



## Connah's Quay Low Carbon Power

### Applicant's Response to Deadline 5 Submissions

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN010166

Document Reference: EN010166/APP/9.33

Planning Act 2008 (as amended)

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 - Regulation 5(2)(q)

Revision 00

May 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 of this Document .....	1
2.	Organisations / Businesses (Non-Landowners) .....	2
2.1	REP5-068 Natural England .....	2
2.2	REP5-070 Natural Resources Wales (NRW).....	4
2.3	REP5-072 Climate Emergency Science Law (CESL).....	19
2.4	REP5-071 Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB).....	24
3.	Landowners .....	26
3.1	REP5-088 Tata Steel UK.....	26
4.	Local Authorities .....	27
4.1	REP5-067 Flintshire County Council (FCC) .....	27
	Abbreviations .....	32

## Tables

Table 1:	Response to Natural England's Deadline 5 submission .....	2
Table 2:	Response to NRW's Deadline 5 submission.....	4
Table 3:	Response to CESL's Deadline 5 submission .....	19
Table 4:	Response to RSPB's Deadline 5 submission .....	24
Table 5:	Response to Tata Steel's Deadline 5 submission .....	26
Table 6:	Response to FCC's Deadline 5 submission.....	27

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Overview

- 1.1.1 This document has been prepared on behalf of Uniper UK Limited in connection with the application (Application) that has been submitted to the Secretary of State (the SoS) for the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ) for a Development Consent Order (a DCO) under Section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008) in respect of the Connah's Quay Low Carbon Power Project.
- 1.1.2 The Application was submitted to SoS on 5<sup>th</sup> August 2025 and accepted for examination on 28<sup>th</sup> August 2025. The Examination commenced on 13<sup>th</sup> January 2026.

## 1.2 Purpose of this Document

- 1.2.1 This document provides the comments of the Applicant in response to the submissions made by Interested Parties (IPs) at Deadline 5 of the Examination.
- 1.2.2 Accordingly, responses to the following IPs are contained in the subsequent sections of this document:
- Section 2 – Organisations / Business (Non-Landowners)
  - Section 3 – Landowners
  - Section 4 – Local Authorities.
- 1.2.3 The Applicant has not commented on every point made within the IP's submissions. Instead, the Applicant has sought to provide comments where it is helpful to the Examining Authority (ExA) or where it considers that it would be appropriate for the ExA to have the Applicant's view on the matter raised.
- 1.2.4 For the avoidance of doubt, where the Applicant has chosen not to comment on matters raised by an IP, this is not an indication the Applicant agrees with the point or comment raised or opinion expressed.
- 1.2.5 When responding to Deadline 5 submissions, 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 Development Consent Order (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, 2, 3, 4 or 5 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 6, the document reference is provided (e.g. EN010166/APP/X.X).

## 2. Organisations / Businesses (Non-Landowners)

### 2.1 REP5-068 Natural England

2.1.1 Natural England's Deadline 5 submission and the Applicant's response are set out in **Table 1** below.

**Table 1: Response to Natural England's Deadline 5 submission**

Source Document	Reference	Topic	Source Document Text	Applicant's Response
<b>Comments on any submissions received by Deadline 4</b> (Natural England) <b>[REP5-068]:</b> Annex 1 – Comment on documents submitted at Deadline 4	1.1	Without Prejudice Habitats Regulations Derogations Report (Rev01)	We welcome the inclusion of the impacts from aerial deposition in the Without Prejudice Derogations Report for completeness.	The <b>Applicant's Legal Submissions on Mitigation vs Compensation [REP4-086]</b> set out the Applicant's position on these matters and confirm why it is legally and factually correct to determine that the measures proposed constitute mitigation.
	1.2	Without Prejudice Habitats Regulations Derogations Report (Rev01)	Our position remains as set out in our Relevant Representations, and subsequent submissions – the proposed measures constitute compensation rather than mitigation.	
	1.3	Without Prejudice Habitats Regulations Derogations Report (Rev01)	As per our Deadline 2 submission Natural England does not have a statutory role in the derogations provisions of the Habitat Regulations. The onus is on the applicant to satisfy the Competent Authority (Secretary of State/ PINS in this case) that there are no alternative solutions and that there are imperative reasons of over-riding public interest.	The Applicant has provided evidence within the <b>Notice of a proposed without prejudice HRA derogation in Wales [REP4-078]</b> to demonstrate that alternatives have been considered and to document why the relevant alternatives have been discounted. It also establishes that there are imperative reasons of over-riding public interest. Whilst it remains the Applicant's firm position that the Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment carried out in the <b>Report to Inform Habitats Regulations Assessment (RIHRA) (EN010166/APP/6.12)</b> is robust and legally sound, the <b>Notice of a proposed without prejudice HRA derogation in Wales [REP4-078]</b> evidences how a Stage 3 Derogation case would also be satisfied should the Secretary of State determine one to be necessary.
	1.4	Report to Inform Habitats Regulations Assessment (Rev02)	We also note the further detail provided regarding aerial nitrogen deposition on the saltmarsh of the Dee Estuary SAC. We maintain that measures proposed to address this impact are insufficient, but continue to discuss how this can be progressed towards a mutually satisfactory conclusion with the applicant and Natural Resources Wales.	The Applicant has included an additional financial contribution to Flintshire County Council (FCC) within the <b>Deed of Development Consent Obligation (EN010166/APP/9.25)</b> for management of saltmarsh throughout the operational life of the Proposed Development. The value of this contribution has been informed by ongoing discussions with Natural Resources Wales (NRW).



## 2.2 REP5-070 Natural Resources Wales (NRW)

2.2.1 NRW's Deadline 5 submission and the Applicant's response are set out in **Table 2** below.

**Table 2: Response to NRW's Deadline 5 submission**

Source Document	Reference	Topic	Source Document Text	Applicant's Response
<b>Comments on any submissions received by Deadline 4 (NRW) [REP5-070]:</b> Annex A – NRW Comments on the updated report to inform Habitats Regulations Assessment	A.1.1	Atmospheric pollution of Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SAC / SPA / Ramsar site	We continue to disagree with the Applicant's opinion that the outline proposals to address the loss of saltmarsh habitat associated with the new surface water outfall will " <i>also offset 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.</i> " (updated paragraph 10.3.12)	The Applicant has explained in Table 1 of the <b>Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submissions [REP5-062]</b> why the botanical effect will be relatively subtle. This is not simply assertion but a reflection of the quantifiably small additional nitrogen deposition from the Proposed Development, equivalent to a 1.4% increase in current nitrogen deposition. The 'tipping point' for saltmarsh is at the 10 kgN/ha/yr deposition rate. The Dee Estuary is already 63% above this. Therefore, the 'tipping point' at which significant change would be most likely to occur has already been passed and it can be reasonably expected that small amounts of additional nitrogen will have a commensurately small effect. The Applicant recognises this still requires mitigation, hence the managed retreat area being significantly larger than would be needed to purely address the direct loss of saltmarsh from the proposed new outfall. However, it is nonetheless a small (and thus subtle) effect. For example, species-rich saltmarsh routinely persists in conditions of high nitrogen deposition, as evidenced by the fact that most saltmarsh in the UK is subject to high nitrogen deposition mainly due to sources such as agriculture (livestock and fertilizer).
	A.1.2	Atmospheric pollution of Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SAC / SPA / Ramsar site	As outlined in our WR [REP1-073], the impact of additional Nitrogen deposition (N-dep) is likely to have a botanical effect on the saltmarsh species composition, such as the spread of nitrophilous species including the coarse grasses <i>Elytrigia atherica</i> and <i>Elytrigia repens</i> which often grow into dense single species stands of vegetation, outcompeting the majority of other species. The effect on the Atlantic salt meadows would be the loss of smaller and less tolerant plant species which contribute to the biodiversity and hence condition of the Dee Estuary SAC / SPA/ Ramsar site.	Noting Natural England's comments, the Applicant has included an alternative form of mitigation through a financial contribution to FCC within the <b>Deed of Development Consent Obligation (EN010166/APP/9.25)</b> for additional management of saltmarsh throughout the operational life of the Proposed Development. The value of this contribution has been informed by ongoing discussions with NRW.
	A.1.3	Atmospheric pollution of Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SAC / SPA / Ramsar site	We note the Applicant's assertion that such botanical effects are "likely to be relatively subtle." However, we maintain that there is insufficient evidence provided to support their conclusion and as such reasonable scientific doubt exists as to the likely magnitude of change.	Accordingly, the Applicant's position is that the financial contribution to be secured through the <b>Deed of Development Consent Obligation (EN010166/APP/9.25)</b> now adequately mitigates the air quality impacts on the Dee Estuary SAC / SPA/ Ramsar site. Accordingly, the managed realignment is not relied upon as mitigation for such air quality effects and, therefore, to the extent such managed realignment is progressed to mitigate the surface water outfall impacts, this would be enhancement in respect of air quality elements.
	A.1.4	Atmospheric pollution of Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SAC / SPA / Ramsar site	The extent of exceedance of N-dep on the Annex I Atlantic salt meadows in-combination with other projects is predicted to be 445ha, and 245ha for the proposals alone. We acknowledge that the predicted exceedance is of a relatively low level of the relevant 1% Critical Load (2.3% in combination, 1.3% alone). However, the impact covers a significant area of the Atlantic salt meadow within the Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SAC / SPA / Ramsar site: 22% of the 2045.2ha (JNCC Standard Data Form) of Atlantic salt meadow within the SAC in-combination and 10% due to the proposals alone.	

Source Document	Reference	Topic	Source Document Text	Applicant's Response
	A.1.5	Atmospheric pollution of Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SAC / SPA / Ramsar site	Critical Loads are defined as: "a quantitative estimate of exposure to one or more pollutants below which significant harmful effects on specified sensitive elements of the environment do not occur according to present knowledge". The widespread exceedance of the critical load for N-dep means that Likely Significant Effects cannot be ruled out for the Annex I Atlantic salt meadows habitat within the Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SAC / SPA / Ramsar site. The broad spatial scale of the additional N-dep for both alone and in-combination assessments should therefore be considered, and an appropriate and precautionary level of compensation should be provided.	
	A.1.6	Atmospheric pollution of Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SAC / SPA / Ramsar site	The Applicant proposes to use the 0.13ha managed realignment (MR) area, which is intended to offset the 650m <sup>2</sup> area of permanent and temporary saltmarsh loss from the new surface water outfall, to also offset the predicted additional N-dep. However, we do not consider this alone to be adequate for offsetting the potential effects of additional N-dep on the species composition of up to 445ha of saltmarsh (in-combination).	
	A.1.7	Atmospheric pollution of Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SAC / SPA / Ramsar site	We also note that any new saltmarsh created within the MR area would still be subject to the same increased N-dep levels predicted elsewhere across the saltmarsh.	
	A.1.8	Atmospheric pollution of Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SAC / SPA / Ramsar site	Therefore, we continue to advise that further compensatory measures should be provided and justified.	
	A.1.9	Atmospheric pollution of Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SAC / SPA / Ramsar site	We have previously provided three potential locations for saltmarsh enhancement within the Dee estuary to the Applicant for further consideration and would welcome further engagement with them regarding these, along with any other options that they deem may be feasible.	The Applicant has included a financial contribution to FCC within the <b>Deed of Development Consent Obligation (EN010166/APP/9.25)</b> for management of saltmarsh throughout the operational life of the Proposed Development. The value of this contribution has been informed by ongoing discussions with NRW. The areas included within the Saltmarsh Area, as shown in Plan C of the <b>Deed of Development Consent Obligations (EN010166/APP/9.25)</b> , includes a number of the areas identified by NRW.
	A.1.10	Atmospheric pollution of Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SAC / SPA / Ramsar site	In addition, we would highlight: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In respect of alternative approaches to addressing potential increases in-atmospheric nitrogen deposition, Annex 1 of Natural England's "Atmospheric nitrogen theme plan - IPENSTP013" identifies a range of measures that could, in principle, be explored for application within the wider estuarine system.</li> </ul>	This report has been reviewed by the Applicant. However, the measures listed in Annex 1 of the report are measures that have already been included as part of the design of the Proposed Development to reduce the scale of impact to the small residual impact that remains (such as selective catalytic reduction or combustion modification). The other measures listed in Annex 1 are either measures which would only affect vehicular ammonia rather than stack emissions (e.g. physical changes to

