



Connah's Quay Low Carbon Power

Applicant's Response to ExQ1

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN010166
Document Reference: EN010166/APP/9.16
Planning Act 2008 (as amended)
Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations
2009 - Regulation 5(2)(q)
Revision 00

10 March 2026

Prepared for:
Uniper UK Limited

Prepared by:
AECOM Limited

© 2026 AECOM Limited. All Rights Reserved.

This document has been prepared by AECOM Limited ("AECOM") for sole use of our client (the "Client") in accordance with generally accepted consultancy principles, the budget for fees and the terms of reference agreed between AECOM and the Client. Any information provided by third parties and referred to herein has not been checked or verified by AECOM, unless otherwise expressly stated in the document. No third party may rely upon this document without the prior and express written agreement of AECOM.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
1.1 Overview	1
1.2 Purpose and Structure of this Document.....	1
Abbreviations	74

Tables

Table 1: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 General and Cross-Topic Questions	2
Table 2: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Design, Parameters and Other Details of the Proposed Development.....	4
Table 3: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Project Alternatives	8
Table 4: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Planning Policy	10
Table 5: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Need	14
Table 6: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Air Quality.....	15
Table 7: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Noise and Vibration.....	25
Table 8: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Traffic and Transport	27
Table 9: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Terrestrial and Aquatic Ecology	32
Table 10: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Marine Ecology	43
Table 11: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Water Environment and Flood Risk	44
Table 12: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Geology and Ground Conditions	49
Table 13: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Landscape and Visual Amenity	50
Table 14: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Physical Process.....	52
Table 15: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Terrestrial Heritage.....	53
Table 16: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Marine Heritage	54
Table 17: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism	55
Table 18: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Climate Change	57
Table 19: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Human Health	60
Table 20: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Major Accidents and Disasters	61
Table 21: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Materials and Waste	63
Table 22: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Cumulative and Combined Effects	66
Table 23: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Development Consent Order	69
Table 24: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary possession and Other Land or Rights Considerations	71

1. Introduction

1.1 Overview

- 1.1.1 This document has been prepared on behalf of Uniper UK Limited (Applicant). It forms part of the application (Application) that has been submitted for a Development Consent Order (DCO) from the Secretary of State (SoS) for Energy Security and Net Zero under Section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (2008 Act).
- 1.1.2 The Applicant is seeking development consent in respect of the Connah's Quay Low Carbon Power (CQLCP) Project (Proposed Development) on land at, and in the vicinity of, the existing Connah's Quay Power Station, Kelsterton Road, Connah's Quay, within Flintshire County Council (FCC), North Wales.
- 1.1.3 The Application has been accepted for examination. The Examination commenced on 13 January 2026.

1.2 Purpose and Structure of this Document

- 1.2.1 The purpose of this document is to set out the Applicant's responses to the **Examining Authority's Written Questions (ExQ1) [PD-012]**, which were issued on 17 February 2026. This document contains a table which includes the reference number for each relevant question, the Examining Authority's (ExA) comments and questions and the Applicant's responses to each of those questions.
- 1.2.2 The Applicant's responses relate to the DCO Application as it is proposed to be changed by the Change Application which has been submitted at Deadline 3 (**EN010166/APP/10.1**).
- 1.2.3 When responding to ExQ1's, the Applicant has referenced the version of each document that was current at the time the relevant matter was originally addressed, with updated material cited only where necessary, to clarify or expand upon the Applicant's position, so that the evolution of the evidence base through the Examination is transparent to the ExA. However, where mitigation or controls are discussed that would ultimately be secured through the **Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1)**, the Applicant has referred to the latest version of the relevant securing document, as this is the version to be secured. Accordingly, where issues were addressed in the DCO submission or at Deadline 1 or 2, references are provided to those assigned in the examination library (e.g. APP-XXX, REP1-XXX and REP2-XXX). Where a matter is being addressed in a document being submitted at Deadline 3, the document reference is provided (e.g. EN010166/APP/X.X).

Table 1: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 General and Cross-Topic Questions

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
Q1.1	The Applicant	<p>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?</p>	<p>The indicative programmes, which are shown in Table 5-1 and Table 5-2 of Chapter 5: Construction Management and Programme [APP-043], illustrate a phased approach to construction and a single phase of construction works. This is retained in the Deadline 3 revision (EN010166/APP/6.2.5).</p> <p>As described in Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearing 1 and response to Action Points [REP1-065], the approach to construction phasing is not yet certain. Construction of one, or both trains, could commence between 2026 and 2031, depending on when consents are granted. The Applicant entered Train 1 (with the opportunity for later expansion through Train 2) of the Proposed Development into the latest HyNet cluster sequencing competition round and was successful in being selected by Government for the Project Negotiation List (PNL) as part of the CCUS Cluster Sequencing programme. It has been selected as a priority project for connection to the HyNet cluster and negotiations continue to secure a Dispatchable Power Agreement (DPA) for Train 1. The timing of negotiation for Train 2 is dependent upon future selection processes being designed by UK Government. Therefore, whilst the Applicant is progressing design of both Trains through ongoing Front End Engineering Design (FEED) and seeking consents for both Trains with an intent to ultimately deploy these two trains, it is not possible, and will likely not be possible before the close of the Examination, to confirm whether the second Train will be capable of being constructed simultaneously with the first Train or will need to be phased subsequently to the first Train. As both construction scenarios will need to remain available, the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), documented in the Environmental Statement (ES), has selected a worst case construction scenario (which is either simultaneous or phased depending on topic area) as the basis for assessment. Accordingly, the assessment presented reflects the reasonable worst case in terms of construction programme.</p>
Q1.2	The Applicant	<p>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?</p>	<p>One of the advantages of the Proposed Development, as originally set out in Chapter 6: Project Alternatives [APP-044], is that the proposed the Connah's Quay Low Carbon Power (CQLCP) Abated Generation Station, if consented, would make use of existing connections available at the Application Site. These connections, including those for natural gas imported as fuel, cooling water passing through the process (abstracted from, and returned to, the Dee) and export of the electricity generated, are currently associated with the existing power station. In the scenario where Train 1 is constructed and commissioned first in a phased programme, approximately half of the working capacity of these connections would be employed by the CQLCP Abated Generation Station, meaning then that these would not be available to allow that part of the existing power station to continue operation. When the second train is then commissioned, the remaining capacity in connections employed by the existing power station would be required for Train 2. Therefore, as the capacity of connections is transferred from the existing Connah's Quay Power Station to the CQLCP Abated Generation Station, the existing plant will no longer have access to export power to the grid. In line with the Applicant's strategy to decarbonise its existing fossil fleet, the Connah's Quay Low Carbon Power project would ultimately replace the existing power station in order to ensure that the Applicant, and the site, can continue to contribute to security of supply but in a way that is lower carbon.</p>
Q1.3	The Applicant	<p>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?</p>	<p>As set out in the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearing 1 and response to Action Points [REP1-065], the Proposed Development is part of the PNL for the HyNet cluster sequencing process. The aim of this is to bring forward capture projects (such as the CQLCP Abated Generation Station) and CO₂ transport and storage in a sequenced manner in order to derisk these developments. The HyNet CO₂ pipeline and offshore storage in Liverpool Bay have taken their investment decision and commenced construction work. Therefore, the risk of the HyNet transport and storage infrastructure not being developed is very low.</p> <p>Delay in operation is also considered a low risk because the HyNet CO₂ pipeline and offshore storage in Liverpool Bay makes significant use of repurposed infrastructure, thereby reducing the amount of new plant and equipment to be deployed to ensure the storage solution is available to the proposed development on commencing commercial operation.</p> <p>It should also be noted that a new requirement has been inserted in the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1), submitted at Deadline 3, stating that "<i>Work No. 1(a) may not be brought into commercial use without Work Nos. 1(b), 1(c), 1(e), 7 and 8 also</i></p>

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p><i>being brought into commercial use and Work Nos. 7 and 8 being connected to an operational storage site” (Schedule 2, Part 1, Requirement 21). Accordingly, there is no need for a contingency because the Proposed Development is controlled such that the proposed development cannot be brought into operational use without being connected to the developed HyNet project.</i></p>

Table 2: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Design, Parameters and Other Details of the Proposed Development

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
Q2.1	The Applicant	<p>Existing power station ([APP-043] Ref: 6.2.5.2.1) How does the demolition of the above ground installation (AGI) at the Main Development Area affect the existing Connah's Quay power station operation?</p>	<p>Historically the Gas AGI (also referred to as Gas Reception Facility) was the delivery point of natural gas, through the P852 pipeline, to fuel the existing Connah's Quay Power Station. However, since 2023, the P852 pipeline does not transport any Natural Gas, and the existing Connah's Quay Power Station takes all the Natural Gas it requires from the National Transmission System (owned by National Gas Transmission plc). The AGI is in a state of isolation and preservation. As such, its demolition will have no effect on the security of fuel supply to the existing Connah's Quay Power Station. Decommissioning and demolition activities of the AGI will be phased with other site preparation activities to enable construction works within the Main Development Area and will have negligible impact on the continued operation of the existing Connah's Quay Power Station.</p>
Q2.2	The Applicant	<p>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:</p> <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? 	<p>Section 6.0 (paragraphs 6.2.122 to 6.2.131) and Table 2.2 (pp70-72) of Appendix 2 of the Planning Statement [APP-262] consider the 'Criteria for "good design" in energy infrastructure' and sign-post to the relevant documents assessing how the Proposed Development complies with planning policy relating to good design.</p> <p>In particular, the Design Approach Document (DAD) [APP-263] is a key document which evidences that the Applicant has applied "good design" to the Proposed Development, and iterated improvements as per NPS EN-1 (January 2024).</p> <p>Chapter 6: Project Alternatives [APP-044] also evidences the approach to the siting and design of the Proposed Development, including the alternatives considered.</p> <p>In line with NPS EN-1 (paragraph 4.7.7), the DAD [APP-264] demonstrates how the design process was conducted and how the proposed design evolved. Specifically, Section 4.9 onwards in the DAD [APP-264] provides a well-structured and sequential explanation of the approach that has been taken in developing the design of the Proposed Development and its iterations. The DAD [APP-264] defines and describes, amongst other items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the overarching strategic "Design Vision" – how the completed Proposed Development would be sustainable, create a new place and hold the design together; and the set of "Design Objectives" (Table 2 of the DAD [APP-264]) that has been informed by the appraisal of the identified opportunities and constraints within the Order limits, which were applied to each stage of the design evolution of the Proposed Development to ensure that good design is delivered. <p>Section 5 of the DAD [APP-263] goes on to explain in detail how the early layout and design studies were coordinated and the evolution of the indicative design, through to the final indicative design (Section 6 of the DAD [APP-264]) in delivering sustainable infrastructure that is sensitive to place.</p> <p>Item 3.8 in the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearing 1 and Response to Action Points [REP1-065] also provides a detailed summary of the DAD [APP-263], including the Design Principles Document (DPD) [APP-264], and the approach that has been taken to good design.</p> <p>In particular, the design approaches that have been taken to help shape the themes identified in Q2.2 are described below:</p> <p>Q2.2 theme: "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"</p> <p>In the context of the key national policies, as noted in Sections 3, 4 and 5 of the Planning Statement [APP-262], the Government has concluded that the need for new low carbon energy infrastructure, such as the Proposed Development, is so acute that it is a 'Critical National Priority' (CNP).</p>

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>The DAD [APP-264] (paragraph 8.1.4) acknowledges that the strong and well-established need, as set out in Planning Statement [APP-262], has been a key consideration throughout the design process, starting with the Design Vision and Design Objectives that have fed into the design throughout.</p> <p>The key design objectives relating to the aesthetics and the landscape are identified primarily under 'place', 'appearance and visual impact' in Table 2 of the DAD [APP-264].</p> <p>For example, these design objectives include, but are not limited to, a masterplanned composition, rather than a series of unplanned individual buildings/structures; a linear configuration of the main built elements; close and long distance views to inform the design process; and landscape design work integrated to reduce landscape and visual impacts – all as far as practicable.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.11.4 of the DAD [APP-263] explains how adherence to the design objectives allowed a good process to follow during the pre-application process, which was iterative, and allowed the Applicant to refine and evolve the design via workshops, options appraisals, neighbour engagement, consultation and so on.</p> <p>Section 6.3 of the DAD [APP-263] goes on to explain how the proposed layout evolved to be made of three distinct components (islands), arranged in operational sequence, as illustrated by the Parameter Plans (EN010166/APP/2.5) (which have been updated for the Change Application at Deadline 3), including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a CCGT (Combined Cycle Gas Turbine) / HRSG (Heat Recovering Steam Generator) island (shown as '1A' and '1B'); • a CCP (Carbon Capture) island (shown as '1D' and '1E'); and • cooling towers island (shown as '1F'). <p>The subsequent sections of the DAD [APP-264], after Section 6.3, provide a detailed description of these components, and other elements and how the proposed indicative design has been prepared in terms of its architecture (composition, scale and massing, appearance/built form), materials, colour and other issues/topics.</p> <p>As detailed within Section 4.12 of the DAD [APP-264], it is acknowledged that the approach to design should be appropriate as far as practicable to the context and purpose of the Proposed Development, which is to generate electricity and then export it to the national grid. Whilst the design by its very nature is inherently influenced by technical design matters, from the outset, the Applicant has sought to minimise impacts and adopt good design principles through embedded design mitigation measures.</p> <p>Furthermore, item 3.8 in the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions ISH2 and Response to Action Points [REP1-066] covered matters relating to design. Paragraph 1.4.125 notes the comments from Applicant's representative that legacy heritage infrastructure which is now praised today did face objection at the time it was designed and constructed. The Applicant is proud of what it is doing but there is the proper opportunity to refine the detailed design through the processes provided for in the DCO.</p> <p>The design principles are set out in the DPD (EN010166/APP/7.8) and will be secured via the appropriate articles and requirements within the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1) to ensure that the detailed design of the Proposed Development is controlled and secured.</p> <p>Appendix B of the DAD [APP-264] also includes a table explaining the Applicant's compliance with Annex A of the Planning Inspectorate's Advice on Good Design.</p> <p>Q2.2 theme: "Future reuse of the proposed development in a future energy or alternative scenario"</p>

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>The design approach taken to help shape the aforementioned theme identified a number of opportunities of the existing site.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.2.1 (second and third bullet points) of the Planning Statement [APP-262] highlights that the majority of the Application Site is within the ownership or control of the Applicant, and that the Proposed Development thus would make use of brownfield land within the operational boundary of the existing Connah's Quay Power Station. Furthermore, the Proposed Development has excellent proximity to and would connect with one of the Government's selected CCS / Carbon Capture, Usage and Storage (CCUS) clusters, i.e. the HyNet Cluster. The CO₂ captured from the CCGT Generating Station would be transported via the HyNet CO₂ Pipeline Project to permanent offshore storage facilities in repurposed depleted gas fields in Liverpool Bay. The Proposed Development would therefore act as an important enabler in the development of the HyNet Cluster in line with the Government's objectives of decarbonising the UK's industrial and power generation sectors.</p> <p>These key elements were also identified as opportunities in the DAD [APP-264]. Section 4.8 and Section 6.2 of the DAD [APP-264] notes that the Main Development Area sits within an industrialised context that has a long history of power generation, and as a consequence comprises some brownfield land that is already associated with power generation and therefore can utilise existing connections corridors and infrastructure.</p> <p>Whilst future scenarios cannot be predicted with any certainty, given the existing infrastructure that is being utilised for the Proposed Development, if delivered (subject to consent being granted), there is significant potential and opportunities in terms of the future reuse of the Proposed Development in a future energy or alternative scenario.</p> <p>Q2.2 theme: "Recognising the long history of energy production and support to the national energy need the site has supported"</p> <p>The design approach taken to help shape the aforementioned theme recognises the use and the long history of energy production at the site. Section 4.3 and paragraphs 6.4.4-5 of the DAD [APP-264] note that the existing built forms and the industrial architecture of the existing Connah's Quay Power Station create a distinct composition along the River Dee Estuary. The DAD [APP-264] goes on to recognise that that the existing Connah's Quay Power Station is a specialist structure and has since 1996 been the second generation of energy generation, with the first generation being the demolished Connah's Quay 'A' Power Station from 1958 to 1984. The Proposed Development (providing up to a likely maximum of 1,380 MW net electrical output) would in turn provide the third generation of energy generation to be hosted, and its technological evolution to a low carbon technology including a CCP would represent a new age of power generation. It would therefore significantly contribute towards the urgent need for low carbon electricity generation (in line with NPS EN-1) and which has become more urgent following the national legally binding target of net zero by 2050.</p> <p>Q2.2 theme: "Recognising the cultural history of the site and the need to provide for future Welsh generations"</p> <p>The design approach taken to help shape the aforementioned theme includes evolving the design throughout the pre-application period which includes (amongst other matters) consultation with the local community. The full details are set out in the Consultation Report [APP-028] and its supporting appendices [APP-029 to APP-036].</p> <p>There has been a power station on site at Connah's Quay for over 70 years, and investment at Connah's Quay through development of the Proposed Development by the Applicant could contribute significantly to economic growth in the region, by providing skilled technical jobs and creating new opportunities during construction, along with potential opportunities through the wider supply chain.</p> <p>The Planning Statement [APP-262] summarises and cross references a number social, economic, and cultural improvements for local communities as a result of the Proposed Development, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enabling an existing industry to continue to operate.

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefits from the on-hand expertise of the existing highly skilled workforce. • In terms of Gross Value Added, it is estimated that the construction workforce of the Proposed Development would directly contribute £33.24 million to the national economy during the construction phase of which £14.98m would likely be within the 60-minute drive area. <p>Chapter 19: Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism [APP-057] sets out that the operation of the Proposed Development is expected to support approximately 66 jobs once operational. In addition, the operational phase would support employment through maintenance activities, the purchase of local products and workforce spending in the local economy. Periodic planned outages are also expected to generate employment opportunities for approximately 300 additional temporary workers. These planned outages would occur for approximately two months every four years.</p> <p>The Applicant also recognises the need to provide for future Welsh generations. Recently, the Connah's Quay Power Station Education Centre reopened in November 2025 and is open to students from primary school to university age where engineers and apprentices at the site host a range of tailored workshops to help inspire future engineers and scientists to pursue a career in 'STEM' (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) subjects. The Education Centre has been used by thousands of pupils since its original opening in 1998, until its temporary closure following the pandemic in 2020. This will continue to be available through construction of the Proposed Development.</p>

Table 3: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Project Alternatives

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
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?	A number of alternative types of power generation were outlined in Chapter 6: Project Alternatives [APP-044] and how well they matched the project goals was set out. The technologies considered included small modular reactors, hydrogen firing and renewables (tidal, wind or solar). Whilst these technologies may all have their role in the future electricity grid, it was considered that they did not meet the project objectives due to either the time to deployment, technology readiness, land take at the Application Site, availability of materials, or business case. In particular, the proposed new CQLCP Abated Generation Station with carbon capture at Connah's Quay would be able to flexibly and reliably generate low carbon power to meet the growing need for electricity, whenever it is required. Power stations such as this will play a crucial role in the future energy system, as they can help ensure that energy is available at times when it is needed most, and when power from renewable sources cannot meet demand. Indeed, as presented in the Planning Statement [APP-262] , to support the urgent need for new low carbon infrastructure, natural gas fired generation, which is carbon capture ready, is considered to be CNP infrastructure. NPS EN-2 ¹ confirms the vital role gas fired generating stations will play in providing reliable electricity supplies and a secure and diverse energy mix as the UK makes its transition towards a secure decarbonised electricity system.
Q3.2	The Applicant	Site Selection What alternative locations were considered for siting the proposed development outside of the order limits?	Alternative site locations were described in Chapter 6: Project Alternatives [APP-044] . The Applicant owns and operates a flexible generation portfolio of power stations, a fast-cycle gas storage facility and two high pressure gas pipelines in the UK. The Connah's Quay site (the Main Development Area) is one of these sites. Suitability of a location for the technology selected requires the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • availability of adequate land for the Proposed Development, whilst minimising the use of compulsory acquisition; and • connections to the national grid (for export of generated electricity), the gas network (for fuel), water connections (for cooling, process and hygiene needs) and, critically for a carbon capture equipped power station, a connection to a transport and storage system for the captured CO₂. Other sites owned by the Applicant, such as its flexible generation locations at Grain, Killingholme, Cottam Development Centre, Taylors Lane and Enfield, or its fast cycle gas storage location at Holford, may benefit from some of these attributes, but the Connah's Quay location benefits from its proximity to the HyNet CO ₂ Pipeline Project, which was granted development consent in March 2024. As such, this is the ideal location for the Proposed Development, deliverable in the timelines required to support the goals of Clean Power 2030 and allowing the Connah's Quay site to continue to contribute to security of supply but in a way that is lower carbon, whilst re-using the already existing site connections.
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?	In developing the Proposed Development, the Applicant has also considered a 'Do Minimum' scenario, in section 6.6.4 and summarised in Table 6-2 of Chapter 6: Project Alternatives [APP-044] . This scenario would comprise the installation of carbon capture infrastructure to the existing Connah's Quay Power Station instead of carrying out the Proposed Development. This option would require the upgrade and replacement of internal components, plant and other equipment alongside the construction of new infrastructure required to allow the plant to run in an abated mode (the major part of which is the carbon capture plant). The Applicant considers that this would likely be possible, on the basis that works for the installation of CCS infrastructure would be required regardless of whether a new power station is constructed or the existing Connah's Quay Power Station modified. However, there are drawbacks to this approach, as discussed in Chapter 6: Project Alternatives [APP-044] , specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the age of the existing Connah's Quay Power Station, and the large amounts of equipment in the existing plant that would need to be replaced. Additionally, major works to structures of the existing power station would be needed, and their feasibility has not been demonstrated; • the layout of the facility is not amenable to the retrofit of carbon capture, meaning that the integration could be complex and the existing plant layout may need to be modified;

¹ Department for Energy Security and Net Zero [DESNZ]. (2023). National Policy Statement for Natural Gas Electricity Generating Infrastructure (EN-2) [online]. Available at: [EN-2 Fossil Fuel Electricity Generating Infrastructure National Policy Statement](#)

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • this would entail an extended period of loss of generation while the upgrades and integration occurred, reducing the generation available to the national grid; • the works required to install the new equipment may be shorter in duration than construction of a new power station. However, this may be complicated by the challenge posed by the existing layout and scale of works required, as a result it is not certain that there would, in fact, be a saving in project duration; and • the retrofit of carbon capture equipment to the existing Connah's Quay Power Station would reduce the electricity generated and exported from the site (largely due to the thermal and electrical energy demand of the capture process itself).

