



The Planning Inspectorate Yr Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

PROSIECT WYLFA NEWYDD

NODYN O'R CYFARFOD RHAGARWEINIOL

Crynodeb o'r Pwyntiau Allweddol a Draffodwyd a'r Cyngor a Roddwyd

Cais	Gorsaf Bêr Niwclear arfaethedig Wylfa Newydd
Cyfeirnod	EN01007
Amser a Dyddiad	10.00am 22 Hydref 2018
Lleoliad	Maes Sioe Ynys Môn, Gwalchmai, Caergybi, LL65 4RW

Nid yw'r nodyn hwn yn drawsgrifiad llawn o'r Cyfarfod Rhagarweiniol. Crynodeb ydyw o'r pwyntiau allweddol a draffodwyd a'r ymatebion a roddwyd. Mae recordiad sain o'r digwyddiad ar gael ar y wefan Cynllunio Seilwaith Cenedlaethol.

1. Croeso a Chyflwyniadau

Agorwyd y Cyfarfod Rhagarweiniol gan **Frances Fernandes** (FF), sef aelod arweiniol y panel sy'n ffurfio'r **Awdurdod Archwilio** (ExA), a chroesawodd y rhai a oedd yn bresennol ac esboniodd y trefniadau ymarferol ar gyfer y cyfarfod, gan gynnwys y trefniadau ar gyfer cyfieithu ar y pryd o'r Gymraeg i'r Saesneg.

Cyflwynodd **FF** ei hun fel aelod arweiniol y Panel, a benodwyd gan yr Ysgrifennydd Gwladol dros y Weinyddiaeth Dai, Cymunedau a Llywodraeth Leol, ac aelodau eraill y Panel: **Peter Braithwaite** (PB), **Joanna Dowling** (JD), **Michael Hayes** (MH) a **Clive Sproule** (CS).

Dywedodd **FF** mai hwn oedd y Cyfarfod Rhagarweiniol ar gyfer y cais a wnaed gan Horizon Nuclear Power ar gyfer prosiect Wylfa Newydd, ac esboniodd y byddai'r pum aelod o'r Panel yn cymryd rhan yn y cyfarfod ac y byddai pob un yn ymwneud yn llawn ac yn weithgar â'r archwiliad trwy ystyried deunydd ysgrifenedig, gwrandao ar gyflwyniadau llafar ac arwain gwrandawiaadau dilynol.

Esboniodd **FF** fod panel o bum unigolyn wedi cael ei benodi gan yr Ysgrifennydd Gwladol dros y Weinyddiaeth Dai, Cymunedau a Llywodraeth Leol i fod yr ExA ar gyfer yr archwiliad hwn. Mae gan y panel brofiad helaeth; gan gynnwys gweithio mewn gwahanol gyfundrefnau cynllunio

wrth archwilio prosiectau seilwaith cenedlaethol eraill yng Nghymru a Lloegr, ac roedd un aelod o'r Panel wedi bod yn rhan o'r archwiliad o gais gorsaf bŵer niwclear Hinkley Point C.

Esboniodd **FF** fod **CS** yn arolygydd o swyddfa'r Arolygiaeth Gynllunio yng Nghymru. Mae ef, a dau aelod o'r Tîm Achos, yn siarad Cymraeg. Roedd cyfieithydd Cymraeg yn bresennol hefyd ac fe'i cyflwynwyd. Mae gan y Gymraeg a'r Saesneg statws cydradd yng Nghymru. Roedd croeso i bobl gyfrannu yn Gymraeg, ac roedd cyfieithu ar y pryd i'r Saesneg ar gael trwy'r clustffonau yn yr ystafell. Bydd recordiad sain o'r trafodion ar gael ar wefan yr Arolygiaeth Gynllunio yn fuan ar ôl y cyfarfod.

Esboniodd **FF** mai unig ddiben y cyfarfod oedd ystyried materion gweithdrefnol yn ymwneud â'r ffordd y dylai'r archwiliad gael ei gynnal, gan gynnwys yr amserlen, ac nid trafod rhinweddau'r cynnig.

Esboniodd **FF** fod y Panel wedi darllen dogfennau'r cais a'r holl Gynrychiolaethau Perthnasol, ac y bu'r rhain yn ddefnyddiol iawn wrth eu galluogi i baratoi ar gyfer y cyfarfod.

Cyhoeddodd **FF** fod **yr Ymgeisydd** (APP) wedi gwneud cyflwyniad ynglŷn â newidiadau posibl i'r cais, ac y byddai hyn yn cael ei drafod fel eitem ychwanegol ar ddiwedd Eitem 3 yr agenda.

2. Sylwadau ynglŷn â'r Broses Archwilio

Esboniodd **FF** fod Deddf Cynllunio 2008 (PA2008) yn cyflwyno cyfundrefn wahanol ar gyfer ystyried Prosiectau Seilwaith o Arwyddocâd Cenedlaethol arfaethedig ac, oherwydd na fyddai pawb yn gyfarwydd â gweithdrefnau PA2008, amlinellodd sut y byddai'r Panel yn symud ymlaen.

Esboniodd **FF** y bydd y Panel yn ystyried y cais a'r holl gynrychiolaethau a wnaed iddynt ynglŷn ag ef. Byddant yn ymchwilio i faterion sydd, yn eu barn nhw, yn bwysig ac yn berthnasol i'w casgliadau a'u hargymhelliad terfynol; yn enwedig y rhai hynny sy'n ddadleuol, yn ystod y 6 mis nesaf. Ar ddiwedd yr archwiliad, bydd gan yr ExA 3 mis i gyflwyno adroddiad i'r Ysgrifennydd Gwladol dros Fusnes, Ynni a Strategaeth Ddiwydiannol yn amlinellu eu casgliadau a'u hargymhelliad ynglŷn â ph'un a ddylid rhoi caniatâd. Yr Ysgrifennydd Gwladol fydd yn gwneud y penderfyniad terfynol. Nid yw'r Panel wedi gwneud unrhyw benderfyniadau ynglŷn â rhinweddau'r cais.

Eglurodd **FF** mai proses holgar ydyw, ac y bydd y Panel yn arwain wrth sefydlu beth sy'n bwysig ac yn berthnasol i'r penderfyniad y mae angen i'r Ysgrifennydd Gwladol ei wneud, a'i bod hefyd yn broses ysgrifenedig i raddau helaeth.