Source Document	Reference	Topic	Source Document Text	Applicant's Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NRW has recently commissioned work to examine opportunities for the creation of intertidal habitat through the placement of polders. We have notified the Applicant about this.</li> </ul>	road transport infrastructure) or alternatively would only be applicable to agricultural sources of nitrogen, and/or are not within the ability of the Applicant to secure (e.g. changes to local farming practices, introduction of Low Emission Zones on the highway network).
	A.1.11	Atmospheric pollution of Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SAC / SPA / Ramsar site	Finally, updated paragraph 10.3.13 still refers to “ <i>positive management of 26 ha of the SAC that would otherwise cease to be managed at all, due to the lapse of the management agreement on decommissioning of the existing power station</i> ”. However, this appears to be an error as other references to it have been deleted from the updated RIHRA. As advised in our Written Representation [REP1-073], the extant management agreement is a legal requirement of the Section 36 consent for the existing power station and was established to serve a wider conservation purpose at the site. We welcome that this would be replaced by an updated version following decommissioning of the old power station, as an embedded design measure of the proposals, as we would expect regardless of the identified N-dep impact to the saltmarsh. We have provided comments on the Applicant's current implementation of the extant plan in our Deadline 4 response [REP4-091].	<p>In the <b>Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submissions [REP5-062]</b>, the Applicant confirmed that an updated Conservation Areas Management Plan would be prepared and submitted to FCC and NRW for approval prior to the decommissioning of the existing Connah's Quay Power Station. This has been clarified in an updated version of <b>Appendix 4-A: Operation and Maintenance Mitigation Register (EN010166/APP/6.4)</b> and is reflected in the <b>RIHRA (EN010166/APP/6.12)</b>.</p> <p>The noted section of the <b>RIHRA (EN010166/APP/6.12)</b> has been updated to remove reference to the updated Conservation Areas Management Plan.</p>
	A.2.1	Direct habitat loss within Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SAC / SPA / Ramsar site	An updated Saltmarsh Creation Strategy (EN010166/APP/6.16), including Saltmarsh Implementation and Monitoring Plan, was shared with NRW in March, and our feedback on this was subsequently provided at Deadline 4 [REP4-091].	These are matters that are acknowledged in the document as requiring further investigation and further detail post-consent through a series of further investigations and a final saltmarsh implementation and monitoring plan to be agreed with NRW prior to commencement of new outfall works. The Applicant notes that NRW have acknowledged they are 'broadly satisfied with the approach in principle'. In relation to the scientific uncertainty referenced, the Applicant would reiterate that the permanent loss of saltmarsh due to the proposed new outfall is a maximum of 5 m <sup>2</sup> . Even if the entirety of the 1,300 m <sup>2</sup> managed retreat could not be delivered, there is a high level of confidence, given saltmarsh immediately abuts the retreat area, that considerably more than 5 m <sup>2</sup> would be delivered thus ensuring no adverse effect on the integrity of the SAC/SPA/Ramsar site from a net loss of saltmarsh.
	A.2.2	Direct habitat loss within Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SAC / SPA / Ramsar site	Regarding updated paragraph 10.3.1 relating to direct habitat loss only, whilst we are broadly satisfied with the outline saltmarsh creation approach in principle, there remain practical and evidential uncertainties relating to ground conditions, contamination, implementation, and ecological establishment, for example, which will only be resolved through future work. As a result, we consider that reasonable scientific doubt remains at this stage as to the effectiveness of the measures, such that they cannot yet be relied upon at Appropriate Assessment. Please see our WR [REP1-073] and Annex F of this letter for further details regarding our position on defining mitigation and compensation.	Regarding whether the realignment is mitigation or compensation, the Applicant has set out its position in the <b>Applicant's Legal Submission on Mitigation vs Compensation [REP4-086]</b> but has also provided a Without Prejudice Derogation Case [REP4-078] to aid the Examining Authority and Secretary of State should they deem the managed retreat to be compensation.
	A.3.1	Loss of functionally linked land for Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy	Updated paragraph 10.2.20 states: “using a metric agreed with Natural Resources Wales (namely whether the site supports more than 1% of the SPA population of a given qualifying species) only the use of land within the Order limits by curlew is considered significant. Therefore, only habitat loss for this species requires mitigation.”	The Applicant prepared the <b>Further Information on Wetland Bird Count Data Report [REP5-056]</b> to provide further evidence of wetland bird counts within the Order limits. The report identifies counts of all other Dee Estuary SPA / Ramsar site qualifying species recorded within the Order limits and confirms they are present in numbers well below the 1% threshold.

Source Document	Reference	Topic	Source Document Text	Applicant's Response
		SPA / Ramsar site		
	A.3.2	Loss of functionally linked land for Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SPA / Ramsar site	To clarify, we have agreed with the use of 1% of the SPA population as a factor for assessing functionally linked land, but we have not agreed with the conclusion that curlew are the only species that meets the criteria for functional linkage. We acknowledge and welcome that the Applicant will share further data provided to them by the Deeside Naturalists' Society (covering January 2023 to December 2025). Until these data are presented, we are unable to comment on whether the use of land within the Order limits by any other species features is considered significant.	<p>The Applicant has also reviewed the data provided by the Deeside Naturalists Society (DNS) covering the period between January 2023 to December 2025, however this does not include counts for areas within the Order limits, and only covers Compartments 1 and 2 of the Connah's Quay Nature Reserve. A summary of these data is provided in <b>Appendix 11-D: Ornithology Technical Appendix (EN010166/APP/6.4)</b>. These data are broadly in keeping with those previously presented for 2019-23, albeit with uplifted maximum counts of Black-tailed Godwit (n=2,000, August 2025) from Compartment 1, and Avocet (n=32, July 2025) and Knot (n=1,700, September 2025) from Compartment 2. A maximum count of 1,200 Dunlin in Compartment 2 was also recorded in January 2025. All these records are located within the Dee Estuary SPA / Ramsar site and therefore have already been considered within the relevant assessments on the designated sites themselves (rather than in the context of functionally linked land) and do not change any of the assessment conclusions within the <b>RIHRA (EN010166/APP/6.12)</b> or <b>Chapter 11: Terrestrial and Aquatic Ecology (EN010166/APP/6.2.11)</b>.</p> <p>It is noted that the DNS data do not contain records from within the Order limits. The Applicant is yet to be presented with any data from other sources which demonstrates regular usage of the Order limits by important numbers of qualifying species, other than Curlew.</p>
ANNEX B – NRW comments on the updated notice of a proposed without prejudice HRA derogation in Wales document	B.1.1	Atmospheric pollution of Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SAC / SPA / Ramsar site	We welcome that the Applicant has now included consideration of atmospheric pollution (N-dep) impacts to the Annex I Atlantic salt meadow feature within the updated document. However, we continue to disagree with the extent of the Applicant's proposed measures to offset this, as set out in our Written Representation (WR) [REP1-073] and Annex A above. Our additional comments on the updated document are as follows:	This is noted by the Applicant and responses are provided to each of NRW's comments in turn.
	B.1.2	Atmospheric pollution of Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SAC / SPA / Ramsar site	Paragraph 5.1.17 states that <i>"the nitrogen due to the Proposed Development is small (a maximum 0.13 kgN/ha/yr, with most saltmarsh being subjected to smaller quantities), which is only slightly above the level (0.10 kgN/ha/yr) at which it could be dismissed as imperceptible, particularly given that as a precaution the lower critical load for saltmarsh (that applicable to upper saltmarsh) has been applied to the entire affected area. Areas of lower (pioneer) saltmarsh would be affected to a smaller extent."</i> The proposals would add additional nitrogen to the N-dep levels at a site that is already in exceedance of the relevant critical load, and it is not possible to rule out an adverse effect with confidence. Furthermore, the development's contribution needs to be fully assessed in-combination with other new developments in the area before a baseline can be established. Therefore, a process contribution of less	The Applicant has explained in Table 1 of the <b>Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submissions [REP5-062]</b> why the botanical effect will be relatively subtle. The assessment (i.e. the need for mitigation and the scale of the area affected) has been based on the 'in combination' effect, rather than the effect from the Proposed Development alone. For clarity, the Applicant has never claimed that the impact does not require mitigation, but that the small scale of the impact (albeit over a large area) is clearly relevant in determining an appropriate scale of mitigation. This is the purpose of the quoted text. The Applicant is only responsible for mitigating the Proposed Development's contribution to any in combination effect.

Source Document	Reference	Topic	Source Document Text	Applicant's Response
			than 1% would still need to be considered in-combination with other sources, so we consider that this should not automatically be "dismissed as imperceptible".	
	B.1.3	Atmospheric pollution of Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SAC / SPA / Ramsar site	Furthermore, we note that lower 'pioneer' saltmarsh (the 'Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand' Annex I habitat type) has a higher critical load (20-30 kg/ha/yr). However, there is only 107.48ha (JNCC Standard Data Form) of pioneer marsh within the overall Dee Estuary SAC saltmarsh (2045.2ha) and this is scattered both inside and outside the areas of predicted exceedance.	This point is noted. In the Applicant's conclusion in the <b>RIHRA (EN010166/APP/6.12)</b> regarding the impact of the Proposed Development it has reported the entire 445 ha of saltmarsh that lies within the affected area as being the spatial impact, irrespective of whether it is pioneer saltmarsh or other saltmarsh. This area is based on the lower critical load. No change is therefore required.
	B.1.4	Atmospheric pollution of Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SAC / SPA / Ramsar site	Therefore, we have not seen evidence to suggest that the lower critical load should be used solely on a precautionary basis; rather, we consider it to be the appropriate critical load for assessment (please see our further comments on this below).	
	B.1.5	Atmospheric pollution of Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SAC / SPA / Ramsar site	In relation to the predicted botanical change on saltmarsh (para. 5.1.18), the Caporn et al., 2016 study of N-dep did not include saltmarsh as one of the habitat study types, as noted by the Applicant. Therefore, we consider the findings of the report to have limitations, particularly when inferring minimum nitrogen doses which cause changes in species. The report states that further work needs to be undertaken for the gaps in habitats which are dissimilar to those which were studied. When habitats within the study were considered separately for levels of N-dep at and above the upper end of each habitat-specific critical load, additional increments of long-term nitrogen were associated with further declines in species richness. Over the nitrogen range investigated there was no evidence of a limit at the low end of the range below which negative change does not occur (Caporn et al., 2016).	The Caporn et al., 2016 study did not include saltmarsh, but it did include a wide diversity of habitats in different environments, including those more sensitive to nitrogen deposition than saltmarsh (e.g. bogs, sand dunes and lowland heathland). The trend of reducing impact on species richness from additional nitrogen doses at increasing background deposition rates above the critical load was observed fairly consistently. Moreover, this matches the response one would expect to see when considering nitrogen simply as a form of fertilisation. Competitive plants do not continue to respond infinitely as further fertiliser is added; a point is reached at which nutrients are present so far in excess that competitive plants have all the nutrients they need to grow vigorously.
	B.1.6		Further evidence (Bobbink et al., 2022, "Review and revision of empirical critical loads of nitrogen for Europe") also highlights that the low to mid marsh zones can be impacted by accelerated succession caused by critical load exceedance. Where N-dep is over the critical load accelerated succession within the mid to low saltmarsh (within the Atlantic salt meadows habitat type), would likely impact the marsh as the suite of earlier successional species are lost to late successional species resulting in a decline in positive indicator species (Bobbink et al., 2022).	The Applicant does not argue that saltmarsh is not sensitive to nitrogen deposition and accepts that the Bobbink et al., 2022 report shows that the habitat is more sensitive than was previously understood, hence the reason for lowering the critical load from its original minimum of 20 kgN/ha/yr to 10 kgN/ha/yr. Nor does the Applicant dispute that additional nitrogen deposition may cause a further botanical effect. Rather, the Applicant's position is that a small amount of additional nitrogen, even over a large area, is likely to have a commensurately small impact, particularly when the critical load (tipping point) is already far exceeded.
	B.1.7	Atmospheric pollution of Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SAC / SPA / Ramsar site	Following the publishing of Bobbink et al. (2022), nitrogen critical loads for Atlantic upper-mid and mid-low salt marshes changed from 20-30 kgN/ha/yr to 10-20 kgN/ha/yr. Bobbink refers to two gradient studies as the main evidence for this change. Of note, the Aherne et al. study investigated nitrogen impacts using community-level change points, which identify the deposition level at which multiple characteristic plant species begin to decline, and for Atlantic saltmarsh found a z-community change point of 7.8kg N/ha/yr, leading to a recommended empirical	The Applicant agrees that its small contribution to additional nitrogen deposition in Dee Estuary SAC/SPA/Ramsar site nonetheless requires mitigation.

