



Application by Uniper UK for an order granting development consent for the Connah's Quay Low Carbon Power Project (EN010166)
The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ2): Issued on 5 May 2026
Responses are due by deadline 6: 29 May 2026

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) written questions and requests for information - ExQ2.

Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the initial assessment of principal issues provided as **annex C** to the Rule 6 Letter dated 9 December 2026 but also covering other themes and topics. Questions have been added to the framework of issues set out there as they have arisen from representations and to address the assessment of the application against relevant policies.

Column 2 of the table indicates which interested parties (IPs) and other persons each question is directed to. The ExA would be grateful if all persons named could answer all questions directed to them, providing a substantive response, or indicating that the question is not relevant to them for a reason. This does not prevent an answer being provided to a question by a person to whom it is not directed, should the question be relevant to their interests.

Each question has a unique reference number which starts with 2 (indicating that it is from ExQ2) and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on air quality and emissions issues is identified as ExQ2.1.1. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

You should respond to the questions by using the **Have your say** function on the project page of the National Infrastructure website and selecting 'Responses to Examining Authority's First Written Questions (ExQ2)' when asked.

If you are responding to a small number of questions, you can submit your answers by choosing 'Make a comment' and entering your answers in the 'Your comments' box. If you are answering a larger number of questions you should email the case team on connahsquay@planninginspectorate.gov.uk for a Microsoft Word version of the ExA's written questions, enter your answers and save the document using an appropriate file name. You can then submit the completed document by choosing 'Make a comment' and selecting 'Upload files'.



Planning Inspectorate Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Acronyms and Abbreviations used:

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



Planning Inspectorate Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

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



Planning Inspectorate Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

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



Planning Inspectorate Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

TPO	Tree Preservation Order
UKHSA	United Kingdom Health Security Agency
UXO	Unexploded Ordnance
VP	View Point
WAG	Welsh Assembly Government
WNMP	Welsh National Marine Plan
ZOI	Zone of Influence

The Examination Library

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

It will be updated as the examination progresses.

Citation of questions

Questions in this table should be cited as follows:

Question reference: issue reference: question number, for example ExQ2 1.1 – refers to question 1 in this table.



Index	
1	General and cross-topic questions.....7
2	Design, parameters and other details of the proposed development7
3	Project alternatives7
4	Planning policy7
5	Need.....7
6	Air quality7
7	Noise and vibration8
8	Traffic and transport8
9	Terrestrial and Aquatic Ecology.....8
10	Marine Ecology8
11	Water Environment and Flood Risk9
12	Geology and Ground Conditions9
13	Landscape and Visual Amenity9
14	Physical Processes9
15	Terrestrial Heritage.....10
16	Marine Heritage.....10
17	Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism.....10
18	Climate Change10
19	Human Health..... 10
20	Major Accidents and Disasters..... 10
21	Materials and Waste 10
22	Cumulative and Combined Effects..... 10
23	Development consent order [REP5-004] 10
	Articles..... 11
	Schedule 2 – Requirements..... 11
24	Compulsory acquisition, temporary possession and other land or rights considerations 11