Dyweddodd **FF** y byddai'n cyhoeddi'r llythyr Rheol 8, a wneir o dan Reolau Cynllunio Seilwaith (Gweithdrefn Archwilio) 2010, ar ôl y Cyfarfod Rhagarweiniol, a fyddai'n cynnwys cwestiynau ysgrifenedig y Panel i ystod o bartion, yn deillio o archwiliad y Panel ei hun o ddogfennau'r cais a'r Cynrychiolaethau Perthnasol a wnaed gan lawer o Bartion â Buddiant ac Ymgygoreion Statudol ac a drefnir yn ôl Aseiad Cychwynnol o Brif Faterion y Panel. Nodwyd os bydd y Panel yn gofyn cwestiwn sy'n ymdrin â'r un testun â phwynt y mae Parti â Buddiant yn dymuno ei wneud yn ei Gynrychiolaeth Ysgrifenedig, y dylai sicrhau ei fod yn ateb y cwestiwn yn y termau y'u gofynnir ynddo. Caiff Unigolion â Buddiant gynnwys y pwynt yn eu Cynrychiolaeth Ysgrifenedig o hyd, ond mae'n bwysig i ymatebion fod yn gyson.

Dyweddodd **FF** fod y llythyr Rheol 8 yn gosod terfyn amser ar gyfer derbyn ymatebion i'r cwestiynau hynny. Pan dderbynnir ymatebion, fe'u cyhoeddir ar dudalen y Prosiect ar wefan yr Arolygiaeth Gynllunio.

Cadarnhaodd **FF** y bwriad i gynnal nifer o wrandawiadau, y cyntaf o'r rhain ar ddydd Mercher (24 Hydref 2018) i ystyried y Gorchymyn Caniatâd Datblygu drafft ac yna dau wrandawiad Llawr Agored ar ddydd Iau (25 Hydref 2018).

Esboniodd **FF** fod y gwrandawiadau hyn yn gosod y sylfeini ar gyfer Cynrychiolaethau Ysgrifenedig, cwestiynau a sylwadau. Dylai Parti'n â Buddiant geisio ymgysylltu'n llawn drwy gydol y prosesau ysgrifenedig yn hytrach nag aros am wrandawiad penodol fel cyfle i ddylanwadu ar y trafodion. Dylai parti'n hefyd ddilyn y dogfennau tystiolaeth fel y maent yn ymddangos ar dudalen y Prosiect ar wefan yr Arolygiaeth Gynllunio fel y gallant weld sut mae'r archwiliad yn symud ymlaen.

Esboniodd **FF** fod dyletswydd ar yr ExA i sicrhau bod yr archwiliad yn deg ac yn drylwyr. Bydd nifer sylweddol o gwestiynau ysgrifenedig. Bydd y rhain yn bellgyrhaeddol; bydd rhai ohonynt yn canolbwyntio ar faterion eithaf sylfaenol tra bydd eraill yn ymdrin â phwyntiau eithaf manwl.

Cyhoeddodd **FF** y bydd yr ExA yn cynnal ymweliadau safle yn ystod y 6 mis nesaf o'r archwiliad, ac y gall y rhain fod gyda chwmni neu'n ddi-gwmni. Ddoe (22 Hydref 2018), cynhaliodd yr ExA ddiwrnod llawn o archwiliadau safle di-gwmni i ymgysylltu ag elfennau o'r cais. Ymwelodd yr ExA â'r canlynol, ymhlith manau eraill:

- Y safle parcio a theithio arfaethedig yn Dalar Hir;
- Caergybi (gan gynnwys Parc Cybi);
- Porth-y-Pistyll a Bae Cemlyn; a
- Phenrhyn Wylfa, Tregele, Cemaes ac Amlwch.

Bydd nodyn byr o'r ardaloedd yr ymwelodd yr ExA â nhw, gan gynnwys yr adeg o'r dydd a'r tywydd, yn cael ei gyhoeddi ar dudalen y Prosiect ar wefan yr Arolygiaeth Gynllunio.

Esboniodd **FF** mai craidd yr adroddiad a gyflwynir i'r Ysgrifennydd Gwladol fydd argymhelliad yr ExA ynglŷn â ph'un a ddylai'r Gorchymyn Caniatâd Datblygu drafft gael ei gymeradwyo. Bydd hefyd yn cynnwys argymhellion ynglŷn â pha dir y dylid ei gaffael yn orfodol os bydd yr Ysgrifennydd Gwladol yn cymeradwyo'r Gorchymyn Caniatâd Datblygu. Hyd yn oed os nad yw'r ExA yn argymhell y dylid rhoi caniatâd, mae'n rhaid iddo gynnig y Gorchymyn Caniatâd Datblygu mwyaf priodol, yn ei farn ef, rhag ofn y bydd yr Ysgrifennydd Gwladol yn mynd yn erbyn yr argymhelliad hwnnw. Y pwynt pwysig yw bod yr holl faterion sy'n ymwneud â'r Gorchymyn Caniatâd Datblygu drafft yn rhannau annatod o'r Archwiliad.

Esboniodd **FF** nad yw'r ExA yn bwriadu dyblygu materion sy'n dod o fewn cylch gorchwyl y cyrff sy'n gyfrifol am reoleiddio niwclear yng Nghymru. Mae'r cyrff hyn yn cynnwys y Swyddfa Rheoleiddio Niwclear a Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru. Mae adran 2.7 y Datganiad Polisi Cenedlaethol ar gyfer Cynhyrchu Pŵer Niwclear, sef EN-6, yn amlinellu cyfrifoldebau'r sefydliadau hyn yn fanylach. Nid yw'n rhan o gylch gorchwyl yr ExA i ystyried neu gwestiynu polisi'r llywodraeth ar bŵer niwclear.

Esboniodd **FF** fod digwyddiadau diweddar, llyfrgell yr archwiliad ac amserlen yr archwiliad ar gael ar wefan yr Arolygiaeth Gynllunio. Gellir cael mynediad at y wefan ledled gogledd Cymru ac Ynys Môn mewn amryw lyfrgelloedd.

3. Gwybodaeth ychwanegol mewn ymateb i gyngor a51 a cheisiadau gweithdrefnol

Dywedodd **PB** fod yr Arolygiaeth Gynllunio wedi derbyn y cais fel un sy'n addas i'w archwilio, mewn ymateb i gyngor a roddwyd o dan a51 PA2008. Yn dilyn hynny, mae'r Ymgeisydd wedi cyflwyno sawl dogfen wedi'u diweddarau. Mae'r rhain yn cynnwys:

- Atodiad i'r Adroddiad Asesiad Rheoliadau Cynefinoedd Cysgodol [AS-010],
- Llyfr Cyfeirio wedi'i ddiweddarau [AS-012, AS-013, AS-014],
- Cynlluniau Tir wedi'u diweddarau [AS-009]; a
- Memorandwm Esboniadol wedi'i ddiweddarau i'r Gorchymyn Caniatâd Datblygu drafft [AS-011].