Source Document	Reference	Topic	Source Document Text	Applicant's Response
			critical load range of 5–10kg N/ha/yr. While higher critical loads have been proposed elsewhere and differences may exist between systems such as the Dee estuary and Irish saltmarshes, application of the precautionary principle supports use of the lower end of the widely cited Bobbink et al. range (10 kgN /ha/ yr/).	
	B.1.8	Atmospheric pollution of Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SAC / SPA / Ramsar site	The available evidence therefore suggests that a critical load of 10 kgN/ha/yr is appropriate for saltmarsh.	
	B.1.9	Atmospheric pollution of Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SAC / SPA / Ramsar site	We note the existing elevated background N-dep levels at the site (para. 5.1.19-20). According to the APIS historical data for the Dee estuary, background N-dep for short vegetation has been above the recently revised critical load of 10 kgN/ha/yr since records began in 2003. Despite a recent peak between 2016 and 2019, overall N-dep levels have been relatively stable at the site between 2003 and 2021. We advise that existing elevated levels of N-dep should not solely be used to justify additional contributions, as additional N-dep above the critical load may increase the risk of adverse effects. It is also worth noting that any potential future decreases in background N-dep would increase the relative contribution of the proposed development.	This position is agreed by the Applicant. The Applicant has never claimed that the fact that the critical load is far exceeded means that mitigation is not required. On the contrary, the Applicant fully accepts that even the small amount of additional nitrogen deposition due to the Proposed Development nonetheless requires mitigation, and this mitigation has been included via the managed retreat area.
	B.1.10	Atmospheric pollution of Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SAC / SPA / Ramsar site	We acknowledge that it is difficult to quantify with certainty the impact of a modelled >1% N-dep exceedance over an area of 245ha alone (noting the additional greater in-combination effects over 445ha). Considering the high level of uncertainty involved, without firm evidence to suggest to the contrary, we maintain our disagreement with the extent of the Applicant's proposed measures to offset this impact. Please refer to our comments above in Annex A and our Written Representation [REP1-073] for further details regarding this.	The Applicant has addressed this matter in its response to A.1.1 of this table.
	B.1.11	Atmospheric pollution of Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SAC / SPA / Ramsar site	Section 6.9 appears to relate to future monitoring of the proposed creation of new saltmarsh habitat, but no monitoring of potential impacts on existing saltmarsh habitat, particularly in relation to N-dep impacts, has been proposed. However, following a recent meeting with the Applicant we note that they are currently considering potential monitoring of the existing saltmarsh and we would therefore welcome further engagement with them regarding this.	
	B.2.1	Loss of functionally linked land for Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy	Paragraph 6.1.7: We note that the document still refers to "80 years as being the standard HRA definition of in perpetuity", with which we do not agree. Please see our Deadline 4 response for further details about this [REP4-091]. The Applicant has recently confirmed to us that they will be seeking to change this definition. We will therefore provide further comment on receipt of the relevant updated documents.	An updated <b>RIHRA [REP5-030]</b> was submitted at Deadline 5 to address comments made by NRW at Deadline 4. This update removed reference to 80 years as the standard HRA definition of in perpetuity. This amendment was also carried through to the <b>Curlew Mitigation Strategy [REP5-032]</b> and <b>Saltmarsh Creation Strategy [REP5-034]</b> also submitted at Deadline 5.

Source Document	Reference	Topic	Source Document Text	Applicant's Response
		SPA / Ramsar site		
	B.2.2	Loss of functionally linked land for Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SPA / Ramsar site	We also acknowledge that the Applicant will share further existing data provided to them by the Deeside Naturalists' Society (covering January 2023 to December 2025). We look forward to reviewing the results of these surveys and providing further comments.	The Applicant refers the reader to response A.3.2 for further details.
ANNEX C – NRW comments on the updated Curlew Mitigation Strategy	C.1.1	Curlew Mitigation Strategy	Within the context of the notified status of the land and previous management targets, we are suitably assured, in principle, that management of the land can be re-focused to enhance populations of the above bird species and maintain reedbed habitat as appropriate, with an emphasis upon concentrated management for over-wintering curlew in a dedicated area equating to approximately 26 hectares (ha) of the land parcel, as set out in principle in the 'Curlew Mitigation Strategy' (CMS). However, please see our following comments on the updated CMS.	The Applicant notes this position and provides a response to each of the detailed comments in turn below.
	C.1.2	Curlew Mitigation Strategy	We note that the CMS states " <i>the measures set out in this document are secured via Requirement 11 of the Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) (EN010166/APP/3.1). Requirement 11 identifies that a Curlew Mitigation and Monitoring Plan must be developed in general accordance with this strategy document and the enhancement measures must be in place prior to works commencing within the relevant areas of the Order limits</i> ". Our comments are therefore made on the outline provisions of the CMS. Until the results of the ground works (para. 40) and the feedback from site visits (para. 41) have been established and a management and monitoring plan has been agreed; we reserve comment regarding the detailed measures to be taken.	This is noted by the Applicant. Engagement with NRW and other parties would continue during the development of the <b>Outline Curlew Implementation and Monitoring Plan (EN010166/APP/6.13)</b> .
	C.1.3	Curlew Mitigation Strategy	Paragraph 1.1.1 of the CMS states that " <i>where appropriate, the strategy also considers other qualifying bird species of the Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SPA / Ramsar site.</i> " However, little further detail has been provided in the CMS regarding this. We note that the previous paragraph 3.5.7, which stated that " <i>the remaining 14.8ha of land [would be] used to manage land for other qualifying species as well as curlew</i> ", has now been removed from the CMS. To ensure the CMS considers the overall management focus of the land at Gronant Fields, and the wider SPA and Ramsar site conservation objectives, it should include further consideration of such measures to enhance the area to encourage greater use of the site by other qualifying bird species.	<p>Due to the crossover in the non-breeding season habitat requirements between the target species (Curlew) and other non-breeding SPA qualifying features that may utilise grassland habitats, the Applicant considers that the actions proposed in the <b>Outline Curlew Implementation and Monitoring Plan (EN010166/APP/6.13)</b> will also serve to benefit other species. However, should post-implementation monitoring indicate that this is not the case, the Applicant is open to discussing the potential for adaptive management to be undertaken to improve the suitability of the mitigation area for select qualifying features, as required.</p> <p>Section 5 clarifies the objectives of the remainder of the Gronant Fields site which would be managed under the <b>Off-site Net Benefit for Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure Strategy (EN010166/APP/6.14)</b>. Paragraph 5.2.2 states "<i>The remainder of the Gronant Fields site would</i></p>

Source Document	Reference	Topic	Source Document Text	Applicant's Response
				<i>be managed in accordance with the <b>Off-site Net Benefit for Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure Strategy (EN010166/APP/6.14)</b>, providing a further 2.29 ha of wet grassland alongside 21.56 ha of existing other neutral grassland (to be enhanced to species rich grassland). Whilst not required for offsetting the loss of Functionally Linked Land within the Order limits, similar management of sward height and taller vegetation encroachment in these secondary areas would provide additional habitat enhancements for Curlew, as well as other SPA bird species."</i>
	C.1.4	Curlew Mitigation Strategy	Where compatible with the overall aims to enhance the site for bird species, further consideration of reedswamp management should be included within the CMS or the future Curlew Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (CMMP).	This is noted by the Applicant, and it will continue to engage with NRW on habitat management details during the preparation of the <b>Outline Curlew Implementation and Monitoring Plan (EN010166/APP/6.13)</b> and the Gronant Fields Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP), including those for reedswamp.
	C.1.5	Curlew Mitigation Strategy	We note the proposed additional use of Gronant Fields to achieve green infrastructure / Net Benefit for Biodiversity targets. However, this should not be at the risk of conflicting with the designated aims of this land for curlew and other bird species, as such current targets are likely to be incompatible with the core management objectives for Gronant Fields. We therefore advise that alternative sites should be considered for achieving these targets where such risks are likely.	<p>The Applicant can confirm that any management objectives of the wider Gronant Fields site would be complimentary to the core management objectives of the <b>Outline Curlew Implementation and Monitoring Plan (EN010166/APP/6.13)</b> as outlined in the <b>Off-site Net Benefit for Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure Strategy [REP4-059]</b> and as noted above in response to C1.3. The habitat creation and enhancement proposals included in Figure 6 of the <b>Off-site Net Benefit for Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure Strategy [REP4-059]</b> demonstrate how planting would be focussed on the perimeter of the site to create screening features with the majority of the remaining part of the site to be enhanced through management and an appropriate grassland mix.</p> <p>Pursuant to Requirement 18 of the <b>Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1)</b>, the Applicant will prepare a detailed LEMP for the whole of Gronant Fields which will detail habitat creation and management activities required to deliver Net Benefit for Biodiversity (NBB). Whilst this detailed LEMP is not required to include the measures which will be separately outlined in the <b>Outline Curlew Implementation and Monitoring Plan (EN010166/APP/6.13)</b>, prepared pursuant to Requirement 11 and Schedule 16, it also cannot include anything that would conflict with these measures because any conflict would cause a breach of the DCO. Therefore, the manner in which the mitigation for both Curlews and NBB has been secured in the <b>Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1)</b> means that there cannot be an incompatibility with the core management objectives of Gronant Fields and NRW will be engaged throughout the process of all mitigation on Gronant Fields being developed.</p>
	C.1.6	Curlew Mitigation Strategy	We have previously advised the Applicant to 'characterise' the land at Gronant Fields in terms of its current hydrology and soil characteristics, including invertebrate abundance and distribution, and have provided feedback on their proposed scope of works regarding this. This is important to achieve in the initial stages of the project, to help account for the current limited but regular distribution of semi-resident and passage	The Applicant is in discussion with NRW on the scope of proposed ground investigation to characterise current hydrology and soil characteristics. The Applicant is also undertaking a suite of ecological surveys at the site, including invertebrate surveys. As data from these investigations becomes available, the findings will be shared with members of the proposed Curlew Steering Group.

