



Application by Uniper UK for an order granting development consent for the Connah's Quay Low Carbon Power Project (EN010166)
The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1): Issued on 17 February 2026
Responses are due by deadline 3: 10 March 2026

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) written questions and requests for information - ExQ1. If necessary, the examination timetable enables the ExA to issue a further round of written questions in due course. If this is done, the further round of questions will be referred to as ExQ2.

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 dated 9 December 2026 but also covering other themes and topics. Questions have been added to the framework of issues set out there as they have arisen from representations and to address the assessment of the application against relevant policies.

Column 2 of the table indicates which interested parties (IPs) and other persons each question is directed to. The ExA would be grateful if all persons named could answer all questions directed to them, providing a substantive response, or indicating that the question is not relevant to them for a reason. 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 1 (indicating that it is from ExQ1) and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on air quality and emissions issues is identified as ExQ1.1.1. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

You should respond to the questions by using the **Have your say** function on the project page of the National Infrastructure website and selecting 'Responses to Examining Authority's First Written Questions (ExQ1)' when asked.

If you are responding to a small number of questions, you can submit your answers by choosing 'Make a comment' and entering your answers in the 'Your comments' box. If you are answering a larger number of questions you should download a copy of the Microsoft Word version of the document, enter your answers and save the document using an appropriate file name. You can then submit the completed document by selecting 'Upload files'.



Planning Inspectorate
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Email the case team on connahsquay@planninginspectorate.gov.uk for a Microsoft Word version of the ExA's written questions, enter your answers and save the document using an appropriate file name. You can then submit the completed document by choosing 'Make a comment' and selecting 'Upload files'.



Planning Inspectorate Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Acronyms and Abbreviations used:

| | |
|------------------|--|
| AEoI | Adverse Effect on Integrity |
| AGI | Above Ground Installation |
| AIL | Abnormal Indivisible Load |
| ALC | Agricultural Land Classification |
| AoC | Adequacy of Consultation |
| AQAL | Air Quality Assessment Levels |
| AQMA | Air Quality Management Area |
| Art | Article |
| ALA1981 | Acquisition of Land Act 1981 |
| BMV | Best and Most Versatile (Land) |
| C&IEA | Construction and Indicative Enhancement Area |
| BoR | Book of Reference |
| CA | Compulsory Acquisition |
| CAH | Compulsory Acquisition Hearing |
| CCGT | Combined Cycle Gas Turbine |
| CCP | Carbon Capture Plant |
| CCS | Carbon Capture and Storage |
| CCUS | Carbon Capture, Utilisation and Storage |
| CEMP | Construction Environmental Management Plan |
| CMTTP | Construction Management Travel Plan |
| CO2 | Carbon Dioxide |
| CoMAH | Control of Major Accident Hazard |
| CQLCP | Connah's Quay Low Carbon Power |
| CWTP | Construction Workers Travel Plan |
| DCO | Development Consent Order |
| dDCO | draft Development Consent Order |



Planning Inspectorate Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

| | |
|-------------|---|
| DEMP | Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan |
| DMRB | Design Manual for Roads and Bridges |
| DNS | Deeside Naturalist Society |
| EM | Explanatory Memorandum |
| EMF | Electro-Magnetic Field |
| EN-1 | The National Policy Statement for Energy |
| EN-2 | The National Policy Statement for Natural Gas Electricity Generating Infrastructure |
| EN-4 | The National Policy Statement for Natural Gas Supply Infrastructure and Gas and Oil Pipelines |
| EN-5 | The NPS for Electricity Networks Infrastructure |
| ES | Environmental Statement |
| ExA | Examining Authority |
| FCC | Flintshire County Council |
| FEED | Front-End Engineering Designs |
| FLDP | Flintshire Local Development Plan |
| ha | Hectares |
| HAT | Highest Astronomical Tide |
| HE | Historic England (Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England) |
| HGV | Heavy Goods Vehicles |
| HRA | Habitats Regulations Assessment |
| ISH | Issue Specific Hearing |
| LAT | Lowest Astronomical Tide |
| LIR | Local Impact Report |
| LPA | Local Planning Authority |
| LSE | Likely Significant Effect |
| MCA | Maritime and Coastguard Agency |
| MDA | Main Development Area |
| MHWS | Mean High Water Springs |
| MMO | Marine Management Organisation |
| MSL | Mean Sea Level |



Planning Inspectorate Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| NE | Natural England |
| NGET | National Grid Electricity Transmission |
| NH3 | Ammonia |
| NOX | Nitrogen Oxide |
| NPS | National Policy Statement |
| NRA | Navigational Risk Assessment |
| NRW | Natural Resources Wales |
| NSIP | Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project |
| NTS | Non Technical Summary |
| OD | Ordnance Datum |
| OFH | Open Floor Hearing |
| OLEMP | Outline Environmental Management Plan |
| OSWDS | Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy |
| PHW | Public Health Wales |
| PRoW | Public Right of Way |
| RIHRA | Report to Inform Habitats Regulations Assessment |
| RR | Relevant Representation |
| SAC | Special Area of Conservation |
| SCR | Selective Catalytic Reduction |
| SOCG or SoCG | Statement of Common Ground |
| SoS | Secretary of State |
| SPA | Special Protection Area |
| SUDS | Sustainable Drainage Strategy (or System) |
| TCE | The Crown Estate |
| TP | Temporary Possession |
| TPO | Tree Preservation Order |
| UKHSA | United Kingdom Health Security Agency |
| UXO | Unexploded Ordnance |



Planning Inspectorate Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

| | |
|-------------|----------------------------|
| VP | View Point |
| WAG | Welsh Assembly Government |
| WNMP | Welsh National Marine Plan |
| ZoI | Zone of Influence |

The Examination Library

References in these questions set out in square brackets (for example [APP-0XX]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library. The Examination Library can be obtained from the following link: [EL web link](#)

It will be updated as the examination progresses.

Citation of questions

Questions in this table should be cited as follows:

Question reference: issue reference: question number, for example ExQ1 1.1 – refers to question 1 in this table.



| | |
|--------------|--|
| Index | |
| 1 | General and cross-topic questions.....8 |
| 2 | Design, parameters and other details of the proposed development8 |
| 3 | Project alternatives8 |
| 4 | Planning policy8 |
| 5 | Need.....9 |
| 6 | Air quality9 |
| 7 | Noise and vibration12 |
| 8 | Traffic and transport13 |
| 9 | Terrestrial and aquatic ecology.....14 |
| 10 | Marine ecology18 |
| 11 | Water environment and flood risk.....18 |
| 12 | Geology and ground conditions19 |
| 13 | Landscape and visual amenity19 |
| 14 | Physical processes19 |
| 15 | Terrestrial heritage20 |
| 16 | Marine heritage20 |
| 17 | Socio-economics, recreation and tourism20 |
| 18 | Climate change20 |
| 19 | Human health 21 |
| 20 | Major accidents and disasters..... 21 |
| 21 | Materials and waste..... 22 |
| 22 | Cumulative and combined effects..... 22 |
| 23 | Development consent order [APP-019] 23 |
| | Articles.....23 |
| | Schedule 2 – Requirements..... 24 |
| 24 | Compulsory acquisition, temporary possession and other land or rights considerations 24 |