Table 4: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Planning Policy

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
Q4.1	The Applicant	<p>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?</p>	<p>For the reasons explained in paragraphs 1.4.99 to 1.4.100 of the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearing 1 and response to Action Points [REP1-065], and as further explained in Table 3 of the Applicant's Response to Deadline 2 Submissions (EN010166/APP/9.14), the Applicant considers that the separate pollution control regime, together with the DPA, will adequately control the operational emissions from the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Nevertheless, for the avoidance of doubt, the Applicant has updated the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1) at Deadline 3 to define "<i>carbon dioxide capture plants</i>" to mean those which are "<i>designed to capture a minimum rate of 95% of the carbon dioxide emissions of the generating station operating at full load</i>" (Article 2(1)) and to insert a new requirement providing that "<i>Work No. 1(a) may not be brought into commercial use without Work Nos. 1(b), 1(c), 1(e), 7 and 8 also being brought into commercial use and Work Nos. 7 and 8 being connected to an operational storage site</i>" (Schedule 2, Part 1, Requirement 21).</p>
Q4.2	The Applicant	<p>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?</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that whilst revised versions of energy NPSs EN-1 and EN-5 came into force in January 2026, those revised versions do not apply to the DCO Application for the Proposed Development as it was accepted for examination before January 2026. The relevant energy NPSs for the purposes of the Proposed Development are therefore the NPSs that came into force in January 2024.</p> <p>In December 2024 the government published The Clean Power 2030 Action Plan, which sets out infrastructure deployment pathways and generation capacity ranges, aimed at ensuring that by 2030 clean sources will produce at least 95% of Great Britain's electricity generation, meeting the sixth Carbon Budget advice and pushing the country towards net zero 2050. This is referenced at paragraph 2.2.6 of the January 2026 version of NPS EN-1, but that version of EN-1 does not contain a specific limitation in respect of electricity generation from abated natural gas-fired power stations.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.2.2 of the January 2024 version of NPS EN-1, which is the relevant version of EN-1 for the purposes of the Proposed Development, is clear in stating that it is not the role of the planning system to deliver specific amounts or to limit any form of energy infrastructure covered by the NPS and that it is for industry to propose new energy infrastructure projects that it considers to be viable within the strategic framework set by government. Paragraph 3.2.3 goes on to state that, with the exception of coal or large-scale oil-fired electricity generation, the government does not consider it appropriate for planning policy to set limits on different technologies. In addition, paragraph 3.2.4 of EN-1 states that it is not the government's intention in presenting any figures or targets in EN-1 to propose limits on any new infrastructure that can be consented in accordance with the energy NPSs. Furthermore, a large number of consented projects can help deliver an affordable electricity system, by driving competition and reducing costs within and amongst different technology and infrastructure types.</p> <p>It should be noted that the policy set out at paragraphs 3.2.2 to 3.2.4 of the January 2024 version of NPS EN-1 has been retained at paragraphs 3.2.4 and 3.2.6 of the January 2026 version of EN-1.</p> <p>As noted in response to Q 4.1, the Applicant has updated the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1) at Deadline 3 to define "<i>carbon dioxide capture plants</i>" to mean those which are "<i>designed to capture a minimum rate of 95% of the carbon dioxide emissions of the generating station operating at full load</i>" (Article 2(1)) and to insert a new requirement providing that "<i>Work No. 1(a) may not be brought into commercial use without Work Nos. 1(b), 1(c), 1(e), 7 and 8 also being brought into commercial use and Work Nos. 7 and 8 being connected to an operational storage site</i>" (Schedule 2, Part 1, Requirement 21).</p>
Q4.3	The Applicant	<p>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?</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that whilst revised versions of energy NPSs EN-1 and EN-5 came into force in January 2026, those revised versions do not apply to the DCO Application for the Proposed Development as it was accepted for examination before January 2026. The relevant energy NPSs for the purposes of the Proposed Development are therefore the NPSs that came into force in January 2024.</p>

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>Paragraph 3.3.44 of NPS EN-1 (January 2024) states “<i>Combined Cycle Gas Turbines (CCGTs) using natural gas can be equipped with CCS which is intended to reduce emissions compared to unabated gas-fired plants by 90 per cent or more.</i>”</p> <p>ES Volume II, Chapter 20: Climate Change [APP-058] presents the lifecycle Greenhouse Gas (GHG) assessment which identifies the impacts of GHG emissions from the Connah’s Quay CCGT fitted with CCP on the climate during the construction, operational and decommissioning phases.</p> <p>Paragraph 20.6.32 explains that three operating cases were used to form the basis of the assessment; the Reference Case, Dispatchable Case (high) and Dispatchable Case (low). For the lifecycle GHG assessment, the GHG impact of the Proposed Development has been determined for the Reference Case, which enables an assessment of unconstrained operation and the subsequent presentation of the worst-case scenario for GHG emissions.</p> <p>Table 20-8 of this chapter provides a breakdown of the estimated emissions by each emission source over the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development operating under the Reference Case. This assumes a 95% carbon capture rate and estimates that ~90% of operational emissions are estimated to result from fuel usage (CCGT combustion and other fuel sources).</p> <p>In assessing the net benefit of the Proposed Development on operational carbon emissions, the GHG assessment compares the Proposed Development with existing unabated CCGT technologies currently connected to the UK grid. This comparison reflects the energy generation capacity that the Proposed Development is likely to replace.</p> <p>Paragraphs 20.6.42 to 20.6.47 quantify the net benefits of the Proposed Development by calculating its operational carbon intensity in comparison with an existing unabated CCGT. The results of the calculation show that the operational carbon intensity of the Proposed Development is estimated to be approximately 75% lower than that of existing unabated CCGTs when generating a MWh of electricity.</p> <p>This confirms that the Proposed Development’s lifecycle GHG emissions while operating under the Reference Case will be demonstrably lower than a corresponding unabated power station and while equipping the CCGT with CCP is not anticipated to achieve a 90 per cent reduction in emissions under the Reference Case, it provides a net positive impact and is aligned with paragraph 3.3.44 of NPS EN-1.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the Applicant would refer the ExA to paragraphs 1.4.99 to 1.4.100 of the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearing 1 and response to Action Points [REP1-065], and Table 3 of the Applicant's Response to Deadline 2 Submissions (EN010166/APP/9.14) which sets out why the Applicant considers that there are adequate controls for the operational emissions of the Proposed Development which are aligned with paragraph 3.3.44 of NPS EN-1.</p> <p>Moreover, the Applicant has updated the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1) at Deadline 3 to define “<i>carbon dioxide capture plants</i>” to mean those which are “<i>designed to capture a minimum rate of 95% of the carbon dioxide emissions of the generating station operating at full load</i>” (Article 2(1)) and to insert a new requirement providing that “<i>Work No. 1(a) may not be brought into commercial use without Work Nos. 1(b), 1(c), 1(e), 7 and 8 also being brought into commercial use and Work Nos. 7 and 8 being connected to an operational storage site.</i>” (Schedule 2, Part 1, Requirement 21).</p>

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
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?	The Applicant would refer the ExA to paragraphs 3.4.12 to 3.4.19 of the Planning Statement [APP-262] where the Welsh National Marine Plan (WNMP) is considered. These paragraphs set out how the Proposed Development would support relevant policies of the WNMP such as Sector Policy 'Energy – Oil and Gas' and Policy 'O&G_02: Oil and gas (supporting)'. A more detailed assessment of the Proposed Development against the policies of the WNMP is provided at Table 2.3 in Appendix 2 of the Planning Statement [APP-262] . This demonstrates how the Proposed Development complies with the policies contained in the WNMP and that there is no conflict with it.
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?	<p>As detailed within the Planning Statement [APP-262], including paragraph 3.2.6, the NPSs are the primary policy used by the SoS to examine and determine relevant applications for nationally significant infrastructure projects (NSIPs). Section 104 of the 2008 Act requires the SoS to determine DCO applications in accordance with the relevant NPSs, where these are in place, having regard to a number of specified matters including any matters which the SoS thinks are both <i>"important and relevant"</i> to their decision. Paragraph 5.1.1 of the Planning Statement [APP-262] explains that matters that the SoS may consider important and relevant may include national and regional planning policy and local development plan policy. Therefore, in the case of the Proposed Development, the North Wales Energy Strategy could be relevant. This is for the SoS to determine.</p> <p>The Applicant would refer the ExA to paragraphs 5.3.1, 5.3.2 and 7.21 of the Planning Statement [APP-262] and the Applicant's response to Ambition North Wales's Relevant Representation [REP1-062]. Power stations such as the Proposed Development will play a crucial role in the future energy system, as they can help ensure that energy is available at times when it is needed most, and provide back-up, which would otherwise be met by unabated gas fired power stations when renewables cannot meet demand.</p> <p>This benefit of the Proposed Development is consistent with the 2035 energy vision statement provided on page 19 of the North Wales Energy Strategy (NWES) and its core principles of North Wales becoming a leader in low carbon energy generation and developing infrastructure and technology that integrates into future systems for the duration of its lifespan. The Proposed Development also directly addresses the NWES's priority to <i>"Explore the role of CCS as a route to decarbonise power generation and potential to balance intermittency from renewables."</i></p> <p>Furthermore, page 41 of the NWES sets out a modelled pathway to achieve a 54% reduction in commercial and industrial emissions in North Wales by 2035 through a combination of decarbonisation of the electricity grid through renewable generation and low carbon hydrogen power generation. The supporting text states that <i>"this would depend on significant installation of new low carbon generation capacity both in North Wales and across the UK."</i> The Proposed Development represents low carbon generation capacity.</p> <p>The Proposed Development is consistent with the NWES's modelled pathway for commercial and industrial emissions. Although the Proposed Development would not use low hydrogen, it would still represent low carbon generation and, therefore, make a positive contribution toward NWES emissions reduction ambitions.</p> <p>Page 50 of the NWES presents 'Energy vision scenario: electricity generation – Box 3: A note on grid carbon factors' and states that a net increase of 68 and 74 GW of low carbon electricity is needed across the UK by 2035. The Proposed Development is a major investment in low carbon electricity generation, providing up to a likely maximum of 1,380 MW net electrical output. This is a significant contribution towards the urgent need for low carbon electricity generation set out in the NWES and would also help existing industry in North Wales to reduce its CO₂ emissions and stay in North Wales where it can continue to provide economics benefits consistent with the objectives in the NWES.</p>

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>The NWES contains an economic assessment of the economic impacts related to the changes in energy generation to achieve its energy vision scenario. With regards to investment and jobs, this would require £750 million of additional investment is required and could create 7,400 additional jobs.</p> <p>As stated in the Applicant's response to Ambition North Wales' Relevant Representation [REP1-062] and within the Planning Statement [APP-262], investment at Connah's Quay through development of the Proposed Development by the Applicant could contribute significantly to economic growth in the region, by providing skilled technical jobs and creating new opportunities during construction, along with potential opportunities through the wider supply chain. It is estimated there would be approximately 683 net Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) jobs per year, of which around 308 FTEs per year would be filled by people living within the Study Area. In terms of jobs during the operational phase, it is estimated that the Proposed Development would provide a total net employment of 82 jobs, and of these, 37 jobs would be within a 60-minute drive study area. This includes positive multiplier effects within the local economy through indirect/induced employment. The Applicant also intends to support skills and training of the local population.</p> <p>The Applicant, therefore, considers that the Proposed Development is aligned with the low carbon energy generation and economic ambitions for the NWES.</p>
Q4.6	The Applicant FCC	<p>Flintshire Local Development Plan ([APP-045] Ref: 6.2.7.4.17) How does the proposed development align to the Flintshire Local Development Plan?</p>	<p>The Applicant would refer the ExA to Table 2.6 in Appendix 2 of the Planning Statement [APP-262], which demonstrates how the Proposed Development complies with the policies contained in the Flintshire Local Development Plan (FLDP). Table 2.6 of the Planning Statement [APP-262] does not identify any conflict between the Proposed Development and relevant policies of the FLDP. The Applicant would also refer the ExA to the Applicant's Response to [FCC's] Local Impact Report (LIR) (EN010166/APP/9.15) in which it is noted that FCC has not raised any policy objections to the Proposed Development.</p>

Table 5: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Need

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
Q5.1	The Applicant	<p>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?</p>	<p>Total failure of the power system is extremely rare and, therefore, the number of operations of the Proposed Development to restore the network would be very small, possibly zero.</p> <p>All power stations must comply with the "Grid Code" as set by NESO (the technical rules for connecting to and using the National Electricity Transmission System (NETS)). The Proposed Development will meet the mandatory Grid Code requirements on restoration resilience, meaning that all equipment shall remain intact for up to 72 hours while there is no grid supply, so has to be able to cold start the power plant once the electricity transmission network is energised.</p> <p>The Applicant's response to Q5.2 provides further detail on the number and frequency of operations to support the normal routine running of the national grid.</p>
Q5.2	The Applicant	<p>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?</p>	<p>The Proposed Development would be able to generate low carbon power flexibly and reliably, in order to meet the growing need for electricity whenever it is required. Power stations such as this will play a crucial role in the future energy system, as they can help ensure that energy is available at times when it is needed most, such as when power from renewable sources cannot meet demand.</p> <p>The Combined Heat and Power Readiness Report [APP-261] explains that to remain conservative, an annual operating time of 3,500 hours has been assumed for the Combined Heat and Power assessment undertaken (note this is distinct from the ES assessment undertaken, which adopts a reasonable worst case environmental effects assumption). However, this could increase to 6,000 hours or more, depending on the operational dispatch as dictated by demand from the national grid. Whilst this demand can be modelled, it is inherently variable in the short and longer term. Given this uncertainty, it is also possible that operational hours could at times become more sporadic and there may be relatively long periods without operation. Nevertheless, the Proposed Development will be available to generate if called upon, in order to maintain a secure and stable supply of electricity (unless under a period of maintenance overhaul or repair).</p> <p>The EIA has been carried out on the basis of operation all year round and therefore defines a worst case Rochdale Envelope with respect to the environmental impact of operation. The variable, and hard to accurately predict, operating regime of the CQLCP Abated Generating Station will sit within this envelope.</p>
Q5.3	The Applicant	<p>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?</p>	<p>Any system restoration capability beyond that described in the Applicant's response to Q5.1 will be subject to a separate confidential procurement exercise undertaken by NESO. If the station is selected to provide such a service, the terms of this will be covered by a specific commercial agreement with NESO.</p>

Table 6: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Air Quality

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
Q6.1	The Applicant NRW	Zone of Influence for impacts on human health ([APP-037] Ref: 6.2.1 NTS) Why was a Zol of 2 km adopted for the consideration of the impact of emissions on human health, and given the plume distribution is this reasonable?	At the scoping stage of the Proposed Development, it was anticipated that a Zone of Influence (Zol) of 2 km from the Main Development Area would be appropriate based on permitting requirements for a development of this type. However, the dispersion model does also report values at distances beyond 2 km with a full list of human health receptors set out in Table 4 of Appendix 8-D: Operational Air Quality Assessment [APP-183] and shown on Figure 8-2: Operational Phase Assessment - Air Quality Study Area and Human Health Receptors [APP-093] . These additional values were included in Chapter 8: Air Quality [APP-046] and have been provided within the updated revision provided at Deadline 3 (EN010166/APP/6.2.8), to promote transparency by demonstrating impacts for the interest of stakeholders. It should be noted that the maximum impacts do occur within 2 km as demonstrated in Tables 8-14 (FEED 1), 8-15 (FEED 2) and 8-16 (Unabated) of Chapter 8: Air Quality [APP-046] . Whilst these results have been superseded by the updated modelling provided in the Change Application at Deadline 3 (EN010166/APP/6.2.8), the maximum impacts remain within 2 km of the source of emissions.
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?	Measurement data gathered by the Welsh Government, FCC and the baseline for this Application all confirm background levels of air pollutants in the study area for the Proposed Development meet the national air quality standards (objective values and targets) by a large margin. The annual mean target value for oxides of nitrogen is also achieved by a large margin. In general, air quality within the study area can be described as being of a very good standard. For the abundance of nitrogen and acidic substances contained in soils, deposition from atmosphere only accounts for a small proportion of the total amount present. Background levels are above the critical loads identified as ideal for designated ecological features. Pollutant levels exceeding critical loads are primarily due to agricultural practices and transfer of emissions from distant urban areas (road networks, etc). In deciding whether to grant an environmental permit, Natural Resources Wales (NRW) will confirm if best available techniques are being adopted to minimise emissions to air. However, it would require a more strategic regional approach than is appropriate for a single development to resolve the wider contribution from distant sources.
Q6.3	The Applicant NRW	Plume distribution of emitted particles and wind direction 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?	The dispersion models quantify the impacts under the meteorological conditions observed for every hour of a five- year period (43,824 sets of conditions). The annual mean concentrations illustrated in Figure 8-5: Air Quality Study Area – FEED 2 Modelled Buildings (EN010166/APP/6.3) , submitted at Deadline 3, align with the most frequently occurring wind direction because these contribute more hours when emissions are carried to these locations. It is highly unlikely that during the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development (30 years), the wind patterns in Flintshire will change noticeably or that climate change will introduce combinations of meteorological parameters that are not already included in the five-year period used in the air quality assessment.

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
Q6.4	The Applicant NRW	<p>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?</p>	<div data-bbox="1543 262 2418 1228" data-label="Figure"> </div> <p>This wind rose shown above and as Plate 1 of Appendix 8-D: Air Quality Operational Assessment [APP-046] (unchanged in the Deadline 3 revision (EN010166/APP/6.4)) represents wind patterns from 2020. Each sector of the wind rose represents the frequency with which winds blow from each direction. This pattern is influenced by local topography and synoptic air flow patterns.</p> <p>The way that the ground (vegetation, structures, etc) interacts with moving air is complex and is included within the dispersion modelling calculations. These interactions have been taken into account in the reported impacts at all receptors using the approach set out in NRW's guidance on <i>Environmental permitting: air dispersion modelling reports</i> (reference 8-34 of Chapter 8: Air Quality [APP-046] (which has remained unchanged in updated revisions through to Deadline 3 (EN010166/APP/6.2.8)).</p>
Q6.5	The Applicant NRW	<p>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.</p>	<p>If the only parameter changing was the height of release, then a reduction in release height would result in an increase in the maximum ground level concentration.</p> <p>The model scenarios being used to represent the Change Application also include changes to the modelled structures on the Application Site, repositioning of some points of emissions and the removal of some pollutant sources. The net change in impacts at receptors is reported based on new dispersion model outputs in the Change Application Report (EN010166/APP/10.1) and the updated Chapter 8: Air Quality (EN010166/APP/6.2.8), submitted at Deadline 3. The updated modelling does not change the conclusions of the original assessment in Chapter 8: Air Quality [APP-046], and</p>

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			effects would remain negligible to minor adverse (not significant) on human health. In addition, the updated modelling for the Change Application (submitted at Deadline 3) does not change the conclusions of the original assessments presented in Chapter 11: Terrestrial and Aquatic Ecology [APP-049] or the Report to Inform Habitats Regulations Assessment (RIHRA) [APP-253] when considered in an ecological context (reflected in the Deadline 3 submission revisions).
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?	Figure 8-8: FEED 1 Scenario, Maximum 1-hour Mean Amines Process Contribution [APP-099] is a plot of maximum 1-hour concentrations, with each value in the grid being due to conditions that occurred in different hours of the year. Typically, 1-hour plots look like a series of nested circles like a slice through an onion. This regular shape is then modified for wind directions that occur less frequently or only occur with high wind speeds which typically cause more rapid dilution of the plume. The concentrations of amines reported in Figure 8-8: FEED 1 Scenario, Maximum 1-hour Mean Amines Process Contribution [APP-099] are extremely low, with the outer line representing a 1-hour maximum concentration of 0.05 µg/m ³ which is 0.013% of the assessment level. At such extremely low concentrations, the isopleth lines are further distorted.
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?	Further to the wind rose illustrated in the response to Q6.4, winds blowing from the north-east to the south-west occur very infrequently and therefore the impact on the annual mean nitrogen deposition rate in a south-westerly direction is markedly less than for other directions. The wind blows toward the north-west more frequently than to the south-east, resulting in higher annual nitrogen deposition rates to the north-west. The greater range of meteorological conditions occurring during the hours when the wind blows to the north-west results in more elongated isopleth lines.
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?	There are two reasons for the apparent variation: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The short-term concentrations are affected by the abated and unabated emissions being from different emission points amongst the structures within the Application Site. In the figure, the abated sources are coloured pink and the unabated sources are coloured green. 2. There is more consistency in the long-term (annual mean) figures (for example, figure 13 (abated, 2020 met data) versus figure 28 (unabated, 2020 met data), than the short-term figures, as for the latter, building downwash effects have a greater influence on the reported results.
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?	The Applicant notes that Chapter 11: Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology (EN010166/APP/6.2.11) and RIHRA (EN010166/APP/6.12) have been updated at Deadline 3 as part of the Change Application. However, these updates do not change the position set out below. Air quality impacts on designated sites are reported in Chapter 11: Terrestrial and Aquatic Ecology [APP-049] and the RIHRA [APP-253] submitted as part of the DCO Application. The relevant sections in summary are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • paragraphs 7.2.55 to 7.2.67 and 10.2.25 to 10.2.26 of the RIHRA [APP-253] discuss the construction traffic effects on SACs, SPAs and Ramsar sites. They conclude that impacts on all sites are imperceptible except for Dee Estuary SAC/SPA/Ramsar at the A548 bridge regarding nitrogen deposition. Even here, it is concluded that due to the short duration of exposure there will be no significant botanical effect; • paragraph 11.6.27 of Chapter 11: Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology [APP-049] reports on the construction period impact on SSSIs and confirms that there would be no likely significant effects from construction traffic emissions on any other SSSIs. This is because they lie beyond the 200m zone of influence for traffic-related air quality impacts from affected roads; • paragraphs 7.3.26 to 7.3.43 and 10.3.5 to 10.3.20 of the RIHRA [APP-253] discuss the operational impacts on SACs, SPAs and Ramsar sites. They conclude that impacts on all sites are imperceptible, or the sites are not sensitive, with the exception of nitrogen deposition at Dee Estuary SAC/SPA/Ramsar site and ammonia and nitrogen deposition at Deeside & Buckley Newts SAC;

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the subtle botanical effects that can be expected on these two sites are discussed in paragraphs 10.3.7 (regarding Dee Estuary SAC/SPA/Ramsar site) and 10.3.14 (regarding Deeside & Buckley Newts SAC); • paragraphs 11.6.153 to 11.6.163 of Chapter 11: Terrestrial and Aquatic Ecology [APP-049] discuss the operational period impact on other SSSIs. For ammonia and nitrogen deposition, these paragraphs conclude that either the contribution of the Proposed Development is imperceptible for all SSSIs, or the SSSIs are not sensitive. The paragraphs do identify that cumulative nitrogen deposition (i.e. from the Proposed Development considered with other projects) to Heswall Dales SSSI and River Dee SSSI (Wales) is perceptible. However, they conclude that the forecast nitrogen deposition is a less than 1% increase compared to background rates (i.e. very small) and well below both the levels expected to cause a change in vegetation based on research and National Highways guidance. Therefore, there will be no botanical effect and no mitigation is needed; and • paragraphs 11.6.166 to 11.6.168 of Chapter 11: Terrestrial and Aquatic Ecology [APP-049] discuss the impact on ancient woodlands. They conclude that the impact of the small forecast increase in ammonia and nitrogen deposition is likely to be relatively subtle (e.g. a change in the frequency of occurrence of some ground flora species, increase in amount of grass cover, or shift to more competitive ground flora species). Moreover, changes in vegetation may not arise at all in practice due to the effect of woodland canopy and woodland management in influencing vegetation. Therefore, there would be no significant adverse effect. <p>The only mitigation required is that discussed in paragraphs 10.3.10 to 10.3.12 of the RIHRA [APP-253] in relation to the Dee Estuary SAC/SPA/Ramsar site and 10.3.15 to 10.3.19 of the RIHRA [APP-253] in relation to the Deeside & Buckley Newts SAC. This can be summarised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dee Estuary SAC/SPA/Ramsar: As secured by Requirement 22 of the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1), the Applicant must prepare a Saltmarsh Implementation and Monitoring Plan. This will include an implementation timetable demonstrating how and when the managed retreat will be created before any loss of saltmarsh, and a management and monitoring programme to ensure the retreat will be effective at meeting the aims and objectives of the plan. The setback of existing flood defences south of the existing Connah's Quay Power Station, as detailed in the Saltmarsh Creation Strategy (EN010166/APP/6.16), will allow an existing area of saltmarsh to continue to persist in the face of sea level rise. This setback is being delivered to address the direct loss of saltmarsh due to the new outfall. However, the area being created is more than 200 times larger than the area to be permanently lost and it will allow an equivalent area to persist that would otherwise be lost to coastal squeeze. It is considered that allowing an entire area of saltmarsh to persist in the face of sea-level rise will not only address the direct loss of habitat due to the outfall but also mitigate any subtle qualitative botanical changes that may arise across the wider saltmarsh in the Dee Estuary as a result of nitrogen deposition (for example, minor shifts towards more competitive grass species) during operation of the Proposed Development. The Applicant emphasises that such botanical changes may not occur in practice; and • a costed draft management agreement with FCC to deliver enhanced management of Connah's Quay Ponds and Woodlands to make the site more resilient (as habitats in better condition are generally more resilient to the effects of nitrogen deposition) and to offset any slight increase in habitat management (e.g. control of more competitive ground flora species) that may be required to offset the small increase in nitrogen. The management agreement will be secured through the Deed of Development Consent Obligations, to be submitted in draft at Deadline 4.
Q6.10	NRW NE	<p>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?</p>	Not addressed to the Applicant.
Q6.11	NRW NE	<p>HRA: Dust emissions mitigation The applicant has clarified in their Response to Relevant Representations [REP1-062] that</p>	Not addressed to the Applicant.