Source Document	Reference	Topic	Source Document Text	Applicant's Response
			feeding and roosting birds. We advise that the Applicant should give greater precedence to this in the CMS, as the results of such investigations will have a significant bearing upon the inputs to the CMMP and therefore future management of the land.	
	C.1.7	Curlew Mitigation Strategy	We have also previously recommended that interested parties and expert bodies are invited to the site to discuss the Applicant's' outline CMS proposals, in order to provide ground-truthed observations and opinions regarding the future management. Again, we consider this a key step towards informing the direction of proposed future management of the land and are currently in discussions with the Applicant about attending such a site visit with them later this month.	The Applicant and NRW met on site on 28 April 2026. Whilst at this stage the visit was limited to NRW, a workshop is planned within other members of the proposed Curlew Steering Group in June 2026 to discuss the <b>Outline Curlew Implementation and Monitoring Plan (EN010166/APP/6.13)</b> .
	C.1.8	Curlew Mitigation Strategy	We advise that confirmation is provided on whether the CMS, and subsequent CMMP, could be developed into a Gronant Fields Environmental Management Plan, which would be either separate to or part of the overarching updated Conservation Areas Management Plan, approved through a section 106 agreement or similar mechanism. As the land is within the Dee Estuary SPA/Ramsar site/SSSI, the management plan may need to be regularised through a section 16 management agreement (Wildlife and Countryside Act) to ensure NRW's future participation as a key stakeholder in management decisions for the life of the programme.	<p>Pursuant to Requirement 18 of the <b>Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1)</b>, the Applicant will prepare a detailed Off-site Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) for the whole of Gronant Fields which will detail habitat creation and management activities required to deliver Net Benefit for Biodiversity (NBB). Whilst this detailed LEMP does not need to include the measures which will be separately outlined in the <b>Outline Curlew Implementation and Monitoring Plan (EN010166/APP/6.13)</b>, prepared pursuant to Requirement 11 (and Schedule 16), it also cannot include anything that would conflict with these measures. Therefore, whilst there would not be one combined plan for Curlew and NBB mitigation across the whole of Gronant Fields, there will still be sufficient continuity of approach between the <b>Outline Curlew Implementation and Monitoring Plan (EN010166/APP/6.13)</b> and the overarching LEMP.</p> <p>Noting the site's location within the Dee Estuary SPA/Ramsar site/SSSI the Applicant will engage NRW during the preparation of both the Curlew Implementation and Monitoring Plan and the overarching LEMP for Gronant Fields. The position regarding the Section 16 management agreement (Wildlife and Countryside Act) is noted by the Applicant.</p> <p>As the plans noted above are both secured by requirements of the <b>Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1)</b>, no further securing mechanism is necessary.</p>
	C.1.9	Curlew Mitigation Strategy	Section 2.4 states that surveys were undertaken by Aspect Ecology between April 2022 and February 2023, and by AECOM between November 2023 and October 2024, and that the results from the Aspect Ecology surveys " <i>indicated that the fields to be used as a laydown area (in the intermediate term, see paragraph 2.4.5) during construction works and to be lost to the permanent footprint of the Proposed Development, could be used by important numbers of the non-breeding Curlew population associated with the Dee Estuary / Aber Dyfrdwy SPA / Ramsar site.</i> " However, only the results from the AECOM surveys appear to have been presented in ES Technical Appendix 11-D. We acknowledge that the Applicant will submit further existing data that have been provided to them by the Deeside Naturalists' Society (covering	<p>The Aspect Ecology surveys are provided in full within <b>Appendix 11-C: Botanical Survey and Information Report [REP3-016]</b>. This report has been shared with NRW following a keep in touch call in March 2026. In addition, the Applicant submitted the <b>Further Information on Wetland Bird Count Data Report [REP5-065]</b> at Deadline 5 which also includes further information on the wetland bird counts within the Order limits during these surveys.</p> <p>The Applicant has also reviewed the data provided by the DNS covering the period between January 2023 to December 2025. However this does not include counts for areas within the Order limits and only covers Compartments 1 and 2 of the Connah's Quay Nature Reserve, both of which sit within the Dee Estuary SPA / Ramsar site. The Applicant refers</p>

Source Document	Reference	Topic	Source Document Text	Applicant's Response
			January 2023 to December 2025), and we will therefore review these when available.	the reader to response A.3.2 for further details. For completeness, these data are now included in <b>Appendix 11-D: Ornithology Technical Appendix (EN010166/APP/6.4)</b> submitted at Deadline 6, however, they do not alter the conclusions presented in the <b>Chapter 11: Terrestrial and Aquatic Ecology [REP5-011]</b> and the <b>RIHRA [REP5-030]</b> (which has been updated at Deadline 6 ( <b>EN010166/APP/6.12</b> )).
	C.1.10	Curlew Mitigation Strategy	Paragraph 3.1.1 of the CMS states that “ <i>Discussions with Natural Resources Wales (NRW) and Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) have identified that the offsetting objective should be to ensure no net loss in Curlew foraging and roosting habitat. This would be achieved by creating and managing wet grassland habitat, alongside the creation of shallow scrapes that would become seasonally inundated and by raising ground water level at appropriate times.</i> ” While we generally agree with this statement, we consider that a reduction in curlew numbers in the SPA as a result of the loss of functionally linked land (FLL) would also have a negative impact on the conservation objectives of the SPA, in addition to any net curlew foraging and roosting habitat loss. Therefore, impacts on the net curlew population within the whole estuary site should also be considered in addition to net habitat loss.	Whilst the specific target of the mitigation area at Gronant Fields is framed in the context of no net loss of functionally linked land, the purpose of these measures is to maintain the numbers of Curlew in the overall SPA population by ensuring sufficient foraging and roosting resources are available in areas outside the boundaries of the SPA. These measures are to avoid negative impacts on the conservation objectives of the SPA.
	C.1.11	Curlew Mitigation Strategy	For paragraph 3.5.5 we maintain our concerns about the Applicant's definition of the term 'in perpetuity' (please see our advice in REP4-091). The affected functionally linked land currently used by curlew is expected to be permanently lost as feeding habitat. Even if the new building works are decommissioned in future, with the land being outside of the protected sites (SSSI/SPA/Ramsar site) it is not currently clear that the land would be suitable again for curlew to use again, and there is currently no management regime proposed to ensure that it would be. Therefore, we consider that this would amount to permanent loss of the FLL, so any mitigation/compensation for this loss should also be permanent. We would therefore expect the land at Gronant Fields to be permanently managed as part of an agreed management strategy by the Applicant, or succession owners, to manage the land as intended within the CMS.	The Applicant updated the <b>Curlew Mitigation Strategy [REP5-032]<sup>1</sup></b> at Deadline 5 to address comments raised by NRW in their response at Deadline 4 on the definition of the term 'in perpetuity'. It was then further amended at Deadline 6 as a result of additional comments from NRW in order to confirm that the replacement functionally linked land will continue to be managed “ <i>until the Proposed Development is decommissioned and the 26 ha of functionally linked land within the Order limits is reinstated to its existing or a materially similar condition that is suitable to function as functionally linked land for curlew, unless otherwise agreed with FCC in consultation with NRW</i> ”, with a footnote to define suitability to function as functionally linked land. This ensures that the replacement functionally linked land would be managed until the existing functionally linked land being lost is reinstated to a suitable condition, which has proven to be a suitable habitat condition by virtue of its existing status as functionally linked land. Accordingly, the amendments made at Deadlines 5 and 6 should resolve NRW's reservations in this respect because it will be mandatory under the <b>Outline Curlew Implementation and Monitoring Plan (EN010166/APP/6.13)</b> (secured by Requirement 11 and Schedule 16 of the <b>Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1)</b> ) that such land on Gronant Fields is either maintained in accordance with the <b>Outline Curlew Implementation and Monitoring Plan (EN010166/APP/6.13)</b> continuously or, upon decommissioning of the Proposed Development, the existing functionally linked land is reinstated to a suitable condition. Should the existing functionally linked land be reinstated to a suitable condition, management of Gronant Fields beyond this would be subject to agreement between the Landowner and NRW at that time.

<sup>1</sup> Please note that the **Curlew Mitigation Strategy [REP5-032]** has been renamed at Deadline 6 to the **Outline Curlew Implementation and Monitoring Plan (EN010166/APP/6.13)**. Where reference is made to the “Curlew Mitigation Strategy” it relates to a specific revision prior to the updated name.

Source Document	Reference	Topic	Source Document Text	Applicant's Response
	C.1.12	Curlew Mitigation Strategy	We advise that a realistic baseline for historic curlew numbers at Gronant Fields should be established to provide a measure against which the Applicant can quantify future management achievements.	The Applicant requested the noted data on 27 April 2026. The data has since been received and interpreted. A summary of this data has been included in the <b>Outline Curlew Implementation and Monitoring Plan (EN010166/APP/6.13)</b> submitted at Deadline 6. It is considered that with the inclusion of this data, in addition to that already collated, there is an appropriate understanding of the baseline of actual Curlew numbers at the site provided in the <b>Outline Curlew Implementation and Monitoring Plan (EN010166/APP/6.13)</b> .
	C.1.13	Curlew Mitigation Strategy	Paragraph 4.1.4 of the CMS states that " <i>The BTO WeBS Five Year (2018 to 2023) Curlew winter peak count for the Gronant Fields site which includes a disjunct land parcel (the combined WeBS count sector is known by BTO as 'Gronant Fields') is 95 individuals (range 53 to 144).</i> " We note that the WeBS sector is larger than the Gronant Fields site, so we are concerned that an artificially high baseline may be applied against which to assess actual curlew numbers at the site. We hold raw data of bird counts for these fields, which can be made available upon request. Whilst historic records are not continuous throughout the period of recording, they give a better reflection of observations of previous bird count data for Gronant Fields, not only for curlew but also for other qualifying bird species.	
	C.1.14	Curlew Mitigation Strategy	Paragraphs 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 refer to Figures A-4 and A-5 respectively, but we are unable to locate these figures within the document.	Figures A4 and A5 remain unchanged from the original submission version [APP-254], however these are included in Appendix A in the revision of the <b>Curlew Mitigation Strategy [REP5-032]</b> submitted at Deadline 5.
	C.1.15	Curlew Mitigation Strategy	Section 5.1: We agree with and welcome the implementation of a Curlew Steering Group. In relation to our involvement with such a group, and any similar groups established through a DCO for this project, we would wish to discuss with the Applicant appropriate recovery measures for the reasonable and proper costs of our officers in respect of their activities.	This is noted and would be subject to separate discussions between the Applicant and NRW, separate to the consenting of the DCO for the Proposed Development itself.
	C.1.16	Curlew Mitigation Strategy	Paragraph 5.3.3 states that " <i>the implementation of the actions set out in section 5.3.2 will be undertaken prior to the commencement of construction works at the Main Development Area,</i> " which indicates that only the sward height will be implemented before the FLL is lost. For the area to be at optimal condition for curlew, both sward height and wetland features would need to be established prior to the commencement of construction works affecting the FLL. We therefore advise that the full site management measures outlined in the CMS, including the management of wet grassland, should be implemented satisfactorily via Requirement 11 (CMMP) before the commencement of work at the Main Development Area. This advice also applies to Section 5.4 of the CMS.	<p>The mitigation included within the <b>Outline Curlew Implementation and Monitoring Plan (EN010166/APP/6.13)</b> consists of a number of stages which will be enacted over time. At present the Gronant Fields site does not support Curlew and this is primarily considered to be due to the sward height and composition, which has arisen through a lack of active management and grazing. The first and immediate stage is reducing the sward height and rankness to allow suitable foraging conditions for Curlew, i.e., to enable birds to access the existing soil invertebrate prey resource. The Applicant has commenced this stage by introducing grazing and so in a relatively short period of time the existing food resource should become available again for Curlew. This will mean that by the time works start within the Order limits, alternative habitat (not currently available to the SPA Curlew population) will be available at Gronant Fields, thus retaining the overall quantum of habitat for the SPA Curlew population.</p> <p>The next stage of the mitigation is to enhance the Gronant Fields site to increase the foraging opportunities for Curlew, by increasing the prey resource. The aim being that a greater number of Curlew will then be able to use the Gronant Fields site. This will take longer to deliver and the Applicant will continue to engage with NRW and others (as part of the Curlew Steering Group) on what the final solutions will be, but the aim is to create conditions where there are elevated densities of soil</p>