Mae'r dogfennau hyn wedi cael eu derbyn yn ffurfiol i'r Archwiliad gan yr ExA. Os hoffai unrhyw barti â buddiant wneud sylwadau ar y dogfennau penodol hyn, gofynnir iddynt wneud hynny yn rhan o'u Cynrychiolaethau Ysgrifenedig erbyn Terfyn Amser 2 (4 Rhagfyr 2018).

Amlinellodd **PB** nifer o benderfyniadau gweithdrefnol a wnaed gan yr ExA fel y'u nodwyd yn Atodiad E y llythyr Rheol 6. Mae'r rhain yn cynnwys:

- Hysbysiad o'r gwrandawriad Gorchymyn Caniatâd Datblygu a dau wrandawriad Llawr Agored.
- Cais am Ddatganiadau Tir Cyffredin gyda sefydliadau sy'n cynrychioli'r iaith Gymraeg.
- Ceisiadau i ddod yn bartion â buddiant o dan a102B(4) PA2008.

Eitem Ychwanegol – Newidiadau arfaethedig i'r cais

Dyweddodd **FF** fod yr Ymgeisydd wedi rhoi gwybod i'r ExA ar 17 Hydref ei fod eisiau gwneud dau newid i'r cais mewn perthynas â'r Strategaeth Ffrwydro a Symudiadau Llongau Morol. Yn ogystal â hynny, roedd yn ystyried tri newid arall i'w cyflwyno yn ddiweddarach yn ystod yr Archwiliad. Mae llythyr yr Ymgeisydd wedi'i gyhoeddi ar dudalen y Prosiect ar wefan yr Arolygiaeth Gynllunio.

Dyweddodd **FF** fod yr ExA yn cael ei benodi i archwilio ac adrodd ar y cais fel y'i cyflwynwyd ac ni all archwilio prosiect sylweddol wahanol. I esbonio'r cyd-destun ymhellach, mae paragraff 106 y Canllawiau Archwilio yn datgan:

"Pan fydd Ymgeisydd yn cyflwyno newid arfaethedig i gynnig, bydd angen i'r Ysgrifennydd Gwladol benderfynu ar ba mor sylweddol yw'r newid a ph'un a yw o'r fath raddau sy'n gyfystyr â phrosiect newydd neu a ellir ei ystyried o hyd o dan y cais presennol."

Cyflwynodd **FF** y ddau gais ysgrifenedig am yr hyn y mae'r Ymgeisydd yn ei ddisgrifio fel newidiadau nad ydynt yn sylweddol i'r Strategaeth Ffrwydro a Symudiadau Llongau Morol, fel y'u hamlinellir yn Atodiad 1 a 2 llythyr yr Ymgeisydd, dyddiedig 17 Hydref 2018 [AS-019].

Gofynnodd **FF** i'r Ymgeisydd gadarnhau'n fyr yr hyn a amlinellwyd yn Atodiad 1 a 2.

Dyweddodd **Michael Humphries QC** (APP), sy'n cynrychioli'r Ymgeisydd, fod y ddau gais am newidiadau nad ydynt yn sylweddol yn ymwneud ag agweddau manwl ar adeiladwaith yr orsaf bŵer. O ran y Strategaeth Ffrwydro, roedd yr Ymgeisydd eisiau newid y cyfnod ffrwydro arfaethedig presennol o 10:00-16:00 o ddydd Llun i ddydd Gwener a 10:00-13:00 ar ddydd Sadwrn, i 09:00-19:00 o ddydd Llun i ddydd Gwener a 09:00-13:00 ar ddydd Sadwrn.

Esboniodd **APP** fod amserau'r cynnig cyntaf yn adlewyrchu Nodyn Cyngor Technegol Mwynau Llywodraeth Cymru, a bod yr ail gynnig yn glynu'n agosach at y Safonau Prydeinig ar gyfer gwaith mwynau. Pwysleisiodd **APP** na fyddai unrhyw ffrwydro ychwanegol y tu hwnt i'r uchafswm o dri ffrwydriad y dydd a gynigiwyd yn wreiddiol.

Esboniodd **APP** fod yr ail newid arfaethedig yn ymwneud â defnyddio'r Cyfleuster Dadlwytho Morol (MOLF) i gynyddu hygyrchedd o'r môr, yn

ystod y cyfnod adeiladu. Dywedodd **APP** mai'r cyfartaledd a fwriadwyd yn wreiddiol oedd 2 long y dydd; fodd bynnag, ni fyddai hyn yn wir mewn gwirionedd a gallai fod hyd at 8 long (16 o symudiadau) bob dydd. Felly, mae'r ail gais yn ymwneud â chynyddu symudiadau i uchafswm o 16 y dydd. Pwysleisiwyd y byddai cyfanswm y symudiadau wythnosol yn aros yr un fath yn gyffredinol, a gallai fod sawl symudiad ar rai diwrnodau a dim ar rai eraill; byddai'n gyfartaledd.

Gofynnodd **FF** i'r Ymgeisydd a oedd ganddo unrhyw gwestiynau ynglŷn â'r amserlen o ran y ddau newid. Esboniodd **APP** er nad oedd gofyniad statudol i ymgynghori ynglŷn â'r newidiadau hyn, ei fod wedi gwneud hynny beth bynnag a bod angen i'r ExA benderfynu bellach.

Gofynnodd **FF** am amserlen gan yr Ymgeisydd mewn perthynas â'r ceisiadau am newidiadau ychwanegol posibl. Ymatebodd **APP** drwy ddweud er mwyn cwblhau'r gwaith yn derfynol a chaniatáu 28 niwrnod ar gyfer ymgynghori, y targed oedd canol mis Ionawr (Terfyn Amser 4).

Gofynnodd **FF** a hoffai unrhyw barti arall wneud sylwadau ynglŷn ag amseru arfaethedig yr Ymgeisydd o ran y ddau gais hyn am newidiadau; ni wnaed unrhyw sylwadau.

Gofynnodd **FF** i'r Ymgeisydd grynhoi'r tri newid a gynigiwyd, yn ymwneud â phatrymau sifft, danfoniadau nwyddau trwm ac oriau gwaith y prif safle, fel yr amlinellwyd ym mharagraffau 9-30 llythyr yr Ymgeisydd, dyddiedig 17 Hydref 2018.

Esboniodd **APP** fod y newidiadau posibl canlynol yn cael eu hystyried:

1. Patrymau sifft

Canfuwyd bod y patrymau sifft arfaethedig blaenorol yn gorgyffwrdd, ac roedd Menter Newydd wedi cynghori'r Ymgeisydd y byddai hyn yn anghynhyrchiol. Yn wreiddiol, cynigiwyd tri phatrwm sifft o 10 awr, ac mae'r Ymgeisydd bellach yn cynnig 2 sifft ddydd gyfnodol ac 1 sifft nos 10.5 awr yr un yn 2020, a thair sifft ddydd (10.5 awr) a 2 sifft nos (10 awr) yn 2023 [REP1-014]

2. Oriau gwaith y prif safle

Roedd yr Ymgeisydd yn cynnig ymestyn yr oriau mewn perthynas â chloddwaith cyffredinol, gwaith stancio morol, adeiladu'r MOLF, sefydlu'r safle, cloddio dwfn a chyfleusterau cymorth er mwyn darparu mwy o hyblygrwydd ac effeithlonrwydd yn ystod y cyfnod adeiladu.