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>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?</p>	
Q6.12	The Applicant	<p>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].</p>	<p>Acid deposition from construction traffic was inadvertently omitted from Appendix 8C: Air Quality Traffic Emission Assessment [APP-182] and therefore was not discussed in the RIHRA [APP-253]. It will be included in updates to Appendix 8C: Air Quality Traffic Emission Assessment [APP-182] and the RIHRA (EN010166/APP/6.12) at Deadline 4. In summary, for Deeside & Buckley Newts SAC (transects 7a to 7c) the contribution of the Proposed Development is too low to show in the model when reported to two decimal places, meaning the Proposed Development's contribution is imperceptible and it will not contribute to any 'in combination' acid deposition effect on the SAC. This is also true for two of the three transects into Dee Estuary SAC/SPA/Ramsar site (transects 8a and 8c). For Transect TE8b the contribution of the Proposed Development is 1% of the critical load equivalent, with the 'in combination' effect being 2% of the critical load equivalent.</p> <p>This is the same transect where the worst-case nitrogen deposition is also forecast. This is to be expected as the nitrogen deposition as a result of the Proposed Development is also what results in the acid deposition; the two are directly mathematically linked. However, acid deposition during construction is not considered to result in an Adverse Effect on the Integrity of the SAC/SPA/Ramsar site, for the same reasons that nitrogen deposition is deemed not to result in an Adverse Effect on Integrity (paragraph 10.2.25 of the RIHRA [APP-253] and subsequent bullet points). This position is reflected in the revision submitted at Deadline 3 (EN010166/APP/6.12).</p>
Q6.13	NE	<p>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 Likely Significant (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?</p>	Not addressed to the Applicant.
Q6.14	The Applicant	<p>HRA: Features of European sites - floating water plantain</p>	As stated in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [REP1-062] , <i>Luronium natans</i> is known to be confined to Bala Lake and associated slow flowing sections of the River Dee, approximately 50 km from the stretch of River Dee relevant to the Proposed Development, and much further than this following the river meanders.

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		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?	It is unrealistic to assume <i>Luronium natans</i> may spread through the river system to the lowland sections which are within the zone of influence of the Proposed Development; the lower stretches of the River Dee are of an entirely different character to the upper stretches and apart from being too far from the existing populations for colonization, are also too fast flowing for the species to establish. The River Dee / Afon Dyfrdwy SSSI Restoration Technical Report ² concludes that the Lower Dee has " <i>Limited suitable habitat present in areas of slower flows. High turbidity may be a limiting factor</i> ".
Q6.15	NE	HRA: River Dee and Bala Lake SAC – Atmospheric pollution exhaust emissions Are NE satisfied with the applicant's conclusion that the critical levels of ammonia (NH3) and nitrogen oxides (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?	Not addressed to the Applicant.
Q6.16	The Applicant	HRA: River Dee and Bala Lake SAC – Atmospheric pollution exhaust emissions 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 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?	Paragraph 7.3.30 of the RIHRA [APP-253] (which is retained in the Deadline 3 revision) discusses operational emissions and notes that ' <i>... the critical level for NOx would not be exceeded under any scenario at any Habitats site (both regarding annual mean and 24-hour maximum NOx concentrations). Therefore, no LSE [likely significant effect] would arise on any Habitats site. NOx is therefore not discussed further in this HRA.</i> ' This would apply to all sites including River Dee & Bala Lake SAC. Paragraph 7.3.38 of the RIHRA [APP-253] (which is retained in the Deadline 3 revision) states regarding all pollutants that ' <i>As discussed for construction air quality, the modelled part of River Dee and Bala Lake/Afon Dyfrdwy a Llyn Tegid SAC (the River Dee) is not designated for features sensitive to air quality and is therefore not discussed further in this HRA.</i> ' However, the data regarding operational NO _x and ammonia at River Dee & Bala Lake SAC are presented in Appendix 8-D: Air Quality Operational Assessment (EN010166/APP/6.4) (which has been updated at Deadline 3 as part of the Change Application). Tables 32 and 33, 39 and 40, and 46 and 47 present NO _x while tables 35, 42 and 48 present ammonia. Receptor OE10 represents the River Dee & Bala Lake SAC. The PEC/AQAL column indicates if the critical level is exceeded. For OE10 it is not exceeded in any scenario for either NO _x or ammonia (i.e. the numeral given in this column is always below 100%).
Q6.17	NE	Atmospheric pollution at internationally designated sites – Construction Are NE satisfied that the concerns raised in ID NE35 of their relevant representation [RR-	Not addressed to the Applicant.

² Jacobs (2023), River Dee/ Afon Dyfrdwy SSSI Restoration Technical Report

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		026] have been addressed in ES chapter 8, table 8-5 [APP-046] ?	
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>	<p>The Applicant had not identified the area of managed retreat as compensation for air quality impacts because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly, due to the Applicant's previously expressed view that the managed retreat area is not 'compensation' for any impacts, because the Applicant is not 'creating' new saltmarsh but is removing an artificial barrier thus allowing natural coastal processes to resume in an area of existing saltmarsh. The Applicant is not creating saltmarsh but allowing an existing area of saltmarsh to persist. • Secondly, the need for the managed retreat is driven by the direct loss of saltmarsh to the new outfall; the extent of managed retreat was based on a doubling of the extent of temporary loss during outfall construction. Air quality impacts are not what is driving the managed retreat. • However, since the managed retreat will in the long-term enable far more saltmarsh to persist than would be permanently lost, the RIHRA [APP-253] concludes that this will also incidentally offset any subtle negative air quality impacts that may (or may not) arise by allowing an entire area of saltmarsh to persist that would otherwise entirely disappear. <p>Notwithstanding the above, given the request of the ExA, the Applicant will update the Notice of a proposed without prejudice HRA derogation in Wales [PDA-003] for Deadline 4.</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>	<p>There is no legal requirement to address impacts on a European site within a specific geography or jurisdiction where the European site straddles jurisdictions. From an ecological point of view, the European site is treated as a whole. For example, the conservation objectives of the Dee Estuary SAC/SPA/Ramsar site as set out in the Regulation 33 report³ set a series of parameters for Atlantic salt meadows (such as extent and morphology) that apply 'within the site', rather than being split into English and Welsh sections or English and Welsh conservation objectives. The Applicant's view is that, while the mitigation measures are located in Wales, they will offset the air quality impact that is forecast across the Dee Estuary SAC/SPA/Ramsar as a whole by ensuring an entire 0.13 ha area of existing saltmarsh that would otherwise be lost to sea level rise will be able to persist.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the expected botanical air quality effect on Dee Estuary SAC/SPA/Ramsar is forecast to be subtle (e.g. a small shift in plant species composition possibly favouring more competitive species) and may not arise at all in practice due to other influences that typically have a greater influence on vegetation composition, such as existing management, existing high background nitrogen deposition rates, and tidal inundation limiting the ability of more competitive species to increase in abundance.</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</p>	<p>In paragraph 2.1.15 of their Written Representation [REP1-073], NRW has confirmed that the sensitive lower plant features of the Annex 1 oakwoods habitat (these being the features most vulnerable to ammonia) have already been lost and would be unlikely to recolonise even if pollutant concentrations and deposition rates were restored. In which case, as noted by Natural Resources Wales in paragraph 2.1.24 of their Written Representation [REP1-073], the appropriate ammonia critical level would be 3 µgm⁻³ rather than 1 µgm⁻³. This higher critical level is not forecast to be exceeded. Therefore, the main role of</p>

³ NRW (2009). Dee Estuary Reg 33: Volume 1 (English) [online]. Accessed 04/03/2026. Available at: [Natural England & the Countryside Council for Wales' advice given under Regulation 33\(2\) of the Conservation \(Natural Habitats &c.\) Regulations 1994](#)

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>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. 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>	<p>ammonia at this SAC is as a source of nitrogen and is thus captured through consideration of the nitrogen deposition rate and related mitigation. As such the contribution is to address nitrogen deposition impacts rather than ammonia.</p>
Q6.21	The Applicant	<p>Impact of stack height reduction on assessment of atmospheric pollution 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>	<p>The RIHRA [APP-253] has been updated to account for the Change Application and submitted at Deadline 3 (EN010166/APP/6.12).</p> <p>Please refer to the response above to Q6.5. It can be confirmed that in relation to the revised assessment contained within the RIHRA (EN010166/APP/6.12), the change is minimal and does not alter the conclusions of the assessment.</p>
Q6.22	The Applicant	<p>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 AEol of the Deeside and Buckley Newt Sites SAC?</p>	<p>Lowering the CCP stack height and other associated changes to the site layout also has the potential to slightly reduce the nitrogen deposition and ammonia at Deeside & Buckley Newts SAC, depending upon the FEED option. The proposed lowering of the stack height and other associated changes to the site layout for all FEED options would not materially change the magnitude of the reported impacts on ammonia concentrations and nitrogen deposition rates.</p> <p>The Proposed Development will be able to meet the Best Available Techniques Associated Emission Levels (BAT AELs) for emissions of NOx without the requirement for Selective Catalytic Reduction (SCR) when operating unabated and emitting via the HRSG stacks. This would remove the only source of ammonia emissions from the HRSG stacks, reducing the magnitude of reported impacts of ammonia and nitrogen deposition.</p>
Q6.23	NRW	<p>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</p>	<p>Not addressed to the Applicant.</p>

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		be required for the applicant to justify their conclusion?	
Q6.24	The Applicant	<p>Atmospheric pollution at the Deeside and Buckley Newt Sites SAC – Mitigation</p> <p>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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Draft DCO. b. Provide a draft of the Section 106 agreement with FCC, no later than deadline 4. 	<p>The Deed of Development Consent Obligations to be entered into pursuant to section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by section 174 of the 2008 Act, will be submitted in draft at Deadline 4 of the Examination. This agreement will secure a financial contribution for the purpose of providing enhanced management within the Deeside and Buckley Newt Sites SAC of oak woodland over a 30-year period commencing on the date on which Work No. 1(a) or (b) in Schedule 1 to the Development Consent Order is first operated. It provides for the payment of a contribution by the Applicant and the use of that contribution by FCC for the defined SAC management purpose.</p> <p>The Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 2023⁴ (NPS EN-1) states at paragraph 4.1.18 that “<i>The Secretary of State may consider any development consent obligations that an applicant agrees with local authorities. These must be relevant to planning, necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the proposed development, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development, and reasonable in all other respects.</i>” Footnote 97 explains that “<i>Where the words “planning obligations” are used in this NPS they refer to “development consent obligations” under section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by section 174 of the Planning Act 2008</i>”. Paragraph 5.4.44 (within Section 5.4 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation) states that “<i>The Secretary of State should consider what appropriate requirements should be attached to any consent and/or in any planning obligations entered into, in order to ensure that any mitigation or biodiversity net gain measures, if offered, are delivered and maintained.</i>”</p> <p>In this context, paragraph 4.1.17 of NPS EN-1 states that the SoS should consider the guidance in the Planning Practice Guidance: Use of Planning Conditions⁵. In relation to the payment of monies, paragraph 005 of that guidance states that “<i>No payment of money or other consideration can be positively required when granting planning permission</i>” but it may be possible “<i>to prohibit development authorised by the planning permission until a specified action has been taken (for example, the entering into of a planning obligation requiring the payment of a financial contribution towards the provision of supporting infrastructure)</i>”.</p> <p>Having regard to NPS EN-1 and the government’s guidance outlined above, the Applicant considers that it is appropriate for the securing mechanism for the payment of the financial contribution and its use for the SAC management purpose to be through a Deed of Development Consent Obligations rather than a DCO requirement. The Applicant considers that these obligations satisfy the tests in the policy because they are relevant to planning, necessary to make the Proposed Development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the Proposed Development, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the Proposed Development, and reasonable in all other respects.</p> <p>Precedents for the use of Deeds of Development Consent Obligations to secure the payment of monies in connection with a DCO application include the agreements entered into for the Longfield Solar Farm and the Sizewell C Project. The Applicant shared a draft of the Deed of Development Consent Obligations with FCC on 20 February 2026 and awaits FCC’s feedback.</p>
Q6.25	NRW	<p>Atmospheric pollution at the Deeside and Buckley Newt Sites SAC</p> <p>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</p>	<p>This response is not addressed to the Applicant, however NRW has been issued with a copy of the draft Deed of Development Consent Obligations for comment. NRW has provided feedback on the management prescriptions developed by FCC which is currently being reviewed by the Applicant.</p>

⁴ DESNZ. (2023). Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1). Available: [Overarching National Policy Statement for energy \(EN-1\), 2025 \(accessible webpage\) - GOV.UK](#)

⁵ Department for Levelling up, Housing and Communities. (2019). Use of planning conditions.GOV.UK. Available: [Use of planning conditions - GOV.UK](#)

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>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?</p>	
Q6.26	FCC	<p>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.</p>	<p>This response is not addressed to the Applicant. However, the draft Deed of Development Consent Obligations continues to be discussed with FCC. The management measures included within the draft Deed of Development Consent Obligations have been prepared and costed by FCC.</p>

Table 7: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Noise and Vibration

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
Q7.1	The Applicant	<p>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?</p>	<p>Further assessment of detailed construction flows for each stage of the Proposed Development, as secured in paragraph 3.3.7 of the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [REP1-025], will be undertaken to determine whether further mitigation measures are required to reduce the potential impacts of construction traffic along Kelsterton Road.</p> <p>Potential mitigation measures are stated in the Framework CTMP [REP1-025], which includes provision of noise monitoring at selected locations and consideration of provision of additional glazing and sound insulation.</p> <p>Temporary acoustic fencing could also be considered to help minimise construction traffic noise in the external areas of the residential properties on Kelsterton Road.</p> <p>Communication and engagement with local residents throughout the construction phase, as detailed in the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [REP2-014] and in Section 5 of the Framework CTMP [REP1-025], will support management of potential impacts and provide advance notice of peak construction traffic movements. These commitments are retained in the revision of the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (EN010166/APP/6.5) submitted at Deadline 3 as part of the Change Application.</p>
Q7.2	The Applicant	<p>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?</p>	<p>Appendix 9-B: Baseline Sound Level Survey [APP-185] provides details of the existing sound sources noted during the baseline noise surveys in April and May 2024.</p> <p>As originally stated in Chapter 9: Noise and Vibration [APP-047], power generation at Connah's Quay has been an operating industrial source in the study area since the original power station began operations in 1954, with the existing Connah's Quay Power Station operating since 1996. Therefore, the existing ambient and background sound levels in the study area are characterised by industrial and road traffic sources.</p> <p>Following the inclusion of appropriate mitigation in the design, the operation of the Proposed Development would not alter the existing mixed industrial and transport related noise character of the area and there would be no material increase in the ambient noise levels.</p> <p>The steady noise from the existing Connah's Quay Power Station has not historically generated complaints (whilst acknowledging there have been complaints over its operational lifetime), and the Proposed Development would have similar perceptibility characteristics.</p>
Q7.3	The Applicant FCC	<p>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?</p>	<p>The Applicant refers to its response to comment reference FCC5 (see Table 20) of the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [REP1-062].</p> <p>As outlined in Section 2.4 of the Framework CEMP (EN010166/APP/6.5), the core construction hours will be 08:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturday. These hours align with construction work hours defined by FCC. Where construction works are proposed outside the core hours, additional assessments would be undertaken to ensure the construction noise and vibration thresholds are not exceeded and would be provided to FCC for approval in accordance with the requirements of the Framework CEMP (EN010166/APP/6.5). The Applicant is not proposing that core working hours start at 07:00 and the revision submitted at Deadline 3 does not modify any of the content referenced above.</p>

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
Q7.4	The Applicant	<p>Potential for vibrations at neighbouring properties</p> <p>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?</p>	<p>Concerns about construction vibration and previous complaints associated with construction activities have been covered in the response to References 7.1.7, 7.4.3, 7.4.5 and 7.4.6 in Table 7 of the Applicant's Response to Deadline 1 Submissions [REP2-019].</p> <p>Operational vibration was scoped out of the assessment in the Scoping Report [APP-172], which was an approach confirmed by the Scoping Opinion [APP-173], as there are to be no vibration creating sources introduced as part of the Proposed Development that will be perceptible off-site at the nearest noise sensitive receptors (NSRs). All operational plant and equipment will be maintained so as not to cause additional vibration.</p> <p>The Applicant agreed the disturbance threshold with NRW prior to completing the assessment, as detailed within the RIHRA [APP-253].</p>
Q7.5	NRW	<p>HRA: noise and visual disturbance at the Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SPA and Ramsar site</p> <p>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?</p>	<p>Not addressed to the Applicant.</p>
Q7.6	NRW	<p>HRA: noise and visual disturbance - otter</p> <p>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?</p>	<p>Not addressed to the Applicant.</p>

Table 8: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Traffic and Transport

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
Q8.1	The Applicant	<p>Optioneering of abnormal indivisible loads (AIL) routes</p> <p>Presently the application highlights three potential routes for the movement of AIL.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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? 	<p>The Applicant needs to retain the potential use of all three delivery points during the construction of the Proposed Development. Each of the different routes has been identified to have different constraints and, therefore, a combination of the delivery points will be used. For example, heavier loads could be delivered to the Main Development Area via Port of Mostyn without weight restrictions imposed by crossing Flintshire Bridge. The other options could be used to deliver larger, lighter, items with limited or no interventions required. In selecting these routes and setting the Order limits for the Proposed Development, the Applicant considered the various types of AILs that would be required for construction and the best route for these to be transported to the Construction and Operation Area. There is not one individual route which works for all types of AILs required.</p> <p>As the final loads would be confirmed through the detailed design process, there will be no further assessments carried out at this stage to discount any of the routes shown, however Requirement 19 of the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1) requires the following:</p> <p><i>“The transport of abnormal indivisible loads in connection with the construction of the authorised development must not commence until a detailed abnormal indivisible load risk assessment and method statement have been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority.”</i></p> <p>As the detailed abnormal indivisible load risk assessment will be undertaken following the detailed design, the Order limits need to remain available for all three routes. The Applicant has prepared AIL Route Feasibility Cautions Assessment which was included as Appendix A of the Framework CTMP [APP-247] which is retained in the Deadline 2 revision [REP2-025], based on all the known information, including reasonable assumptions. As detailed in both revisions, AILs which are transported on the highway are subject to an advance consultation and consent process with the Strategic Network Managers, Trunk Road Authority, Highway Authority and emergency services. Local stakeholder engagement and notification can also be carried out.</p> <p>The AILs will be contained as far as possible to water transport, rail or the strategic road network. The forecast number of AILs over the construction period has been set out.</p> <p>The Applicant has carefully considered the powers required for delivery of the Proposed Development as a whole. The DCO regime is intended to be a ‘one stop shop’ for all consents required to deliver nationally significant infrastructure, such as the Proposed Development. As is precedent for projects of the same nature as the Proposed Development, seeking temporary powers to work in the street to facilitate the transport of AILs is necessary to ensure there is no future impediment to delivery. For further details on why the relevant DCO powers sought are justified, please refer to the Applicant's response to Q24.2 and Q24.9 below.</p>
Q8.2	The Applicant National Highways FCC Highways Authority	<p>Timings of traffic counts</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>The surveys were carried out using industry best practice and professional judgement. The dates were specifically chosen to be outside of school holidays or public holidays, occurring during a ‘neutral’ time period in line with the Department for Transport's Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG) (Unit M1.2 ‘Data Sources and Surveys’). The surveys were carried out by an appointed third party traffic data collection specialist in accordance with the correct way to record and store traffic data. The months selected are regarded as neutral months with modern guidance on data selection suggesting the majority of months are neutral, with the exception of the dates immediately before and after school and public holidays.</p> <p>Following best practice, the survey data gathered at that time is, by the professional standards, considered to be a representative example of any time in that year.</p> <p>Seasonal variation or adjustment is a rare intervention measure to traffic surveys, often reserved and required in areas such as Cornwall and Devon. There is no known mandate to consider seasonality in the study area, it does not appear within any</p>