Source Document	Reference	Topic	Source Document Text	Applicant's Response
				<p>invertebrates and they are available to Curlew over a longer period of time, i.e., throughout the year. One element of achieving this is to manage/control water levels on site to ensure that the soil is kept damp/moist (helps keep worms closer to the surface), without being inundated for long periods of time (to not drown soil invertebrate). Creating linear footdrains allows the surface water to be channeled in certain areas (as opposed to bigger scrapes with a larger surface area), whilst maximising foraging edge habitat and helping to retain surface water into the spring. However, as noted in the <b>Outline Curlew Implementation and Monitoring Plan (EN010166/APP/6.13)</b>, the final solution will be informed by the ongoing water monitoring and other ecological investigations and will be agreed in collaboration with members of the Curlew Steering Group. It is considered the final scheme could therefore take the form of linear footdrains or the creation of shallow scrapes.</p>
	C.1.17	Curlew Mitigation Strategy	<p>Paragraphs 5.3.4 and 5.3.6: To reduce potential disturbance to species using the site in the autumn months, a limit should be defined and agreed as to how late in the autumn a mechanical cut or mow can take place. As wintering bird species may be present from late September, we would advise October as the final month for mowing to avoid the peak wintering season and reduce disturbance as much as possible, while maintaining an optimum sward height.</p>	<p>The Applicant has updated the <b>Outline Curlew Implementation and Monitoring Plan (EN010166/APP/6.13)</b> at Deadline 6 to note that the last cut would be undertaken no later than October in any given year (if a cut is deemed necessary).</p>
	C.1.18	Curlew Mitigation Strategy	<p>Paragraph 5.5.1: We agree with the extension of monitoring at Gronant Fields. However, the CMS states that monthly visits will be carried out for the first ten years after creation, and paragraph 6.9.5 of the updated Notice of a proposed without prejudice Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) derogation in Wales (Tracked), states "<i>there will be further monitoring throughout the lifetime of the Proposed Development, or for 80 years, whichever is the sooner</i>". The proposed monitoring programme length should therefore be confirmed.</p>	<p>The Applicant updated the <b>Curlew Mitigation Strategy [REP5-032]</b> at Deadline 5 to address comments raised by NRW in their response at Deadline 4 in relation to in-perpetuity. Further amendments have been made at Deadline 6 within the <b>Outline Curlew Implementation and Monitoring Plan (EN010166/APP/6.13)</b> (which is the Curlew Mitigation Strategy renamed) in order to reflect subsequent discussions with NRW including to insert a footnote to define suitability to function as functionally linked land.</p> <p>As noted in paragraph 7.1.2 of the <b>Outline Curlew Implementation and Monitoring Plan (EN010166/APP/6.13)</b> "<i>A programme of monitoring for the measures set out in Section 5.4.2, will be agreed with the Curlew Steering Group</i>". This means that whilst only 10 years of monitoring via monthly ornithologist visits is expressly stated within the <b>Outline Curlew Implementation and Monitoring Plan (EN010166/APP/6.13)</b>, further monitoring will be agreed through the Curlew Steering Group and recorded in the Curlew Implementation and Monitoring Plan. It is therefore considered the application documents referenced are consistent with each other.</p>
	C.1.19	Curlew Mitigation Strategy	<p>Paragraph 5.5.3 states "<i>the Gronant Fields site will be subject to long term management based on the results of the first five years of monitoring.</i>" However, we advise that the Gronant Fields site should be subject to long-term management based on the results of the first ten years of monitoring.</p>	<p>The <b>Outline Curlew Implementation and Monitoring Plan (EN010166/APP/6.13)</b> has been updated at Deadline 6 to amend paragraph 5.5.3 to state "<i>the Gronant Fields site will be subject to long term management based on the results of the first <u>ten</u> years of monitoring</i>"</p>

Source Document	Reference	Topic	Source Document Text	Applicant's Response
ANNEX D – NRW comments on the Applicant's response to Deadline 3 Submissions	D.1.1	Applicant's response to Deadline 3 Submissions	Item 1.22: We look forward to reviewing the further existing data provided to the Applicant by the Deeside Naturalists' Society (covering January 2023 to December 2025) when it is available.	This is noted by the Applicant. The Applicant refers the reader to response A.3.2 for further details.
	D.1.2	Applicant's response to Deadline 3 Submissions	Item 1.29: We note the preparation of the Saltmarsh Implementation and Monitoring Plan in general accordance with the Saltmarsh Creation Strategy and to be secured via any DCO granted. An updated draft Saltmarsh Creation Strategy (EN010166/APP/6.16), including the Saltmarsh Implementation and Monitoring Plan, was shared with NRW in March, and our comments on this were subsequently provided to the Examination at DL4 [REP4-091].	The Applicant and NRW discussed a number of the updates being made to this document during a meeting on 14 April 2026. These changes were included in the <b>Saltmarsh Creation Strategy [REP5-034]</b> submitted at Deadline 5. The Applicant and NRW have continued to discuss this document and further amendments have been made at Deadline 6 within the <b>Outline Saltmarsh Implementation and Monitoring Plan (EN010166/APP/6.19)</b> (which is the Saltmarsh Creation Strategy renamed in order to reflect subsequent discussions with NRW and the ExA's request in its <b>Report on the Implications for European Sites [PD-019]</b> .
	D.1.3	Applicant's response to Deadline 3 Submissions	Item 1.44: The Applicant has provided their reasons for excluding the following three proposed installations from their in-combination assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deeside Power</li> <li>• Knauf Mineral Rock Wool Facility</li> <li>• Arrow AD</li> </ul>	Responses to NRW's specific points in relation to these three proposals are presented in the rows below.
	D.1.4	Applicant's response to Deadline 3 Submissions	For Deeside Power, the Applicant states " <i>Deeside Power Station is currently permitted at 927 MWth with unlimited operational hours and the permit application relates to reducing this to 110 MWth with 2000 hours of operation. The current background concentration maps and Air Pollution Information System (APIS) background projection include the impact from this facility at the permitted operation capacity and as such overestimate the future impacts.</i> " Please note that Deeside Power ceased to operate in 2018, therefore previous emissions from Deeside Power may not be included in the current APIS data set for mid-year 2020 (2019-2021).	<p>The Applicant and NRW have discussed this matter. As noted in the <b>Additional Operational Air Quality Considerations (EN010166/APP/9.38)</b> report, it has been agreed between the parties that, on review, the APIS background data does not include the Deeside Power Station after 2018.</p> <p>The air quality impact assessment submitted to NRW (<b>Error! Reference source not found.</b>) (currently under review) as part of the environmental permit application to reduce the operational capacity of the Deeside Power Station reports impacts on human health and ecological receptors. The reported values align with the pattern observed in the Applicant's cumulative assessment for emissions from sources within Deeside Industrial Park having the largest impacts at the eastern edge of the Dee Estuary SAC adjacent to the A548 where it extends inland from the estuary itself and exhibiting minimal overlap with the impacts of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Based on the analysis undertaken in the <b>Additional Operational Air Quality Considerations (EN010166/APP/9.38)</b>, no new or different adverse effects on integrity of Habitats sites have been identified beyond those set out within the <b>RIHRA (EN010166/APP/6.12)</b>.</p>

Source Document	Reference	Topic	Source Document Text	Applicant's Response
	D.1.5	Applicant's response to Deadline 3 Submissions	<p>For Knauf Mineral Rock Wool Facility, the Applicant states "Knauf Rock Mineral Wool Facility has not yet submitted its Environmental Permit application and information relating to its future emissions is not available at this time." NRW has provided statutory pre-planning application advice on the Knauf Rock Mineral Wool proposal, including high level advice relating to the potential air quality impacts based on the submitted information. We also understand that the formal planning application has recently been submitted. We therefore advise that you consult the Local Planning Authority (Flintshire County Council) to confirm whether any relevant details are available to inform an in-combination assessment of this proposal.</p>	<p>An updated cumulative effects assessment has been prepared for Deadline 6 and is presented in <b>Chapter 24: Cumulative and Combined Effects (EN010166/APP/6.2.24)</b>. This updated assessment considers the additional short listed schemes that have been identified during an updated review of relevant applications between 31 March 2025 and 31 March 2026 (see <b>Appendix 24-B Short List of Proposed Schemes [REP5-022]</b>). Whilst it appears an application may have been made for Knauf Mineral Rock Wool Facility, it was not validated by FCC until 22 April 2026. For these reasons it has not been considered within the updated assessment presented in <b>Chapter 24: Cumulative and Combined Effects (EN010166/APP/6.2.24)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has located the air quality assessment through Knauf's project website<sup>2</sup> and notes that cumulative impacts from the Proposed Development have been taken into consideration in the assessment. Although inputs were sourced from the Applicant's <b>Environmental Statement (EN010166/APP/6.2)</b> and not the <b>Change Application Report (EN010166/APP/10.1)</b>, impacts from the Proposed Development have not changed materially and therefore Knauf's Environmental Statement's cumulative assessment is still valid.</p> <p>The <b>Additional Operational Air Quality Considerations (EN010166/APP/9.38)</b> provides the Applicant's qualitative consideration of the Knauf Mineral Rock Wool Facility. It notes the conclusions of Knauf's Environmental Statement's cumulative assessment identify impacts from NH3 and Nitrogen deposition at Dee Estuary Ramsar/SPA/SAC/SSSI, however they contextualise these impacts giving consideration to the baseline environment where there are high background concentrations, and the Predicted Environmental Concentration is less than 100% of the Critical Load. The Knauf Mineral Rock Wool Facility Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment states that predicted nitrogen deposition from the operation of the facility both alone and in combination with other nearby projects would be minor and not sufficient to alter the structure, function, or conservation objectives of any European Site assessed.</p> <p>The reported values align with the pattern observed in the Applicant's cumulative assessment for emissions from sources within Deeside Industrial Park having largest impacts at the eastern edge of the Dee Estuary SAC and exhibiting minimal overlap with the impacts of the Proposed Development.</p>
	D.1.6	Applicant's response to	<p>For Arrow AD, the Applicant states "<i>The combustion of biogas through CHP units from the Arrow AD plant is relatively small in scale and would only be capable of having perceptible impacts within a few hundred meters of the 3m high points of release, within the industrial area. The</i></p>	<p>The Application for Arrow Bio Waste Recycling Facility was submitted to FCC in 2018 which is prior to July 2019 and was therefore over 5 years old at the commencement of the cumulative assessment. On this basis the Arrow Bio Waste Recycling Facility application was not included within</p>

<sup>2</sup> Knauf/WSP (2026). Environmental Statement Volume I - Main Text, Chapter 5: Air Quality [online]. Available at: [d1de4116-2d28-4692-a658-241e48088080](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/111111/d1de4116-2d28-4692-a658-241e48088080) (Accessed 05/05/2026)

Source Document	Reference	Topic	Source Document Text	Applicant's Response
		Deadline 3 Submissions	<i>Environmental Statement for the Arrow AD Plant (planning application reference "05870" at Flintshire County Council) identified negligible impacts within its Air Quality assessment on all receptors (including nature conservation sites)."</i>	<b>Appendix 24-A : Long List (EN010166/APP/6.4) or Appendix 24-B: Short List (EN010166/APP/6.4)</b> and therefore not considered in the <b>RIHRA (EN010166/APP/6.12)</b> or <b>Chapter 24:Cumulative and Combined Effects (EN010166/APP/6.2.24)</b> .
	D.1.7	Applicant's response to Deadline 3 Submissions	NRW received an Environmental Permit Application from Arrow Bio Waste Recycling Facility on 1 April 2025. The application was assessed not to be Duly Made in February 2026. On 17 April 2026 further information was supplied by Arrow Bio Waste Recycling Facility, including an updated Air Quality Assessment. The application is currently not yet Duly Made. The updated Air Quality Assessment is yet to be reviewed by NRW, however the assessment indicates that stack emission parameters and conclusions are different to those quoted by the Applicant above. The Arrow Bio Waste Recycling Facility Air Quality Assessment concludes " <i>At ecological receptors E3, E9 and E11 (Dee Estuary SAC), impacts could not be screened out as insignificant due to exceedances of screening thresholds nitrogen and acid deposition</i> ". We therefore advise the Applicant to include the Arrow Bio Waste Recycling Facility in an updated in-combination assessment.	<p>The Applicant has reviewed the available information on the NRW public register and was unable to identify reporting which reaches the same conclusions as those noted by NRW. NRW has since provided a copy of the report referenced on 5<sup>th</sup> May 2025. This report has been considered within the <b>Additional Operational Air Quality Considerations (EN010166/APP/9.38)</b> which identifies that the reported values from Arrow's air quality assessment align with the pattern observed in the Applicant's cumulative assessment for emissions from sources within Deeside Industrial Park having largest impacts at the eastern edge of the Dee Estuary SAC and exhibiting minimal overlap with the impacts of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Based on the analysis undertaken in <b>Additional Operational Air Quality Considerations (EN010166/APP/9.38)</b>, no new or different adverse effects on integrity of Habitats sites have been identified beyond those set out within the <b>RIHRA (EN010166/APP/6.12)</b>.</p>