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
1 General and cross-topic questions		
Q1.1	The applicant	<p>Existing power station</p> <p>In the applicant's reply to ExQ1 1.2 it is noted that as power production from the proposed development comes online, so power production from the existing power station would diminish. What is the governing factor in this balance, is the input capacity of the various mediums to the site, such as fuel or cooling water; the emissions or discharge permits; or the export grid capacity to controlling issue? How will this limitation arise in practice?</p>
Q1.2	The applicant	<p>Interaction with the HyNet proposed development</p> <p>Accepting that the design, construction and operation of the HyNet project are outside of the scope of this application, what would be the likely consequence of a failure of the HyNet development to be able to accommodate the CO2 discharge from the CQCLP? Specifically, if the HyNet project were unable to adequately store the CO2. Would the CQCLP continue to transfer CO2 to the HyNet project or would some form of limitation come back upstream preventing the operation of CQCLP?</p>
2 Design, parameters and other details of the proposed development		
Q2.1		No additional questions on this subject at this Deadline
3 Project alternatives		
Q3.1		No additional questions on this subject at this Deadline
4 Planning policy		
Q4.1	The applicant	<p>Unabated operation of the proposed development</p> <p>Further to the Applicant's reply to ExQ1 4.3, and whilst it is noted that the assessment makes use of the reference case and accordingly the worst-case scenario for emissions, can the applicant please advise the ExA of the resulting target emissions and CO2 capture rates from the Dispatchable Case (high) and Dispatchable Case (low) scenarios also?</p>
5 Need		
Q5.1	The applicant	<p>System restoration</p> <p>Further to Applicant's response to ExQ1 5.1 and 5.3, and 6.2.4.11 of the Environmental Statement [CR-020] it is not clear whether the proposed development would be able to contribute to the full network restoration following a national power outage or whether it could restart alone should such an outage take place. It is understood that Applicant may want to reserve commercially sensitive matters surrounding this, if in place, but for an assessment of the wider benefit of the proposed development it is necessary for the ExA to ascertain whether this proposed development can make a wider contribution to the overall network resilience or if it would only be self sufficient.</p>
6 Air quality		
Q6.1	The applicant NRW	<p>Nitrogen and ammonia deposition</p> <p>In the applicant's reply to ExQ1 6.9 it is noted that it is proposed to realign the flood defences to allow saltmarsh to be created to compensate for the potential nitrogen and ammonia deposition at the Dee Estuary SAC/SPA/Ramsar site and the Deeside & Buckley Newts SAC. What is the assessment of this benefit of new saltmarsh versus the proposed increased in deposition of nitrogen and ammonia deposits over the wider sites? It is noted that the extent of saltmarsh creation is assessed against the proposed footprint of habitat loss from the construction works for the outfall, but given its provision to offset the nitrogen and ammonia deposition also, where is the measure of this effectiveness? Also this proposal appears to conflict slightly with the later statement in ExQ1 6.18 where it is stated that, firstly the saltmarsh is not being created but allowing natural processes to prevail and reinstate saltmarsh; and that secondly the saltmarsh creation is not behind undertake to address air quality impacts. Please can this be clarified and also advise if it's the Applicant's wish for the newly reinstated saltmarsh to be considered to address multiple impacts.</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
7 Noise and vibration		
Q7.1	The applicant FCC	<p>Mitigation of traffic noise on local residents ([REP4-046] Ref:6.6.3.3.7)</p> <p>The Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (FCTMP) alludes to monitoring of noise at selected locations and potential mitigations measures should this prove an issue during the construction period.</p> <p>Noting these locations will be in agreement with FCC, where are the potential locations for noise monitoring in relation to the local community?</p> <p>What will be the trigger for further mitigation should noise levels prove excessive?</p>
Q7.2	The applicant	<p>Baseline background levels of noise for residential receptors</p> <p>Given the acknowledgement that noise levels for local residents are already high from the existing industrial sites and road adjacent to the local community, where has the applicant demonstrated “good” design in their proposal to help mitigate for this already high level of noise, on to top of the mitigation proposed to address the noise from their proposed development?</p>
Q7.3	The applicant FCC	<p>Potential for vibrations at neighbouring properties</p> <p>Further to ExQ1 7.4 the applicant does not appear to have addressed the specific risk that could arise from vibration to neighbouring properties from any percussive piling during the construction works. It is noted in the Framework Construction Environment Management Plan (FCEMP) Table 3: Noise and Vibration that “<i>use of rotary bored rather than driven piling techniques (if required), where possible</i>” could be implemented if issues arise, but how would this be assessed, monitored and the perceptions of local residents be addressed during construction.</p>
8 Traffic and transport		
Q8.1	The applicant FCC Highways Authority	<p>Increase in traffic movements ([APP-048] Table 10-28)</p> <p>Noting the medium magnitude of impacts at Kelsterton Road during the construction works, the FTCMP refers to monitoring this impact and further mitigation measures if required. Please elaborate on this monitoring regime, the triggers for further mitigation and what these mitigation measures may involve.</p>
9 Terrestrial and Aquatic Ecology		
Q9.1	The applicant NRW	<p>Gronant fields site ([REP5-032] Ref: 6.13.4)</p> <p>Noting the existing survey records for the bird species at the Gronant fields site, what impact is the intention to dedicate the site to relocation of species from the Connah’s Quay site likely to have on the existing species use, and how will the planned works to develop the Gronant files site and make it more attractive to the displaced species impact these existing species.</p> <p>Please update with the continued appropriate evidence of the existing use of the Gronant field sites by other species, in particular scheduled species and what are the likely impacts on these existing species of the planned relocation of additional species to the site.</p> <p>Please verify if the Gronant fields site is already behaving as functionally linked land or not.</p> <p>If works are required to the Gronant fields site to make it suitable for the use of Curlew as proposed in the Curlew Management Strategy, will this work require separate permissions, how will these be secured and what are the risks that they may not proceed if the proposed development application is successful but the proposed works to the Gronant fields site cannot be achieved?</p>
10 Marine Ecology		
Q10.1	The applicant	<p>Proposed surface water outfall construction ([REP4-021] Ref: 6.2.12.1.10)</p> <p>It is noted that the installation of the new outfall will be executed using either trenchless methods or open excavation techniques, extending from the current headwall. Please can this construction technique be clarified as it is likely that open excavation will have different impacts on the habitat to that of trenchless methods, and consequently will require differing considerations.</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
11	Water Environment and Flood Risk	
Q11.1	The applicant NRW	Surface water collection, discharge and protection of the environment ([CR1-022] Ref: 6.2.5.3.40 & [REP4-038] Ref: 5.3 OSWDS) In the applicant's reply to ExQ1 11.3 it is advised that "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". Old Rockcliffe brook appears to cross the main development area and Oakenholt brook appears to in close proximity also to the north of the main development area. It is understood that these brooks may not be open channel watercourses and possibly culverted through the site, but the given the area is already disturbed by these features would it not be possible to divert surface water collection from the proposed development and connect or discharge to these watercourses rather than constructing a new headwall within the estuary. What is the capacity of these brooks to receive additional flows, and if culverted what would be the impact of increasing the culvert sizes as opposed to constructing the proposed outfall within the estuary?
Q11.2	The applicant NRW	Flood risk ([CR1-032]) What is the risk of multi-variate coastal overtopping from the combined action of high tides, surge, waves including wind waves, swell waves and long period waves at the site; and does this present a different flood risk scenario to the extreme water level assessment presented? Given the exposed coastal nature of the proposed development, what is the risk of overtopping and breach of the flood defences and does this exacerbate the flood risk scenario? It is noted in the applicant's reply to ExQ1 that a range of climate change scenarios has been considered but with regards to the assessing credible maximum scenarios for nationally significant infrastructure projects as set out in government guidance, can the applicant confirm that the full range of scenarios has been considered, specifically including the H++ sea level rise assessment for critical national infrastructure.
Q11.3	The applicant NRW	Foul water services ([CR1-020] Ref: 6.2.4.2.50 & [CR1-32] 6.2.13..3.10) Why is the part of the existing foul water treatment at the site "sub-optimal" and being collected and taken away for disposal and can the applicant advise how this will not be the same situation for the proposed development?
12	Geology and Ground Conditions	
Q12.1	The applicant	Possibility of the presence of unexploded ordnance Given that pre-desk study assessment of risk has recommended a detailed desk study be commissioned, why has this been deferred until construction, and what is the risk that this further study highlights additional risks to any of pre-commencement enabling works?
Q12.2	The applicant	Contaminated ground What are the risks of encountering and opening up to the environment hazardous material from the decommissioning of the earlier power station whilst undertaking excavations in the C&IEA, and how would these risks be mitigated?
13	Landscape and Visual Amenity	
Q13.1		No additional questions on this subject at this Deadline
14	Physical Processes	
Q14.1	The applicant NRW	Shoreline management It is noted that the proposal to realign the defences to south of the proposed development within the C&IEA is contrary to the preferred policy within the shoreline management plan. What implication does this have for other stakeholders and signatories to the shoreline management plan, what is the risk that the rate of inundation of the set back site will accelerate as is common where managed realignment activity takes place and what does this mean for rates of coastal erosion adjacent to the site of the proposed managed realignment?