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>published guidance identified by the Applicant's transport experts, and this has been confirmed by FCC within Issue Specific Hearing 2, see paragraph 1.5.14 of the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearing 2 and Response to Action Point [REP1-066]. The Applicant therefore confirms the Highway Authority has not specifically requested these assessments and would not likely do so. Moreover, any potential increase in tourist activity into this area would likely be, in part, counter balanced by locals taking holidays outside of the area.</p> <p>In considering the worst-case scenario for consideration in Chapter 10: Traffic and Transport [APP-048] and Appendix 10-A: Transport Assessment [REP1-016], growth calculations have been applied to traffic data to the selected most traffic intensive construction method (of the two under consideration). From this construction method the Applicant has selected the peak month of traffic activity in the construction period and considered the addition of committed or cumulative developments. This has also been considered in an additional sensitivity assessment of a planned outage event.</p> <p>The assessments in Chapter 10: Traffic and Transport [APP-048] and Appendix 10-A: Transport Assessment [REP1-016] are specific robust assessments considered to be more onerous than any consideration of any holiday season, or outdoor event limited to a short time, potentially held over weekends where construction activity does not generally occur, and where travel by attendees would come from many different directions and not specifically to and from the study area.</p>
Q8.3	The Applicant National Highways FCC Highways Authority	<p>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?</p>	<p>Kelsterton Road currently provides access to the existing Connah's Quay Power Station and is the most appropriate form of access during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. Therefore, there would be an unavoidable impact on this route, in its function as serving the Main Development Area.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the classification of effect on Kelsterton Road has been determined as 'minor adverse' in relation to Severance, Pedestrian Amenity and Fear & Intimidation, and as 'negligible' in relation to Highway Safety, Hazardous / Large Loads, and Driver Delay; therefore, resulting in no significant effects.</p> <p>This has been determined through a combination of professional judgement and through use of the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) Guidelines.</p> <p>The magnitude of impact on Kelsterton Road, relating to the temporary traffic increase during construction, has been reduced from 'high' to 'medium' through consideration of the embedded mitigation measures outlined within the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP2-025] and the Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan [APP-248]. Management of HGV construction traffic will work to ensure vehicles follow the most appropriate available routes and travel outside of network or locally sensitive peak hours, for example, school start and finish times. The Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP2-025] is also inclusive of a number of physical measures to monitor HGV movements along Kelsterton Road, ensuring the condition of the highway is preserved, and that if required, actions are undertaken to restore the highway back to its appropriate standard.</p>
Q8.4	The Applicant National Highways FCC Highways Authority	<p>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?</p>	<p>Section 10.6 of Chapter 10: Traffic and Transport [APP-048] concluded that no significant transport effects would occur during the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development. The impact assessment was undertaken in accordance with the IEMA Guidelines on: Environmental Assessment of Traffic and Movement (July 2023)⁶, and has factored in embedded mitigation. Specifically, this related to the appraisal of the magnitude of impact on Kelsterton Road, relating to the temporary traffic increase during construction, which was reduced from 'high' to 'medium' through consideration of the embedded mitigation measures outlined within the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP2-025] and the Framework Construction Worker Travel Plan [APP-248]. Therefore, the assessment has concluded no significant transport effects, following consideration of embedded mitigation, and therefore does not identify any requirement for additional</p>

⁶ IEMA (2023). Environmental Assessment of Traffic & Movement, July 2023 [online]. Available at: [ISEP - New ISEP Guidance: Environmental Assessment of Traffic and Movement](#) (Accessed 05/08/2026)

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>mitigation, beyond that which has been set out. The assessments consider the worst case peak period, where through the remainder of the construction period, the traffic impact is likely to be less.</p> <p>The routing strategy for heavy vehicles in the construction phase is for vehicles to route to and from the Main Development Area directly from the Strategic Road Network, via the A548. This removes the possibility of a material impact on the surrounding local roads, instead containing the majority of heavy vehicle traffic to the Strategic Road Network, which has the greatest resilience to increases in traffic. With regard to light vehicle traffic associated with construction worker travel, Section 10.6 of Chapter 10: Traffic and Transport [APP-048] has reported that outside of Kelsterton Road, which provides access to the Main Development Area, the majority of remaining highway network links do not experience an increase of greater than 10%, which is not an increase that would be perceivable against typical background traffic levels. These forecasts are based on a worst-case assessment of peak construction traffic.</p>
Q8.5	The Applicant	<p>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?</p>	<p>The existing Connah's Quay Power Station is currently able to use this alternative site access off B1529 Kelsterton Road in Connah's Quay town. It is these rights that the Proposed Development seeks to replicate. This route includes a crossing over the North Wales Main Line railway and under the A548 Chester Road which then connects to the existing Connah's Quay Power Station internal road network. This could then, in turn, provide access towards (or egress from) the Main Development Area. Whilst this access is not routinely used by the existing Connah's Quay Power Station, has not been used recently, and is not envisaged to be used frequently by the Proposed Development, availability of the alternative access improves resilience of the Main Development Area. In the past, this route has been used where access to the former A station site (the construction and indicative enhancement area, C&IEA) has been restricted by NGET, with the Main Development Area accessed through this gate. This eventuality is neither routine nor recent.</p> <p>This alternative access has not been assigned any construction traffic as part of the Traffic Assessment (Appendix 10-A: Transport Assessment (EN010166/APP/6.4)) and, therefore, the potential impact of light vehicles routing to the Main Development Area via this access has not been considered in the Application. Accordingly, the use by the Applicant for the purposes of the Proposed Development would be in case of emergency only.</p> <p>This access is the main route used by NGET to access their 400kV substation facilities.</p> <p>Whilst not defined explicitly or exhaustively, emergencies where the use of this alternative access may be required could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main Development Area evacuation; • C&IEA evacuation; • Entry of emergency vehicles; and • Blockage of main site access. <p>By their nature as emergencies, these circumstances are not common or considered likely in practice. Therefore, the risks associated with the frequency of use of the access are considered negligible.</p>
Q8.6	The Applicant DNS	<p>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?</p>	<p>Paragraphs 5.6.17, 5.6.18, and 5.6.19 of Chapter 5: Construction Management and Programme [APP-043] explain how an alternative temporary access to the Connah's Quay Power Station Nature Reserve would be provided to Deeside Naturalist Society (DNS) members during the construction phase of the Proposed Development, as well as how a permanent access road would be provided to access the bird hides during operation. The Applicant confirms that this is retained and remains unchanged in the revision submitted at Deadline 3 (EN010166/APP/6.2.5) as part of the Change Application.</p> <p>The anticipated access would continue from the Access to the Main Development Area, with a designated access road following the southern and western boundary of the ecological safeguard zone shown on Figure 5-3: Construction Areas</p>

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>[APP-083]; a position that has not changed as a result of the changes submitted at Deadline 3 (EN010166/APP/6.3). This would minimise health and safety risks associated with the construction phase.</p> <p>Article 15(5) of the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1) confirms that no street identified within Parts 1 and 3 of Schedule 5 as being temporarily or permanently stopped up (which includes the DNS access) may be stopped up until "a temporary alternative route for the passage of such traffic as could have used the street, public right of way or right of navigation has been provided and subsequently maintained by the undertaker until either the existing route has been reinstated or a permanent alternative has been provided and open to public use." The relevant routes, which have retained in the Deadline 3 submission, are shown on the Access, Streets, Rights of Way and Rights of Navigation Plans (EN010166/APP/6.3).</p> <p>Therefore, access to the Nature Reserve will be retained in line with the current lease arrangements with DNS.</p>
Q8.7	The Applicant Airbus	<p>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?</p>	<p>The Applicant has submitted a formal Change Application at Deadline 3. As regards the stacks and aviation safety, the stacks for the carbon capture plant and the heat recovery steam generators are all lowered in comparison with what was set out in the Application.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this change, there are a number of provisions within the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1) designed to safeguard aviation safety and demonstrate that, when they are discharged, risk to aviation from the Proposed Development is at a level as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP). Paragraphs 2.5.5 to 2.5.9 of the Framework CEMP (EN010166/APP/6.5) identify controls relating to lighting of cranes during construction and note this would be discussed with Airbus and the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) in accordance with Requirement 14 of the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1).</p> <p>Section 3.4 of the Lighting Strategy [APP-278] outlines the principles associated with aviation warning lighting on operational structures and how these capture the requirements set out in CAA policy and in the Air Navigation Order. The final lighting requirements will be agreed with Airbus and the CAA in accordance with Requirement 14 of the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1). Furthermore, Requirement 15 of the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1) states that no stage of Work No. 1(a) or (b) may commence until details of the heights of structures and temporary cranes and other information that is required by the CAA and Airbus to chart the site for aviation purposes for that stage have been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority, following consultation with the CAA and Airbus.</p>
Q8.8	The Applicant MCA	<p>Risk of maritime collision with vessels (Ref: [RR-044]) 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?</p>	<p>The Applicant has prepared the Navigational Risk Assessment [APP-252] to consider the feasibility of the identified landside delivery points and identify any known cautions. At this stage, the Applicant considers this a proportionate approach to demonstrating that risks associated with such movements can be reduced to as low as reasonably practicable. In the absence of the information on final loads proposed to be transported by sea, there are no further studies that can be undertaken at the time. The Applicant wishes to draw attention to the conclusions of the Navigational Risk Assessment [APP-252] at paragraph 6.1.2 which states:</p> <p><i>"Overall, there is no clear and obvious reason why one port facility should be recommended for use for the Proposed Development ahead of the others. The NRA shows that when mitigations are considered, all routes can be safely used as part of the construction strategy for the Proposed Development"</i></p> <p>In addition to this, as secured through Requirement 19 of the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1), the Applicant is committed to preparing a detailed AIL Risk Assessment and Method Statement in advance of the work commencing in accordance with the requirements of the selected landside delivery point(s).</p>

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			The Applicant confirms that the Navigational Risk Assessment [APP-252] has been undertaken in accordance with the guidance identified by the Maritime and Coastguard Agency within their Relevant Representation [RR-044] (see Table 1 of the Navigational Risk Assessment [APP-252]).

Table 9: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Terrestrial and Aquatic Ecology

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
Q9.1	The Applicant	<p>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?</p>	<p>The Applicant does not intend to repair the sluices as part of the DCO Application as it is considered an ongoing management activity within the existing Conservation Areas Management Plan, rather than a management activity related to the Proposed Development. During recent discussions, the Applicant has confirmed with the DNS that the existing sluices and culvert will be re-instated as part of the ongoing management and maintenance of compartment 2, the details of which are captured within the Draft Statement of Common Ground between Uniper and DNS (EN010166/APP/8.5) submitted at Deadline 3. Please note that this mitigation relates to the existing Connah's Quay Power Station and so should not be taken into account when considering the measures proposed as part of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>In relation to the question over whether development works could be undertaken to the bird hides, the Applicant notes that the land covered by these hides is not included within the Order limits. This is because it would not be possible to include works to these hides as part of the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1) in the absence of any such works satisfying the legal tests for being included within a DCO. Development may only be consented under a DCO to the extent it forms either 'development for which development consent is required' (i.e. the element of the Proposed Development which is facilitating generation of energy of more than 350MW); 'associated development' (which has a very specific definition); or related housing development (which is not relevant in this case). For generating stations in Wales, 'associated development' must be associated with the development for which development consent is required and cannot consist of or include the construction or extension of dwellings. Because improvement works to the existing bird hides would not be in any way related to the element of the Proposed Development, which is generating energy, it cannot be considered 'associated development' and so is not capable of being included within the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1).</p>
Q9.2	The Applicant NRW NE	<p>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?</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed this matter in its response to Q6.9.</p>
Q9.3	The Applicant NRW NE	<p>Gronant fields site ([APP-254] Ref: 6.13)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What measures are in place to secure the Gronant fields site and what are the alternatives if this fails? 2. Are the Gronant fields sites already within a designated site, or already functionally linked land to a designated site? 3. 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? 4. 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 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Applicant already owns the Gronant Fields site and measures set out in the Curlew Mitigation Strategy [APP-254] are secured in Schedule 2, Requirement 11 of the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1). The Applicant does not consider alternatives necessary. There is adequate space and opportunity at Gronant Fields to comfortably deliver the required mitigation, as well as implement adaptive management to secure the objectives of the Strategy. 2. The Gronant Fields site is within the Dee Estuary Ramsar site, SPA and SSSI. 3. The Applicant can confirm that Gronant Fields have not been secured nor proposed as compensatory habitat for any other activities. 4. The Applicant is continuing to undertake ornithological surveys of Gronant Fields, which are due to complete in April 2026, to understand the current usage of the site by qualifying bird species of the SPA/Ramsar site/SSSI. These surveys build on those reported in the Curlew Mitigation Strategy [APP-254] along with the use of existing third party datasets. The Applicant will not be directly translocating any additional species to the site, but rather enhancing habitats present on site to optimize conditions for Curlew, which will in turn have wider benefits for biodiversity, e.g., through creating more diverse habitats with specific management regimes. The Applicant continues to discuss the development of the Curlew Mitigation Strategy with NRW and the RSPB to ensure that the site is enhanced for curlew and other species.

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>the planned relocation of additional species to the site?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Can the Gronant site accommodate an increased population if it is already being used? 6. 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? 7. Should the Gronant fields site be within the proposed order limits? 8. 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? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. To support the desk study data and surveys undertaken between March and April 2025 outlined in the Curlew Mitigation Strategy [APP-254], the Applicant is currently undertaking surveys at Gronant Fields. The Gronant Fields site is of considerable size and currently it is not being used by Curlew. As a result, there is sufficient scope for the site to be able to accommodate increased populations of Curlew. 6. The objective is not to move birds that would be foraging within the Order limits to Gronant Fields. Curlews are found around the SPA, and the conservation objectives of the SPA relate to the Curlew population as a whole. The function of the mitigation land at Gronant Fields is to ensure that there is no net reduction in the foraging and roosting opportunity for Curlew populations associated with the Dee Estuary SPA/Ramsar site outside the boundaries of the designated sites. As such, the mitigation focusses on the SPA population of Curlew as a whole rather than the individual birds within the Order limits. This was discussed in Issue Specific Hearing 2, for which the Applicant's submissions are summarised within Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at ISH2 and response to Action Points [REP1-066], where the Applicant stated that the intention of the Gronant Fields site was to help to ensure the SPA as a whole has sufficient high-tide foraging and roosting habitat. The methods to achieve this will be discussed with NRW. 7. The Applicant does not consider it to be necessary for the off-site mitigation land at Gronant Fields to be within the Order limits. This is because (i) no third-party land rights are required (the Applicant has already acquired the freehold to Gronant Fields) and (ii) pending detailed design, it is not yet certain that any activities at Gronant Fields would constitute development requiring planning permission. If such consent is required, it would be secured separately by the Applicant through the appropriate consenting route. 8. The Applicant refers the ExA to the response provided to NRW9 within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [REP1-062].
Q9.4	The Applicant NRW NE DNS	<p>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?</p>	<p>Appendix 11D: Ornithology Technical Appendix [APP-193] sets out the data available for the Order limits and wider Survey Area, including functionally linked land adjacent to the existing Connah's Quay Power Station. The Applicant has undertaken detailed surveys, covering a full 12-month period (November 2023 to October 2024) and including all phases of the tidal cycle along with nocturnal surveys, the results of which have been used to inform the impact assessment. As set out in Table 1 of Appendix 11D: Ornithology Technical Appendix [APP-193], these data are supported by other third party data, including ornithological surveys undertaken within the Order limits between April 2022 and February 2023 by Aspect Ecology, monthly wetland bird data collected by the Deeside Naturalists' Society for the Connah's Quay Power Station Nature Reserve spanning the period January 2013 to December 2023 and Wetland Bird Survey (WeBS) data obtained from the British Trust for Ornithology (BTO) for the period 2018 to 2023. The Deeside Naturalists' Society have agreed to provide the Applicant with survey data they have collected between December 2023 and March 2026.</p> <p>Collectively, these present data relevant to the Proposed Development spanning the period between 2013 and 2024.</p> <p>Specific reference to birds associated with land deemed to be functionally linked to the Dee Estuary SPA/Ramsar site is also set out in the Curlew Mitigation Strategy [APP-254].</p>
Q9.5	The Applicant Natural England	<p>Concerns raised as to the ability of Natural England (NE) to be able to engage in the examination (Ref: [AoC-003] and [RR-026]) Can the applicant and NE clarify their respective positions with regards to the ability of NE to engage in the examination and what can be done to assist in ensuring the ExA receives valuable representations from them? Can NE reaffirm their commitment to support the examination and also work collaboratively with other statutory nature conservation bodies</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges and welcomes NE's continued engagement in the Examination.</p> <p>The Applicant and NE have established a fortnightly meeting sequence to ensure emerging matters can be discussed and progress can be made towards common ground. This engagement is recorded in the Draft Statement of Common Ground between Uniper UK Limited and Natural England (EN010166/APP/8.16) submitted at Deadline 3. During a meeting on 9th February 2026, NE confirmed that where potential impacts fall within Wales, they will defer to NRW's advice to avoid duplicating assessments or effort. This is reflected in NE's Deadline 2 submission [REP2-022] and the approach has been incorporated into the updated Statement of Common Ground between the Applicant and Natural England (EN010166/APP/8.16) submitted at Deadline 3.</p>

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		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?	Areas of retained habitat within the operational footprint of the existing Connah's Quay Power Station were shown as retained within the DCO application, see Figure 5-5: Vegetation Clearance Plan [APP-085] . Retained habitat does not count as created habitat and cannot count towards any net benefit for biodiversity delivery as it is retained, and is not going to change, and therefore deliver any further benefit for biodiversity as a result of the Proposed Development. Following further clarification, the Applicant has updated the Green Infrastructure Statement (EN010166/APP/6.11) (submitted at Deadline 3) with some small areas of retained habitat amended to be areas of lost habitats to account for changes to the design as presented within the Change Application.
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?	The areas of land outside the Dee Estuary SPA/Ramsar site/SSSI of greatest importance and therefore, 'functionally-linked', are typically adjacent or in close proximity to the designated sites and not further inland, i.e., not south west of the existing Connah's Quay Power Station, railway line and A548, but rather north west adjacent the estuary. As such, the placement of the new stacks will not prevent localised movements of birds between these areas. The Applicant is not aware of any evidence of conflicts between the existing stacks and the qualifying features of the Dee Estuary designated sites. All migratory species which may travel vast distances between breeding and non-breeding grounds negotiate an array of man-made structures and urban environments.
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?	These measures were discussed in paragraph 10.2.12 and subsequent bullet points of the RIHRA [APP-253] . In summary, they described: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• a 3 m acoustic fence on the boundary of the site, as detailed in the Framework CEMP [APP-246]; and• the 'Water Connection Works' and 'Proposed Surface Water Outfall' would be subject to seasonal restrictions, as detailed in the Framework CEMP [APP-246], since acoustic fencing would not be possible (as these works are within the SPA). These are retained in the latest revision of the Framework CEMP (EN010166/APP/6.5) .
Q9.9	The Applicant	General comments on the HRA: Responding to Natural Resources Wales and NE Representation Natural Resources Wales and NE 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 Applicant has already responded to the comments made within the Relevant Representations submitted by NRW [RR-027] and NE [RR-026] within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [REP1-062] and Applicant's Response to Deadline 1 Submissions [REP2-019] . The Applicant does not consider that it is necessary to make any further amendments to the RIHRA [APP-253] , which has been updated at Deadline 3, to address comments raised in the Relevant Representations. However, the Applicant will make amendments to the RIHRA (EN010166/APP/6.12) at Deadline 4, as appropriate. This is because the Applicant has provided a response in Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [REP1-062] and Applicant's Response to Deadline 1 Submissions [REP2-019] , setting out a counterpoint in relation to the issues raised and explaining the reasoning for each point. NE and NRW will need to review those responses and determine if they resolve the point raised. It should be noted that the majority of HRA issues were raised by NE and are on matters on which there is no disagreement between the Applicant and NRW. The Applicant understands that NE intends to defer to NRW regarding impacts in Wales. If so, this will resolve the vast majority of the points raised by NE on the HRA. Following discussion with NRW, the Applicant is committed to updating the Notice of a proposed without prejudice HRA derogation in Wales [PDA-003] at Deadline 4 to include consideration of the air quality effects alone and in-combination with other plans and projects on the Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SAC/ SPA/ Ramsar site. The Applicant is also considering the need for, and feasibility of, additional air quality mitigation proposals that have been shared by NRW.

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>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.</p>	<p>The Applicant is continuing to engage with NRW and NE. This is reported on via the SoCGs submitted at Deadline 3 (EN010166/APP/8.2).</p>
Q9.10	NRW NE	<p>General comments on the HRA: Methodology and data</p> <p>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 RIHRA [APP-253] meet their satisfaction? If not, please explain why not and set out the specific information that would still be required.</p>	<p>Not addressed to the Applicant.</p>
Q9.11	The Applicant	<p>General comments on the HRA: Conservation status of European Sites</p> <p>The Conservation objectives for the sites assessed for Adverse Effects on Integrity (AEoI) are provided in [APP-253] , table C-2.</p>	<p>The Applicant does not believe the conservation status of the European sites taken forward to Stage 2 (Dee Estuary SAC/SPA/Ramsar and Deeside & Buckley Newts SAC) is published. While some marine SACs/SPAs do have a published conservation status, this does not appear to be the case for Dee Estuary SAC/SPA, and conservation status is not published for Ramsar sites, or for terrestrial SACs such as Deeside & Buckley Newts SAC.</p>

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		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] ?	Not addressed to the Applicant.
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.	Not addressed to the Applicant.
Q9.14	The Applicant	General comments on the HRA: Impact Pathways – Direct Habitat Loss/ Damage to Qualifying Habitat 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. 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.	For the Dee Estuary SPA/Ramsar site 'direct habitat loss' and 'loss of supporting habitat for birds using the Dee Estuary SAC for foraging/roosting' are the same impact pathway since the SAC and SPA boundary is coincident and the habitats the SPA birds use within the Dee Estuary include the SAC habitats. However, row 2 of Table 6 of the RIHRA (EN010166/APP/6.12) will be updated for Deadline 4 to include a bullet point for direct loss of / damage to qualifying habitat as already exists in the Table for Dee Estuary SAC.
Q9.15	The Applicant	General comments on the HRA: Stage 1 assessment NRW and NE have raised several concerns in their relevant representations [RR-027] and [RR-026] and written representations [REP1-	The Applicant refers to its responses to NRW and Natural England's Relevant Representations (see Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [REP1-062] and Applicant's Response to Deadline 1 Submissions [REP2-019]). The RIHRA [APP-253] relies on the existing abstraction license and permitted discharge limits controlled via the environmental permit (paragraphs 7.3.17 and 7.3.18 of the RIHRA [APP-253]). Since the existing abstractions have not

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>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>	<p>been put forward for revision, the Applicant is not changing the existing baseline, and that baseline has been deemed acceptable through the grant of the existing environmental permit.</p> <p>At Stage 1, the RIHRA [APP-253] also relies on measures that will be introduced to protect water quality and prevent spread of invasive species, on the basis that these are separate legal requirements and would therefore be implemented whether or not any European sites were involved. This information is retained in the Deadline 3 revision (EN010166/APP/6.12) and are set out in the Framework CEMP (EN010166/APP/6.5).</p> <p>The reference for the existing water abstraction permit held by the Applicant for the existing Connah's Quay Power Station is 24/67/10/124/V004.</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>	Not addressed to the Applicant.
Q9.17	NRW NE	<p>Loss of Atlantic salt meadows (Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SAC): Comments on proposed measures</p> <p>In the RIHRA [APP-253] 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"> a. 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 b. 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"> c. Confirm the efficacy of these measures to address the temporary, medium-term loss of Atlantic salt meadow. d. Do NRW and NE consider that the applicant's proposed measures, would be feasible, deliverable and ecologically effective to alleviate the scale of potential 	Not addressed to the Applicant.