## 2.3 REP5-072 Climate Emergency Science Law (CESL)

2.3.1 CESL's Deadline 5 submission and the Applicant's response are set out in **Table 3** below.

**Table 3: Response to CESL's Deadline 5 submission**

Source Document	Reference	Topic	Source Document Text	Applicant's Response
CESL - Deadline 5 Submission	SECTION B	Response to the applicant's submissions on non-CO2 emissions in aviation at section D	<b>Sources of LNG imports, and the impact on upstream WTT emissions factor.</b>	<p>The Applicant has clearly dealt with the fact that Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) has higher upstream emissions intensity relative to natural gas imported via pipeline, and also that there is substantial variability around the emissions intensity of LNG from different sources.</p> <p>Regarding an up-to-date upstream emissions factor for LNG, the Applicant notes that the International Energy Agency (IEA) published a study in June 2025 entitled "Assessing emissions from LNG supply and abatement options".<sup>3</sup> This document provides estimated emissions from the LNG supply chain, i.e. the same emissions source that CESL discusses in Section B of their Deadline 5 submission [REP5-072]. The IEA study covers: "upstream production and processing of natural gas, pipeline transmission from processing facilities to export terminals, liquefaction processes, shipping and regasification at import terminals. It considers methane emissions, flaring, naturally occurring sources of CO<sub>2</sub> and energy consumption from across the supply chain." [p3]</p> <p>This study, from a credible and objective international organisation, offers a global average upstream intensity of 19.5 gCO<sub>2</sub>e/MJ [Fig 1, p4]. This value can be compared with the most recent upstream emissions factor for LNG published by the UK Government<sup>4</sup>, also in June 2025. The 2025 dataset gives a factor for LNG of 0.07214 kg CO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh (on an Net Calorific Value (NCV) basis)). This is the value applied by the Applicant for the 100% LNG supply scenario in the Sensitivity Analysis submitted at Deadline 5 [REP5-063].</p> <p>For consistency, the IEA factor must be converted from emissions per MJ to emissions per kWh, requiring the factor to be multiplied by 3.6 to give a comparable value of 70.2 g or 0.0702 kg CO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh (NCV). The up-to-date upstream emissions figure for LNG published by the IEA, therefore, effectively corroborates the value used by the Applicant in their sensitivity analysis, and as used by the UK Government to derive an overall upstream emissions factor for natural gas consumed in the UK.</p> <p>The IEA study does differentiate between the upstream emissions of LNG produced in different geographic regions, with southeast Asia producing LNG with the highest upstream intensity and Norway the lowest. Figure 2 on p5 of the IEA study indicates that LNG from North America has an upstream intensity slightly higher than the global average while that from the Middle East is slightly lower than average. Considering that the upstream carbon intensity of any natural gas supplied within the UK will affect the carbon performance of all consumers, this slight variation in upstream carbon intensity between North American and Middle East LNG will not have a material impact on the reduction in emissions intensity of electricity supplied by the Proposed Development relative to that of an existing unabated Combined Cycle Gas Turbine (CCGT) consuming gas from the same source.</p> <p>The Applicant, therefore, maintains that the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) assessment carried out for the Proposed Development and presented in <b>Chapter 20: Climate Change [APP-058]</b> represents a realistic worst case scenario in line with EIA Regulations.</p>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.iea.org/reports/assessing-emissions-from-lng-supply-and-abatement-options>

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/greenhouse-gas-reporting-conversion-factors-2025>

Source Document	Reference	Topic	Source Document Text	Applicant's Response
CESL - Deadline 5 Submission	SECTION C	New submissions on significant assessment and benchmark at section E	<b>GWP20 of Methane.</b>	<p>The GHG assessment carried out for the Proposed Development and presented in <b>Chapter 20: Climate Change [APP-058]</b> applied the 100-year global warming potential (GWP) for all greenhouse gases, including methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), in line with national and international carbon accounting protocols as discussed in the Applicant's response at Deadline 4 <b>[REP4-081]</b> and the Sensitivity Analysis submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 5 <b>[REP5-063]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant maintains that this is the appropriate approach to take, since it is consistent with the approach taken by the Committee on Climate Change in advising on national carbon budgets, and by the UK Government when setting industry-standard emissions factors for GHG reporting. The consistency is important since the GHG impact must be contextualised against a relevant pathway(s) to net zero, as required by the Institute for Sustainability and Environmental Professionals (ISEP) guidance under which the GHG assessment and evaluation of significance is carried out. The relevant pathways to net zero in this instance are represented by the mandatory carbon budgets for Wales and the UK; since these budgets are developed using 100-year GWP values, the GHG impact for the Proposed Development must also be quantified using the same metric in order to make any comparison meaningful.</p> <p>It is widely recognised and acknowledged by the Applicant in their Deadline 2 submission <b>[REP2-019]</b> that a GWP with a 100-year time horizon is less well-suited to report the warming impact of short-lived GHGs such as CH<sub>4</sub>. GWP100, however, is much better at modelling the long-term warming impact of cumulative emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> that control global temperature increases.</p> <p>Entirely without prejudice to the position summarised above, in light of representations from CESL, the Applicant carried out a sensitivity analysis to show the effects of attempting to use GWP20 and the carbon intensity of electricity generated by the Proposed Development relative to that of an existing, unabated gas-fired CCGT using such a metric; this sensitivity analysis was submitted at Deadline 5 <b>[REP5-063]</b>. It demonstrates that even if one seeks to use this metric, the Proposed Development continues to operate with substantially lower carbon emissions per kWh generated with CH<sub>4</sub> reported over a shorter period.</p>
CESL - Deadline 5 Submission	SECTION D	Response to the applicant's substitution arguments made at ISH4 at section F	<b>Comparison with non-CO2 emissions</b>	<p>The Applicant notes that like non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the aviation sector, any attempt to use GWP20 by way of assessment (contrary to international and established practice) is inherently limited due to the lack of a suitable benchmark to enable the assessment to be undertaken. The GHG assessment of upstream impacts from the natural gas supply chain has been carried out using a GWP100 approach in accordance with established practice and this enables upstream GHG emissions to be contextualised against Welsh and UK carbon budgets that are based on the same metric.</p> <p>The basic obstacles to contextualising properly any GHG values generated using a GWP20 metric have been extensively covered in the Applicant's Deadline 2 submission <b>[REP2-019]</b> and the sensitivity analysis submitted at Deadline 5 <b>[REP5-063]</b>.</p>
CESL - Deadline 5 Submission	SECTION E	Written summary of CESL's ISH4 oral submissions on the climate benefits of CQLCP	<b>Significance assessment and benchmarking.</b>	<p>CESL observes that a large proportion of upstream emissions from the Proposed Development, particularly those resulting from the natural gas supply chain, are likely to occur beyond the geographic boundaries of Wales and the UK. This is the nature of a global supply chain and it is acknowledged explicitly in paragraph 20.6.59 of <b>Chapter 20: Climate Change [APP-058]</b>.</p> <p>The IEMA guidance under which the GHG assessment was carried out and the evaluation of significance requires that emissions are contextualised against a relevant pathway to net zero; since there is no equivalent pathway or benchmark against which one can contextualise overseas emissions, these are by necessity</p>

Source Document	Reference	Topic	Source Document Text	Applicant's Response
				<p>compared so far as it possible to do so against Welsh and UK carbon budgets. The Applicant considers that this is a very conservative approach to take. The evaluation of the significance of the GHG impact of the Proposed Development as being Moderate Adverse is therefore affected by (amongst other things) the quantitative contribution of its emissions to the Welsh and UK carbon budgets in a very conservative way. The Applicant would point out once again that the receptor for GHG emissions is the global climate and that the sensitivity of the global climate to GHG emissions is high, as noted in paragraph 20.3.9 of <b>Chapter 20: Climate Change [APP-058]</b>. The Applicant further notes that since a large proportion of upstream emissions will not be reported within legally binding carbon targets, and will not contribute to the UK's 2050 net zero target, these emissions necessarily cannot jeopardise or otherwise affect the ability of the UK Government or Welsh Assembly Government to meet its targets or budgets.</p>
CESL - Deadline 5 Submission	SECTION F	Response to ISH4 [REP4-084] and [APP-058]: Substitution of unabated CCGT	<b>Substitution effect, specifically using an unabated CCGT as counterfactual baseline.</b>	<p>The Applicant maintains its position (as demonstrated by the evidence) that the Proposed Development, as an exemplar of low carbon dispatchable power, can necessarily be expected to displace the use of unabated gas-fired generation in an existing CCGT installation. This is made explicit in the UK Government's Clean Flexibility Roadmap<sup>5</sup> published in July 2025. That document states that:</p> <p><i>"[Low-carbon dispatchable power] will play an important role in a clean power system by generating low carbon electricity continuously over days and weeks, to complement more duration-limited technologies such as batteries and [long duration energy storage]. This helps ensure a reliable electricity supply during prolonged periods of high electricity demand and/or low renewable output, sometimes referred to as 'dunkelflaute'</i></p> <p><i>"After 2030, low carbon dispatchable power will increasingly displace the role of unabated gas, which will move to a back-up role to be called upon only in instances where clean alternatives are unable to meet demand."</i> (Emphasis added).</p> <p>The Clean Flexibility Roadmap points out that low carbon dispatchable power category contains not only Gas with Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) such as the Proposed Development, but also Hydrogen to Power and Biomethane to Power. These technologies and others, as raised by CESL, may all contribute to delivering flexible, secure electricity supplies to the national grid. Each being able to do so in different timescales, for differing durations and at different cost. The Proposed Development is likely to be classified as a "mid-merit" generator, to be dispatched after nuclear baseload and renewable generation, but before dispatchable sources with a higher marginal cost and ahead of higher carbon peaking plant.</p> <p>Indeed, as previously described (<b>Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearing 1 and response to Action Points [REP1-065]</b>), the Applicant is currently in negotiation with DESNZ as part of the cluster sequencing process to conclude a Dispatchable Power Agreement (DPA) for Train 1 of the Proposed Development. The DPA is the means by which the Government is seeking to allow developers to bring forward projects to provide low carbon, dispatchable, generation of the type exemplified by the Proposed Development. The DPA provides two key elements to make projects investable. The first element is an Availability Payment, which incentivised high levels of power output and carbon capture from the Proposed Development. This is analogous in part to the support provided by the capacity market that currently exists for power generation. This rewards the availability of the power station. The second element is a variable payment. This is a function of the additional variable costs seen by a carbon capture equipped power station (less the saving made through not emitting the captured CO<sub>2</sub> from the flue gas stack). The purpose of this is to</p>

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/clean-flexibility-roadmap>

Source Document	Reference	Topic	Source Document Text	Applicant's Response
				<p>adjust the position of the carbon capture equipped plant in the merit order (that is, the order in which plant will be called forward in the market based on their marginal cost of generation). Thereby, the effective marginal cost of the Proposed Development will be below that of an unabated natural gas fired power plant. The availability payment and the variable payment in combination reflect how the business model is shaped around the expected role of the Proposed Development in the electricity market. Specifically, to be able to operate in baseload if needed, but much more likely to operate at lower load factors and displace unabated gas fired generation.</p> <p>In their submission CESL claim that the Applicant has failed to disclose the effects of the energy costs of running the Carbon Capture Plant (CCP) within the GHG assessment presented in <b>Chapter 20: Climate Change [APP-058]</b>. This is incorrect. There are no emissions omitted from the assessment, and the parasitic load on the Proposed Development of operating the CCP is fully accounted for. As discussed in paragraph 20.6.23 of <b>Chapter 20: Climate Change [APP-058]</b>, emissions data were taken directly from the Heat and Material Balance (HMB) tables developed by the design team for the Proposed Development. These data reflect the hourly material flow rates through various stages of the power station, heat recovery steam generator and CCP, and allow emissions to be precisely modelled for different operating modes including the Reference Case.</p> <p>These emissions data from the HMB fully reflect the energy required to run the CCP, and, when combined with the electrical generating capacity of the Proposed Development, allow the operational carbon intensity and overall thermal efficiency to be accurately quantified.</p> <p>CESL also appear to be implying, by reference to the 'West Cumbria Mining' case, that the Applicant has somehow failed to assess the absolute emissions from the Proposed Development. This is completely false – the GHG assessment presented in <b>Chapter 20: Climate Change [APP-058]</b> is clear as to the overall magnitude of operational emissions for the Reference Case. This is shown in Table 20-8 of <b>Chapter 20: Climate Change [APP-058]</b>.</p> <p>The position that the Proposed Development is likely to displace greater emissions that would otherwise occur elsewhere during its operational phase is an entirely valid and logical position to address within the environmental impact assessment. The ISEP guidance itself clearly makes reference to <i>“projects with effects that directly or indirectly remove or avoid GHG emissions in the without-project baseline.”</i></p> <p>As discussed above and previously, the Proposed Development can reasonably be expected to displace substantially higher emissions from an existing, unabated gas-fired generator. It therefore will avoid GHG emissions that would otherwise occur in the “without project baseline” if the Proposed Development were not to go ahead, and such avoided emissions must necessarily constitute a factor to be taken into account by the decision maker.</p> <p>Finally, CESL also suggest that the evaluation of significance of the GHG impact of the Proposed Development is expressed in such a way that that could leave the decision maker confused. This claim is without merit. Paragraph 20.6.68 of <b>Chapter 20: Climate Change [APP-058]</b> is unambiguous in stating that the <i>“overall evaluation of significance for the proposed Development’s operational GHG impact [is] moderate adverse and significant”</i> (emphasis in original). This overall evaluation of significance is re-stated in paragraph 20.7.2 and again in Table 20-12, and the Applicant considers that there is no room for any confusion in the way the overall significance of GHG impact has been communicated.</p>