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|---|---------------|---|
| 1 General and cross-topic questions | | |
| Q1.1 | The applicant | Simultaneous or phased construction programme ([APP-040] Ref: 6.2.2.17) What are the governing factors and reasons that will dictate the decision whether to approach constructing the trains concurrently (simultaneously) or consecutively (phased) and how might this evolve during the examination to help refine the overall length of the construction period and impacts thereof? |
| Q1.2 | The applicant | Existing power station ([APP-040] Ref: 6.2.2.2.23) If it is proposed to retain the existing power station at the Connah's Quay, why might the plant not continue to run at full capacity? |
| Q1.3 | The applicant | Interaction with the HyNet proposed development What will happen if the HyNet proposed development is not operational and ready to accommodate the CO2 output from the Connah's Quay proposed development and what are the contingency plans in the event of this happening or failing to be developed? |
| 2 Design, parameters and other details of the proposed development | | |
| Q2.1 | The applicant | Existing power station ([APP-043] Ref: 6.2.5.2.1) How does the demolition of the AGI at the MDA affect the existing Connah's Quay power station operation? |
| Q2.2 | The applicant | Good design (Ref: NPS EN-1 4.7) Where is the evidence that the applicant has applied "good design" to the proposal and iterated improvements as per NPS EN-1? In particular, what design approaches have been taken to help shape the following themes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aesthetics to balance the sensitive nature of the development in the landscape along with identifying its critical national need and importance to national energy production and local economic support, • Future reuse of the proposed development in a future energy or alternative scenario, • Recognising the long history of energy production and support to the national energy need the site has supported, and; • Recognising the cultural history of the site and the need to provide for future Welsh generations? |
| 3 Project alternatives | | |
| Q3.1 | The applicant | Site Selection What alternative options were considered for producing the same power output, support to the NGET and carbon efficiencies at the site? |
| Q3.2 | The applicant | Site Selection What alternative locations were considered for siting the proposed development outside of the order limits? |
| Q3.3 | The applicant | Existing power station Why has the option of installing the CCP to the existing power station not been further considered and why was this not a viable "Do Minimum" option? |
| 4 Planning policy | | |
| Q4.1 | The applicant | Unabated operation of the proposed development ([APP-045] Ref: 6.2.7.3.2) What condition is in place to ensure the plant does not operate continuously in an unabated condition |

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|----------------------|----------------------|--|
| Q4.2 | The applicant | Unabated operation of the proposed development ([APP-045] Ref: 6.2.7.3.2) What conditions are proposed to ensure the proposed development aligns with the Government's objectives and commitment within NPS EN-1 ensuring that no more than 5% of energy generation will come from unabated gas plant? |
| Q4.3 | The applicant | Unabated operation of the proposed development ([APP-045] Ref: 6.2.7.3.13) How does the operation of the proposed development align to the 90% threshold set within NPS EN-1? |
| Q4.4 | The applicant FCC | Welsh National Marine Plan ([APP-045] Ref: 6.2.7.3.34) How does the proposed development align to the Welsh National Marine Plan? |
| Q4.5 | The applicant FCC | North Wales Energy Strategy ([APP-045] Ref: 6.2.7.4.11) How does the proposed development align with the North Wales Energy Strategy? |
| Q4.6 | The applicant FCC | Flintshire Local Development Plan ([APP-045] Ref: 6.2.7.4.17) How does the proposed development align to the Flintshire Local Development Plan? |
| 5 Need | | |
| Q5.1 | The applicant | Frequency of operation What is likely number of operations and frequency for the proposed development to operate to supplement the NGET network, and also potentially restart the network from a total power loss? |
| Q5.2 | The applicant | Frequency of operation ([APP-042] Ref: 6.2.4.2.12) It is implied that typically the proposed development will be operational for a quarter of the time to fill the need requirements of the NGET network. How might this change over the lifetime of the proposed development? |
| Q5.3 | The applicant | System restoration Will the proposed development provide system restoration capacity to the NGET network and how will the site operate to reinstate the network during the interim power loss? |
| 6 Air quality | | |
| Q6.1 | The applicant NRW | Zone of Influence for impacts on human health ([APP-037] Ref: 6.2.1 NTS) Why was a ZoI of 2km adopted for the consideration of the impact of emissions on human health, and given the plume distribution is this reasonable? |
| Q6.2 | The applicant NRW | Background levels of pollutants Background levels of pollutants in the vicinity of the proposed development are already noted to be high. How, with it acknowledged that the proposed development will contribute to this by as small amount as practical, will this affect the overall pollution levels, and could more be done with pollution control from the proposed development to reduce this further and help address and ameliorate the existing high background levels |
| Q6.3 | The applicant NRW | Plume distribution of emitted particles and wind direction |

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|-------|----------------------|---|
| | | Particle distribution from the emissions appears to be predicated on dominant wind direction. How might this particle distribution change in the future with shifting wind patterns or as a result of climate change? |
| Q6.4 | The applicant NRW | Localised topography and wind effects What effects does the local topography and adjacent structures have on wind patterns at the site and what is the potential for these effects to concentrate particle emissions onto nearby communities or habitats? |
| Q6.5 | The applicant NRW | Stack heights ([APP-183] Ref: App 8D 1.5.3) What is the consequence of a nominal reduction or increase in stack heights on the localised depositions and distribution of emissions? In light of the proposed change request, explain how any stack height reduction will not result in increased concentrations of pollutants. |
| Q6.6 | The applicant NRW | Amine dispersal ([APP-099] Ref: Fig 8.8) What is the reason for the indicated distribution of amines, south west to north east, approximately perpendicular to the dominant wind direction at the site? |
| Q6.7 | The applicant NRW | Nitrogen deposition ([APP-104] Ref: Fig 8.13) Why does there appear to be no dispersal of the particles in the south westerly direction and also why is the plume distribution more dominant to the north west as opposed to the south easterly plume flow? |
| Q6.8 | The applicant NRW | Variation in dispersal for abated and unabated conditions (Ref: Figs 8) What is the reason for the variation in the south westerly direction of plumes for the abated versus unabated conditions? |
| Q6.9 | The applicant NRW | Nitrogen and ammonia deposition The documents note increase in deposition of nitrogen and ammonia compounds within the designated sites and local habitats. What are the consequences of this, the mitigation measures for all sites and the likely consequences for any residual increases in these levels at the sites? |
| Q6.10 | NRW NE | HRA: Air quality modelling Are NE and NRW satisfied with the air quality modelling that has been undertaken (ES appendix 8-D [APP-183]) to inform the assessment of atmospheric pollution on European sites? |
| Q6.11 | NRW NE | HRA: Dust emissions mitigation The applicant has clarified in their Response to Relevant Representations [REP1-062] that the mitigation measures proposed to control dust emissions during construction are standard embedded measures and would be included in the project proposals irrespective of the presence of European sites. Are NE and NRW satisfied that the mitigation measures proposed to control dust emissions are embedded into the proposed development and in line with the People Over Wind ruling by the Court of Justice of the European Union and can therefore be considered during the HRA screening stage? |
| Q6.12 | The applicant | HRA: Acid deposition from exhaust emissions – construction Can the applicant signpost to the assessment of acid deposition arising from construction traffic at Dee Estuary SAC, SPA and Ramsar site and Deeside and Buckley Newt Sites SAC? If an assessment has not been undertaken, please provide an assessment of acid deposition arising from construction traffic or provide a clear justification explaining why acid deposition from construction traffic has not been assessed in the RIHRA [APP-253] . |
| Q6.13 | NE | HRA: Features of European sites - floating water plantain The applicant has provided further information in their Response to Relevant Representations [REP1-062] to explain why the floating water plantain (<i>Luronium natans</i>) qualifying feature has not been considered in the assessment of atmospheric pollution on the River Dee and Bala Lake/ Afon Dyfrdwy a Llyn Tegid SAC. Do NE consider the justification provided by the applicant to be acceptable or should the applicant provide an assessment of the potential for LSE from atmospheric pollution on populations of Floating water plantain (<i>Luronium natans</i>) within the River Dee and Bala Lake/ Afon Dyfrdwy a Llyn Tegid SAC? |