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>harm to the European sites? If not, what amendments or other measures would NRW/ NE propose?</p> <p>e. 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?</p>	
Q9.18	The Applicant	<p>Loss of Atlantic salt meadows (Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SAC): Connah's Quay conservation area 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>	<p>The Applicant confirms that it is the manager of the Connah's Quay conservation area within its ownership. This ownership represents around 51 hectares within the SAC. Past human activities have led to the site taking its current form and the land area and its nature has resulted from large scale land reclamation following the operation of the Connah's Quay coal-fired power station. In the mid 1990's the current power station was constructed and commissioned, and as a condition of the consent from the Secretary of State under Section 36 of the Electricity Act 1989 for the existing Connah's Quay Power Station the conservation area was established in agreement with the Countryside Commission for Wales (CCW, now NRW). It is managed according to a specific conservation management plan. The area is divided into three, known as Compartments 1, 2 and 3, each constructed and managed to conserve existing habitats and develop new ones to attract waders and wildfowl. Compartment 1 comprises an 11 hectare conservation area, Compartment 2 a bunded pools complex and saltmarsh and Compartment 3 the Station Saltings. These three Compartments form part of the Dee Estuary SSSI.</p> <p>The Applicant manages Compartments 1, 2 and 3 to comply with relevant conditions stated in the conservation management plan. Management measures combine active intervention (e.g. grazing, cutting, water-level control) with areas where non-intervention is employed, depending on habitat type. The habitats present include internationally important saltmarsh, swamp and reedbed, marshy and coastal grassland, and open water and islands.</p> <p>The success of the management approach as set out in the management plan is assessed through a program of monitoring to test performance against the success criteria. These include bird counts and seasonal usage surveys, habitat condition assessments (vegetation structure, water levels, invasive species) and fixed-point and aerial photography, along with additional, and ecological surveys where needed. To the extent that the results of monitoring to date allow conclusions to be made, the condition of saltmarsh is judged to be in favourable condition. Current management prescriptions involve cutting and removal of arisings in parts of the Bunded Pools and non-intervention elsewhere. This approach was a trial being carried out to help identify whether cutting of the saltmarsh is seen to be beneficial for waders and waterfowl. A continuation of past management policy is therefore considered to be appropriate regarding saltmarsh. The Applicant is currently progressing a number of areas of civil engineering works (such as sluice gate repairs) to further protect the reserve for the future. The field study centre also underwent a refurbishment in 2025.</p> <p>Annual reviews assess monitoring results, confirm whether objectives are being met, and feed into the longer term reviews and possible updates to the management prescriptions contained in the plan (at approximately a 5 year frequency). The conservation plan is in the process of being updated to ensure its management goals remain current and reflect the most recent monitoring data.</p>
Q9.19	The Applicant	<p>Loss of Atlantic salt meadows (Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SAC): Plans to secure proposed measures 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</p>	<p>a) Requirement 22 of the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1) secures the Saltmarsh Creation Strategy (EN010166/APP/6.16). This requirement provides that a Saltmarsh Implementation and Monitoring Plan must be submitted to and approved by FCC, in consultation with NRW, before construction of the new surface water discharge forming Work No. 5 is commenced or Work No. 1(a) is brought into commercial use (whichever is earlier). The Saltmarsh Implementation and Monitoring Plan must be in general accordance with the Saltmarsh Creation Strategy (EN010166/APP/6.16) and establish the aims and objectives of the plan, details of the existing saltmarsh communities that need to establish,</p>

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>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 DCO. 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> <p>a) When is the applicant planning to provide the rest of this information? The ExA expects the Draft DCO 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 commencement of the impact, success criteria, restoration timescales, ongoing management and monitoring, adaptive management, and data-sharing proposals.</p> <p>b) Can the applicant confirm how the Saltmarsh Method Statement would interact/ relate to the Framework Saltmarsh Creation Strategy?</p>	<p>information on the consideration of suitable mitigation locations, details of monitoring and management to achieve such aims and objectives, and an implementation timetable to ensure that the plan will be effective at meeting the aims and objectives of the plan ahead of any loss of saltmarsh. The Saltmarsh Creation Strategy (EN010166/APP/6.16), submitted at Deadline 3, does provide indicative details of the creation, monitoring, adaptive management and the creation of a Saltmarsh Steering Group.</p> <p>b) The Applicant can confirm that the Saltmarsh Creation Strategy (EN010166/APP/6.16) and Saltmarsh Method Statement are entirely separate and distinct. The provisions of the Saltmarsh Creation Strategy (EN010166/APP/6.16) are to enable managed realignment to allow the natural retreat of saltmarsh at the eastern extent of the C&IEA. The Saltmarsh Method Statement, to be developed prior to construction, is related to the temporary loss of saltmarsh associated with the construction of the proposed Surface Water Outfall to detail measures and monitoring for successful establishment.</p>
Q9.20	The Applicant	<p>Loss of Atlantic salt meadows (Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SAC): Derogations case – alternatives</p> <p>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?</p>	<p>Both of the identified scenarios within this question would likely result in equivalent or greater impacts on the designated features of the Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SAC either in its establishment or its operation. There is no current discharge route to this location and therefore a new culvert and headwall would be required. Introducing new flows into this location could influence the water levels across the Connah's Quay Nature Reserve making the existing control structures redundant without further intervention.</p>
Q9.21	The Applicant	<p>Loss of Atlantic salt meadows (Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SAC): Progress on agreeing measures with NRW and NE</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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).</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that the provision of the Saltmarsh Creation Strategy (EN010166/APP/6.16) at Deadline 3 is sufficient to address this point, as noted in the Notice of a proposed without prejudice HRA derogation in Wales [PDA-003].</p>

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
Q9.22	The Applicant	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>The direct and indirect effects on the Dee Estuary SPA and Dee Estuary Ramsar site are identical to those for the SAC except regarding loss of functionally-linked land which applies only to the SPA and Ramsar site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct loss of habitat: This would apply to qualifying saltmarsh habitat for the SAC and Ramsar site, which is also supporting habitat for SPA and Ramsar birds. Loss of saltmarsh would negatively affect the SAC, SPA and Ramsar site in the same way. • Air quality impact on saltmarsh habitat (a qualifying habitat for the SAC and Ramsar site and supporting habitat for SPA and Ramsar birds): A shift in the botanical composition of the SAC and Ramsar saltmarsh has been precautionarily assumed to also potentially affect SPA and Ramsar birds by changing habitat structure. • Introduction of invasive species: A shift in the botanical composition of the SAC and Ramsar saltmarsh has been precautionarily assumed to also potentially affect SPA and Ramsar birds by changing habitat structure. • Water quantity, level and flow impacts: These could affect the SAC and Ramsar saltmarsh and if they did so would also affect the Ramsar and SPA birds that rely upon that saltmarsh. • Disturbance: This applies to SPA and Ramsar site bird species and also to SAC and Ramsar fish and otter. • Loss of functionally-linked land: This applies to the birds of the SPA and Ramsar. <p>The habitats for which the SAC and Ramsar site are designated are also habitats used by SPA and Ramsar birds and therefore impacts on SAC and Ramsar saltmarsh will also affect SPA and Ramsar birds. The baseline for those impact pathways that affect SAC saltmarsh is therefore also the baseline for SPA and Ramsar saltmarsh habitat, and the SPA/SAC and Ramsar boundaries are co-incident. The merged approach was taken to avoid duplicating text, as the assessment for all impact pathways except disturbance is effectively identical for the SAC, SPA and Ramsar site and the three designations have many identical qualifying features.</p> <p>Ornithology baseline data relevant to the assessment of loss of functionally-linked land for SPA/Ramsar birds (curlew) is presented in paragraph 10.2.19 of the RIHRA [APP-253]. Disturbance impacts are discussed separately for the non-avian SAC/Ramsar features (otter/fish) and the avian Ramsar/SPA features. This applies in paragraph 7.2.20 (which discusses birds) and 7.2.21 (which discusses fish), 10.2.11 to 10.2.18 (concerning disturbance of SPA and Ramsar birds), and 10.3.1 to 10.3.3 (concerning disturbance of SPA and Ramsar birds).</p> <p>The Applicant will adjust the way the assessment is reported in an update to the RIHRA (EN010166/APP/6.12) for Deadline 4, but it should be noted this will mainly increase the amount of repetition.</p>
Q9.23	NRW NE	<p>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 AEol 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.</p>	<p>Not addressed to the Applicant.</p>
Q9.24	The Applicant	<p>Loss of functionally linked land (Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SPA/ Ramsar site): Baseline data for and assessment of qualifying bird species</p>	<p>There are no outstanding surveys to establish the baseline data for qualifying bird species of the Dee Estuary SPA/Ramsar site required to inform the assessment of the Proposed Development and the RIHRA (EN010166/APP/6.12). Full details of the ornithological baseline relevant to and used in the assessment of impacts of the Proposed Development are provided in Appendix 11D: Ornithology Technical Appendix [APP-193].</p>

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		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.	There are ongoing non-breeding bird surveys being undertaken by the Applicant at Gronant Fields, but these are to inform the long-term management prescriptions for the site and not to inform the RIHRA (EN010166/APP/6.12) . The Applicant will continue to provide survey results to NRW, NE and RSPB going forward, but does not propose to submit these into the examination.
Q9.25	The Applicant	<p>Loss of functionally linked land (Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SPA/ Ramsar site): Designated bird features</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>The requested information is provided in Annex F of Appendix 11-D: Ornithology Technical Appendix [APP-193]. This presents the data collected by the Applicant with the Survey Areas, defined in sections 3.2.1 to 3.2.8 and shown on Figures 11-D2 to 11-D4 of Appendix 11-D: Ornithology Technical Appendix [APP-193].</p> <p>Specifically, for the fields west of the existing Connah's Quay Power Station and deemed to be functionally-linked to the Dee Estuary SPA/Ramsar site because of regular usage by Curlew, information pertaining to the number of individual Curlew recorded in the context of the proportion of the citation count is provided in Table 1 of the Curlew Mitigation Strategy [APP-254].</p> <p>No other areas of functionally linked land were identified within the zone of influence of the Proposed Development.</p>
Q9.26	The Applicant	<p>Loss of functionally linked land (Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SPA/ Ramsar site): Area of functionally linked land</p> <p>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 RIHRA [APP-253] Please revise in the updated RIHRA [APP-253] to be submitted no later than deadline 4.</p>	The Applicant confirms that the total area of functionally linked land to be delivered at Gronant Fields is 26 ha. References to 25 ha will be corrected in an updated revision of the RIHRA (EN01066/APP/6.12) submitted at Deadline 4, as it does not form part of the Change Application.
Q9.27	NRW NE	<p>Loss of functionally linked land (Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SPA/ Ramsar site): Comments on proposed measures</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>b) Are NRW satisfied that Gronant Fields does not fall within the existing management</p>	Not addressed to the Applicant.

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>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>c) 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?</p> <p>The ExA requests that the applicant set out progress on each measure in a tabulated form which is subsequently updated at each deadline.</p>	<p>The Applicant considers the measures in the Curlew Mitigation Strategy [APP-254] are clearly defined and sufficiently robust to support the conclusion of no AEoI. The strategy is a framework document, with the details to be included in the Curlew mitigation and monitoring plan secured in Schedule 2, Requirement 11 of the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1).</p> <p>Discussions in relation to the Curlew Mitigation Strategy [APP-254] are ongoing with multiple stakeholders and an update will be submitted to the examination at Deadline 4. This update will not be substantive but will include some further details agreed to be provided with relevant stakeholders.</p>

Table 10: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Marine Ecology

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
Q10.1	The Applicant NRW	<p>Increased silt loading ([APP-050] Ref: 6.2.12.2.20) 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>	<p>As set out in Chapter 16: Physical Processes [APP-054] (paragraphs 16.6.9 to 16.6.14 and 16.6.16 to 16.6.17; and Table 16-13), the Proposed Development will utilise the existing cooling water inlet/outlet infrastructure and will not introduce new discharge points or mechanisms that would alter baseline sediment dynamics. The Physical Processes assessment concludes there will be no change to morphology or sediment resuspension relative to existing conditions.</p> <p>Construction of the Marine Elements will occur at low tide only, with no in-river works and no interaction with the riverbed (further details are in Section 12.2 of Chapter 12: Marine Ecology [APP-050]). During operation, cleaning of intake/outfall structures will follow the same methods as currently used.</p> <p>Accordingly, no increase in suspended sediment concentrations or deposition is predicted, and there will be no physical disturbance to benthic habitats or designated features from increased silt loading. This impact has, therefore, been scoped out of further assessment in Chapter 12: Marine Ecology [APP-050].</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) 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? Is there a potential for thermal limits to be exceeded during the dual operation of the existing and the proposed development?</p>	<p>As set out in Chapter 12: Marine Ecology [APP-050] (Section 12.3; paragraph 12.2.16), the worst-case thermal discharge scenario has been assessed within the limits of the existing Environmental Permit. The Proposed Development will operate within these permitted limits, including during any period of dual operation. There is no evidence of thermal effects on marine ecology receptors arising from existing discharges. Accordingly, no exceedance of thermal limits is predicted, and no changes or physical disturbance to marine ecology receptors within the designated sites are anticipated due to water column temperature fluctuations.</p> <p>On this basis, indirect effects to marine ecology from thermal impacts during operation have been scoped out of further assessment in Chapter 12: Marine Ecology [APP-050].</p>

Table 11: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Water Environment and Flood Risk

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
Q11.1	The Applicant NRW	<p>Impact of water abstraction and discharge on designated sites ([APP-051] Ref: 6.2.4.2.40)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 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? 2. How will this interact with and be balanced with the existing abstraction and discharge for the existing power station? 3. Were the existing intakes and discharge arrangements originally oversized for the existing development? 4. How will the changes to the eel screens affect the intake's ability to abstract water? 5. 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? 6. What evidence is there that the proposed and existing thermal arrangements will be the same given the same discharge permits requirements? 	<p>Cooling water abstraction and discharge arrangements are described in Chapter 4: The Proposed Development [APP-042] of the Application.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The feed of cooling water required for the Proposed Development will be sourced from the existing cooling water supply abstracted from the River Dee, via a new make-up connection pipe to the existing cooling water settling pond. Minor upgrades to the existing cooling water intake equipment to meet current legislative requirements including the Eels (England and Wales) Regulations 2009 (Eels Regulations) will be required. This will comprise installation of new 2 mm eel screens on the abstraction point subject to legislative control within a Marine Licence. Some minor localised repair of the cooling water piping may also be undertaken as dictated by inspection of the system. Overall, the Applicant considers there is no impediment to the reuse of the cooling water system and considers the ability to reuse it following minor upgrades an advantage of the Proposed Development. 2. The Applicant proposes to maintain the permitted abstraction and discharge parameters as far as reasonably practicable, e.g. abstraction would continue to be limited to periods around high water and volumes abstracted and returned would be consistent with the current abstraction licence. Abstraction and discharge would be regulated by Natural Resources Wales (NRW) through the Abstraction License and Environmental Permit respectively as required for operation of the Proposed Development. The existing Connah's Quay Power Station would not operate at its full installed capacity (four CCGT units) concurrently with the Proposed Development. Therefore, in the event of phased construction, Train 1 of the Proposed Development and two existing Connah's Quay Power Station CCGT units could require cooling water at the same time; or following simultaneous construction (or in the event of phased construction, following commercial operation of Train 2), the currently permitted maximum cooling water volumes would be such that only the demand of the Proposed Development would be met. In essence, the existing cooling water supply and return will be transferred from the existing Connah's Quay Power Station to the Proposed Development to match the latter's demand as Trains come into operation. No increase in flow is being sought as part of this Application, or the Environmental Permit. 3. Whilst some design margin, as is usual in equipment design, may have been included in the original design of the cooling water system, the intended use of the system for the Proposed Development (in terms of flow volumes, periods of abstraction and other parameters) will remain within the same operating envelope as the existing Connah's Quay Power Station. The Proposed Development does not rely on any oversizing of the original installation. 4. It is not expected that the revised eel screens would reduce the ability of the plant to abstract water. The detailed design will be carried out during the execution and detailed design phase of the Proposed Development. Whilst the size of openings will be reduced, moving from 3 mm to 2 mm screens, additional basket area is envisaged as part of the modification. This means that the reduction, due to the smaller screen apertures, in free area - through which water must pass - is balanced by an increase in the total area of screens installed. Appendix 4-A: Operation and Maintenance Mitigation Register [APP-177] also makes reference to cleaning provisions should water flow become inhibited. 5. Water abstraction rates and timings are dictated by permit requirements, not by any direct demand signal from the plant. The current Abstraction Licence and Environmental Permit discharge parameters in relation to cooling water will be maintained throughout the life of the Proposed Development. Abstraction will be intermittent and limited to no more than three hours abstraction per tide around high water (one hour before and two hours after, but only when the water level at Summer's Jetty is higher than 0.8 m AOD (Above Ordnance Datum)). Current abstraction limits are shown in Table 13-9 of Chapter 13: Water Environment and Flood Risk [APP-051]. This abstraction from the Dee feeds the settlement pond. The existing Connah's Quay Power Station and the Proposed Development will both draw their cooling water from this pond, not directly from the Dee. Similarly, the existing Connah's Quay Power Station and Proposed Development both return cooling water to the purge pond.

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>Discharge from the purge would be consistent with the existing site operation, with operation of the purge being for no more than three hours commencing on the ebb tide one hour after high water. Overall, cooling water use profiles would be expected to be unchanged, remaining within that currently consented. The existing permit limits are summarised in Table 13-10 of Chapter 13: Water Environment and Flood Risk [APP-051].</p> <p>6. Cooling system design, and the performance of the system when placed into operation, will be subject to performance guarantees with the technology providers being given the current plant performance parameters and permit constraints as requirements to design the Proposed Development to operate within. As such, it is not expected to exceed the current discharge permit requirements.</p> <p>The above information is retained and unchanged within the documentation submitted as part of the Change Application.</p>
Q11.2	The Applicant NRW	<p>Protection of groundwater from site risks What measures have been proposed to protect existing groundwater at the site from contamination during the construction and operation phase?</p>	<p>Measures to protect existing groundwater at the Order limits from contamination during the construction and operation phase are summarised in Section 13.5 of Chapter 13: Water Environment and Flood Risk [APP-051].</p> <p>With regard to the construction phase, the Framework CEMP (EN010166/APP/6.5) outlines measures to manage surface water runoff, potential spillages and water removed from excavations that might impact groundwater, based on good practice (e.g. Guidance on Pollution Prevention). A Water Management Plan (WMP) would be annexed to the final CEMP(s) and would outline in further detail the mitigation measures necessary to avoid, prevent and reduce adverse effects where possible upon the local surface water and groundwater environment. The WMP would include an outline of responsibilities with regard to water management, required water quality monitoring, pollution prevention measures, training requirements for construction workers related to the water environment, an outline of likely relevant permissions and consents required, and a Pollution Incident and Response Plan.</p> <p>Where dewatering is required, a dewatering scheme would be developed prior to construction to demonstrate that there is an effective strategy to manage water arising from the works and, where required, sufficient proposals to treat the water prior to controlled discharge. Any such assessment would consider the effects of any drawdown or impacts on nearby abstractions or resources. This is secured through the Framework CEMP (EN010166/APP/6.5).</p> <p>To prevent potential contamination of the bedrock and superficial aquifers during piling operations, the piling design would include method statements that are informed by a Foundation Works Risk Assessment (FWRA). These method statements would outline specific measures for pollution prevention, which would include techniques for avoiding the creation of flow paths between groundwater and/or contaminated soils. This is secured through the Framework CEMP (EN010166/APP/6.5).</p> <p>For the operational phase, there are no process water or drainage discharges to groundwater, with these instead being directed to surface waters. Potential impacts associated with chemical and material storage (and hence accidental spillage to ground) would be in line with measures outlined in the site operator's Environmental Management System (EMS). This is secured through the requirement for an Operational and Maintenance Environmental Management Plan (OMEMP), which would be in general accordance with Appendix 4-A: Operation and Maintenance Mitigation Register [APP-177].</p> <p>A site Emergency Response Plan would be in place for dealing with emergency situations involving loss of containment of hazardous substances. This would detail how to contain and control incidents to minimise the effects and limit danger to the environment, including groundwater. This is secured through the requirement for an OMEMP, in general accordance with Appendix 4-A: Operation and Maintenance Mitigation Register [APP-177].</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>1. For the operational phase of the Main Development Area, the Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy [REP1-022] outlines how surface water will be collected and discharged. Initial interception and attenuation of surface water runoff would be provided by SuDS measures, which would provide water quality treatment. Indicative types, positions and</p>

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What measures are proposed to prevent any contaminated surface water from being discharged into the environment and how will this be managed. 2. 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. 3. 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. 4. Explain how these alternative considerations interact with the appropriate assessment for habitats regulations assessment. 	<p>extents of SuDS features are shown on the Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy General Arrangement drawing included as Annex G of the Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy [REP1-022]. The SuDS proposals are subject to change as the site layout and detailed design are progressed post-consent. The SuDS approach would be confirmed and explained in the future Surface Water Drainage Strategy which would be prepared by the Principal Contractor(s) pursuant to Requirement 6 of the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1). Pervious paving across the parking areas could be included, to allow for intercepting and treating runoff from adjacent areas. Filter drains or swales could provide initial treatment of road and/or building drainage. The drainage network could include oil interceptors and/or downstream defenders within each catchment to remove oils, suspended solids and sediment bound hydrocarbons, as necessary based on the development layout. At detailed design stage, the reuse of attenuated surface water volumes in site related processes shall also be considered.</p> <p>The firewater strategy for the Main Development Area is to be developed post-DCO consent and would be included in the Surface Water Drainage Strategy prepared pursuant to Requirement 6 of the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1). If firewater runoff is to be directed to the new surface water network, bunding and penstocks would be used to contain potentially contaminated runoff and prevent it from draining freely to the water environment. Subject to water quality testing, uncontaminated runoff could be released by opening the penstocks. If the water is found to be contaminated the runoff would be pumped out for treatment and disposal at a suitable wastewater facility.</p> <p>The operation and maintenance of the new surface water system would be the responsibility of the site Operator. Maintenance would be undertaken in accordance with the maintenance management plan and appropriate schedules. These details are to be included in the Surface Water Drainage Strategy to be prepared pursuant to Requirement 6 of the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1). This information would be made available in the CDM Health & Safety file.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy [REP1-022] indicates that the new outfall would be formed via a new headwall alongside the existing headwall to Old Rockcliffe Brook, or a rebuild of the existing headwall to accommodate an additional outlet. The final design of the Proposed Surface Water Outfall will be subject to various technical assessments to identify the most appropriate solution. Based on initial calculations of surface water runoff volumes, the pipe size for the new outfall would be approximately 1200 mm diameter. The total temporary loss of saltmarsh associated with the proposed new surface water outfall structure, including from the construction works area, has been estimated at approximately 650 m². Permanent losses, which will be associated with the permanent footprint of the new outfall structure, would be much smaller than 650 m² (estimated to be no greater than 5m²) as the works corridor can be restored and most of the outfall pipe can be buried. Outfall details would be confirmed in the detailed Surface Water Drainage Strategy which would be prepared by the Principal Contractor(s) pursuant to Requirement 6 of the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1). 3. The Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy [REP1-022] was revised at Deadline 2 to provide further details around alternative runoff destinations (see Table 5-1). Rainwater reuse is the highest priority in the discharge hierarchy. The incorporation of rainwater harvesting systems will be considered by the Principal Contractor(s) at detailed design. The anticipated ground conditions and the proposed site layout are such that infiltration potential is limited. Groundwater levels and infiltration rates will be confirmed through further ground investigation, and if it is appropriate, disposal via infiltration will be maximised as much as practicable. At detailed design stage, infiltration features may be introduced, but their disposal capacities are likely to be limited. Other disposal methods would be required in addition to any infiltration features. The next option in the discharge hierarchy is to drain the site to the nearest open watercourse/s. There are no open watercourses located on the Main Development Area. The nearest downstream watercourses are located beyond the north-east boundary, within the adjacent Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SAC, which is within an area of saltmarsh. Any option to drain to an open watercourse will require a new structure(s) in the boundary of the Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SAC, which would result in temporary loss of saltmarsh during its creation and permanent loss of saltmarsh associated with the footprint of the structure(s). The Oakenholt Brook culvert, the Old Rockcliffe Brook culvert and the surface water sewer serving the existing Connah's Quay Power Station site all pass through the Main Development Area. These three existing piped surface water systems have the potential to serve as surface water outfalls, which would avoid the direct loss of / damage to qualifying habitat features of the Dee Estuary /