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
15	Terrestrial Heritage	
Q15.1		No additional questions on this subject at this Deadline
16	Marine Heritage	
Q16.1		No additional questions on this subject at this Deadline
17	Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism	
Q17.1	The applicant FCC	Additional support to the local community What can the applicant do to further support the local community with regards to the issues raised at OFH1 including any support to energy needs for the local swimming pools and the improvements to the works at the boundary of their site to reduce risk to students walking to college.
18	Climate Change	
Q18.1	The applicant	Upstream emissions ([REP5-072]) Considering CESL's Deadline 5 submission, please explain, with reference to the Environmental Statement and the EIA Regulations, how the Applicant is satisfied that the approach taken to the identification and assessment of upstream (well-to-tank) greenhouse gas emissions, including methane, is sufficient to enable the Examining Authority and the Secretary of State to understand and assess the significance of the Proposed Development's effects on climate change.
Q18.2	CESL	Upstream emissions <u>Please clarify succinctly which requirement(s) of Regulation 5(2) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 you contend have not been met, and explain why, in your view, the matters raised amount to a legal deficiency in the Environmental Statement rather than a disagreement with the Applicant's exercise of professional judgement.</u>
19	Human Health	
Q19.1		No additional questions on this subject at this Deadline
20	Major Accidents and Disasters	
Q20.1	The applicant PHWUKHSA HSE	Accidental release of CO2 ([CR1-020] Ref: 6.2.4.4.15) Noting the applicant's reply to ExQ1 20.1 and the provisions and measures to be taken to prevent an accidental release of CO2 from either the CCP at the main development area or the pipeline to the Hynet corridor, what would a potential accidental release of CO2 look like? Are any specific communities or habitats more at risk than others due to their low lying nature or proximity to potential release points? How would these communities be advised of a deliberate or accidental release; and what measures would be taken to disperse the CO2 to natural background levels?
21	Materials and Waste	
Q21.1		No additional questions on this subject at this Deadline
22	Cumulative and Combined Effects	
Q22.1		No additional questions on this subject at this Deadline
23	Development consent order [REP5-004]	