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|-------|---------------|--|
| Q6.14 | The applicant | <p>HRA: Features of European sites - floating water plantain</p> <p>The conservation objectives for the floating water-plantain qualifying feature of the River Dee and Bala Lake/ Afon Dyfrdwy a Llyn Tegid SAC states that “the lake will have sufficient habitat to support existing L. natans populations within their current distribution and for future expansion”. Noting NE’s [RR-026] comments requesting that the quality assessment should consider expanding populations of floating-water plantain, can the applicant explain why the proposed development would not impede the conservation objectives of the River Dee and Bala Lake/ Afon Dyfrdwy a Llyn Tegid SAC?</p> |
| Q6.15 | NE | <p>HRA: River Dee and Bala Lake SAC – Atmospheric pollution exhaust emissions</p> <p>Are NE satisfied with the applicant’s conclusion that the critical levels of ammonia (NH3) and nitrogen (NOx) would not be exceeded at River Dee and Bala Lake SAC during both construction and operation of the proposed development? If not, what further evidence is required for the applicant to justify their conclusion?</p> |
| Q6.16 | The applicant | <p>HRA: River Dee and Bala Lake SAC – Atmospheric pollution exhaust emissions</p> <p>The Applicant’s Response to Relevant Representations [REP1-062] refers to paragraph 7.2.56 of the RIHRA [APP-253] to explain that the critical levels for ammonia (NH3) and nitrogen (NOx) would not be exceeded at the River Dee and Bala Lake/ Afon Dyfrdwy a Llyn Tegid SAC alone or in-combination during both construction and operation. However, paragraph 7.2.56 sets out the data for atmospheric pollution from exhaust emissions during construction and no information is provided to explain that the critical levels would not be exceeded at this SAC during operation. No further data is provided in paragraph 7.3.38 of the RIHRA [APP-253]. Can the applicant provide or signpost to where the relevant information is located in the application documents, explaining that the critical levels would not be exceeded at this SAC during operation?</p> |
| Q6.17 | NE | <p>Atmospheric pollution at internationally designated sites – Construction</p> <p>Are NE satisfied that the concerns raised in ID NE35 of their relevant representation [RR-026] have been addressed in ES chapter 8, table 8-5 [APP-046]?</p> |
| Q6.18 | NRW NE | <p>Atmospheric pollution at the Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SAC, SPA and Ramsar site – Derogations</p> <p>The RIHRA [APP-253] proposes that the measures relied on for the loss of Atlantic salt meadow (extending the duration of management of the Atlantic salt meadow within the existing Connah’s Quay conservation areas that are managed by the applicant; and allowing natural coastal processes to resume south of the existing power station to substantially delay the rate of coastal squeeze) would also offset the ecological effect of nitrogen deposition during operation on the Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SAC/ SPA/ Ramsar site. The ExA and NE [RR-026] consider these measures to constitute compensation in relation to the direct loss of habitat impact pathway. Therefore, the applicant is requested to provide, on a without prejudice basis, a derogations case, without prejudice DCO schedules, and without prejudice compensation Implementation and Monitoring Plan(s) regarding the atmospheric pollution impact pathway on the Dee Estuary SAC, SPA and Ramsar site.</p> |
| Q6.19 | The applicant | <p>Atmospheric pollution at the Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdw SAC, SPA and Ramsar site</p> <p>In their relevant representation, NE (ID NE47) [RR-026] note that it is unclear whether the proposed mitigation measures for atmospheric pollution would address the effects within the English section of the Dee Estuary SAC, SPA and Ramsar site. Can the applicant explain how the proposed measures would mitigate the potential effects of atmospheric pollution within the English section of the Dee Estuary SAC, SPA and Ramsar site?</p> |
| Q6.20 | The applicant | <p>Atmospheric pollution at the Deeside and Buckley Newt Sites SAC - Mitigation</p> <p>Paragraphs 10.3.15 to 10.3.20 of the RIHRA [APP-253] describe the proposed mitigation for nitrogen deposition on the Deeside and Buckley Newt Sites SAC required to avoid an AEol of the designated site. However, it is not clear whether the proposed financial contribution is also proposed as mitigation for the botanical effects associated with ammonia.</p> <p>Can the applicant confirm whether the financial contribution is also proposed as mitigation for ammonia and if so, explain how both pollutants have been accounted for in the financial provision to site? If not, please explain how the potential botanical effects from ammonia would be mitigated?</p> |
| Q6.21 | The applicant | <p>Impact of stack height reduction on assessment of atmospheric pollution</p> <p>The change notification [AS-006] sets out the proposed reduction in height of the emissions stacks. Can the applicant explain how the changes to the emission stack heights would alter the conclusions of the assessment of atmospheric pollution on European sites within the RIHRA [APP-253]? The applicant should highlight whether the changes to stack height would alter the conclusions in regard to LSE and AEol as well as the requirements for mitigation and/ or compensation measures. The RIHRA [APP-253] should be updated to include this information as part of the wider revision of the RIHRA, to be submitted no later than deadline 4.</p> |

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|----------|----------------------------|---|
| Q6.22 | The applicant | Atmospheric pollution at the Deeside and Buckley Newt Sites SAC – Stack Height Does the proposed lowering of the stack height in the upcoming change notification [AS-006] have the potential to increase ammonia and/ or nitrogen deposition rates and alter the mitigation that is required to avoid an AEoI of the Deeside and Buckley Newt Sites SAC? |
| Q6.23 | NRW | Atmospheric pollution at the Deeside and Buckley Newt Sites SAC Are NRW satisfied that the financial contribution proposed by the applicant to mitigate effects from nitrogen deposition and ammonia (if the financial contribution is also intended to mitigate for ammonia - this matter is still outstanding with the applicant) on the Deeside and Buckley Newt Sites SAC constitutes mitigation rather than compensation? If not, please provide your reasoning and what further evidence would be required for the applicant to justify their conclusion? |
| Q6.24 | The applicant | Atmospheric pollution at the Deeside and Buckley Newt Sites SAC – Mitigation The applicant [REP1-062] proposes to secure the financial contribution to mitigate botanical effects from nitrogen deposition on Deeside & Buckley Newts SAC through a Section 106 Agreement with Flintshire County Council (FCC). The applicant also states that the agreement will be signed prior to the end of examination. The applicant is therefore requested to: a) Explain why a Section 106 agreement was chosen as the most appropriate method to secure this mitigation and justify why this measure is not secured through a requirement in the dDCO. b) Provide a draft of the Section 106 agreement with FCC, no later than deadline 4. |
| Q6.25 | NRW | Atmospheric pollution at the Deeside and Buckley Newt Sites SAC The applicant proposes to secure the financial contribution towards nitrogen deposition and ammonia (if the financial contribution is also intended to mitigate for ammonia - this matter is still outstanding with the applicant) impacts on the Deeside and Buckley Newt Sites SAC through a Section 106 Agreement. Are NRW satisfied that this is an appropriate method of securing the relevant mitigation? |
| Q6.26 | FCC | Atmospheric pollution at the Deeside and Buckley Newt Sites SAC The applicant proposes to secure the financial contribution towards nitrogen deposition and ammonia (if the financial contribution is also intended to mitigate for ammonia - this matter is still outstanding with the applicant) impacts on the Deeside and Buckley Newt Sites SAC through a Section 106 Agreement with FCC. Are FCC satisfied that this is an appropriate method of securing the relevant mitigation? If so, are you content to provide an in-principal letter of support for this method. |
| 7 | Noise and vibration | |
| Q7.1 | The applicant | Mitigation of traffic noise on local residents ([APP-047] Ref: 6.2.9.6.27) What further mitigation could be provided to reduce the impacts of traffic noise arising from the peak movements during the construction period on local residents, especially those in close proximity to Kelsterton Road? |
| Q7.2 | The applicant | Baseline background levels of noise for residential receptors The location of existing residences in close proximity to the existing development has led it to be proposed that the existing residential receptors are already conditioned and accepting of higher than normal background noise levels. Where is the evidence to corroborate this and what is the existing local populations view on noise levels from the existing Uniper development at the site and how this impacted by the proposed new noise level emissions? |
| Q7.3 | The applicant FCC | Working hours and days Can the applicant clarify and confirm that there is agreement of the proposed working hours and days between its construction programme, timings used in the noise and traffic assessment studies and the recommendations and guidelines set out by Flintshire County Council? |
| Q7.4 | The applicant | Potential for vibrations at neighbouring properties Vibrations were noted by residents in properties adjacent to the site during construction of the original and current power stations. What is the risk and likelihood of similar vibrations occurring during the proposed development from activities such as percussive piling during the construction phase or other ground vibratory treatments, and also from harmonic vibration resulting from the operation of the plant, turbines and other heavy machinery during the operation of the development? |
| Q7.5 | NRW | HRA: noise and visual disturbance at the Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SPA and Ramsar site |