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>Aber Dyfrdwy SAC/ area of saltmarsh. The capacities of these systems are limited and discharges to them would likely need to be restricted. The attenuation volume required would likely be larger than for the single outfall solution into the Old Rockcliffe Brook open watercourse and may not be achievable within the proposed site layout. Detailed modelling will be undertaken by the Principal contractor(s) to assess the viability of splitting the surface water discharge across the existing piped surface water systems. If it is deemed viable, it will be the preferred drainage solution as it will avoid the loss of qualifying habitat features of the SAC/saltmarsh. The results of this modelling must be provided as part of the surface water drainage strategy for the relevant stage of the Proposed Development in justifying the final selected strategy in accordance with Requirement 6 of the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1). As a worst-case for the purposes of the assessment, a single discharge to the Old Rockcliffe Brook open watercourse has been assumed.</p> <p>4. The Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy [REP2-012] has been prepared to demonstrate a feasible option for the drainage design for the Proposed Development. In the absence of additional modelling to assess the viability of splitting the surface water discharge across the existing piped surface water systems, this is considered a reasonable worst case. Whilst a final Surface Water Drainage Strategy would be prepared pursuant to Requirement 6 of the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1) to confirm the final discharge location, this would be provided within the Surface Water Outfall Area shown on Figure 3-3: Areas Described in the ES (EN010166/APP/6.3). Flexibility has been allowed in the assessment for the permanent loss of Saltmarsh to be approximately 5m², however the Saltmarsh Creation Strategy (EN010166/APP/6.16) details how an area of 1,300m² would be provided to allow for natural recolonisation by Saltmarsh, which is considerably larger than this permanent loss. Should it be determined through modelling that it is viable to split the surface water discharge across the existing piped surface water systems, it may be possible to avoid the permanent loss of saltmarsh and the measures outlined in the Saltmarsh Creation Strategy (EN010166/APP/6.16) would not be required. This demonstrates how the conclusions of the RIHRA (EN010166/APP/6.12) would remain unchanged regardless of the final Surface Water Drainage Strategy. The Applicant has also submitted a Notice of a proposed without prejudice HRA derogation in Wales [PDA-003] which provides further discussion on this matter, in outlining alternative drainage solutions considered by the Applicant.</p>
Q11.4	The Applicant NRW	<p>Flood risk ([APP-051] Ref: Table 13-7 & [APP-212] Fig 13C-1)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was joint probability considered in the hydraulic analysis? 2. Where in the tidal modelling has the risk of overtopping of defences from wave action and breach of defences been considered? 3. The appendices state that the Main Development Area is free from flood risk but the Figure 13C 1 appears to contradict this. 4. Why is the site shown in flood zone 3 if the site is actually free from flood risk including future climate change projections? 5. 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? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Paragraph 7.3.5 of Appendix 13-F: Hydraulic Modelling Report [APP-215] states impacts of a tidal result coinciding with a fluvial result show minimal changes around the Operational Footprint. Therefore, the outcomes of this study are not sensitive to the joint probability of a fluvial and tidal event. 2. Paragraph 4.1.1 of Appendix 13-F: Hydraulic Modelling Report [APP-215] states that the model was simulated in the partially undefended scenario (undefended at the Construction and Operation Area, defended throughout the wider model) that removes the private defences and screening mound along the frontage of the existing Connah's Quay Power Station site. Paragraph 4.1.2 states it was agreed with NRW at the meeting in May 2025 that the undefended scenario presented in this report represents the worst-case scenario for the Proposed Development. Therefore, no breach analysis has been undertaken as part of this assessment. 3. Figure 13C-1: Maximum Modelled Flood Depths Tidal 0.5% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) plus 2074 Climate Change Event [APP-212] shows the Main Development Area to be free from flooding in the 0.5% AEP plus 2074 Climate Change Event. Whilst some flooding is shown in the C&IEA, this is distinct from the Main Development Area. 4. Flood Zone 3 is associated with Wales Tidal 2018 model. Site specific hydraulic modelling has been undertaken using the latest climate change allowances which is considered more representative and shows the Main Development Area to be flood free in the 0.5% AEP plus 2074 Climate Change Event. 5. The design life of the development is to 2074. Therefore, the following tidal AEP events were simulated for the baseline scenario (partially undefended): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. 0.5% AEP (present day 70th percentile); b. 0.5% AEP (2074 70th percentile); c. 0.1% AEP (present day 70th percentile); and d. 0.1% AEP (2074 70th percentile).

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>Further future resilience scenarios were simulated using the following tidal AEP events:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e. 0.5% AEP (2074, 95th percentile); f. 0.1% AEP (2074, 95th percentile); g. 0.5% AEP (2100, 70th percentile); and h. 0.1% AEP (2100, 70th percentile).
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) What are the existing domestic foul drainage services at the site and how will this waste be managed? What are the containment and storage facilities for operational foul water arising from the plant operation?</p>	<p>As originally outlined in Chapter 13: Water Environment and Flood Risk [APP-051], black and grey wastewater (i.e. non-cooling and non-process wastewater) from the existing Connah's Quay Power Station is currently directed to an underground septic tank system for storage and settling (as treatment) (this remains unchanged at Deadline 3). Current permitted practice is to treat sewage on site and discharge treated sewage waters with main cooling water purge discharge to the River Dee under the conditions of the environmental permit. Due to sub-optimal operation of one of the existing systems, the septic tank is instead currently emptied periodically by a specialist contractor (approximately once per six-month period). It is expected that the Proposed Development would utilise a new similar system for black and grey wastewater including foul drainage from permanent welfare facilities, with treated black and grey wastewater either to be discharged to the River Dee with main cooling water purge discharge (in accordance with the existing permit) or to be removed by specialist contractor. Connection to the closest public sewer is not considered feasible due to the presence of the railway line that would need to be crossed. A Water Quality Risk Assessment for discharges to the River Dee would be undertaken if this option is taken forward, once details of effluent quality are available. This is secured through Appendix 4-A: Operation and Maintenance Mitigation Register [APP-177].</p>

Table 12: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Geology and Ground Conditions

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
Q12.1	The Applicant	<p>Possibility of the presence of unexploded ordnance 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>	<p>Appendix 14-A: Geo Environmental Desk Based Assessment [APP-216], Section 4.11 '<i>Unexploded Ordnance</i>' and Annex C, states: '<i>A Pre-Desk Study Assessment carried out by Zetica recommended that a detailed desk study is commissioned, based on preliminary findings.</i> <i>The Pre-Desk Study Assessment is reported in Annex C.</i>'</p> <p>The detailed desk study would confirm the final mitigation measures required to mitigate the risks posed by unexploded ordnance during construction. These measures would be included within the final CEMP(s) to be prepared by the Principal Contractor(s). The Framework CEMP (EN010166/APP/6.5) has been updated at Deadline 3 to provide clarity on measures related to unexploded ordnance.</p>
Q12.2	The Applicant	<p>Contaminated ground 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>	<p>Section 8.2 of Appendix 14-A: Geo Environmental Desk Based Assessment [APP-216] '<i>Sources of Potential Contamination</i>' includes the potential constituents of made ground to the demolished Connah's Quay 'A' Power Station. A Preliminary Risk Assessment is presented in Section 9.2.</p> <p>Appendix 14-C: Potential Areas of Contamination and Further Risk and Impact Assessment [APP-218] presents further risk and impact assessment for potential areas of contamination during construction, including the existing Connah's Quay Power Station (Site ID CL01, in particular Tables 3, 5, 7 and 8). The outcome of which is summarised in Chapter 14 Geology and Ground Conditions [APP-052], Section 14.6 '<i>Assessment of Likely Impacts and Effects</i>'. The Change Application has not impacted the findings of this assessment.</p>

Table 13: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Landscape and Visual Amenity

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
Q13.1	The Applicant	<p>Visual impact assessment from adjacent residential property 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 north-west of the proposed development.</p>	<p>All identified representative viewpoints within Chapter 15: Landscape and Visual [APP-053] are taken from publicly accessible locations and follow guidance given within GLVIA3 and good practice. Oakenholt Farm is a private property that functions as a hotel, accessed via a private road.</p> <p>Representative viewpoints, specifically VP9 and VP10, are in relatively close proximity to Oakenholt Farm and the assessment of these viewpoints, as set out in Tables 9 and 10 of Appendix 15-D: Landscape Impact Assessment [APP-226], provides a representative understanding of the impact to visual receptors in proximity to Oakenholt Farm. For these viewpoints, effects are considered to be long term, reversible, moderate to major adverse (significant) during the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. A night time assessment is also included for both locations with no significant effects predicted during the construction, operation or decommissioning.</p> <p>There is a need to maintain a consistent approach by focusing on publicly accessible locations to ensure that the assessment remains unbiased, and replicable. Within GLVIA3 paragraph 6.16 states that viewpoints may include public viewpoints, transport routes and places where people work. GLVIA3 paragraph 6.17 states that in some instances it may be appropriate to consider private views, but this must be agreed with the competent authority as it is impractical to visit all properties that may be affected. Paragraph 6.20 states that <i>'The selection of the final viewpoints used for the assessment should take account of a range of factors'</i>. This includes accessibility to the public.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the viewpoints utilised in the assessments were agreed with FCC on 14 June 2024.</p>
Q13.2	The Applicant	<p>Mitigation measures to reduce visual impact on adjacent residential property and views from national character areas Clarify the measures proposed to mitigate the visual impact on adjacent residential properties and views from national character areas.</p>	<p>The mitigation in relation to the Proposed Development is set out in Chapter 15: Landscape and Visual [APP-053] Section 15.5 'Development Design and Embedded Mitigation'. This includes the layout of the Proposed Development following a broadly linear configuration with the massing of the main built elements 'centralised' and sited in proximity to the existing Connah's Quay Power Station. This reduces the impact of newly built structures to the landscape by integrating them to the existing industrial context. Furthermore, the design principles and materials will accord with the Design Principles Document (EN010166/APP/7.8), which will reduce reflections and use lighter coloured materials on the taller structures to enable them to recede against the sky.</p> <p>In accordance with NPS EN2 Paragraphs 2.5.3 to 2.5.5: <i>'It is not possible to eliminate the visual and landscape impacts associated with a natural gas electricity generating station. 2.5.4 Mitigation should be implemented to reduce the visual intrusion of the buildings in the landscape and minimise impact on visual amenity as far as reasonably practicable. For proposals affecting designated landscapes the applicant should also consider how the scheme will further the purposes of the designation through its design, delivery, and operation. These measures may go beyond the mitigation measures needed to minimise the effects of the scheme. 2.5.5 Applicants should design natural gas electricity generating stations with the aim of providing the best fit with the existing local landscape so as to reduce visual and landscape impacts. This may include design of buildings to minimise negative aspects of their appearance through decisions in areas such as size, external finish and colour of the plant as far as compliance with engineering and environmental requirements permit.'</i></p>
Q13.3	The Applicant	<p>Control measures on massing dimensions and height control Clarify the control measures within the Draft DCO that relate to overall massing dimensions and height control.</p>	<p>The maximum design and scale parameters (used for the EIA of the Proposed Development) are set out in Table 1-1 of the DPD (EN010166/APP/7.8). The maximum design and scale parameter are secured through the DPD (EN010166/APP/7.8), the Parameter Plans [REP1-012] and the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1) (Requirement 3). Requirement 3 states that, in relation to any stage of the authorised development (the Proposed Development), no development of that stage may commence until written details of the detailed design for that stage have been approved by the relevant planning authority. Accordingly, the massing dimensions and height control set out in the Application documents will need to be adhered to when detailed design is developed in order to satisfy Requirement 3 of the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1).</p>

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
Q13.4	The Applicant	<p>Colour palette of the proposed development 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 	<p>The Applicant submitted Appendix 15-F: Colour Analysis [APP-227] as part of the Application to evaluate the visual and aesthetic impact of the components of the Proposed Development within its surrounding environment, focusing on how colours interact with the landscape, context, and viewer perception. The selected colour palette draws on the colours from the sky, existing Connah's Quay Power Station, surrounding vegetation and existing infrastructure (such as houses). The identified viewpoints (5, 12 and 15) are considered to be dominated by similar colour palettes on the basis they provide long distance views of arable fields, hedge lines and trees as well as vast amounts of sky. On this basis the Applicant does not propose to provide any further information to address this point.</p> <p>The detailed design of the Proposed Development is required to be developed in accordance with the Design Principles Document (EN010166/APP/7.8) which states:</p> <p><i>"The Proposed Development will apply lighter colours at high level and darker colours at low level. The choice of colour is to be developed in general accordance with the completed Environmental Colour Analysis contained in Appendix 15-F: Colour Analysis of the ES Volume IV (EN010166/APP/6.4) to minimise the overall scale and appearance of the Proposed Development."</i></p>

Table 14: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Physical Process

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
Q14.1	The Applicant NRW	<p>Coastal change 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?</p>	<p>The Applicant refers to Chapter 16 Physical Processes [APP-054], paragraphs 16.6.11 to 16.6.14, which discusses scour and natural re-alignment.</p> <p>The coastal erosion risk to the Main Development Area during its lifetime is negligible under past and current coastal processes as the existing Connah's Quay Power Station contributed to the change in the local environment, as outlined in Chapter 17 Terrestrial Heritage [APP-055] paragraphs 17.6.7 and 17.6.25. The Proposed Development incorporates a Saltmarsh Creation Strategy (EN010166/APP/6.16) to mitigate potential losses of this habitat involving realignment of existing flood embankments. This local realignment will be designed sensitively to minimise the risk of any future coastal erosion. The current (2025) short to mid-term Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) policy for the Main Development Area and C&IEA and to the north and south is to "hold the line" and "maintain/replace" and on this basis there will be no related change to local baseline conditions in terms of the physical marine and coastal environment, see Chapter 16 Physical Processes [APP-054], paragraphs 16.4.</p>
Q14.2	The Applicant NRW	<p>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?</p>	<p>The Applicant refers to Chapter 16 Physical Processes [APP-054], paragraph 16.6.13, which discusses natural re-alignment. The current SMP that relates to the location of the Proposed Development is described in the Applicant's response to Q14.1. It is proposed to realign a section of the existing flood embankments wall within the C&IEA to allow for natural retreat of saltmarsh in an area to the south of the Proposed Development. Beyond this there is no intention to modify the preferred policy in the shoreline management plan which would remain as 'hold the line'.</p>
Q14.3	The Applicant NRW	<p>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?</p>	<p>The Applicant refers to Chapter 16 Physical Processes [APP-054], paragraphs 16.6.9 to 16.6.14, which discuss morphology change, and 16.6.16 to 16.6.17 and Table 16-13, which discuss sediment resuspension.</p> <p>The Proposed Development will utilise the existing cooling water infrastructure. The only works required at this location would be minor modifications which are described in Chapter 4: The Proposed Development (EN010166/APP/6.2.4). The existing permitted discharge limits are set out within paragraphs 16.6.9 and 16.6.10 of Chapter 16 Physical Processes [APP-054] and it is assumed that the Proposed Development would operate within these existing limits.</p> <p>Neither the utilisation of the existing cooling water infrastructure (in line with existing permits) or works to upgrade the existing eel screens would change the baseline sedimentation regime or create additional risk in terms of the mobilisation of sediment.</p>

Table 15: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Terrestrial Heritage

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
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?	The setting of the Scheduled Monument Castell y Fflint / Flint Castle (FL003), including its relationship with the estuary, foreshore and local coastal landscape has been set out in paragraphs 5.4.15 – 5.4.19 of Appendix 17-A Terrestrial Heritage Desk-based Assessment [APP-229] . The potential impact of the Proposed Development on this setting has been set out in paragraphs 17.6.14 – 17.6.18 of Chapter 17: Terrestrial Heritage [APP-055] , which has identified that the existing Connah's Quay Power Station site has already contributed to the partial erosion of the local landscape in which the asset is situated, and the addition of the Proposed Development within this area would have minimal further impact to the erosion of the setting of the asset. This impact has been identified as a minor adverse effect, which is considered to be 'not significant' in EIA terms, and as such no additional mitigation has been considered as required. Embedded mitigation measures, including those related to the design of the Proposed Development, are outlined in the DPD (EN010166/APP/7.8) and secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1) .
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 CO ₂ corridor?	The Terrestrial Heritage Desk-based Assessment [APP-229] sets out the potential for encountering archaeological remains within the Proposed CO ₂ Connection Corridor. This has been assessed as a medium potential for encountering potential archaeological remains dating to the Roman period, taking into account the presence of known Roman activity in the immediate vicinity, the geophysical survey results in these fields and the limited impact area as a result of the Proposed CO ₂ Connection Corridor. As such, mitigation in the form of archaeological monitoring and recording has been agreed with the Archaeological Advisor to FCC (Heneb) which has been set out within the Overarching Written Scheme of Investigation [APP-249] .
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.	The NTS [APP-037] will be updated and submitted at Deadline 4 to clarify that impacts identified during the construction phase as a result of the physical presence of the Proposed Development within the setting of assets would continue through the operation phase and would be not significant. In addition, decommissioning impacts are expected to be limited to temporary impacts and are not considered to be greater than those reported during construction / operation. With regards to below ground archaeological remains, there would be no additional physical impacts during the operation and decommissioning phases as these would have occurred and been mitigated during the construction phase.

Table 16: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Marine Heritage

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
16.1	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?	Not addressed to the Applicant.

Table 17: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
Q17.1	The Applicant FCC	<p>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?</p>	<p>Assessment of employment effects is included in Chapter 19: Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism [APP-057]. The assessment is based on clearly defined assumptions (set out in Section 19.3) regarding peak and average construction Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) employment, together with operational staffing requirements. These assumptions reflect the current design parameters and have been informed by industry benchmarks and experience from comparable infrastructure projects.</p> <p>The sensitivity of the local economy to employment change has been assessed as low, reflecting the existing estimated construction labour pool and strength of the baseline labour market in the Study Area.</p> <p>In line with the Rochdale Envelope methodology, the assessment is based on average construction employment, rather than peak workforce. This provides a minimum 'worst-case' scenario that is a realistic and proportionate basis for assessment of beneficial socio-economic effects.</p> <p>The assessment estimates that construction would support approximately 683 net FTE jobs per year, of which around 308 FTEs per year would be filled by people living within the Study Area. When considered against the size of the local construction workforce and wider labour market, the magnitude of impact is assessed as medium, resulting in a minor beneficial (not significant) effect.</p> <p>If actual employment levels were higher than assessed (including at peak which is considered to be a workforce of 1,600 gross FTEs), this would increase beneficial effects but is not assumed to alter the significance conclusion, given the assessed low sensitivity of the local economy. If employment levels were lower than assessed, the magnitude of beneficial effect would reduce proportionately, and would remain not significant.</p> <p>During operation, approximately 66 direct jobs would be supported, with additional temporary employment (approximately 300 workers) during planned outages (around two months every four years). Given the scale of the Study Area labour market, reasonable variation in these figures would not materially alter the assessment conclusions (not significant).</p> <p>The assessment conclusions are therefore considered robust and precautionary, and not materially sensitive to reasonable deviation from the forecast workforce assumptions.</p>
Q17.2	The Applicant FCC	<p>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?</p>	<p>An assessment of accommodation for temporary workforce is included in Chapter 19: Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism [APP-057]. In line with the Rochdale Envelope methodology, the assessment is based on peak construction employment of 1,600 workers as a worst-case scenario. This is additionally precautionary, as approximately 45% of workers are expected to be home-based and would not require accommodation.</p> <p>Within a 60-minute drive time Study Area, analysis shows that even at peak seasonal occupancy (August), there would remain 4,057 rooms available after accounting for existing demand and the full peak workforce. There are also alternative accommodations including the private rental sector, which has been assessed that could also cater for a portion of any demand generated and, therefore, mitigate further any impact on accommodation provision.</p> <p>The sensitivity of local accommodation receptors is assessed as low, reflecting the scale and distribution of existing provision across the 60-minute area. The magnitude of impact is assessed as medium at peak, resulting in a minor adverse (not significant) effect on temporary accommodation capacity.</p>

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>If accommodation demand were higher than forecast (e.g. fewer home-based workers), pressures could increase locally, however, capacity within the wider 60-minute Study Area and availability within the private rental sector provide flexibility. This is set out in Table 19-19 of Chapter 19: Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism [APP-057], which identifies that during the peak construction period, there would still be 14% of rooms within a 60-minute drive time radius available. The significance conclusion would not materially change. Conversely, if demand were lower than forecast, effects would reduce accordingly.</p> <p>The assessment conclusions are, therefore, considered robust and precautionary, and not materially sensitive to reasonable deviation from the forecast workforce accommodation assumptions.</p>

Table 18: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Climate Change

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
Q18.1	The Applicant	Commissioning ([APP-042] Ref: 6.2.4.4.10) How long would commissioning take, and potentially for how long could the plant be run in an unabated fashion?	As originally stated within Chapter 5: Construction Management and Programme [APP-043] and retained in the revision submitted at Deadline 3 (EN010166/APP/6.2.5), an indicative construction and commissioning schedule is provided in Table 5-1 and Table 5-2, respectively, for a phased construction and single (simultaneous) phase of construction works. In the phased scenario, commissioning of each Train would take around 12 months, subject to finalisation of the execution schedule as part of the construction contract. In simultaneous construction, this is expected to take longer overall with Table 5-2 showing two separate blocks each of 12 months. Whilst the extent of unabated operation during this commissioning phase is not currently known, commissioning of the facility would be undertaken in accordance with a commissioning plan. It is expected that the commissioning plan would be a pre-operational condition of the Environmental Permit.
Q18.2	The Applicant	CCP stack bypass Clarity the frequency and scenarios when the CCP stack bypass would be in operation.	<p>Following commissioning, where some operation of the plant through the bypass stack may be expected, the Proposed Development is designed to be operated in dispatchable mode with the CCP in service, providing low carbon power, flexibly, to the national grid. This entails being able to export power to match the anticipated intermittency of renewable power in the future power market, ramping up and down in load, and switching on and off to meet this demand. This would be with the CCP in service, because the Dispatchable Power Agreement that the Applicant is seeking incentivises electricity generation with carbon capture, rather than unabated operation.</p> <p>However, it is anticipated that there would also be a number of limited scenarios in which the CCGT may need to operate without the CCP, these are set out in Chapter 4: The Proposed Development (EN010166/APP/6.2.4) and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unabated Scenario 1: on commissioning, in the event that the downstream Transport and Storage (T&S) network is unavailable; • Unabated Scenario 2: during operation, to meet electricity demand when the CCP is offline (for example, due to outages of the T&S network); and • Unabated Scenario 3: during a NatTS (electrical) total or partial shutdown event, in which the plant is called upon to support system restoration. Further information on this eventuality is provided in the responses to Q5.1 and Q5.3.
Q18.3	The Applicant	CO₂ venting Clarity the frequency and scenarios when the CO ₂ venting would take place.	<p>During the operation of the Proposed Development there are likely to be events where it is necessary to vent CO₂ to atmosphere. These could be regular events associated with the routine maintenance of the Proposed Development, pressure relief valve (PRV) activation for safety reasons or single large scale releases in the event of an emergency. The Proposed Development will be designed to minimise the frequency and duration of such events. Such operations will be regulated under the environmental permit.</p> <p>The following scenarios have been identified where CO₂ may be released to atmosphere:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During start-up or shutdown conditions it is envisaged that the CO₂ captured can be fed through to the CO₂ pipeline. However, in the event that the CO₂ purity is not suitable to be fed to the CO₂ pipeline, this may require short-duration venting. This would occur either via the absorber stack or a separate vent adjacent to the absorber stack. The location of venting would be finalised following technology selection and detailed design. • During routine operation when venting takes place for safety reasons such as activation of a PRV allowing short term releases, preventing pressure build-up and the CCP tripping (going off-line). • Emergency (e.g. unplanned plant shut down or pressure release). • Maintenance of compressors or other CO₂ pipeline equipment when the pipeline and compression equipment need to be depressurised for safe maintenance and inspection.