3. Symudiadau HGV

Cais arfaethedig i ymestyn yr oriau ar gyfer symudiadau HGV yn ystod yr wythnos ac ychwanegu cyfnod danfon arall ar ddydd Sadwrn. Pwysleisiwyd unwaith eto y byddai nifer y symudiadau HGV yr un fath,

ond byddai ymestyn yr oriau yn rhoi mwy o hyblygrwydd ac effeithlonrwydd.

Esboniodd **FF** y byddai'r ExA yn ystyried cyflwyniadau'r Ymgeisydd ac yn nodi sut mae'n bwriadu symud ymlaen yn ei lythyr Rheol 8.

4. Asesiad Cychwynnol o'r Prif Faterion

Esboniodd **MH** fod asesiad cychwynnol y Panel o'r prif faterion sy'n codi o'r cais wedi cael ei ddisbarthu fel Atodiad B llythyr yr Arolygiaeth Gynllunio, dyddiedig 25 Medi 2018. Yn ôl paragraff 43 Deddf Cynllunio 2008: *Canllawiau ar gyfer Archwilio Ceisiadau am Ganiatâd Datblygu* (MHLG 2015) '*ni fydd yn ddatganiad diffiniol o'r materion i'w hystyried*' gan fod rhaid i'r ExA fod yn rhydd i glywed yr holl dystiolaeth sydd, yn ei farn ef, yn berthnasol i ystyried yr achos.

Esboniodd **MH** fod y rhestr o brif faterion wedi'i seilio'n fras ar y materion a amlinellir yn y Datganiadau Polisi Cenedlaethol ar gyfer Ynni (EN-1) ac ar gyfer Cynhyrchu Pŵer Niwclear (EN-6) ac asesiad cychwynnol yr ExA ei hun. Rhestr ragarweiniol ydoedd, wedi'i chyflwyno yn nhrefn yr wyddor heb unrhyw flaenoriaeth. Er bod y rhestr hon yn debygol o fod yn sail i adroddiad yr ExA, mae'n bosibl na fydd o reidrwydd yn gofyn am wybodaeth am bob un o'r materion hyn yn ystod yr Archwiliad. Bydd yr ExA ond yn gofyn cwestiynau os bydd ganddo ymholiad neu os bydd eisiau cael mwy o wybodaeth. Os yw'r Archwiliad yn ddistaw ynghylch meysydd pwnc penodol, nid yw hynny'n golygu eu bod yn cael eu hanwybyddu.

Cadarnhaodd **APP** nad oedd ganddo unrhyw sylwadau i'w gwneud ynglŷn â'r prif faterion a amlinellwyd yn Atodiad B.

Esboniodd **MH** fod yr ExA wedi derbyn nifer o gyflwyniadau ynglŷn â'i asesiad cychwynnol o'r prif faterion, oddi wrth **Gyngor Sir Ynys Môn, Llywodraeth Cymru, Mr Roger Dobson (RD)** a **Heddlu Gogledd Cymru**, ymhlith eraill. Ar ôl i bob un o'r rhain wneud sylwadau, byddai partion eraill sy'n bresennol yn cael gwahoddiad i amlinellu eu cyflwyniad yn fyr.

Cyflwynodd **Timothy Corner QC (LIC)** ei hun fel adfocad Llywodraeth Cymru (LIC), a oedd wedi codi'r canlynol yn ei Chynrychiolaeth Berthnasol:

- perygl llifogydd;
- TG a band eang;
- traffig – yn enwedig y gallai fod yn briodol egluro yn y rhestr o faterion fod y rhwydwaith priffyrdd y cyfeirir ato yn y rhestr yn cynnwys y Rhwydwaith Cefnffyrdd Strategol; a'r
- effaith gronnol.

Cyflwynodd **Martin Kingston QC** (IACC) ei hun fel adfocad Cyngor Sir Ynys Môn (IACC). Tynnodd **IACC** sylw at lythyr Mr Williams, dyddiedig 12 Hydref 2018, i'r Arolygiaeth Gynllunio [EV-003]. Dymunai bwysleisio'r pryderon a godwyd yn y llythyr. Dywedodd **IACC** er bod llawer o bynciau, nad oedd unrhyw ystyriaethau gofodol penodol ar hyn o bryd. Roedd Cyngor Sir Ynys Môn yn pryderu'n arbennig am effeithiau ar ogledd Ynys Môn, sy'n ysgwyddo baich llawer o'r materion a godwyd yn y llythyr. Awgrymodd **IACC** bwnc a fyddai'n ymwneud yn ofodol ac yn benodol â gogledd Ynys Môn ac, yn ogystal, bod effeithiau cronol yn bryder mawr i'r rhanbarth ac yn enwedig gogledd Ynys Môn.

Yna, cyfeiriodd **IACC** at effeithiau economaidd-gymdeithasol, sy'n faterion eithriadol o bwysig ym marn y Cyngor; ystyrir bod nifer o benawdau o fewn 'Effeithiau Economaidd-Gymdeithasol' yn faterion pwysig ynddynt eu hunain, er enghraifft, cyflogaeth, hyfforddiant, tai, twristiaeth a'r iaith Gymraeg. Mae Cyngor Sir Ynys Môn yn credu y bydd angen rhoi ystyriaeth benodol i oblygiadau cyd-destun deddfwriaethol Cymru, sef yn bennaf Deddf Llesiant Cenedlaethau'r Dyfodol 2015.

Dywedodd **IACC** fod hefyd angen ystyried y Cynllun Datblygu ar y Cyd cyfredol a chanllawiau cynllunio atodol, sydd wedi ystyried Wylfa Newydd a'i goblygiadau yn benodol ac y mae Cyngor Sir Ynys Môn yn credu y dylai gael ei amlygu i'w ystyried.

Cyfeiriodd **IACC** at lythyr Mr Williams unwaith eto, a phwysleisiodd ba mor bwysig ydyw i'r Cyngor fod Wylfa Newydd yn arwain at waddol. Mae cefnogaeth Cyngor Sir Ynys Môn wedi'i seilio ar y dybiaeth o fudd priodol i gyflogaeth a materion eraill yn y pen draw, ac mae'n credu y bydd y ffordd y mae'r gwaddol hwnnw'n datblygu yn fater arwyddocaol iawn.