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|--------------------------------|--|---|
| | | Are NRW satisfied with the applicant's approach and conclusions in regard to the assessment of noise disturbance to the qualifying features of the Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SPA and Ramsar site during operation of the proposed development? |
| Q7.6 | NRW | HRA: noise and visual disturbance - otter Are NRW satisfied with the applicant's approach and conclusions in regard to the assessment of noise and visual disturbance to foraging and commuting otter (qualifying feature of the River Dee and Bala Lake/ Afon Dyfrdwy a Llyn Tegid SAC) during construction, demolition and operation of the proposed development? |
| 8 Traffic and transport | | |
| Q8.1 | The applicant | Optioneering of abnormal indivisible loads (AIL) routes Presently the application highlights three potential routes for the movement of abnormal indivisible loads (AIL). At what stage will an option be decided upon, and if is this likely to occur during the examination ? If so, will the order limits and extent of assessment for the proposed development be reduced accordingly; or If not, can the applicant provide reasonable justification for the consideration of disruption and consideration owing to the extent and length of highway being considered? In addition, can the applicant provide further justification as to the need for the use of powers within the order limits rather than relying on the more usual use of legislation and permitting for the movements of AILs? |
| Q8.2 | The applicant National Highways FCC Highways Authority | Timings of traffic counts It is noted that traffic counts to assess the background levels of traffic at the site were undertaken in March and April only. Can the applicant advise how these figures might vary at other times of the year and whether they would cover any peak movements associated with holiday season or other seasonal peak points for the region and locality, such as large scale outdoor events. |
| Q8.3 | The applicant National Highways FCC Highways Authority | HGV movements on local road network ([APP-048] Ref: 6.2.10 Table 10.19) What mitigation has the applicant considered to reduce and distribute the movement of HGV movements around the road and junctions along Kelsterton Road? |
| Q8.4 | The applicant National Highways FCC Highways Authority | Increase in traffic movements ([APP-048] Ref: 6.2.10.7.1) What evidence is there for the applicant's conclusion that no mitigation is required for the increase in traffic movements on the local road network? |
| Q8.5 | The applicant | Use of the alternative access to the main development area Can the applicant clarify what are the likely scenarios for the use of the alternative access to the main development area, the likelihood of this route being used, the typical vehicle types and frequency of use and the associated risks presented by the use of the routing versus the proposed main access route? |
| Q8.6 | The applicant DNS | Alternative access to the wildlife reserve and hides ([APP-042] Ref: 6.2.4.4.6 & [APP-043] Ref: 6.2.5.6.17) When will the alternative access arrangements to the wildlife reserve and hides be in place and how will this be managed throughout the construction period and finally after and during the operational use of the proposed development? |
| Q8.7 | The applicant Airbus | Risk of aircraft collision with stacks at the proposed development It is understood that a change request may be forthcoming that will result in a lowering of the proposed stack heights. Can the applicant and Airbus clarify that the risks to aviation presented by the proposed development have been reduced to as low as reasonably practicable and what residual risks remain? |
| Q8.8 | The applicant | Risk of maritime collision with vessels (Ref: [RR-044]) |

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| | MCA | Notwithstanding the content of the marine navigation risk assessment that has been prepared can the applicant and MCA clarify that they have reached an agreed position to ensure that the planned movement of any vessels in the River Dee area and in particular with regards to the designated port and harbour authorities in the area that risks associated with such movements have been reduced to as low as reasonably practicable? |
| 9 Terrestrial and aquatic ecology | | |
| Q9.1 | The applicant DNS | Repairs to the existing sluice ponds and hides (Ref: 13 no. relevant representations) Can the applicant address the numerous requests received from members of DNS regarding the potential for reinstating the sluice pond arrangements and the possibility of including this reinstatement within the proposed works? Are the existing bird hides within the order limits, and could improvement works be undertaken to them as part of the proposed development and can they be undertaken within Wales as associated development? |
| Q9.2 | The applicant NRW NE | Deposition of emissions on to the adjacent habitats What is the likely quantum and associated impacts and effects of deposition of emissions from the proposed development on adjacent habitats including the designated sites and local nature sites? What are the impacts of additional nitrogen deposition on the Desside and Buckley Newt Sites SAC and can the applicant clarify how this has been mitigated for? |
| Q9.3 | The applicant NRW NE | Gronant fields site ([APP-254] Ref: 6.13) What measures are in place to secure the Gronant fields site and what are the alternatives if this fails? Are the Gronant fields sites already within a designated site, or already functionally linked land to a designated site? Has Gronant fields already been secured as compensatory habitat for other activities such as coastal squeeze identified in the shoreline management plan and is there a risk of additionality with other strategies or plans? What evidence is there of the existing use of the Gronant field sites by other species, in particular scheduled species and what are the likely impacts on these existing species of the planned relocation of additional species to the site? Can the Gronant site accommodate an increased population if it is already being used? How will existing species using the functionally linked land at Connah's Quay be encouraged to make use of the newly secured site at Gronant? Should the Gronant fields site be within the proposed order limits? What evidence is there that the use of the Gronant site is mitigation and not compensation with regards to the process set out in the Habitats Regulations and UK government guidance? |
| Q9.4 | The applicant NRW NE DNS | Functionally linked land adjacent to the existing Connah's Quay power station What evidence has been collected and presented to illustrate the extent of use of the functionally linked land adjacent to the existing Connah's Quay power station? |
| Q9.5 | The applicant Natural England | Concerns raised as to the ability of Natural England to be able to engage in the examination (Ref: [AoC-003] and [RR-026]) Can the applicant and Natural England clarify their respective positions with regards to the ability of Natural England to engage in the examination and what can be done to assist in ensuring the ExA receives valuable representations from them? Can Natural England reaffirm their commitment to support the examination and also work collaboratively with other statutory nature conservation bodies including NRW to ensure a consensus view on issues is provided to the ExA? |
| Q9.6 | The applicant NRW | Existing habitat at the site of the proposed development ([APP-085] Ref: Fig 5.5 Sheet 2 of 2) Is the site of the existing power station being shown as retained habitat, and if so does this count towards new habitat creation or is it a requirement of conditions related to the existing development and unable to be counted towards any new net increase of biodiversity? |