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>Provision for planned temporary venting of CO₂ would be provided at the Flint AGI and the Proposed CO₂ AGI. Temporary CO₂ venting would take place via the installation of a temporary vent stack at the AGIs. This would be removed once the temporary venting activity has been completed.</p> <p>There are two separate maintenance activities that will require such temporary venting at the AGIs: PIG trap venting and manifold venting.</p> <p>PIG Trap Venting is carried out during the pipeline in-line inspections, where a PIG (Pipeline Inspection Gauge) is launched/received at the AGIs. There would be a need to vent the PIG trap once it is isolated from the pipeline. This would empty the contents (minor volumes) of the trap so that the PIG equipment can be safely entered into/retrieved from the trap. This would not be part of the regular, frequent inspection procedure as it is anticipated to be required approximately once every five years following commissioning of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Manifold venting will take place when extraordinary or repair work is required at the AGIs. This would allow contents of the pipework within the AGIs to be cleared, prior to works taking place. The frequency of manifold venting is likely to be less than once every five years.</p>
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?	For the purposes of the GHG assessment, the existing power station provides the most coherent baseline from a comparative viewpoint, given that the Proposed Development would provide a similar level of dispatchable power to the grid, albeit with far lower carbon emissions per MWh supplied. The existing power station is consented, in situ and fully operational, and both the existing power station and the Proposed Development actively support the electricity grid and contribute to the overall security of supply. As such, it would not be appropriate to exclude the existing power station from the baseline. This is discussed in Section 20.4 of Chapter 20: Climate Change [APP-058] .
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	The Application does not provide commentary on the future operations of the existing Connah's Quay Power Station save for references related to the future interaction with the Proposed Development and with those in Chapter 6: Alternatives [APP-044] .
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?	<p>The current version of NPS EN-1, the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy, requires that all new fossil- or biomass-fuelled combustion power stations with a capacity greater than 300 MW must be constructed to be "Carbon Capture Ready", but this stops short of requiring that they have a functional carbon capture plant fitted and connected to a suitable downstream transport and storage facility. Accordingly, it is not the case that all new development has to be CCUS, it simply needs to be 'ready' for this.</p> <p>In the context of the Chapter 20: Climate Chapter [APP-058] the comparison is not with a new development, but with an existing, unabated dispatchable gas-fired power station. There is currently over 30 GW of unabated gas-fired generating capacity within the UK, and new low-carbon dispatchable capacity such as the Proposed Development can provide a similar form of generating capacity with a much lower carbon intensity. As such, the Proposed Development clearly provides a carbon benefit relative to an existing, unabated gas-fired power station.</p>
Q18.7	The Applicant	Upstream emissions ([APP-058] Plate 20-2) Why do the "well to tank" emissions increase for the proposed development?	<p>There are two reasons why the well to tank emissions, on a per MWh basis, are higher for the Proposed Development relative to the counterfactual CCGT in Plate 20-2 of [APP-058].</p> <p>Firstly, the operation of the carbon capture plant means that the overall thermal efficiency of the Proposed Development is slightly lower than a comparable unabated CCGT. A gas-fired power station with carbon capture must divert a proportion of both steam and electricity to the capture plant, requiring it to consume more natural gas for the same electrical output and thereby increasing the overall carbon intensity per unit of electricity supplied to the grid.</p>

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>Secondly, the emissions intensity data for the counterfactual CCGT were taken directly from information published by the UK Government in an answer to a written parliamentary question in 2015⁷. That answer incorrectly applied the gross calorific value of natural gas to determine the overall carbon intensity of a CCGT when it should have used the net calorific value. The effect of this error by the government is to make the counterfactual unabated CCGT appear as if it has a carbon intensity almost 10% lower than in reality.</p> <p>The combined effect of these two issues accounts for the lower WTT intensity in the counterfactual CCGT relative to the Proposed Development. If the government error was addressed in Plate 20-2, the overall reduction in the overall carbon intensity of the Proposed Development would be even greater than shown in the chapter.</p>
Q18.8	The Applicant	<p>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.</p>	<p>A climate change risk assessment is provided in Appendix 20-C: Climate Change Resilience Assessment [APP-238].</p>

⁷ UK Parliament (2015). Written Question 17799: Energy: Carbon Emissions. Asked 26 November 2015. Answered 3 December 2015. [online]. Available at: [Written questions and answers - Written questions, answers and statements - UK Parliament](#)

Table 19: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Human Health

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
Q19.1	The Applicant PHW UKHSA	<p>Electro-magnetic field effects</p> <p>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?</p>	<p>An assessment of the potential effects of electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) during the operational phase of the Proposed Development has been included in Chapter 21: Human Health [APP-059] because the Proposed Development contains an Electrical Connection. This assessment is in line with the Control of Electromagnetic Fields at Work Regulations 2016.</p> <p>Section 21.6 of Chapter 21: Human Health [APP-059] considers the risk and likelihood of EMF-related effects in determining receptor sensitivity and magnitude of impact. While high-voltage underground cables can generate higher magnetic fields directly above them than overhead lines at ground level (due to their closer proximity), field strength falls more rapidly with distance to the sides, and they produce no external electric field. Given the Electrical Connection Corridor is situated more than 175 m from residential areas, the potential magnitude of impact on human health is considered low, and no significant effects are anticipated.</p>

Table 20: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Major Accidents and Disasters

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
Q20.1	The Applicant Public Health Wales (PHW) UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA)	<p>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?</p>	<p>The risks and mitigation measures associated with the accidental release of CO₂ have been assessed within Table 22-9 of Chapter 22: Major Accidents and Disasters [APP-060] under scenario reference O-2.</p> <p>The CO₂ system associated with the carbon capture plant has been specified and designed to withstand the range of pressure and temperatures expected with the operational range of the plant, plus margin for excursions. This design includes appropriate codes and standards for pressure systems, such as American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) B31.3, and development (and operation) of a written scheme of inspection as required under the Pressure Equipment Directive/Pressure Systems Safety Regulations 2000. The plant has been studied by HAZOP (Hazard and Operability study), with consideration for the scenario where there is overpressure, leading to a release of CO₂. In this unlikely circumstance, the plant would behave by tripping the capture plant and isolating the system. Other potential accidental releases such as flange leaks or incorrect position of valves would be detected via instrumentation and appropriate action taken. Any venting of gases would be to a safe location. Commissioning would be in line with the Commissioning Plan and involve pressure tests and inspections, as well as control scheme testing before bringing into service for the first time. There is no repurposed piping within the CO₂ capture plant, up to and including, the connection to the new AGI. The pipeline system infrastructure (new and repurposed sections) will be designed, constructed, commissioned and operated in compliance with applicable Regulations and industry codes & standards, which together with requalification studies & assessments to confirm the suitability of repurposed (existing) pipelines for transportation of CO₂ provide the basis for safe operation (see also the response to Q20.2 below). Together with comprehensive Pipeline Integrity Management Systems (including operating procedures, preventative maintenance, regular inspections, continuous monitoring of pressure, composition and flow), this will ensure continued integrity and safe operation of the pipeline. Pipeline Integrity Management System will follow an in-house standard which is based on several international standards, including International Organization for Standardisation (ISO) standards 12747, 13623, 16708, 19345-1 and 20074. Overall, the design and basis for operation of the pipeline will ensure that the likelihood of accidental releases from the pipeline system is extremely low.</p> <p>In the highly unlikely event of a release the pipeline system is equipped with a leak detection system and provisions for emergency shutdown and isolation of the pipeline to limit the duration and volume of any release and associated hazardous conditions. Emergency response plans and procedures will be implemented to ensure appropriate actions are taken to manage any incident effectively, together with the relevant authorities and agencies. Overall, these provisions will ensure that the risk from accidental releases is effectively managed.</p> <p>It is also noted that while CO₂ is not currently classified as a dangerous fluid under the Pipelines Safety Regulations and as such is not classified as a Major Accident Hazard Pipeline, the assessments undertaken and the operational controls applied will be to the same standard and principles.</p>
Q20.2	The Applicant	<p>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?</p>	<p>The existing pipeline (P852) is a 24" diameter steel pipeline approximately 27km long, buried throughout its length and running between the natural gas treatment facility at Point of Ayr and the existing Connah's Quay Power Station.</p> <p>The repurposing of approximately 25km of this pipeline, from Point of Ayr to a new tie-in point at Flint, for the purposes of transporting gas phase CO₂, has been consented for Liverpool Bay CCS Limited (LBCCS) under the HyNet Carbon Dioxide Pipeline Order 2024. The Application proposes to similarly repurpose the remainder of the pipeline.</p> <p>In-line inspection and repurposing / requalification studies, including verification of suitability for new flows and design conditions, have been completed to confirm that P852 is suitable for repurposing, and complies with relevant pipeline design code requirements. As a result of this work, LBCCS has been able to confirm that the pipeline is suitable for repurposing to transport CO₂ at the conditions defined for the T&S system, including the section from Flint to the Main Development Area.</p>

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
Q20.3	The Applicant HSE	<p>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?</p>	<p>Current information provided to the Applicant confirms that neither of the solvents being considered for use in the Proposed Development are considered dangerous substances under the COMAH Regulations. However, final chemical inventories, and therefore COMAH license requirements, are not determined as yet.</p> <p>It is the current assumption that a COMAH licence would be required (as acknowledged in the Consents and Agreement Position Statement [APP-021]). At a high level, the requirements this would place on the Proposed Development are presented in Section 22.5.17 of Chapter 22: Major Accidents and Disasters [APP-060].</p>
Q20.4	The Applicant HSE	<p>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?</p>	<p>For all chemicals used in the Proposed Development, storage arrangements will be appropriate for the materials being stored. Main storage tanks will be connected to the Distributed Control System (DCS) which can monitor, and trip plant to protect the tanks, along with alarms in the main control room and elsewhere if appropriate. Storage tanks and their un/loading points will be located within bunded areas that are designed to store 110% of the maximum capacity of the tanks. These bunded areas will drain to the contaminated drains system to ensure contaminated fluids do not reach the environment. As part of routine, periodic, maintenance activities storage tanks and bunded areas will be inspected to ensure their integrity. In addition to automated monitoring, alarms, and trips, evident in the main control room, main storage tanks will have local indicators to provide local monitoring for those taking part in deliveries of chemicals. All delivery drivers are to be suitably qualified and experienced. Deliveries will be by road, either in road tankers or using isotainers. Spill kits are also to be provided at appropriate locations around plant.</p> <p>Flanged connections will be kept to a minimum and all tanks, pipes and valves will be designed and installed to appropriate industry standards. They will also be subject to a preventative maintenance programme to ensure continued integrity and effective operation. Operators will walk-down the plant daily and inspect for signs of leakage, with repairs undertaken as soon as reasonably practicable.</p> <p>Procedures will be in place to manage any losses of containment should occur.</p> <p>All of the above measures serve to reduce the risk of accidental release. Nonetheless, the risks and mitigation measures associated with the accidental release of Amines have been assessed within Table 22-9 of Chapter 22: Major Accidents and Disasters [APP-060] under scenario reference O-3.</p>

Table 21: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Materials and Waste

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
Q21.1	The Applicant	<p>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?</p>	<p>The Applicant refers the ExA to Appendix 14-A: Geo Environmental Desk Based Assessment [APP-216]. Section 5.3 'Waste Management Facilities' details the licensed and historical landfills (and their contents) present within the Order limits, and within a 250 m study area. These are also summarised in Section 8.2 'Sources of Potential Contamination'.</p> <p>Appendix 14-F: Stage 1, Tier 2 Generic Risk Assessment: Soil and Groundwater [APP-221] informs the baseline groundwater quality at the Proposed Development. The report describes the ground conditions encountered during this preliminary investigation which included locations around the Main Development Area and the C&IEA. Chapter 14: Geology and Ground Conditions [APP-052], Section 14.5 'Development Design and Embedded Mitigation' indicates that further, more detailed ground investigations (geo-environmental and geotechnical) would be undertaken before construction to inform the development of the detailed design. These would target potentially contaminative sources identified, including the historical landfilling activities, Made Ground, and former coal-fired power station areas identified within the Order limits. This is also outlined in Table 8 of the Framework CEMP (EN010166/APP/6.5).</p> <p>Chapter 14: Geology and Ground Conditions [APP-052], Section 14.5 'Development Design and Embedded Mitigation' states: <i>'Consideration would be given as part of the design process as to what excavated materials could be reused or would be required for the various components of the Proposed Development, and what materials would be surplus and would require either disposal or onward management to ensure appropriate re-use. The overall aim of the earthworks design would be to achieve an optimal cut-fill balance, as far as practicable within the project constraints, to avoid or minimise the creation of surplus material. The volume of disposal of soil waste, contaminated or otherwise, to landfill sites would be mitigated by minimisation during design of the overall quantities of surplus material generated during construction, and by optimising the cut to fill balance as part of the design.'</i></p> <p>Section 14.5 also references that any re-use of excavated materials will be undertaken through the adoption of a Materials Management Plan (MMP) developed in accordance with the CL:AIRE Definition of Waste: Development Industry Code of Practice (DoW CoP), an environmental permit or a relevant exemption which will provide the framework to ensure that waste material is not incorrectly re-used as part of the Proposed Development. These measures are also outlined in Table 8 of the Framework CEMP (EN010166/APP/6.5).</p> <p>Where documents have been updated and submitted at Deadline 3, this is retained and unchanged.</p>
Q21.2	The Applicant	<p>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?</p>	<p>The Applicant refers the ExA to Appendix 14-A: Geo Environmental Desk Based Assessment [APP-216]. Section 8.2 'Sources of Potential Contamination' identifies the capped asbestos landfill in the area of the C&IEA. Furthermore, previous investigations and partial remediation (capping) have been undertaken within this area and are summarised in Section 7 'Previous Ground Investigations'. A Preliminary Risk Assessment is presented in Section 9.2 which identifies risks from the asbestos landfill area and mitigation (i.e., to be managed in accordance with the Control of Asbestos Regulations 2012).</p> <p>Chapter 14: Geology and Ground Conditions [APP-052], Section 14.5 'Development Design and Embedded Mitigation' states that asbestos management would be included within the final CEMP, incorporating the final Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP). The final CEMP would set out procedures for dealing with unexpected soil or groundwater contamination that may be encountered, including potential mitigation such as further assessment / remediation of any unacceptable risk from soil contamination.</p> <p>Where documents have been updated and submitted at Deadline 3, this is retained and unchanged.</p>

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
Q21.3	The Applicant	<p>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?</p>	<p>The Applicant refers the ExA to Appendix 14-A: Geo Environmental Desk Based Assessment [APP-216]. Section 8.2 'Sources of Potential Contamination' identifies potential sources of contamination within the C&IEA, including the former Connah's Quay Power Station. A Preliminary Risk Assessment is presented in Section 9.2.</p> <p>Appendix 14-C: Potential Areas of Contamination and Further Risk and Impact Assessment [APP-218] presents further risk and impact assessment for potential areas of contamination during construction, including the former Connah's Quay Power Station (Site ID CL02, in particular Tables 3, 5, 7 and 8). The outcome of which is summarised in Chapter 14: Geology and Ground Conditions [APP-052], Section 14.6 'Assessment of Likely Impacts and Effects'.</p> <p>Chapter 14 Geology and Ground Conditions [APP-052], Section 14.5 'Development Design and Embedded Mitigation' states that the final CEMP would set out procedures for dealing with unexpected soil or groundwater contamination that may be encountered, including potential mitigation such as further assessment / remediation of any unacceptable risk from soil contamination.</p> <p>Where documents have been updated and submitted at Deadline 3, this is retained and unchanged.</p>
Q21.4	The Applicant	<p>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?</p>	<p>The efficient management of the amine solvent will be fundamental to the performance of the capture plant and hence the efficiency of carbon capture, and the Proposed Development as a whole. Thermal degradation and oxidative degradation of the solvent will be minimised through the application of appropriate process control measures, for temperature and exhaust gas trace species, as required by, and specific to, the selected technology. Nevertheless, some solvent degradation is expected to occur over time and degradation products and corrosion products must be removed, via thermal reclamation. The use of solvent management techniques specific to the solvent will ensure minimum waste generation and optimum capture performance in accordance with indicative Best Available Techniques and will be secured in the environmental permit application.</p> <p>Depending on the Technology Licensor's design, thermal reclaiming for the solvent may be a continuous or batch process. Both would be closely integrated with the capture plant installation on-site. In a continuous process a bleed (expected to be up to 5%) of the hot lean solvent returning to the solvent storage tank (from the desorber-reboiler) will be passed to the thermal reclaimer, where it will be heat treated to break down heat-stable salts formed in the process. This serves to recover solvent and remove degradation products, prior to return to the solvent system.</p> <p>In a batch process, the thermal reclaiming process may occur for 1 week or so every 2-4 months depending on the degradation profile of the solvent.</p> <p>Reclaimer waste will be neutralised prior to transport off-site for treatment by a licenced contractor at an appropriate hazardous waste management site.</p> <p>Overall, operation of the thermal reclaiming unit is key to management of solvent health, and therefore consumption of new solvent, in the capture process.</p>
Q21.5	The Applicant	<p>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?</p>	<p>As outlined in paragraph 23.6.20 of Chapter 23: Materials and Waste [APP-061], "It is currently estimated that 87,100 m³ of material would be excavated with 20% of material (17,420 m³) currently being assumed (in a worst-case) to be hazardous waste with the remaining 80% being non-hazardous and assumed to be reused on-site for land raising." As outlined in paragraph 23.6.24 and 23.6.25 "In a worst-case scenario where all hazardous waste (17,470 m³) is sent to landfill within one calendar year this would be 0.18% of the hazardous waste landfill void capacity in Wales and England (9.9 million m³). The magnitude of this impact is 'minor'. For hazardous waste, the sensitivity of receptor is classified as 'very high' (as outlined in paragraph 23.6.4 and Table 23-8) and the magnitude of impact is 'minor', resulting in a moderate or large adverse effect (as outlined in Table 23-11) which is significant."</p>

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>As the assessment already concludes a Minor magnitude of impact and 'Moderate or Large' adverse effect, any increase in the quantity of hazardous waste e.g. beyond 20% of the total excavated material would result in no change to the assessment outcome. The assessment outcome would still be significant. Whilst the effect classification could uplift to 'Large or Very Large' if waste generated by the Proposed Development were to reduce (see Table 23-10 of Chapter 23: Materials and Waste [APP-061]), for the reported effect classification to change, approximately 55% of the anticipated excavated materials would need to be considered hazardous to exceed 0.5% of the expansive study area landfill void capacity baseline. Based on the anticipated excavated material quantities (87,100m³), it would not be possible for the Proposed Development to exceed the 1% impact threshold.</p> <p>The Applicant refers to the Statement of Competence [APP-174], which outlines the capability and competence of the individuals responsible for undertaking and reporting the findings of the EIA and is confident that the assessment is robust and correct.</p>
Q21.6	The Applicant	<p>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?</p>	<p>As outlined in Chapter 23: Materials and Waste [APP-061], although the Proposed Development requires a substantial volume of concrete, several measures are in place to ensure this demand does not disproportionately impact Welsh concrete supply. Paragraph 23.6.10 states; <i>"Due to the proximity of the Proposed Development close to the Welsh-English border, it is anticipated that concrete may be sourced from North-west England"</i>. Therefore, when this context is considered (i.e., a combined Wales and North West England baseline (4.6 million tonnes) as outlined in Table 2 of Appendix 23-A: Materials and Waste Baseline Data Report [APP-061]), this material requirement is 10.1% of the baseline. As outlined in paragraph 23.6.11 <i>"In addition, batch concrete facilities would be used onsite which may ease demand on local sources."</i> Paragraph 23.6.12 reports as follows: <i>"When considering this, the impact magnitude is reduced but is still classified a 'major' and the effect remains slight or moderate adverse. Using professional judgement, an effect classification of slight has been selected on the basis the material requirement is just above the 10% threshold. Therefore, when considering the combined Wales and North West England baseline, the resultant effect would be not significant."</i></p>

Table 22: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Cumulative and Combined Effects