Gwnaeth **IACC** bwynt olaf ynglŷn â Phrosiect Cysylltiad Gogledd Cymru, a dderbyniwyd i'w archwilio gan yr Arolygiaeth Gynllunio yn ddiweddar. Mae'r Cyngor Sir yn pryderu am y graddau y mae'r ddau brosiect hyn yn cysylltu'n briodol â'i gilydd.

Cyflwynodd **Mr Roger Dobson** (RD) ei hun nid yn unig fel rhywun sy'n ei gynrychioli ei hun, ac yntau'n berchen ar eiddo yn agos i safle datblygu Wylfa Newydd, ond hefyd fel cynrychiolydd Cyngor Cymuned Llanbadrig.

Dywedodd **RD** gan ei fod yn sylweddoli y gallai fod ganddo ragfarn bersonol a safbwynt rhagfarnlyd posibl ynglŷn â'r datblygiad, ei fod wedi cael caniatâd arbennig gan Bwyllgor Safonau Cyngor Sir Ynys Môn i siarad ar ran y Cyngor Cymuned.

Cododd **RD** y materion canlynol:

1. Mae gan Bartneriaeth Gogledd Ynys Môn o Gynghorau Cymuned a Thref bryderon ynglŷn â'r diffyg gwybodaeth a ddarparwyd gan Horizon, yn enwedig ynglŷn â'r effeithiau ar 67 derbynnydd yn Nhrefle a Chemaes, a fyddai'n dioddef effeithiau niweidiol am 8

mlynedd; ac ynglŷn â dirgryniadau difrifol posibl; ysgrifennodd **RD** at Horizon ynglŷn â hyn ar 01 Gorffennaf 2018, ond nid yw wedi derbyn ymateb.

2. Cynllun Cymorth Cymdogaeth Horizon (2014), y mae Mr Dobson a'r rhai y mae'n eu cynrychioli yn credu ei fod wedi dyddio.
3. Yr effaith ar gymunedau lleol, yn enwedig Cemaes, Tregele a Llanfechell, o ganlyniad i'r 4,000 o gontractwyr y disgwylir iddynt fod yn byw ar y safle a'r 9,000 a fydd yn gweithio ar y safle.
4. Effeithiau traffig ar yr A5025.
5. Newid patrymau sifft – ni awgrymir newid nifer yr oriau gwaith, yr ystyrir eu bod yn ormodol ac yn anniogel.

Dywedodd **Jennifer Holgate**, sy'n cynrychioli **Heddlu De Cymru** (NWP), fod **NWP** yn pryderu ynglŷn â'r canlynol:

1. Dylai'r Gorchymyn Caniatâd Datblygu drafft (Prif Fater 5) fynnu amser penodol ar fwy nag un achlysur i drafod y Cytundeb Adran 106 arfaethedig a'i berthynas â chyflawni'r mesurau lliniaru a amlygwyd yn y Gorchymyn Caniatâd Datblygu drafft.
2. Effeithiau Economaidd-Gymdeithasol – mae Heddlu De Cymru yn cefnogi sylwadau blaenorol a wnaed gan Gyngor Sir Ynys Môn ac wedi paratoi asesiad manwl o'r datblygiad o safbwynt yr heddlu a fydd yn cael ei gyflwyno erbyn Terfyn Amser 1.
3. Traffig a Thrafnidiaeth – mae Heddlu De Cymru yn pryderu y gallai'r data a ddefnyddiwyd yn yr asesiad trafndiaeth a gyflwynwyd fod wedi'i danamcangyfrif. Mae Heddlu De Cymru wedi cyfarwyddo ymgynghoriaeth drafndiaeth annibynnol i adolygu'r wybodaeth hon yn llawn a phrofi ei chywirdeb. Mae'n gofyn am Wrandawriad Mater Penodol cyn gynted â phosibl i ystyried p'un a yw'r asesiad trafndiaeth yn addas i'r diben.
4. Dylai'r effeithiau cronol rhwng Wylfa Newydd a Gorchymyn Caniatâd Datblygu Cysylltiad Gogledd Cymru fod yn brif fater ynddynt eu hunain. Mae Heddlu De Cymru, yn ogystal â phartion eraill, yn cynnal asesiad cronol manylach i sicrhau ei fod yn gadarn. Dylid ystyried p'un a ddylai hyn fod yn destun Gwrandawriad Mater Penodol yn ddiweddarach, os yw'n bosibl.

Diolchodd **MH** i Heddlu De Cymru a phwysleisiodd bwysigrwydd y Datganiad Tir Cyffredin a chyflwyno dogfennau nad ydynt eto'n rhan o'r Archwiliad cyn gynted â phosibl; yn enwedig y canllawiau cynllunio atodol yn ymwneud â Gogledd Ynys Môn (*Wylfa Newydd : Canllawiau Cynllunio Atodol*; Mai 2018) a'r adroddiadau ynglŷn â materion economaidd-gymdeithasol.

Cynrychiolwyd **Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru** (NRW) gan yr adfocad **Gwion Lewis** a gododd 2 fater:

1. Perygl llifogydd – mae Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru yn cytuno â safbwyntiau Llywodraeth Cymru ynglŷn â'r mater hwn.

2. Yr effaith ar ardaloedd dyfrol – yn enwedig materion sy'n codi o dan y Gyfarwydddeb Fframwaith Dŵr.

Pwysleisiodd **Stephanie Hall**, sef cwnsler **Land and Lakes Limited (LaL)**, yr angen i asesu dewisiadau amgen rhesymol – yn enwedig o ran campws oddi ar y safle ar gyfer llety dros dro, yn hytrach na campws ar y safle, ac y bydd **LaL** yn craffu ar effeithiau traffig ac effeithiau economaidd-gymdeithasol yn unol â'r polisi cynllunio lleol perthnasol.

5. Amserlen ddrafft ar gyfer archwilio'r cais

Cynigiodd **JD** amlinellu amserlen ddrafft yr ExA o ran cyflwyniadau ysgrifenedig; yna, byddai **CS** yn amlinellu'r amserlen ddrafft ar gyfer Gwrandawiadau a byddai **JD** yn gorffen trwy ymdrin â sut mae'r ExA yn bwriadu cynnal Archwiliadau Safle.

Esboniodd **JD**, er mwyn sicrhau bod pawb sy'n bresennol yn deall y broses, ei bod hi'n bwriadu symud ymlaen ar y sail mai hwn yw'r profiad cyntaf o archwilio prosiect seilwaith o arwyddocâd cenedlaethol i bawb sy'n bresennol.

Esboniodd **JD** mai'r Archwiliad yw'r cyfnod pan fydd yr ExA yn casglu tystiolaeth ac yn profi gwybodaeth ynglŷn â'r cais gan Bartion â Buddiant. Cynhelir y broses archwilio yn ysgrifenedig yn bennaf. Fodd bynnag, mae cyfle i'r ExA gynnal Gwrandawiadau pan ystyrir eu bod yn angenrheidiol neu pan ofynnir amdanynt.