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|-------|----------------------|---|
| Q9.7 | The applicant NRW | Flightpath of birds What risks and effects are there on the flight paths of birds utilising the designated sites and functionally linked land from the new stacks at the proposed development, what evidence is there of conflict with the existing stacks at the site and what can be done to mitigate this risk? |
| Q9.8 | The applicant | Noise control to designated sites What measures have been adopted to limit noise so as specifically not to affect the adjacent bird populations? |
| Q9.9 | The applicant | General comments on the HRA: Responding to Natural Resources Wales and Natural England Representation Natural Resources Wales and Natural England have raised a series of concerns relating to the assessment of European sites in their relevant representations [RR-026] and [RR-027] respectively on matters including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline data, specifically the assessment of LSE and AEol, and mitigation/ compensation for qualifying bird species and assemblages of the Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy Special Protection Area (SPA)/ Ramsar site; • The assessment of LSE on qualifying habitat loss and degradation at the Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy Special Area of Conservation (SAC)/ Ramsar site and the River Dee and Bala Lake/ Afon Dyfrdwy a Llyn Tegid SAC; • The assessment of air quality effects alone and in-combination with other plans and projects on the Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SAC/ SPA/ Ramsar site, the River Dee and Bala Lake/ Afon Dyfrdwy a Llyn Tegid SAC, the Deeside and Buckley Newt Sites SAC and Mersey Estuary SPA/ Ramsar site; • The assessment of water quality impacts to the Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SAC/ SPA/ Ramsar site and River Dee and Bala Lake/ Afon Dyfrdwy a Llyn Tegid SAC at stage 1; and • The assessment of noise and light disturbance, loss of functionally linked land, barriers to movement and water quality degradation for otters and water quantity, level and flow for qualifying fish species of the Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SAC & River Dee and Bala Lake/ Afon Dyfrdwy a Llyn Tegid SAC. Respond by deadline 4 to all the matters raised by NRW and NE (including issues marked as key concerns from NRW and those marked red and amber from NE) and set out how you plan to address these during the examination. A revised Report to Inform Habitats Regulation Assessment (RIHRA) should be provided no later than deadline 4. If any conclusions differ from those of NRW and/ or NE, please clearly explain why and what is being done to resolve them. |
| Q9.10 | NRW NE | General comments on the HRA: Methodology and data Can NRW and NE confirm whether they are in agreement with the methodology and data used in relation to Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) matters, and whether the relevant European sites and qualifying features /criteria in the applicant's HRA Report meet their satisfaction? If not, please explain why not and set out the specific information that would still be required. |
| Q9.11 | The applicant | General comments on the HRA: Conservation status of European Sites The Conservation objectives for the sites assessed for Adverse Effects on Integrity (AEol) are provided in [APP-253] , table C-2. Confirm the conservation status for the European sites carried forward to stage 2. |
| Q9.12 | NRW NE | General comments on the HRA: Features of European sites Are NRW and NE satisfied that all relevant European sites and qualifying features have been identified in the applicant's Report to Inform Habitats Regulations Assessment (RIHRA) [APP-253] ? |
| Q9.13 | NRW NE | General comments on the HRA: Impact pathways Table B-1 of the applicant's RIHRA [APP-253] provides a summary of the impact pathways and qualifying features considered in stage 1 and 2 of the HRA. Can NRW and NE set out the impact pathways to qualifying features where concerns remain, or where the applicant has not yet provided an assessment? Please also confirm the impact pathways to qualifying features where you are satisfied with the applicant's assessment and conclusions. |
| Q9.14 | The applicant | General comments on the HRA: Impact Pathways – Direct Habitat Loss/ Damage to Qualifying Habitat |

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|-------|---------------|---|
| | | <p>Paragraph 6.2.6 of the RIHRA [APP-253] explains that, among other sites, the Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SPA and Ramsar site would be impacted by direct loss of habitat as a result of the proposed development. However, table 6 does not identify direct loss of habitat/ damage to qualifying habitat as a potential impact pathway of the Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SPA/ Ramsar site, or the potential impact of loss of supporting habitat for birds using the Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SAC for foraging/ roosting.</p> <p>The applicant is requested to update table 6 of the RIHRA [APP-253] to either include direct loss of/ damage to qualifying habitat, or loss of supporting habitat for birds using the Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SAC for foraging/ roosting as a potential impact pathway to the Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SPA/ Ramsar site, no later than deadline 4.</p> |
| Q9.15 | The applicant | <p>General comments on the HRA: Stage 1 assessment</p> <p>NRW and NE have raised several concerns in their relevant representations [RR-027] and [RR-026] and written representations [REP1-073] and [REP1-072] relating to measures considered at stage 1 of the HRA. Can the applicant provide further information on the measures which are integral to the proposed development design or are required by existing permits and consents, such as the duration and location of consents and if any review of consents would be planned for the near future.</p> |
| Q9.16 | NRW NE | <p>General comments on the HRA: Stage 1 assessment</p> <p>Can NRW and NE confirm if their concerns relating to measures considered at stage 1 of the HRA are in relation to how the applicant has followed the HRA process or if they are concerned that the measures are not sufficient to avoid LSEs. If it is the latter, please clearly set out your concerns and what amendments or other measures NRW/ NE would propose.</p> |
| Q9.17 | NRW NE | <p>Loss of Atlantic salt meadows (Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SAC): Comments on proposed measures</p> <p>In the RIHRA and without prejudice HRA derogations case [APP-253] and [PD-006] respectively, the applicant proposes two measures to address AEoI on the Atlantic salt meadow qualifying feature of the Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SAC due to direct loss of habitat:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> extend the duration of management of the Atlantic salt meadow within the existing Connah's Quay conservation areas that are managed by the applicant; and allow natural coastal processes to resume south of the existing power station by realigning part of the defences inland and allowing the Atlantic salt meadow to naturally retreat to substantially delay the rate of coastal squeeze. <p>NRW and NE:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Confirm the efficacy of these measures to address the temporary, medium-term loss of Atlantic salt meadow. Do NRW and NE consider that the applicant's proposed measures, would be feasible, deliverable and ecologically effective to alleviate the scale of potential harm to the European sites? If not, what amendments or other measures would NRW/ NE propose? Are NRW and NE content that the applicant's proposed measures would be secured before the commencement of construction? If not, what would NRW/ NE propose? |
| Q9.18 | The applicant | <p>Loss of Atlantic salt meadows (Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SAC): Connah's Quay conservation area</p> <p>In the RIHRA and without prejudice HRA derogations case [APP-253] and [PD-006] respectively, the applicant proposes to mitigate/ compensate for the direct loss of Atlantic salt meadow of the Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SAC, partially by extending the duration of the management of saltmarsh within the existing Connah's Quay Conservation Area that is managed by the applicant. Can the applicant confirm their role in the management of the Connah's Quay conservation area, the current baseline conditions and the proposed conditions, the efficacy of the conservation area in providing high quality Atlantic salt meadow habitat, the management and monitoring measures currently in place, and how those measures relate to the management of the European Site.</p> |
| Q9.19 | The applicant | <p>Loss of Atlantic salt meadows (Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SAC): Plans to secure proposed measures</p> <p>In relation to the loss of Atlantic salt meadow at the Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SAC, the applicant stated within the without prejudice HRA derogations case [PD-006] and confirmed at Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) that they plan to provide a Saltmarsh Method Statement in the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [APP-246], on which they would consult NRW. They also state in [PD-006] that they will add a new commitment within the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO). In their response to Relevant Representations [REP1-062] the applicant also stated that they will submit a Framework Saltmarsh Creation Strategy at deadline 3.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> When is the applicant planning to provide the rest of this information? The ExA expects the dDCO commitment, outline strategies and a Saltmarsh Implementation and Monitoring Plan to be submitted no later than deadline 4 and include details of how measures would be delivered before |

