

From: [Planning Inspectorate](#)
To: [Connahs Quay](#)
Subject: Fwd: Objection to Connah's Quay CCGT Change Application – Local Employment and Energy Cost Concerns
Date: 27 January 2026 10:19:48

You don't often get email from support@pinssupport.zendesk.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

100

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Kursad Curtis Turker

Date: 22/01/2026, 09:14:49

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed changes associated with the Connah's Quay Low Carbon Power Project and to raise wider concerns regarding the overall development.

My objection is based on economic, social, environmental and strategic grounds, particularly the negative impact on local people, long-term energy costs and the continued reliance on gas-fired generation.

Firstly, the project appears to rely heavily on the use of non-local contractors and an imported workforce. There is no clear or binding commitment to prioritise local contractors, local labour or meaningful skills development for people in Flintshire, Ellesmere Port, Wirral and the surrounding areas. Instead, the proposal suggests that specialist contractors and workers will be brought in from elsewhere, with associated accommodation, logistics and infrastructure impacts borne locally. This approach offers limited long-term benefit to the community and actively undermines local employment, apprenticeships and skills transfer.

Furthermore, the relocation and expansion of contractor facilities within the site boundary

reinforces the concern that this development is structured around external workforces rather than investment in local capability. Any short-term construction activity that excludes local people cannot reasonably be presented as economic regeneration.

Secondly, the reliance on combined-cycle gas turbine technology, even when paired with carbon capture, represents a continuation of outdated energy strategy. Gas turbines are increasingly exposed to geopolitical risk. Following the reduction in Russian gas supply, the UK has become more dependent on imported liquefied natural gas, particularly from the United States. This gas is demonstrably more expensive, more carbon intensive when lifecycle emissions are considered and subject to global price volatility. So Carbon capture is just a green washing technic used by the company's project.

As a result, electricity generated from gas-fired plant will continue to drive up consumer energy bills and increase the cost per kWh paid by households and businesses. Carbon capture does not address fuel price risk, nor does it protect consumers from long-term exposure to international gas markets. The proposal therefore conflicts with the stated objective of delivering affordable and secure energy.

Thirdly, while carbon capture is presented as a mitigation measure, it remains an energy-intensive, costly and operationally complex technology. It reduces net plant efficiency, increases auxiliary power consumption and introduces additional operational risk. Any underperformance, downtime or partial operation of the carbon capture system would result in higher emissions than claimed, while still locking the region into fossil fuel infrastructure for decades.

In addition, the permanent loss of designated habitat areas, even if classified as low ecological value, represents a cumulative erosion of local green space within an already industrialised area. The justification for reclassification is driven by operational convenience rather than environmental stewardship and sets a concerning precedent.

The proposed expansion of hardstanding at the North Jetty also raises concerns regarding increased industrialisation of the estuary, construction traffic and disruption during delivery of abnormal loads. While water transport may reduce some road impacts, the scale and duration of construction activity remains significant and insufficiently offset by local benefit.

In summary, this project prioritises corporate operational efficiency over local economic inclusion, locks consumers into higher long-term energy costs and extends dependence on gas generation at a time when investment should be focused on genuinely future-proofed, lower-risk alternatives. Carbon capture does not resolve these fundamental issues.

For these reasons, I object to the proposed changes and urge the Planning Inspectorate and the Secretary of State to give significant weight to the cumulative social, economic and strategic harm this development would cause to local communities and should not be proceed without the concerns mentioned above is secured.

Yours faithfully,

Kursad Curtis Turker, [REDACTED]