar farm. The long-term impacts of the pipeline within this mitigation area and on the function of the supporting habitats needs to be considered within the HRA.

It is stated that soil stabilisation techniques will be required within Cells 1-4 to support the construction corridor and enable excavation of the pipeline trench and we welcome the description that the applicant has provided on this within the HRA. However, the impacts of the soil stabilisation requirements on wetland habitats within Cell 3 must be considered within the HRA. There is a concern regarding the pipeline and required soil stabilisation works to either block or alter the movement of water within Cell 3 and so limit the amount of suitable habitat for SPA birds.

It is also not clear how the timing of construction works will be aligned with the overlapping Frodsham Solar Farm development and secured. Information from the applicant of the solar farm suggests that the construction works for the spur pipeline may not come ahead of the solar farm and so all alternative scenarios should be considered within the HRA.

Noting that it has been some time since the HRA was submitted, we advise any recent updates as result of discussions with the solar farm applicants are updated within the HRA by the applicant and we ask that clarity is provided on any measures to secure construction timing.