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
Q22.1	The Applicant NRW	<p>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?</p>	<p>The air quality Zol for impacts on ecological receptors is 15 km from the stacks, as set in NRW's guidance for the assessment of large combustion plant, and the modelling also considers the Proposed Development's contribution to impacts at most impacted locations reported for each of the cumulative developments. The growth represented by cumulative developments has been considered based on the emissions data from their published environmental assessments. Details of engagement with FCC), within whose authority area the Proposed Development is wholly situated, on cumulative and combined effects are presented in Chapter 24: Combined and Cumulative Effects [APP-062]. FCC was engaged on the Long and Short List of the other proposed schemes, which are directly derived from the Zol's. An agreement was reached for FCC to review the Short List after the meeting, and acknowledgement of receipt was received from FCC.</p> <p>Annex D of Appendix 8-D: Air Quality Operational Assessment (EN010166/APP/6.2.6) provides full details of the emissions from potential schemes in the vicinity of the Proposed Development.</p>
Q22.2	The Applicant National Highways FCC	<p>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? In particular with regards to cumulative effects potential at: 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. 	<p>Cumulative impact is considered to be inherently assessed within the Transport Assessment [APP-188] and Chapter 10: Traffic and Transport [APP-048]. Consideration of committed development has included all schemes within a 15 km distance of the Main Development Area, with proposed schemes included / discounted based on the level of information provided, extent of assessment study area, and forecasted years of traffic generation. The schemes considered were derived from a wider project short list. An agreement was reached for FCC to review the Short List after the meeting, and acknowledgement of receipt was received from FCC. With regard to traffic growth forecasts, baseline traffic data has been factored up using TEMPro, which is an industry standard tool that provides forecasts for growth in background traffic, based on planning projections for growth in housing, employment and car ownership. Therefore, through the inclusion of local committed developments, some element of growth and the factors or uplifts applied are in effect double counting, which is considered a robust approach.</p> <p>The assessment of cumulative traffic impact, which is inclusive of local committed development traffic, future traffic growth (via TEMPro) and Proposed Development traffic, is set out at section 10.6 of the Chapter 10: Traffic and Transport [APP-048]. No likely significant effects on traffic and transport have been identified during either the construction phase or operation phase for any of the Study Area links, inclusive of Kelsterton Road, Kelsterton Lane and the B5129.</p>
Q22.3	The Applicant NRW NE	<p>Terrestrial and aquatic ecology 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>	<p>An assessment of the cumulative impacts of this and other developments in the area was undertaken and is detailed in Chapter 24: Cumulative and Combined Effects [APP-062]. 28 other developments were considered against a number of impact pathways during the construction and operation of the Proposed Development. This assessment concluded that no potential significant cumulative terrestrial and aquatic ecological effects would arise during the construction or operation of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>This was also taken into account in the Air Quality assessment, as detailed in the Applicant's response to Q22.5.</p>
Q22.4	The Applicant NRW EA	<p>Water resources 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</p>	<p>Works to tie the Proposed Development into the existing towns' water pipelines within the existing Connah's Quay Power Station site and connections to fire and raw water storage tanks form part of the Proposed Development within the Main Development Area. The intention is to maintain current water supply terms and allowable limits with Dŵr Cymru Welsh Water with no difference in peak water flow rate during the construction or operation phases of the Proposed Development.</p>

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		consequences of this water demand and what mitigation measures have been proposed?	
Q22.5	The Applicant	<p>HRA stage 1 assessment methodology 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>	<p>In combination effects at the likely significant effects stage (Stage 1) are discussed in section 8.2 of the RIHRA [APP-253]. Impact pathways that were dismissed from the project alone at Stage 1 were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct habitat loss within River Dee & Bala Lake SAC – no habitat loss is expected so there is no potential for ‘in combination’ effects. • Direct habitat loss due to works within the Water Connection corridor on Dee Estuary SAC/SPA/Ramsar site – no habitat loss is expected so there is no potential for ‘in combination’ effects. • Disturbance of qualifying otter of River Dee & Bala Lake SAC – no evidence of otter was recorded within 300 m of the proposed project, so no disturbance is expected to arise and there is no potential for ‘in combination’ effects. • Disturbance of qualifying fish of the Dee Estuary SAC – there is no evidence of SAC fish being present beyond the River Dee itself and therefore there is no potential for ‘in combination’ effects. • Disturbance of qualifying fish of River Dee & Bala Lake SAC – no construction works will be undertaken in a manner that would disturb fish (e.g. below the water line), so there is no potential for ‘in combination’ effects. • Water pollution of Dee Estuary SAC/SPA/Ramsar site during construction and operation – since measures will be put in place to prevent pollution, in line with other legislative drivers, and operational discharge will be within existing permit limits, there is no potential for ‘in combination’ effects. • Water quantity, level and flow impacts on River Dee & Bala Lake SAC - With the Dee General Directions in place no additional water supplies beyond existing consents and licensed volumes would be required for the Proposed Development. As such, there is no potential for ‘in combination’ effects. • Barriers to fish movement for qualifying fish of River Dee & Bala Lake SAC and Dee Estuary SAC during construction – the Proposed Development will not cause any barriers to movement. Therefore, there is no potential for likely significant effects. • Introduction of invasive species to Dee Estuary SAC/SPA/Ramsar site during construction - since measures will be put in place to prevent the spread of invasive species, in line with other legislative drivers, there is no potential for ‘in combination’ effects. • Operational noise and visual disturbance on Dee Estuary SPA/Ramsar birds – acceptable noise thresholds would not be exceeded within the Dee Estuary SPA/Ramsar site during operation and the SPA/Ramsar site would not experience an increase in lighting. There is therefore no potential for ‘in combination’ effects. <p>For all these impact pathways, since no impact was identified as a result of the Proposed Development, there is no potential for effects ‘in combination’ with other projects and therefore specific projects did not require discussion.</p> <p>For air quality, in combination effects are inherent to the modelling methodology (i.e. a cumulative or ‘in combination’ effect was modelled in the same manner as the ‘alone’ effect) and this is reported in the likely significant effect (Stage 1) section of the RIHRA [APP-253] (see paragraphs 7.3.33 to 7.3.43, for example).</p>
Q22.6	The Applicant	<p>Methodology for assessing in-combination air quality effects (Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrdwy SAC/ SPA/ Ramsar site) In their relevant representation [RR-026] NE have raised numerous concerns regarding the methodology for assessing in-combination air quality effects on</p>	<p>The Applicant has provided responses to Natural England's Relevant Representation [RR-026] at Deadline 1 (Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [REP1-062]). Where appropriate, Natural England's comments have been picked up in the assessment presented in the RIHRA (EN010166/APP/6.12) as part of the Change Application, submitted at Deadline 3.</p>

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		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?	
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>	<p>Not addressed to the Applicant. The Applicant has noted Natural England's Deadline 3 response in which they do not consider the in-combination assessment to be adequate because it does not consider any projects on the English side of the border. Paragraph 10.4.1 of the RIHRA [APP-253] sets out the approach taken to 'in combination' assessment. It states that <i>'The in-combination assessment relating to air quality has already been covered above where the air quality results are discussed. With regard to other plans and projects that could operate in combination with the Proposed Development, the following lie within 2 km of the Proposed Development Site...'</i> The air quality assessment took account of all identified projects within 15 km of the Proposed Development in line with Environment Agency and NRW guidance. With regard to other impact pathways, the 2 km distance was used to identify those sites closest to the Main Development Area and most likely to result in 'in combination' effects through pathways other than air quality, notably loss of functionally-linked habitat for Curlew, which is the only species for which loss of functionally linked land is identified due to the Proposed Development. The English border is located over 2 km from the Main Development Area at its closest point and it is almost 5 km before the nearest settlement on the English side of the border. Therefore, no development sites were identified in England for 'in combination' assessment other than for air quality.</p>

Table 23: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Development Consent Order

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
Articles			
Q23.1	The Applicant	Article 2: Commencement Clarify what works are included and excluded from the definition of commencement.	Detail regarding the definition of 'commence' is set out in the Explanatory Memorandum (EN010166/APP/3.2) at paragraph 3.2.2. In addition, a further explanation of what works are included and excluded from the definition of 'commence' were detailed within Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) and can be found summarised within the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at ISH1 and response to Action Points [REP1-065] at paragraphs 1.5.8 to 1.5.12. To summarise, 'commence' means the carrying out of a material operation, as defined in section 155 (when development begins) of the 2008 Act, save for 'site enabling works'. Such site enabling works can be carried out ahead of formal 'commencement' to ensure delivery of the Proposed Development within the timescales required. The site enabling works definition, as well as the wording of relevant requirements within Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1) , ensures that environmental controls are still sufficiently secured such that no works requiring mitigation are excluded from 'commencement' and the definition is a robust means of controlling the exercise of powers under the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1) .
Q23.2	The Applicant	Article 7: Removal of benefit for others Notwithstanding the explanation given at ISH1, please clarify the reason and need for the removal of benefits to others within this article.	<p>As is outlined within the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at ISH1 and response to Action Points [REP1-065] at paragraphs 1.5.13 to 1.5.15, the drafting of Article 7 provides that the provisions of the Order have effect solely for the benefit of the Applicant in general but then also specifically provides for three other entities to benefit from the powers of the Order for works which are within their remit to deliver by virtue of the fact that such works are to their apparatus. This means that only the Applicant and these specified parties can act with the powers of 'undertaker' to carry out the works to be authorised by the Order. Such wording does not inhibit the general benefits the Proposed Development brings. The term 'benefit' in this context is used to describe the powers and restrictions which apply to the entity defined as 'undertaker' within the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1).</p> <p>As is highly standard for DCOs, and indeed the established precedent within the Model Provisions, Article 7 overrides section 156(1) of the 2008 Act (as permitted by 156(2) of the 2008 Act) which limits the benefit of the Order to anyone with an interest in the land. Due to the nature of the works to be carried out as part of the Proposed Development, it is entirely appropriate that the powers under the Order are only exercised by the specified parties with the means, knowledge, capability and expertise to undertake such works, and not simply any other person with an interest in the Order land (unless provided under Article 8).</p> <p>Other parties are able to benefit from the Order by virtue of a transfer pursuant to Article 8 of the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1). Article 8 allows for the transfer of benefit to any party, provided the SoS consents to such transfer, and also prescribes a specific list of parties to whom the benefit can be transferred without the approval of the SoS, where it is considered that such persons would have the equivalent means, knowledge, capability and expertise as those bodies listed in Article 7.</p>
Q23.3	The Applicant	Article 24: Protection of buildings What buildings may require this protection adjacent to the Main Development Area, along the CO ₂ 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.	In the Applicant's response to Action Point 9 contained within the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at ISH1 and response to Action Points [REP1-065] , the Applicant explains the justification for this article's inclusion in the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1) . Whilst there are no buildings that have been identified at this early stage (before the detailed design has been finalised) as requiring protective works, in light of the duration of the Proposed Development, such power is considered prudent so that there is no potential limitation on the ability for the undertaker to carry out such protective works for the benefit of third parties' buildings, where a need for such works is identified.
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.	In the Applicant's response to Action Point 5 contained within the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at ISH1 and response to Action Points [REP1-065] , the Applicant explains the intention behind, scope and justification for this article's inclusion in the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1) . Where the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1) authorises the acquisition of subsurface interests with surface rights only, by reference to the specified interest within the Book of Reference (EN010166/APP/4.1) , Article 33 does not have the effect of expanding this interest to allow for acquisition of

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>airspace as well. Instead it clarifies that, rather than needing to exercise all of the compulsory acquisition powers provided for within the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1), the undertaker may use the lesser power of acquiring only the subsoil or only the airspace in circumstances where this is all that is necessary for the delivery of the Proposed Development to the extent that a wider acquisition type is listed within the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1) or Book of Reference (EN010166/APP/4.1). This article minimises so far as is possible the extent of interest the undertaker needs to acquire, resulting in less impact on landowners and lower compensation payments.</p>
Q23.5	The Applicant	<p>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.</p>	<p>In the Applicant's response to Action Point 6 contained within the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at ISH1 and response to Action Points [REP1-065], the Applicant explains the justification for this article's inclusion in the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1). This detailed response confirms that whilst there are not currently any trees subject to tree preservation orders (TPOs) within the Order limits, in light of the duration of the Proposed Development, there is a very real risk that trees are made subject to a TPO in the future within the Order limits. There is a clear precedent for the current drafting, and it is appropriate to include this power within the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1).</p>
Q23.6	The Applicant	<p>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.</p>	<p>In the Applicant's response to Action Point 7 contained within the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at ISH1 and response to Action Points [REP1-065], the Applicant explains the justification for this article's inclusion in the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1). This detailed response explains that, as there are excavation works due to take place as part of the pipeline works in the Proposed CO₂ Corridor and fresh ground will also be broken over the fields where the new generating station will be erected, this article would add clarity as to the procedure for the event that human remains are discovered.</p>
Schedule 2 – Requirements			
Q23.7	The Applicant	<p>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 Draft DCO 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.</p>	<p>In the Applicant's response to Action Point 8 contained within the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at ISH1 and response to Action Points [REP1-065], the Applicant explains why the term 'general accordance' is appropriate for the controls contained within the Requirements within Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1). For the reasons provided in this detailed response, it is the Applicant's position that such wording does provide a robust control on the form of the detailed plans to be approved by the relevant planning authority and allows for adequate mitigation to be secured, whilst allowing sufficient flexibility for innovation at the detailed design stage.</p>

Table 24: Applicant's Responses to ExQ1 Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary possession and Other Land or Rights Considerations

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
Q24.1	The Applicant	<p>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.</p>	<p>Uniper SE ("Uniper"), the Applicant's parent company, was severely impacted by the gas and energy crisis in 2022, in particular following the Russian invasion of Ukraine and the curtailment of Russian gas supplies. Gazprom no longer honored an existing gas delivery contract to Uniper and Uniper fell short of contracted gas supply volumes. Given Uniper's existing gas delivery obligations to its customers, Uniper had to secure new volumes in the market at very high prevailing prices at the time. The German government decided to take up these mounting losses to stabilize the German gas supply. Accordingly, the German government agreed to subscribe to a € 13.5bn capital increase of Uniper to cover the losses from the Russian gas curtailments.</p> <p>Since 2022, Uniper has secured new gas supply sources. The disputed gas supply relationship with Gazprom Export was formally terminated by Uniper in June 2024 following a positive ruling for Uniper in arbitration proceedings. Therefore, no further loss risks from the disputed gas supply relationship have occurred since.</p> <p>As a result of the above mentioned €13.5bn capital increase as well as notable retained earnings in 2023 and 2024, Uniper is well capitalized again. On 11 July 2025, S&P Global Ratings affirmed Uniper's long-term issuer credit rating at BBB- with a stable outlook. As per latest financial statement published for Q3 2025, Uniper's Net Cash Position amounted to € 3.3bn providing financial flexibility to fund the Proposed Development.</p>
Q24.2	The Applicant	<p>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.</p>	<p>Temporary possession of the subsoil beneath the highway is required in order to facilitate works which may be required for the delivery of Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs) to the Main Development Area. Such temporary works may need to interfere with the highway substrate to dig out obstructions, secure temporary signs and temporarily alter the layout of the street so that AILs can safely be transported from each of the relevant Ports required.</p> <p>As only temporary possession is being sought, there will be no permanent removal of freeholders' rights in respect of this substrate as a result of the Proposed Development. It should also be noted that in most cases the owner of the subsoil below the vertical plane of land forming the highway is not formally registered and instead there is simply a rebuttable presumption that the owners of the subsoil are the owners of the land or houses on either side of the highway up to the middle of the road (known as the <i>ad medium filum</i> rule). Those owners have no use or enjoyment of that subsoil land and will not be prejudiced by the rights to be granted over that land that are necessary for the Proposed Development.</p>
Q24.3	The Applicant	<p>Land plots 7/3 & 7/5 [APP-024] Clarify who are the freeholders and lessees of these plots.</p>	<p>The freeholders over both plots are [redacted]. Neither plot holds any lessees. However, both plots are now being occupied by both Liverpool Bay CCS Limited and United Infrastructure Limited. This occupation is currently on a temporary basis and is associated with the proposed Hynet Carbon Dioxide Pipeline development. Liverpool Bay CCS will obtain either a long term lease or acquire the freehold of the subsurface and surface rights over these plots under the HyNet Carbon Dioxide Pipeline Order 2024.</p>
Q24.4	The Applicant	<p>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?</p>	<p>The Applicant has spoken to the tenant farmer via phone call and email regarding the lease coming to an end in July 2026 and their occupation going forward in line with the future plans, works and timings relating to the Proposed Development. The Applicant has agreed to renew the tenancy agreement on a six month basis to come to an end in January 2027, with a four week break notice at any time should it be necessary to end the tenancy early. The Applicant has agreed to let on a peppercorn rent. The tenant has agreed and is happy with this. The Applicant will need to maintain access for the tenant farmer to continue grazing compartment 1 in line with the Land Management Plan for the existing Connah's Quay Power Station.</p>
Q24.5	The Applicant TATA Airbus	<p>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?</p>	<p>Following email engagement in Q4 2025, and previous meetings, the Applicant continues to engage with Tata Steel. As recognised in previous deadline submissions, matters of particular interest to Tata Steel relate to minimising the impact on operations at the Shotton location, appropriate costs of reimbursement, as well as appropriate risk assessments for haulage activities and movement planning. Furthermore, practical topics such as site inductions and surveys to assess movement of</p>

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>items such as street furniture/signage continue to be discussed. Some survey work has already been conducted working with the Tata Steel team on site.</p> <p>As agreed in previous meetings, the Applicant has provided Tata Steel with draft heads of terms of agreement for consideration setting out proposed commercial and operational arrangements providing for the use of the jetty, adjoining land and access routes.</p> <p>The Applicant also continues to engage with the Dee Conservancy (NRW) in parallel as they own the mooring dolphins that are an integral part of the marine infrastructure to use the jetty.</p>
Q24.6	The Applicant	<p>Land plot 9/23 [APP-024] 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>	<p>Plot 9/23 covers a registered title, and the Book of Reference (EN010166/APP/4.1) reflects this as it describes the Category 1 owner and occupier as Uniper UK Limited (the Applicant), mirroring the information sourced from HM Land Registry. If the query relates to the unknown mines and minerals Category 1 interest, this has been recorded as the underlying HM Land Registry title describes the minerals reserves in ownership of Natural Resources Wales but only in part of the title. In order to try and establish ownership, the Land Referencing team has undertaken contact referencing activities and engaged with suspected interest holders through the means of land interest questionnaires. No claim to ownership of the mines and minerals in part of title was received.</p> <p>In any event, specific protections regarding minerals are provided for within Article 29 of the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1).</p>
Q24.7	The Applicant	<p>Land showing that the applicant requires no possession of 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>	<p>As required by Regulation 7(1)(a)(ii) of the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009, the Book of Reference (EN010166/APP/4.1) includes all land which is proposed to be subject to rights to use land, as well as land which will be subject to powers of compulsory acquisition.</p> <p>The Applicant has already determined that adequate land agreements are secured to facilitate the use and maintenance of the existing pipeline within the Repurposed CO₂ Corridor (with a few exceptions where the relevant compulsory acquisition rights are sought for the relevant stretch of pipeline accordingly). Therefore, neither additional nor duplicate land interests need to be secured via the Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1) where such land interests are already evidenced. Whilst the Applicant is confident that it has already secured the land rights for future use and maintenance of the existing pipeline for the transport of CO₂, the inclusion of this pipeline within the Order limits ensures that the required consent for the change of use, from a planning perspective, is provided for the repurposed use of the pipeline.</p>
Q24.8	The Applicant Essity	<p>Land plot 6/5 [APP-024] 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>	<p>The Applicant has sought permanent acquisition of subsurface and surface rights over plot 6/5 to regularise the land interest position where there is not a clearly identified document trail of the required land interests for future use and maintenance of the existing pipeline in this location.</p> <p>As can be identified from the Works Plans (EN010166/APP/2.4), no works are anticipated over this plot because the Repurposed CO₂ Pipeline is already in existence within this plot and no works are required to allow for the repurposing of the pipeline for the transport of CO₂. The Repurposed Pipeline Corridor is included within the Order limits to ensure that the required development consent, from a planning perspective, is provided for the repurposed use of the pipeline.</p> <p>The Applicant has received no communications from Essity either at the pre-application stage or during the examination process to indicate that inclusion of this plot within the Order limits would constrain any of its future operations.</p> <p>The existing pipeline is subject to an easement and maintenance strip to ensure safety and operational/maintenance requirements. Any statutory undertakers looking to complete works within proximity to the existing pipeline would be required to contact Eni UK Limited or Liverpool Bay CCS Limited to seek prior approval and agree protective measures/crossing agreements as required. This is standard practice for buried infrastructure in the UK.</p>

ExQ1	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
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.</p> <p>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 Draft DCO 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 Draft DCO?</p>	<p>The Applicant confirms it is continuing to seek to utilise a combination of the three port options identified within Chapter 5: Construction Management and Programme [APP-043]. This is further discussed in Item 4.3 of Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions ISH2 and Response to Action Points [REP1-066].</p> <p>Appendix A of the Framework CTMP [APP-247] demonstrates that, based on the Applicant's current understanding of AILs, all three ports provide a viable option for transportation. As each may be more suitable for different delivery types depending on the volume, dimensions or mass of the loads being moved the Applicant is seeking to be able to utilise all three port and route combinations.</p>

Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Term
AEP	Annual Exceedance Probability
AGI	Above Ground Installation
AIL	Abnormal Indivisible Load
AOD	Above Ordnance Datum
APP	Application Document Reference
ASME	American Society of Mechanical Engineers
C&IEA	Construction and Infrastructure Environmental Area
CCGT	Combined Cycle Gas Turbine
CEMP	Construction Environmental Management Plan
CL:AIRE	Contaminated Land: Applications in Real Environments
CL02	Contaminated Land Site Reference 02
COMAH	Control of Major Accident Hazards Regulations
CO ₂	Carbon Dioxide
CTMP	Construction Traffic Management Plan
CWTP	Construction Worker Travel Plan
DCO	Development Consent Order
DCS	Distributed Control System
DESNZ	Department for Energy Security and Net Zero
DoW CoP	Definition of Waste Code of Practice
EA	Environment Agency
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EN	Examination Library Document Reference (e.g. EN010166)
ES	Environmental Statement
ExA	Examining Authority
ExQ	Examining Authority Question
FCC	Flintshire County Council
HAZOP	Hazard and Operability Study
HRSG	Heat Recovery Steam Generator
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment
HSE	Health and Safety Executive

Abbreviation	Term
HyNet	Hydrogen Network (North West CCS cluster project)
IP	Interested Party
ISH	Issue Specific Hearing
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
LBCCS	Liverpool Bay CCS Limited
LSE	Likely Significant Effect
MMP	Materials Management Plan
NE	Natural England
NOx	Nitrogen Oxides
NRW	Natural Resources Wales
PHW	Public Health Wales
PIG	Pipeline Inspection Gauge
PRV	Pressure Relief Valve
RIHRA	Report to Inform the Habitats Regulations Assessment
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SCR	Selective Catalytic Reduction
SoS	Secretary of State
SPA	Special Protection Area
SWMP	Site Waste Management Plan
T&S	Transport and Storage
TPO	Tree Preservation Order
UKHSA	UK Health Security Agency
ZoI	Zone of Influence