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|-------|---------------|---|
| | | commencement of the impact, success criteria, restoration timescales, ongoing management and monitoring, adaptive management, and data-sharing proposals. b) Can the applicant confirm how the Saltmarsh Method Statement would interact/ relate to the Framework Saltmarsh Creation Strategy? |
| Q9.20 | The applicant | Loss of Atlantic salt meadows (Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SAC): Derogations case – alternatives Table 4-4 of the without prejudice derogations case [PD-006] sets out alternative runoff destinations that have been considered, including the use of existing open watercourses for a new outfall. Can the applicant clearly explain what is preventing them from making changes to the sluice structure or constructing a new headwall structure? |
| Q9.21 | The applicant | Loss of Atlantic salt meadows (Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SAC): Progress on agreeing measures with NRW and NE How has the applicant progressed the development of 'without prejudice' compensation measures for the direct loss of/ damage to Atlantic salt meadows within the Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SAC? The ExA requests that the Applicant set out progress on each measure in a tabulated form which is subsequently updated at each deadline. This should include a derogations case, without prejudice DCO schedules, and without prejudice compensation Implementation and Monitoring Plan(s). |
| Q9.22 | The applicant | Assessment of qualifying features (Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SPA/ Ramsar site) In the RIHRA [APP-253] , the assessment of the impacts from the proposed development on the Dee Estuary SPA and Ramsar site are grouped with the Dee Estuary SAC. However, the potential impacts, including but not limited to loss of Atlantic salt meadows and atmospheric pollution on the qualifying features of the SPA and Ramsar site are unclear. The RIHRA [APP-253] does not describe the potential direct and indirect effects on the qualifying features of the Dee Estuary SPA and Ramsar site or provide evidence of the baseline information that has been used to inform the assessment. Please provide a clear description of the potential effects on the qualifying features of the Dee Estuary SPA and Ramsar site as a result of the impact pathways relevant to these European sites as set out in appendix B of the RIHRA [APP-253] and clarify the baseline used to inform the assessment for all relevant qualifying features, no later than deadline 4. |
| Q9.23 | NRW NE | Loss of functionally linked land (Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SPA/ Ramsar site): Baseline data for and assessment of qualifying bird species Are NRW and NE satisfied with the methodology, data/ surveys and qualifying bird species and assemblages included within the assessment of AEoI for loss of functionally linked land at Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SPA/ Ramsar site? If not, why not? Please set out the specific information that would still be required. |
| Q9.24 | The applicant | Loss of functionally linked land (Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SPA/ Ramsar site): Baseline data for and assessment of qualifying bird species Can the applicant confirm by the next deadline which surveys remain outstanding and when the surveys will be completed, reported and submitted to the examination, including further non-breeding bird surveys at Gronant Fields. The RIHRA [APP-253] should also be updated to include this information as part of the wider revision of the RIHRA, to be submitted no later than deadline 4. |
| Q9.25 | The applicant | Loss of functionally linked land (Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SPA/ Ramsar site): Designated bird features Can the applicant provide, or signpost to where in the application they have provided, a table presenting all designated bird features of the Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SPA and Ramsar site, the number of birds present (absolute figure) and as a percentage of the citation count, and if relevant a percentage of a more recent count, no later than deadline 4. |
| Q9.26 | The applicant | Loss of functionally linked land (Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SPA/ Ramsar site): Area of functionally linked land Can the applicant confirm the total area of functionally linked land to be delivered at Gronant Fields, both 25 hectares (ha) and 26 ha are quoted in HRA documentation? Please revise in the updated RIHRA to be submitted no later than deadline 4. |
| Q9.27 | NRW NE | Loss of functionally linked land (Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SPA/ Ramsar site): Comments on proposed measures In the RIHRA and without prejudice HRA derogations case [APP-253] and [PD-006] respectively, the applicant proposes to deliver 25/ 26 ha of functionally linked land at Gronant Fields at Prestatyn which is approximately 21.2 km from the Main Development Area and within the SPA / Ramsar site. a) Do NRW and NE consider that the applicant's proposed measures would be feasible, deliverable and ecologically effective to alleviate the scale of potential harm to the European sites? If not, what amendments or other measures would NRW/ NE propose? |

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|--|----------------------|--|
| | | <p>b) Are NRW satisfied that Gronant Fields does not fall within the existing management and condition obligations of the Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SPA and Ramsar site, and is therefore suitable for mitigation/ compensation? If yes, are NE satisfied that the functionality of Gronant Fields has been clearly identified and that the applicant has demonstrated that Gronant Fields does not benefit the specific features currently?</p> <p>Are NRW and NE content that measures set out in the Curlew Mitigation Strategy [APP-254] would be effective and secured before the commencement of construction? If not, what amendments or other measures would NRW/ NE propose?</p> |
| Q9.28 | The applicant | <p>Loss of functionally linked land (Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SPA/ Ramsar site): Progress on agreeing measures with NRW and NE</p> <p>How has the applicant progressed the development of 'without prejudice' compensation measures for the loss of functionally linked land for curlew at the Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SPA / Ramsar? The ExA requests that the applicant set out progress on each measure in a tabulated form which is subsequently updated at each deadline.</p> |
| 10 Marine ecology | | |
| Q10.1 | The applicant NRW | <p>Increased silt loading ([APP-050] Ref: 6.2.12.2.20)</p> <p>What are the implications of an increase in silt loading from the proposed discharges into the designated site and what are the likely effects and impacts of this increase?</p> |
| Q10.2 | The applicant NRW | <p>Thermal variation of the designated sites ([APP-042] Ref: 6.2.12.3.15 and Table 12-15)</p> <p>What is the potential for changes and physical disturbance to marine ecology receptors within the designated sites due to fluctuations in the temperature of the water column?</p> <p>Is there a potential for thermal limits to be exceeded during the dual operation of the existing and the proposed development?</p> |
| 11 Water environment and flood risk | | |
| Q11.1 | The applicant NRW | <p>Impact of water abstraction and discharge on designated sites ([APP-051] Ref: 6.2.4.2.40)</p> <p>What is the feasibility of the reuse of the existing abstraction and discharge arrangements at the site and how much adaptation work will be required?</p> <p>How will this interact with and be balanced with the existing abstraction and discharge for the existing power station?</p> <p>Were the existing intakes and discharge arrangements originally oversized for the existing development?</p> <p>How will the changes to the eel screens affect the intake's ability to abstract water?</p> <p>What do the abstraction and discharge rates for cooling water look like over the range of scenarios including phased construction and the existing power station?</p> <p>What evidence is there that the proposed and existing thermal arrangements will be the same given the same discharge permits requirements?</p> |
| Q11.2 | The applicant NRW | <p>Protection of groundwater from site risks</p> <p>What measures have been proposed to protect existing groundwater at the site from contamination during the construction and operation phase?</p> |
| Q11.3 | The applicant | <p>Surface water collection, discharge and protection of the environment ([APP-043] Ref: 6.2.5.3.40 & [APP-213] Ref: 5.3 OSWDS)</p> <p>What measures are proposed to prevent any contaminated surface water from being discharged into the environment and how will this be managed.</p> <p>Please provide more detail as to the proposed works to the existing surface water outfall to illustrate the extent of permanent and temporary loss of the designed habitat.</p> <p>Please provide justification of the siting of the surface water outfall and explain why discharge using alternative SUDS hierarchy, such as soakaways or to watercourses within the footprint of the existing site could not be used and avoid disruption to designated site.</p> <p>Explain how these alternative considerations interact with the appropriate assessment for habitats regulations assessment.</p> |