Dywedodd **JD** y bydd yr ExA yn cyhoeddi cwestiynau ysgrifenedig ynglŷn â'r cais. Nod y cwestiynau ysgrifenedig yw casglu a chadarnhau gwybodaeth am y cais. Byddant wedi'u cyfeirio at yr Ymgeisydd yn bennaf, ond mae'n bosibl y bydd cwestiynau ar gyfer cyrff statudol, awdurdodau lleol a phartion â buddiant hefyd. O ganlyniad, mae'r ExA yn gofyn i'r partion ddarllen y cwestiynau i gyd. Os bydd partion eisiau cyfrannu neu wneud sylwadau ar gwestiwn nad yw wedi'i gyfeirio atyn nhw, mae croeso iddynt wneud hynny. Mae'r Panel yn fodlon derbyn yr holl gyflwyniadau ysgrifenedig neu lafar yr hoffai partion eu gwneud yn Gymraeg neu Saesneg.

Dywedodd **JD** y gallai'r ExA gyhoeddi mwy nag un gyfres o gwestiynau, os bydd yn credu bod angen. Fel y gwêl y partion o eitem 14 ar yr amserlen ddrafft, mae cyfres arall o gwestiynau ysgrifenedig, os bydd ei hangen, wedi'i threfnu dros dro ar gyfer mis Ionawr 2019. Gall yr ExA hefyd gyhoeddi cais penodol am wybodaeth gan bartion a enwir, os bydd angen.

Rhoddodd **JD** wybod i'r partïon mai Terfyn Amser 2 yw dydd Mawrth 4 Rhagfyr 2018. Erbyn Terfyn Amser 2, bydd yr ExA yn disgwyl i'r Datganiadau Tir Cyffredin a Datganiad o Gyffredinedd Datganiadau Tir Cyffredin gael eu cyflwyno, ymhlith pethau eraill. Mae Datganiad Tir Cyffredin yn cael ei lunio ar y cyd gan yr Ymgeisydd a pharti arall â buddiant (corff statudol, fel arfer) ac mae'n nodi'r meysydd y mae'r partïon yn cytuno a/neu'n anghytuno arnynt. Mae Datganiadau Tir Cyffredin yn ddefnyddiol, hyd yn oed os nad oes llawer o feysydd sy'n destun anghydfod, gan eu bod yn galluogi'r Panel i amlygu materion nad ydynt yn destun anghydfod neu nad oes angen mwy o dystiolaeth amdanynt.

Dyweddodd **JD** fod y Panel yn ymwybodol bod yr Ymgeisydd wrthi'n paratoi Datganiadau Tir Cyffredin â nifer o sefydliadau, a gellir cael mwy o fanylion am y rhain yn y Datganiad o Sefyllfa ynghylch Datganiadau Tir Cyffredin [APP-443/8.25] a gyflwynwyd gyda'r cais.

Dyweddodd **JD** fod y Panel wedi gofyn i'r Ymgeisydd, yn Atodiad E y llythyr Rheol 6, ystyried cyflwyno Datganiad Tir Cyffredin gyda sefydliadau sy'n cynrychioli'r iaith Gymraeg ac sydd wedi cyflwyno Cynrychiolaeth Berthnasol. Nododd **JD** fod gohebiaeth ddiweddar gan yr Ymgeisydd yn dangos ei fod wedi dechrau'r broses hon.

Yna, gofynnodd **JD** i'r Ymgeisydd, mewn perthynas â phwynt 22 ei lythyr dyddiedig 16 Hydref 2018, sut y dewisodd y 3 sefydliad i lunio Datganiad Tir Cyffredin drafft â nhw ynglŷn â'r iaith Gymraeg, gan fod yr ExA yn nodi bod sefydliadau eraill sydd wedi gwneud cynrychiolaethau hefyd.

Dyweddodd **APP** y byddai angen iddo dderbyn cyfarwyddyd ynglŷn â sut yr amlygwyd y tri sefydliad a gofynnodd a ellid rhoi mwy o amser iddo i lunio ymateb. Cytunodd **JD** ac awgrymodd y gallai'r Ymgeisydd ddymuno cydlynu â Chyngor Sir Ynys Môn a Chyngor Sir Gwynedd wrth ymateb i'r cwestiwn hwn.

Dyweddodd **JD** y gellid ychwanegu at y rhestr o Ddatganiadau Tir Cyffredin yn ystod yr Archwiliad, ac na ddylid ystyried ei bod yn atal unrhyw barti â buddiant na'r Ymgeisydd rhag llunio Datganiad Tir Cyffredin nad yw eisoes wedi cael ei amlygu.

Gofynnodd **JD** i'r Ymgeisydd gyflwyno Datganiad o Gyffredinedd Datganiadau Tir Cyffredin, sy'n darparu rhestr lawn o'r holl Ddatganiadau Tir Cyffredin a'u statws cyfredol; yr hyn y cytunwyd arno; yr hyn sy'n parhau i fod heb ei gytuno a therfyn amser dangosol ar gyfer pryd y gellid disgwyl cytundeb. Mae'r holl ddogfennau hyn yn rhai 'byw', ac mae'r Panel yn disgwyl y byddant yn newid wrth i drafodaethau symud ymlaen. O ganlyniad, mae'r ExA wedi gofyn am ddiweddariad erbyn Terfyn Amser 5 ac i Ddatganiadau Tir Cyffredin a Datganiad Cyffredinedd terfynol gael eu cyflwyno erbyn Terfyn Amser 8.

Dyweddodd **JD** y bydd angen i Bartïon â Buddiant gyflwyno eu Cynrychiolaethau Ysgrifenedig erbyn Terfyn Amser 2 hefyd. Mae hyn yn gyfle i bartïon gyflwyno eu hachos ac ymhelaethu ar unrhyw safbwyntiau a fynegwyd yn eu Cynrychiolaethau Perthnasol. Mae cyngor ar hyn, a materion eraill sy'n ymwneud â'r Archwiliad, ar gael yn Nodyn Cyngor 8 yr Arolygiaeth Gynllunio (*Trosolwg o'r broses cynllunio seilwaith o arwyddocâd cenedlaethol i aelodau'r cyhoedd a phobl eraill*) sydd ar gael ar wefan yr Arolygiaeth Gynllunio:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/cy/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Advice-note-8.0-welsh.pdf>

Ychwanegodd **JD** os bydd partïon eisiau siarad yn unrhyw un o'r Gwrandawiadau neu fynychu Archwiliad Safle gyda Chwmni, y bydd angen iddynt roi gwybod i'r Arolygiaeth Gynllunio yn ysgrifenedig erbyn Terfyn Amser 2. Erbyn y Terfyn Amser hwn, bydd y Panel hefyd yn disgwyl i'r ymateb i gwestiynau ysgrifenedig cyntaf yr ExA ac Adroddiadau ar yr Effaith Leol gael eu cyflwyno.