## 2.4 REP5-071 Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)

2.4.1 RSPB's Deadline 5 submission and the Applicant's response are set out in **Table 4** below.

**Table 4: Response to RSPB's Deadline 5 submission**

Source Document	Reference	Topic	Source Document Text	Applicant's Response
<b>Comments on any submissions received by Deadline 4 (RSPB) [REP5-071]</b>	2.5	RSPB comments on the Curlew Mitigation Strategy	<p>Objectives</p> <p>Para 5.2.1: The objectives of the habitat creation and enhancement work within the offsetting area for the SPA / Ramsar site Curlew wintering population is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provide an optimal Curlew foraging resource;</li> <li>• and support an increased number of individuals that includes an equivalent number to those displaced from the Main Development Area.</li> </ul>	<p>When determining the quantum of habitat required to offset that lost within the Order limits, the Applicant has taken the approach of replicating the overall size of the fields to be lost, rather than mitigating for a specific number of individual birds. This approach acknowledges that the fields where Curlew have been recorded within the Order limits will not be used by birds in their entirety, e.g., that they will likely occur away from field edges, but rather there is a need for certain field unit size. This is what the Applicant has sought to mitigate. By doing this, the Applicant has ensured that there is no net loss in the overall area of suitable foraging habitat available to Curlew outside of the designated site boundary.</p>
	2.6	RSPB comments on the Curlew Mitigation Strategy	<p>Para 5.2.2 expands and categorises the proposed delivery of the offsetting area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The delivery of a core area for primary measures by the provision of 26 ha of wet grassland.</li> <li>• The provision of a further 2.29 ha of wet grassland alongside 21.56 ha of existing grassland to be enhanced to species rich grassland (under Net Benefit for Biodiversity). This is described as a secondary area to benefit curlew and other SPA.</li> </ul>	<p>In addition to the offsetting for the loss of the field themselves, the Applicant will also manage and enhance an additional 21.6 ha of adjacent grassland habitat for the benefit of Curlew, as well as other SPA qualifying species. As such, the Applicant is committing to over 26 ha of wet grassland creation and enhancement for waterbirds.</p>
	2.7	RSPB comments on the Curlew Mitigation Strategy	<p>The quantum of the proposed core habitat at Gronant Fields gives cause for concern. Notwithstanding a temporary component of loss at the Main Development Site, there will be a medium-term loss of 26 ha of habitat known to support significant numbers of wintering curlew by essentially a like for like spatial replacement. It is common ecological practice when addressing habitat losses to allow for a multiplier to reflect uncertainty and risk over the successful performance of the replacement site. We note the provision of additional secondary habitat at Gronant Fields, however this is targeted for wider measures, not primarily focused on the conservation priority, that of wintering curlew.</p>	
	2.8	RSPB comments on the Curlew Mitigation Strategy	<p>We also note the ambitious timetable argued for the delivery of the core habitat works. There is consensus (between the Applicant and NRW) that habitat conditions at Gronant Fields will take 3 to 5 years to become optimal, although the Applicant anticipates that habitats would be available within 12 months. We would advise that delivery of curlew focused habitat measures, both in terms of habitat manipulation and prospects for the habitats to successfully develop to compensate for the loss of the existing resources, requires a greater lead in time before construction commences.</p>	<p>This is noted by the Applicant and has been considered previously within this document. The reader is referred to C.1.18 for further details.</p> <p>The Applicant retains its position that the habitats would be available within 12 months. Ongoing monitoring will demonstrate if these habitats are being utilised by Curlew, however as outlined in the <b>Outline Curlew Implementation and Monitoring Plan (EN010166/APP/6.13)</b>, creating and maintaining an optimal sward height would ensure that the mitigation provision is available prior to any displacement occurring.</p>
	2.9	RSPB comments on the Curlew Mitigation Strategy	<p>We reiterate that Gronant Fields on the edge of the outer estuary, lie a considerable distance from the favoured Curlew wintering areas located in the inner estuary (21.3km). Ringing and tagging studies have shown that Curlew are faithful to their winter sites and it appears that most birds stay in one area from the start of the autumn moult through to the spring migration. This site fidelity highlights the uncertainty of the measures being successful as described above.</p>	<p>This is noted by the Applicant. The intention of the mitigation strategy is to ensure no net loss of non-breeding Curlew habitat associated with the Dee Estuary SPA. While the location of Gronant Fields has the potential to not be of benefit to individual Curlew that may be temporarily or permanently displaced from within the Order Limits, the implementation of a habitat</p>

Source Document	Reference	Topic	Source Document Text	Applicant's Response
				management strategy at Gronant Fields ensures that the conservation objectives of the SPA are not contravened. Therefore, the strategy to be implemented at Gronant Fields will effectively mitigate the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on the overall SPA Curlew population.
	2.10	RSPB comments on the Curlew Mitigation Strategy	<p>Implementation</p> <p>Para 5.3.1 states that prior to the implementation of habitat measures, consideration will be given to avoid/reduce the disturbance to protected/notable species at Gronant Fields including Barn owl and Cetti's warbler. Given that Gronant Fields are within the Dee Estuary SPA/Ramsar/SSSI, further consideration should be given to avoid/minimise disruption to the designated bird features that currently use the fields.</p>	This is noted by the Applicant and consideration will be given to avoiding/reducing the disturbance to protected/notable species at Gronant Fields. The Applicant is undertaking a suite of ecological surveys in 2026 to inform any proposals that may come forward in the future under the <b>Outline Curlew Implementation and Monitoring Plan (EN010166/APP/6.13)</b> .
	2.11	RSPB comments on the Curlew Mitigation Strategy	The management prescriptions described in sections 5.3 and 5.4 focus on wet features and 'edge habitat' which are more suited/akin to breeding waders rather than addressing the habitat requirements of non-breeding Curlew.	This is noted by the Applicant. The <b>Outline Curlew Implementation and Monitoring Plan (EN010166/APP/6.13)</b> outlines measures which could be implemented to meet its objectives, and the Applicant will continue to engage with RSPB and other stakeholder representatives regarding recommended management techniques at the site in question to maximise suitability for non-breeding Curlew during the development of the <b>Outline Curlew Implementation and Monitoring Plan (EN010166/APP/6.13)</b> .
	2.12	RSPB comments on the Curlew Mitigation Strategy	Grassland with a rich topsoil and an abundance of earthworms would be more important to foraging Curlews in winter than grassland with a network of 'hollows, channels, footdrains or scrapes' (although a high water table will make worms more easily accessible to these birds). Provision of several larger shallow flashes would be more appropriate wet features for wintering Curlews to offer a secure roosting / bathing area within the wider foraging area.	
	2.13	RSPB comments on the Curlew Mitigation Strategy	Further to the grassland management described in para 5.3.5, we recommend cattle grazing to maintain the pasture in good condition for Curlew. This will keep the grass sward short enough for easy foraging, but also structurally diverse, plus the added benefits of dunging and creating some areas of broken ground that other invertebrates will make use of and be more accessible to feeding waders. A more botanically diverse sward would be preferable, we would recommend reseeding, certainly of the arable fields, as the seed bank there is probably impoverished. A seed mix comprising 80% grass and 20% wildflower seeds, ideally of local provenance, is appropriate.	The Applicant notes the preference for cattle grazing and confirms this forms a key component of the strategy where it is viable. With regard to grassland seed mix, this will be subject to further discussion with relevant parties during the preparation of the <b>Outline Curlew Implementation and Monitoring Plan (EN010166/APP/6.13)</b> .
	2.14	RSPB comments on the Curlew Mitigation Strategy	<p>Monitoring</p> <p>Para 5.5.1 indicates the proposed monitoring of curlew usage at Gronant Fields will run from August to April inclusive. We suggest that the monitoring period is extended to include June and July to help capture the build-up/appearance of any post breeding flocks of Curlews.</p>	The Applicant has updated paragraph 5.5.1 of the <b>Outline Curlew Implementation and Monitoring Plan (EN010166/APP/6.13)</b> to extend the monitoring to cover each month of the year.

## 3. Landowners

### 3.1 REP5-088 Tata Steel UK

3.1.1 Tata Steel UK's Deadline 5 submission and the Applicant's response are set out in **Table 5** below

**Table 5: Response to Tata Steel's Deadline 5 submission**

Source Document	Reference	Topic	Source Document Text	Applicant's Response
<b>Comments on any submissions received by Deadline 4 (Tata Steel UK) [REP5-088]</b>	1.1	Introduction	This submission is made on behalf of Tata Steel UK Limited ("Tata Steel"), further to the relevant representation dated 27 October 2025, written representation dated 27 January 2026, response to ExQ1 and written submissions at Deadlines 2, 3 and 4 ("Previous Submissions"). The issues highlighted in the Previous Submissions are not repeated in this submission.	The Applicant notes and has already responded to all previous submissions made by Tata to the examination. As noted by Tata, the Applicant has engaged with Tata regarding the commercial terms necessary for the use of the Connah's Quay Jetty.
	1.2	Introduction	For the reasons set out in the Previous Submissions and this submission, Tata Steel maintains its objection to the application seeking development consent for the Connah's Quay Low Carbon Power Project ("Application").	Tata do not object in principle to the Applicant using their property for the import of Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs) as they confirmed verbally in the compulsory acquisition hearing as part of the DCO examination. Heads of terms have been exchanged, and solicitors are instructed with documents well progressed for an option to lease that would provide for the Applicant's use of the Tata land.
	2.1	Draft Heads of Terms	Comments on the high-level heads of terms were returned to the Applicant on 31 March 2026, and Tata Steel has subsequently met with the Applicant to discuss those comments. Tata Steel awaits a substantive response to those comments, including in respect of the inclusion of protective provisions in the development consent order. Further meetings have been arranged between Tata Steel and the Applicant, with the intention of agreeing the heads of terms before Deadline 6.	
	2.2	Draft Heads of Terms	While Tata Steel will continue to cooperate with the Applicant in respect of the heads of terms, greater detail is required to address the concerns raised in the Previous Submissions. Until such time as agreement is reached with the Applicant in respect of the HoTs and any resulting agreement has completed, Tata Steel objects to the Application and reserves the right to request the inclusion of protective provisions in the development consent order.	On the basis of progress made to date and in line with the Applicant's position explained within the <b>Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submissions [REP5-062]</b> , the Applicant does not consider protective provisions are necessary or appropriate in this instance.