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|---|----------------------|---|
| Q11.4 | The applicant NRW | <p>Flood risk ([APP-051] Ref: Table 13-7 & [APP-212] Fig 13C-1)</p> <p>Was joint probability considered in the hydraulic analysis?</p> <p>Where in the tidal modelling has the risk of overtopping of defences from wave action and breach of defences been considered?</p> <p>The appendices state that the MDA is free from flood risk but the Figure 13C 1 appears to contradict this. Why is the site shown in flood zone 3 if the site is actually free from flood risk including future climate change projections?</p> <p>Have the most recent allowances for climate change been included in the flood risk assessment including the uplifts required for flood modelling of critical national infrastructure, such as H++ sea level rise?</p> |
| Q11.5 | The applicant NRW | <p>Foul water services ([APP-042] Ref: 6.2.4.2.50 & [APP-051] 6.2.13.5.7.9)</p> <p>What are the existing domestic foul drainage services at the site and how will this waste be managed?</p> <p>What are the containment and storage facilities for operational foul water arising from the plant operation?</p> |
| 12 Geology and ground conditions | | |
| Q12.1 | The applicant | <p>Possibility of the presence of unexploded ordnance</p> <p>What is the likelihood of the presence of unexploded ordnance at the site given its industrial history and what risks are presented by this?</p> |
| Q12.2 | The applicant | <p>Contaminated ground</p> <p>What are the constituents of the made ground to the original power station at the site and what risks do these pose during their re-disturbance during the proposed development?</p> |
| 13 Landscape and visual amenity | | |
| Q13.1 | The applicant | <p>Visual impact assessment from adjacent residential property</p> <p>Please provide an additional visual impact assessment from Oakenholt Farm situated between VP9 and VP10 to provide a visual example from the residential properties situated, near to, and to the northwest of the proposed development.</p> |
| Q13.2 | The applicant | <p>Mitigation measures to reduce visual impact on adjacent residential property and views from national character areas</p> <p>Clarify the measures proposed to mitigate the visual impact on adjacent residential properties and views from national character areas.</p> |
| Q13.3 | The applicant | <p>Control measures on massing dimensions and height control</p> <p>Clarify the control measures within the dDCO that relate to overall massing dimensions and height control.</p> |
| Q13.4 | The applicant | <p>Colour palette of the proposed development</p> <p>Please provide a side by side comparison of the proposed colour palette to be used at the proposed development alongside the respective dominant colour palettes notable from, and surrounding to, the following viewpoints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross estuary viewpoints eg. VP5 • Residential eg. VP12 • National Landscape eg. VP15 |
| 14 Physical processes | | |
| Q14.1 | The applicant | Coastal change |

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|---|------------------------------|--|
| | NRW | What are the coastal erosion risks to the site of the proposed development over its lifetime, how are these mitigated and what effects might these mitigations have on shoreline management policies upstream and downstream of the site, and the long term evolution for this section of the coast? |
| Q14.2 | The applicant NRW | Shoreline management How does the proposed realignment of existing coastal defences to the south of the proposed development align with the preferred policy in the shoreline management plan for the respective management unit and what are the associated effects that might arise from this policy? |
| Q14.3 | The applicant NRW | Deposition and disturbance of material and sediment from cooling water What are the risks associated with the deposition of any solid matter that collects in the cooling water discharge and also the risks associated with the mobilisation of sediment adjacent to cooling water discharges. What are the consequences for the physical processes adjacent to the proposed development from any change in sedimentation regime? |
| 15 Terrestrial heritage | | |
| Q15.1 | The applicant Cadw FCC | Castell y Fflint / Flint Castle How does the proposed development change the setting, visual relationship and context with the estuary for Castell y Fflint / Flint Castle and what mitigation has been proposed to minimise this effect? |
| Q15.2 | The applicant Cadw FCC | Presence of unforeseen archaeological features What is the risk of encountering unforeseen archaeological features within the excavations along the route of the CO2 corridor? |
| Q15.3 | The applicant | Terrestrial heritage in the non-technical summary Please can the appropriate sections of the chapters 8.10.10 to 8.10.13 of the non-technical summary be updated to reference the likely construction and decommissioning effects, and the operation effects on terrestrial heritage. |
| 16 Marine heritage | | |
| Q16.1 | Cadw FCC | Marine heritage assets What are Cadw and others' views on the assessment of likely effects on marine heritage provided by the applicant and its adequacy? |
| 17 Socio-economics, recreation and tourism | | |
| Q17.1 | The applicant FCC | Employment prospects What is the sensitivity of the employment assessment to both peak construction and typical operational periods and what is the potential deviation from these assessed figures should they prove to be incorrect? |
| Q17.2 | The applicant FCC | Local accommodation for construction workforce What is the likely effect of accommodation need for the construction workforce at peak and typically on the local accommodation availability and what happens if the assessment of these effects differ from those forecast? |
| 18 Climate change | | |
| Q18.1 | The applicant | Commissioning ([APP-042] Ref: 6.2.4.4.10) |

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|---|
| | | How long would commissioning take, and potentially for how long could the plant be run in an unabated fashion? |
| Q18.2 | The applicant | CCP stack bypass Clarity the frequency and scenarios when the CCP stack bypass would be in operation. |
| Q18.3 | The applicant | CO2 venting Clarity the frequency and scenarios when the CO2 venting would take place. |
| Q18.4 | The applicant | Existing baseline ([APP-058] Ref 6.2.20.4.3) Why does the existing baseline include the existing power station outputs and not the original site baseline? |
| Q18.5 | The applicant | Future baseline ([APP-058] Ref 6.2.20.4.6) Is this a correct assumption with existing Combined Cycle Gas Turbine being converted to flywheel |
| Q18.6 | The applicant | Net operational carbon ([APP-058] Ref 6.2.20.6.41) If all new development has to be CCUS why does this development use this saving as a benefit? |
| Q18.7 | The applicant | Upstream emissions ([APP-058] Plate 20-2) Why do the "well to tank" emissions increase for the proposed development? |
| Q18.8 | The applicant | Climate change risk assessment sensitivity assessment Given the development's proximity to the estuary please provide a sensitivity assessment to climate change effects that may arise there to be undertaken, e.g., sea level rise, increased storminess etc and potential impacts on the proposed development. |
| 19 | Human health | |
| Q19.1 | The applicant PHW UKHSA | Electro-magnetic field effects What are the risks, likelihood and effects that may arise from the presence of high voltage electro-magnetic effects from the plant generation, overhead and underground cabling in close proximity to residences.? |
| 20 | Major accidents and disasters | |
| Q20.1 | The applicant PHW UKHSA | Accidental release of CO2 ([APP-042] Ref: 6.2.4.4.15) What is risk, likelihood and consequence of an accidental release of CO2 from the proposed development site or CO2 corridor and how is this mitigated? The submitted documents note that new pipework would be designed to prevent accidental release or rupture but how will this also be assured with the existing pipework? |
| Q20.2 | The applicant | Condition of the existing, proposed to be repurposed CO2 pipeline What is the condition and specification of the existing, proposed to be repurposed CO2 pipeline and how has it been assessed as suitable to carry the new proposed flows, pressures and loadings including direction of flow and changes in direction? |