Esboniodd **JD** fod Adroddiadau ar yr Effaith Leol yn cael eu paratoi gan awdurdodau lleol y mae'r cais yn effeithio arnynt. Maen nhw'n caniatáu iddynt ddefnyddio eu gwybodaeth leol ac amlinellu'r effeithiau cadarnhaol a negyddol y byddai'r cynnig yn eu cael, yn eu barn nhw, ar yr ardal leol a chymunedau. Rhoddir statws arbennig i Adroddiadau ar yr Effaith Leol ac, ar yr amod y'u cyflwynir erbyn y terfyn amser a gytunwyd, mae'n rhaid i'r ExA eu hystyried.

Gofynnodd **JD** i'r Ymgeisydd nodi'r cais am gyflwyno Atodlen Caffael Gorfodol ac Atodlen Mesurau Lliniaru. Mae'r dogfennau hyn wedi bod yn ddefnyddiol mewn archwiliadau eraill trwy roi diweddariad ar gynnydd trafodaethau ynglŷn â'r materion 'byw' hyn. Byddai Atodlen Caffael Gorfodol yn rhoi diweddariad ar wrthwynebiadau a chytundebau cyfredol ynglŷn â'r tir y mae'r Ymgeisydd eisiau ei gaffael yn orfodol a lle y cwblhawyd trafodaethau'n llwyddiannus.

Esboniodd **JD** y byddai Atodlen Mesurau Lliniaru yn debyg iawn i'r Map Llwybr Mesurau Lliniaru y mae'r Ymgeisydd eisoes wedi'i gyflwyno gyda'r cais. Fodd bynnag, byddai'n dwyn ynghyd yr holl fesurau lliniaru ymgorfforedig yn un ddogfen 'fyw', sy'n cyfleu'r cynnydd sy'n cael ei wneud ac yn rhoi diweddariad unigol i'r Panel ar statws trafodaethau; lle y daethpwyd i gytundeb a'r hyn sy'n parhau i fod heb ei gytuno.

Esboniodd **JD** fod yr amserlen ddrafft yn dangos bod yr ExA yn gofyn i'r Atodlen Caffael Gorfodol gael ei diweddaru erbyn Terfynau Amser 3, 4 a 5, ac i fersiwn derfynol gael ei chyflwyno erbyn Terfyn Amser 8; mae hefyd yn gofyn i'r Atodlen Mesurau Lliniaru gael ei diweddaru erbyn Terfyn Amser 5 ac i'r atodlen derfynol gael ei chyflwyno erbyn Terfyn Amser 7.

Gofynnodd **JD** i'r partïon adolygu'r holl eitemau eraill o dan Derfyn Amser 2, a nodi unrhyw sylwadau yr hoffent eu gwneud, o bosibl. Mae wyth terfyn amser arall erbyn pryd y bydd angen cyflwyno gwybodaeth i'r Panel. Gofynnodd **JD** i'r partïon adolygu gofynion y terfynau amser a nodi unrhyw sylwadau yr hoffent eu gwneud, o bosibl.

Esboniodd **JD** y gellir cyhoeddi Adroddiad ar yr Effaith ar Safleoedd Ewropeaidd pan fydd effeithiau arwyddocaol tebygol ar safleoedd o'r fath. Os nad oes effeithiau o'r fath, bydd Adroddiad Dim Effeithiau Arwyddocaol yn cael ei gyhoeddi. Diben Adroddiad ar yr Effaith ar Safleoedd Ewropeaidd yw amlinellu'r hyn y cytunwyd arno a'r hyn sy'n parhau i fod yn ddadleuol o ran safleoedd o arwyddocâd Ewropeaidd a'u nodweddion gwarchoddedig – ni fwriedir iddo lunio barn am rinweddau'r cais.

Dywedodd **JD** fod eitem 25 ar yr amserlen ddrafft yn dangos y byddai'r Adroddiad ar yr Effaith ar Safleoedd Ewropeaidd yn cael ei gyhoeddi ddydd Mercher 27 Mawrth 2019, ac y disgwyliid sylwadau arno erbyn Terfyn Amser 9, sef dydd Mercher 10 Ebrill 2019.

Dywedodd **JD** fod yr ExA yn argymhell bod yr Ymgeisydd yn cyflwyno canllaw i'r cais erbyn pob terfyn amser. Dogfen ymarferol yw hon sy'n darparu rhestr â chod lliw o'r dogfennau a gyflwynwyd ar y dyddiad hwnnw; yn nodi rhifau dogfennau'r Ymgeisydd a'r Arolygiaeth ac yn dangos naill ai'r fersiwn ddiweddaraf neu ba bryd y cyflwynwyd dogfen newydd a pha ddogfennau y mae'n eu disodli.

6. Gwrandawiadau

Esboniodd **CS** fod modd cynnal gwahanol fathau o wrandawiadau yn ystod yr Archwiliad o dan PA2008:

- Gwrandawiadau Llawr Agored;
- Gwrandawiadau Mater Penodol; a
- Gwrandawiadau Caffael Gorfodol.

Gofynnodd **CS** i'r partïon nodi y bydd yr ExA yn bwriadu cyhoeddi agendâu ar gyfer pob gwrandawriad ar dudalennau seilwaith gwefan yr Arolygiaeth Gynllunio oddeutu 5 niwrnod cyn y gwrandawriad hwnnw. Yna, esboniodd **CS** ddiben y tri math o wrandawriad.

1. Gwrandawiadau Llawr Agored:

O dan a.93 Deddf Cynllunio 2008, mae'n rhaid i Wrlandawiadau Llawr Agored gael eu cynnal os bydd unrhyw Barti â Buddiant yn gofyn amdanynt. Diben y rhain yw galluogi pob Parti â Buddiant i wneud cynrychiolaethau llafar ynglŷn â'r cais. Fel y cyfryw, mae'r pynciau mewn Gwrandawriad Llawr Agored yn amrywiol iawn fel arfer. Dylai

unrhyw un sy'n siarad mewn Gwrandawriad Llawr Agored ddisgwyl i'r Panel ofyn cwestiynau iddo ynglŷn â'i gynrychiolaeth.

Dylai ceisiadau gan Bartion â Buddiant i siarad mewn unrhyw Wrandawriad Llawr Agored yn y dyfodol gael eu cyflwyno erbyn Terfyn Amser 2, sef 4 Rhagfyr 2018.