## 4. Local Authorities

### 4.1 REP5-067 Flintshire County Council (FCC)

4.1.1 FCC's Deadline 5 submission and the Applicant's response are set out in **Table 6** below.

**Table 6: Response to FCC's Deadline 5 submission**

Source Document	Reference	Topic	Source Document Text	Applicant's Response
<p><b>Comments on any submissions received by Deadline 4 (FCC) [REP5-067]:</b> Table 1-1 – Flintshire County Council's (FCC) position on submissions made by the applicant at Examining Authority's at Deadline 4</p>	1.1	<p>Document Ref. 6.2.15 – ES Chapter 15: Chapter 15: Landscape and Visual Amenity, Rev 2 (clean and tracked) [Landscape Plume Assessment]</p>	<p>Reason for Submission: Updated to reflect the Applicant's response to Local Impact Report (LIR) [REP3-058] (Reference 16.43).</p> <p>FCC's Response: Noted. No further comments to make. Position is outlined as resolved in SoCG.</p>	<p>This is noted. The Applicant and FCC continue to discuss matters related to the landscape and visual amenity assessment. This is documented in the <b>Final Statement of Common Ground between Uniper and Flintshire County Council (EN010166/APP/8.1)</b>.</p>
	1.2	<p>Document Ref. 6.9 - Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, Rev 03 (clean and tracked)</p>	<p>Reason for Submission: Updated to reflect multiple Applicant's responses to LIR [REP3-058].</p> <p>FCC's Response: HRA-relevant mitigation measures should be secured through enforceable DCO requirements and approved plans. Deferring key detail to post-consent strategies is not sufficient where that detail is necessary at Examination to support conclusions on LSE/AEol.</p> <p>Critical (for HRA purposes) to clearly distinguish mitigation relied upon in the HRA from compensation.</p> <p>Position is outlined in SoCG.</p>	<p>The <b>Report to Inform Habitats Regulations Assessment (EN010166/APP/6.12)</b> does not make reference to any measures included within the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (EN010166/APP/6.9)</b> in reaching its conclusions.</p> <p>Where mitigation has been identified, the Applicant has prepared strategy documents to identify what must be delivered. The <b>Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1)</b> includes requirements for detailed plans to be prepared in general accordance with the strategy documents prior to undertaking certain works associated with the Proposed Development. The relevant strategy documents from a HRA perspective are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Outline Curlew Implementation and Monitoring Plan (EN010166/APP/6.13)</b> – secured by Requirement 11 and Schedule 16; and</li> <li>• <b>Outline Saltmarsh Implementation and Monitoring Plan (EN010166/APP/6.19)</b> – secured by Requirement 22 and Schedule 16.</li> </ul>

Source Document	Reference	Topic	Source Document Text	Applicant's Response
				<p>Similarly, the <b>Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (EN010166/APP/6.5)</b> provides outline measures to be employed by the appointed contractor(s). These measures will be finalised by the appointed contractor(s) and submitted to FCC for approval (under Requirement 4 of the <b>Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1)</b>) prior to the start of the relevant stage of the Proposed Development. This process reflects that further details on construction methodology will be finalised through the detailed design process to enable further details of the mitigation measures to be documented. The final CEMP(s) must be prepared in general accordance with the <b>Framework CEMP (EN010166/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>This is the standard approach followed by almost all DCO projects to secure mitigation measures, both with respect to EIA and HRA matters. As is set out in the <b>Commitments Register (EN010166/APP/6.10)</b>, all mitigation measures relied upon in the <b>RIHRA (EN010166/APP/6.12)</b> are specifically set out in an outline document which is then secured via a requirement in the <b>Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1)</b> or <b>through the Deed of Development Consent Obligations (EN010166/APP/9.25)</b>. DCOs provide for outline consent and must necessarily, due to their nature and scale, be subject to post-consent detailed design. Where FCC is the approving body for the requirements set out in Schedule 2 of the <b>Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1)</b>, FCC will have the ability to consider and approve the detailed mitigation measures formulated as part of the requirement discharge process post-detailed design.</p> <p>The Applicant has confirmed its approach to mitigation within the <b>RIHRA (EN010166/APP/6.12)</b> and it remains the Applicant's position that all proposals provided for as part of the Proposed Development are mitigation as opposed to compensation. Notwithstanding this, the Applicant has submitted a without prejudice derogation case so that, in the event the Secretary of State as decision maker for the DCO determines a stage 3 HRA is required, they have the detail before them to determine this and can rely on the measures proposed as adequate compensation to offset the effects of the Proposed Development from a HRA perspective.</p>
	1.3	Document Ref 6.11 – Green	<p>Reason for Submission: Updated to reflect multiple Applicant's responses to LIR [REP3-058].</p> <p>FCC's Response:</p>	<p>The Applicant has identified in correspondence with FCC that the assessment presented in the <b>Green Infrastructure Statement (EN010166/APP/6.11)</b> builds upon the approach taken for other consented DCOs within Wales, such as the Mona Offshore Windfarm (PINS Ref: EN010137) and Hynet CO<sub>2</sub> Pipeline (PINS</p>

Source Document	Reference	Topic	Source Document Text	Applicant's Response
		Infrastructure Statement, Rev 02 (clean and tracked)	<p>The NBB approach and baseline data does not follow 'standard best practice' for projects in Wales. Information is currently insufficiently detailed to inform a DECCA assessment. The assessment further contains inconsistencies and uncertainty identified by the Council and NRW.</p> <p>Position is outlined in SoCG.</p>	<p>Ref: EN070007). Further to this, available Green Infrastructure Statements of the following Developments of National Significance have been reviewed and the Applicant considers the approaches to be consistent with that for the <b>Green Infrastructure Statement (EN010166/APP/6.11)</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Carbon Capture and Storage Project – Padeswood, North Wales<sup>6</sup>;</li> <li>• Aberedw Energy Park Limited<sup>7</sup>;</li> <li>• Plas Power Solar and Energy Storage Project<sup>8</sup>;</li> <li>• Lluest y Gwynt Wind Farm and Grid Connection<sup>9</sup>; and</li> <li>• Bryn Cadwgan Energy Park<sup>10</sup>.</li> </ul> <p>The Applicant is confident the material provided is sufficient and demonstrates the Proposed Development would result in a net benefit for biodiversity.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, as noted in the <b>Applicant's Responses to Deadline 4 Submissions [REP5-062]</b>, an Appendix to the <b>Green Infrastructure Statement (EN010166/APP/6.11)</b> has been provided at Deadline 6 to provide a standalone DECCA assessment of the baseline condition.</p>
	1.4	Document Ref. 6.13 – Curlew Mitigation Strategy, Rev 01 (clean and tracked)	<p>Reason for Submission: Updated to reflect Applicant's response to the ExQ [PD-012] (Question 9.28) and correct minor inconsistencies.</p> <p>FCC's Response: The HRA-relevant mitigation measures should be secured through enforceable DCO requirements and approved plans. FCC does not agree that deferring key detail to post-consent strategies is sufficient where that detail is necessary at Examination to support conclusions on LSE/AEol.</p> <p>Position is outlined in SoCG.</p>	<p>The Applicant's position on these matters is provided in response to reference 1.2 above.</p>
	1.5	Document Ref. 6.14 – Off-site Net Benefit for Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	<p>Reason for Submission: Updated to reflect multiple Applicant's responses to LIR [REP3-058].</p> <p>FCC's Response:</p>	<p>The Applicant submitted an updated version of the <b>Off-site Net Benefit for Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure Strategy [REP4-058]</b> at Deadline 4 to address the concerns of FCC in relation to a consistent evidence base. An indicative Landscape Plan for the Off-site Delivery Area (Figure 6) was also provided in this revision of the <b>Off-site Net Benefit for Biodiversity and</b></p>

<sup>6</sup> RSK (2024), Castle Cement Limited, Carbon Capture and Storage Project – Padeswood, North Wales, Green Infrastructure Statement

<sup>7</sup> LUC (2025), Bute Energy, Aberedw Energy Park Limited Green Infrastructure Statement Document reference AEP.APP.10

<sup>8</sup> RPS (2024), lightsource bp, Plas Power Solar and Energy Storage Project 3.0.9 Green Infrastructure Statement

<sup>9</sup> Dulas (2024), Lluest y Gwynt Wind Farm and Grid Connection Green Infrastructure Statement

<sup>10</sup> Savills (2025), Galileo 06 Limited, Bryn Cadwgan Energy Park Green Infrastructure Statement

Source Document	Reference	Topic	Source Document Text	Applicant's Response
		Strategy, Rev 02 (clean and tracked)	<p>The NBB assessment is not currently demonstrated to be appropriate. The documentation does not yet provide a complete and internally consistent evidence base to support conclusions on the proposal outcomes.</p> <p>Position is outlined in SoCG.</p>	<p><b>Green Infrastructure Strategy [REP3-058]</b> to demonstrate how the required off-site planting could be delivered.</p> <p>The Applicant retains its position that the combination of on-site and off-site habitat creation secured through the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (EN010166/APP/6.9)</b> and the <b>Off-site Net Benefit for Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure Strategy (EN010166/APP/6.14)</b> would result in a net biodiversity benefit. This position is summarised in the <b>Green Infrastructure Strategy (EN010166/APP/6.11)</b>, which provides further details of how the Proposed Development has followed the 'stepwise' approach and fulfilled the requirements of Planning Policy Wales 12.</p>
	1.6	Document Ref. 9.24 – Community and Local Benefits Statement, Rev 00	<p>Reason for Submission: This document is submitted in response to Action Point 2 in Document Ref. 9.20.</p> <p>FCC's Response: FCC are reassured to see this submission. The document commits to:</p> <p>"The exact nature and operation of the benefit fund will be finalised following further engagement with local stakeholders and will be formalised through a Community Fund Agreement. At this stage, the Applicant anticipates that the scope of the benefit fund could include the following, but this would be guided by local stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STEM engagement and promotion, as well as education initiatives;</li> <li>• Promotion of health and wellbeing in the local community;</li> <li>• Enhancements to public rights of way and footpaths; and</li> <li>• Nature enhancement and improved access to the natural environment."</li> </ul> <p>FCC retain concern on the commitment to deliver the last two bullet points (marked in bold) and seek reassurance that there will be a trigger, or a requirement in the DCO to deliver these community benefits. If not, we question the validity of commitments.</p> <p>FCC seeks a visible plan or schedule of actions <b>prior to the next Deadline</b>, Deadline 6. To ensure that this Community Benefit is delivered and can be considered viable.</p>	<p>As explained within the <b>Community and Local Benefits Statement [REP4-087]</b> submitted at Deadline 4, the CQLCP Community Benefit Fund is not mitigating the effects of the Proposed Development and, therefore, it cannot be given any weight in the determination of the DCO application. It would, therefore, be inappropriate to secure the fund within the DCO.</p> <p>The Applicant has made a public commitment to the provision of community benefits within the <b>Community and Local Benefits Statement [REP4-087]</b>, which continues the efforts already pursued by the Applicant on a voluntary basis (see Section 2.2) as well as the specified further enhancement identified by FCC.</p> <p>An overview of the scope of potential community benefits has already been provided within the <b>Community and Local Benefits Statement [REP4-087]</b>. These initiatives would be progressed should the Proposed Development be granted consent and progress to the construction phase. It would be premature to prepare a more detailed schedule of actions at this stage because the Applicant would want to ensure that its actions to provide a community benefit and funding provided through the Community Benefit Fund, are proceeded within the context of the detailed design of the Proposed Development and following further community engagement to determine the most effective benefits that can be provided locally.</p> <p>As explained, the Applicant would also seek to engage with the community and wider stakeholders to shape collaboratively the Community Fund Agreement where the operation and goals of the scheme will be captured. It is typical for schemes to commence this process following award of consent and commencement of construction.</p>

Source Document	Reference	Topic	Source Document Text	Applicant's Response
				Overall, this means it is neither possible, nor appropriate, to secure outcomes of the proposed scheme in the <b>Draft DCO (EN010166/APP/3.1)</b> itself.
	1.7	Environmental Statement Volume IV Appendix 11-J: Otter Technical Appendix CONFIDENTIAL	Reason for Submission: Document absent in previous submission.  FCC's Response: FCC did not have time to consider this document ahead of Deadline 5. We will review and provide any further comments for Deadline 6.	The Applicant notes that FCC may provide comments following their review of this appendix and will respond accordingly, once received.

## Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Term
CCGT	Combined Cycle Gas Turbine
CCP	Carbon Capture Plant
CCS	Carbon Capture and Storage
CEMP	Construction Environmental Management Plan
CESL	Climate Emergency Science Law
CIEEM	Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management
CO <sub>2</sub>	Carbon Dioxide
CQLCP	Connah's Quay Low Carbon Power Project
DCO	Development Consent Order
DECCA	Diversity, Extent, Condition, Connectivity, and Adaptability
DESNZ	Department for Energy Security and Net Zero
DNS	Deeside Naturalists Society
DPA	Dispatchable Power Agreement
EPR	Environmental Permitting Regulations
ES	Environmental Statement
ExA	Examining Authority
FCC	Flintshire County Council
FLL	Functionally linked land
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GWP	Global Warming Potential
HMB	Heat and Material Balance
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment
IEA	International Energy Agency
INNS	Invasive Non-Native Species
IP	Interested Party
IPs	Interested Parties
ISEP	Institute of Sustainability and Environmental Professionals
LNG	Liquified Natural Gas
MH <sub>4</sub>	Methane
NCV	Net Calorific Value
NRW	Natural Resources Wales
PA 2008	Planning Act 2008
REP	Examination Library reference prefix related to all deadline submissions
RIHRA	Report to Inform Habitats Regulations Assessment

<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Term</b>
RSPB	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
SoS	Secretary of State
SPA	Special Protection Area