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|---|---|---|
| Q20.3 | The applicant HSE | CoMAH licensing requirements ([APP-060] Ref: 6.2.22.6) What triggers the CoMAH licence requirements for the site, and if it is the storage of amines, what are potential risks and consequences associated with this? |
| Q20.4 | The applicant HSE | Amine storage and containment ([APP-060] Ref: Table 22-8) How will Amines be delivered and stored on site, in what quantities and what are the risks of accidental release of Amines and the likelihood and effects of their loss of containment? |
| 21 Materials and waste | | |
| Q21.1 | The applicant | Potential for known and unknown waste materials existing at the site What is the potential for the disturbance or uncovering of known and unknown existing waste materials during construction within the order limits, and if encountered, how would this be dealt with? |
| Q21.2 | The applicant | Risks from existing buried material within the C&IEA What is the risk and likelihood of during the proposed development encountering arisings from the asbestos landfill and the piled boundary and concrete topper to the historic works carried out at the site? |
| Q21.3 | The applicant | Risks from arisings of the demolition of Connah's Quay A power station within the C&IEA What is the risk and likelihood of during the proposed development encountering arisings from the demolition of the Connah's Quay A power station particularly within the C&IEA? |
| Q21.4 | The applicant | Amine solvent purging arisings ([APP-042] Ref: 6.2.4.2.16 & 6.2.4.2.56) What is the frequency of Amine solvent purging and what are the risks, likelihood and effects associated with this activity? |
| Q21.5 | The applicant | Proportion of hazardous waste on site ([APP-061] Ref: 6.2.23.6.20) What is the sensitivity to the assessment of the proportion of waste arising at the site that could be hazardous and what would be the impacts should this assessment prove to be incorrect? |
| Q21.6 | The applicant | Concrete production demand ([APP-061] Ref: 6.2.23.6.6) What is the plan to deal with potentially utilising such a high proportion of the Welsh concrete production capacity, what are the alternatives if production quantities are unavailable and what are the likely effects on other infrastructure operations and needs in the area if the proposed development dominates supply? |
| 22 Cumulative and combined effects | | |
| Q22.1 | The applicant NRW | Air quality How does the general growth trend included in AQ make allowance for the emissions from potential schemes in the vicinity of the proposed development? What is the justification for the relatively small Zol that has been adopted for the AQ assessment, given the high level of associated heavy industry and emissions in the local area? |
| Q22.2 | The applicant National Highways FCC | Traffic and transport How does the general growth trend included in traffic make allowance for the potential schemes in the vicinity of the proposed development and associated increased traffic coinciding with any proposed development at the site? |

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|---|----------------------------|--|
| | | <p>In particular with regards to cumulative effects potential at:</p> <p>During construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential properties West end of Kelsterton Road (including the travellers' encampment); Kelsterton farm; Residential properties at Kelsterton lane / Kelsterton road intersection; and Residential properties close to Spar shop on Chester road. <p>During operation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential properties West end of Kelsterton road. |
| Q22.3 | The applicant NRW NE | <p>Terrestrial and aquatic ecology</p> <p>Impacts on terrestrial and aquatic ecology are a principal issue how can the combined impacts of the other developments not also have a significant bearing on the integrity of the habitats adjacent to the developments and what does the total cumulative effects look like.</p> |
| Q22.4 | The applicant NRW EA | <p>Water resources</p> <p>Concerns have been raised as to the total water capacity required past 2030 for all Hynet related projects in the area. Given this forecast increased demand what are the risks, likelihood and consequences of this water demand and what mitigation measures have been proposed?</p> |
| Q22.5 | The applicant | <p>HRA stage 1 assessment methodology</p> <p>Can the applicant confirm whether it considered in-combination effects at the screening stage where impact pathways on European sites were identified but no LSE were concluded? If so, please confirm the methodology for assessing in-combination effects in stage 1 and the plans and projects that were considered.</p> |
| Q22.6 | The applicant | <p>Methodology for assessing in-combination air quality effects (Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SAC/ SPA/ Ramsar site)</p> <p>In their relevant representation [RR-026] NE have raised numerous concerns regarding the methodology for assessing in-combination air quality effects on the Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SAC/ SPA/ Ramsar site. Can the applicant confirm the sources of emissions considered and update the RIHRA [APP-253] accordingly, no later than deadline 4?</p> |
| Q22.7 | NRW NE FCC | <p>In-combination plans and projects</p> <p>The RIHRA [APP-253] sets out in section 10.4 the plans and projects considered in the in-combination assessment at stage 2 appropriate assessment. Can NRW, NE, and Flintshire County Council confirm whether they are satisfied with the projects and plans that have been included within the in-combination assessment in Stage 2: Appropriate Assessment of the RIHRA?</p> |
| 23 Development consent order [APP-019] | | |
| Articles | | |
| Q23.1 | The applicant | <p>Article 2: Commencement</p> <p>Clarify what works are included and excluded from the definition of commencement.</p> |
| Q23.2 | The applicant | <p>Article 7: Removal of benefit for others</p> <p>Notwithstanding the explanation given at ISH1, please clarify the reason and need for the removal of benefits to others within this article.</p> |

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|--|---------------------------------|--|
| Q23.3 | The applicant | Article 24: Protection of buildings What buildings may require this protection adjacent to the MDA, along the CO2 corridor or anywhere else within the order limits ? Clarify why the powers are required, the potential for risks to others property and the likelihood of the need. |
| Q23.4 | The applicant | Article 33: Rights over subsoil Clarify that rights are being sought over subsoil alone, and that rights over airspace will remain with which parties. |
| Q23.5 | The applicant | Article 42: Felling of trees Clarify the presence, or not, of any existing trees with tree preservation orders within the order limits. Justify why this power is needed and the risk it addresses for the applicant. |
| Q23.6 | The applicant | Article 51: Human remains Clarify the likely presence of any human remains within the order limits. Justify why this power is needed and the risk it addresses for the applicant; and why the normal provisions in this instance are insufficient to allow the applicant to address the potential requirement given the risk of encountering such remains. |
| Schedule 2 – Requirements | | |
| Q23.7 | The applicant | Control plans and documents The use of the term “in general accordance with” is not precise and is used in reference to delivering the proposed development for a number of plans and documents to control the works. The use of this term in the dDCO does not allow robust control and compliance with any documentation or plans that may be approved. Please remove the use of this term or justify its inclusion. |
| 24 Compulsory acquisition, temporary possession and other land or rights considerations | | |
| Q24.1 | The applicant | Funding Statement [APP-027] The funding statement shows a significant drop in turnover and change from profit to loss making of the company in 2022-23. Presumably this is linked to the conflict in Ukraine and supply of gas, but what confidence can the applicant provide that it will weather this storm and have the ability to fund and complete the project. |
| Q24.2 | The applicant | Temporary possession of the substrate to the highway ([APP-026] Ref: 6.2) Justify why the applicant requires temporary possession of the substrate to the highway and the need to remove freeholders’ rights thereof. |
| Q24.3 | The applicant | Land plots 7/3 & 7/5 [APP-024] Clarify who are the freeholders and lessees of these plots. |
| Q24.4 | The applicant | Land plot 8/10 [APP-024] The plot is shown in the ownership of Uniper but leased to a farmer. What communications have been undertaken with the lessee to advise them of the plans for the land and their future options? |
| Q24.5 | The applicant TATA Airbus | Connah’s Quay South What progress has been made with regards to negotiations for the land required at Connah’s Quay South and the existing freeholder and any lessees? |

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|-------|---|--|
| Q24.6 | The applicant | <p>Land plot 9/23 [APP-024]</p> <p>This land is shown as unregistered and is likely to form a significant part of the proposed development. What progress has been made in trying to identify the freeholder and any users of the land?</p> |
| Q24.7 | The applicant | <p>Land showing that the applicant requires no possession of</p> <p>It was described at ISH1 that land showing in the book of reference as “no possession of” generally relates to land where the repurposed CO2 pipeline is present. Can this be clarified and also how future maintenance and works to the pipeline route would be undertaken if no possession is sought.</p> |
| Q24.8 | The applicant Essity | <p>Land plot 6/5 [APP-024]</p> <p>The works in this land plot would appear to constrain the future ability to operate of other statutory undertakers. What are the views on this?</p> |
| Q24.9 | The applicant National Highways FCC | <p>Abnormal indivisible load routes</p> <p>It is proposed to take temporary possession of three alternative highway routes for the movement of abnormal indivisible loads. What is the justification for requiring these powers other three route options and why cannot a single route be defined?</p> <p>Also, what is the justification for using the powers in the dDCO for this purpose rather than the more frequently used permitting options provided by existing legislation and the general powers that will be provided under streets within the dDCO?</p> |