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
Articles		
Q23.1	The applicant	Article 24: Protective works to buildings Provide justification for the inclusion of this power when no buildings have been identified within the Order Limits that are not within the ownership of the Applicant, and none are noted to be close proximity to the proposed works.
Q23.2	The applicant	Article 33: Acquisition of subsoil or airspace only What is the justification for acquisition of airspace rights? No indication has been made by the Applicant of use of airspace to facilitate or operate the works. Please justify the inclusion of this power or amend the article to ensure rights to subsoil only is sought.
Q23.3	The applicant	Article 51: Human remains Further to the applicant's reply to ExQ1 23.6 and noting the removal of this article from numerous recently consented DCOs by the Secretary of State, please justify why the risk of encountering human remains is so high as to warrant the inclusion of this article and why the measures provided for by it are more economic or time saving than those afforded by the normal provisions for unforeseen encountering of human remains by the Burial Act 1857.
Schedule 2 – Requirements		
Q23.4	The applicant	Control plans and documents The applicant advises that it would like to use the term "in general accordance with" to give some degree of flexibility. However, as the plans and details are developed as the design is progressed why would this term be required rather than in accordance with?
24 Compulsory acquisition, temporary possession and other land or rights considerations		
Q24.1	The applicant	Land plots along CO2 corridor Please provide an update with regards to the negotiations with all affected persons with regards to the permanent acquisition of subsoil rights along the proposed CO2 corridor.
Q24.2	The applicant	Minimal use of powers Can the Applicant explain how the scope of compulsory acquisition powers has been minimised in order to reduce interference with affected persons' rights, and what safeguards would be in place should those powers be confirmed?