2. Gwrandawiadau Mater Penodol:

Cynhelir Gwrandawiadau Mater Penodol os bydd y Panel yn penderfynu eu bod yn angenrheidiol i sicrhau bod y mater dan sylw'n cael ei archwilio'n ddigonol, neu i sicrhau bod Parti â Buddiant yn cael cyfle teg i gyflwyno ei achos.

3. Gwrandawiadau Gorchymyn Caniatâd Datblygu:

Cynhelir y rhain sawl gwaith yn ystod yr Archwiliad i ystyried diwygiadau i'r Gorchymyn Caniatâd Datblygu drafft.

Dywedodd **CS** y byddai'r Gwrandawriad Mater Penodol cyntaf yn cael ei gynnal drannoeth (23 Hydref 2018) ac y byddai'n ymdrin â'r Gorchymyn Caniatâd Datblygu drafft. Diben y gwrandawriad fyddai deall sut y bwriedir i'r Gorchymyn Caniatâd Datblygu drafft weithio a phryderon posibl y partion amrywiol ynglŷn ag ef.

Esboniodd **CS** fod Gorchymyn Caniatâd Datblygu yn dechrau fel dogfen yr Ymgeisydd, ond mae'n rhaid i'r ExA fynd i'r afael â'i gynnwys a gwneud argymhellion ynglŷn ag ef, ni waeth p'un a yw'n argymhell y dylai'r cynllun arfaethedig gael ei dderbyn ai peidio. Mae'n bwysig deall na fydd unrhyw barti dan anfantais o ganlyniad i'r trafodaethau ar y Gorchymyn Caniatâd Datblygu drafft, gan ei fod yn fater y mae'n rhaid i'r ExA fynd i'r afael ag ef yn ysgrifenedig yn ei adroddiad. Anogir pob parti i wneud sylwadau ar y Gorchymyn Caniatâd Datblygu drafft hyd yn oed os yw'n gwrthwynebu'r cynnig ei hun.

Gofynnodd **CS** i unrhyw barti sy'n dymuno siarad mewn unrhyw Wrandawriad Mater Penodol yn y dyfodol ynglŷn â'r Gorchymyn Caniatâd Datblygu roi gwybod i'r Arolygiaeth Gynllunio erbyn Terfyn Amser 2, sef 4 Rhagfyr 2018.

Esboniodd **CS** y disgwylir i Wrandawiadau Mater Penodol eraill gael eu cynnal yn ystod y pythefnos a neilltuwyd ar gyfer gwrandawiadau ym mis Ionawr a mis Mawrth 2019, ac y byddai manylion y Gwrandawiadau Mater Penodol hyn yn cael eu rhoi i Bartion â Buddiant a'r Ymgeisydd yn unol â hynny. Dylid rhoi gwybod am ddymuniad i siarad mewn unrhyw Wrandawriad Mater Penodol yn y dyfodol erbyn Terfyn Amser 2, sef 4 Rhagfyr 2018.

Esboniodd **CS** fod rhaid i wrandawiadau Caffael Gorfodol gael eu cynnal os bydd unrhyw un yr effeithir arno'n gofyn amdanynt. Mae'r ExA yn disgwyl i'r gwrandawiadau hyn gael eu cynnal yn ystod yr ail wythnos a neilltuwyd

(Mawrth 2019). Tynnodd **CS** sylw'r partion at y terfyn amser ar gyfer rhoi gwybod i'r Panel am eu dymuniad i gael gwrandawriad Caffael Gorfodol erbyn Terfyn Amser 2, sef 4 Rhagfyr 2018.

Dyweddodd **CS** fod manylion yr holl ddyddiadau hyn, gan gynnwys y dyddiadau erbyn pryd y mae'n rhaid i Bartion â Buddiant roi gwybod eu bod yn dymuno cael eu clywed mewn unrhyw Wrandawriad Llawr Agored, Gwrandawriad Mater Penodol neu Wrandawriad Caffael Gorfodol arall, wedi'u rhoi yn Atodiad C llythyr yr ExA, dyddiedig 25 Medi 2018. Ceir gofyn cwestiynau mewn unrhyw wrandawriad Mater Penodol neu Gaffael Gorfodol yn ôl disgrisiwn y Panel. Weithiau, gallai'r ExA benderfynu bod croesholi'n ddymunol mewn gwrandawriad penodol hyd yn oed os nad oedd wedi cael cyflwyniadau ar y pwynt penodol hwnnw. Eglurodd **CS** na fyddai'r Panel yn gwneud unrhyw benderfyniadau yn y Gwrandawriad Rhagarweiniol, ac y byddai'n penderfynu ar yr ymagwedd briodol ar ddiwrnod y Gwrandawriad.

7. Archwiliadau Safle

Dyweddodd **JD** fod yr ExA wedi cynnal archwiliad safle di-gwmni ddydd Llun 22 Hydref 2018, pryd yr edrychwyd ar y safle a'r amgylchoedd o nifer o olygfannau, yr oeddent i gyd ar dir cyhoeddus. Y bwriad oedd i nodyn yn amlinellu'r hyn a welodd y Panel, a phryd, gael ei gyhoeddi ar wefan y prosiect yn ddiweddarach y diwrnod hwnnw.

Dyweddodd **JD** fod yr ExA yn bwriadu cynnal Archwiliadau Safle Di-gwmni eraill yn ystod yr ychydig fisoedd nesaf, yn ogystal ag Archwiliad Safle gyda Chwmni. Mae'r ExA wedi neilltuo amser ar gyfer yr Archwiliad Safle gyda Chwmni hwn naill ai ym mis Ionawr (eitemau 8-12 ar yr amserlen ddrafft) neu ym mis Mawrth (eitemau 18-22 ar yr amserlen ddrafft). Un o nodau'r Archwiliad Safle gyda Chwmni fyddai galluogi'r Panel i weld ac ymweld â safleoedd nad ydynt yn agored i'r cyhoedd.

Tynnodd **JD** sylw at Derfyn Amser 2 a gofynnodd i'r partion nodi cais am gyflwyno awgrymiadau ar gyfer lleoliadau/safleoedd i'r Panel eu cynnwys mewn Archwiliadau Safle Di-gwmni eraill neu yn yr Archwiliad Safle gyda Chwmni, gan gynnwys y materion i'w hystyried yno, gwybodaeth ynglŷn â ph'un a ellir cyrraedd y safle o dir cyhoeddus a'r rhesymau pam y byddai angen i'r Panel ymweld â phob safle a enwebwyd. Pan fydd gan y Panel y wybodaeth hon, bydd mewn sefyllfa i benderfynu ar yr adeg orau i gynnal yr Archwiliadau hyn.

Ailadroddodd **JD** os hoffai unrhyw Bartion â Buddiant fynychu'r Archwiliad Safle gyda Chwmni, fod angen iddynt roi gwybod i'r Arolygiaeth Gynllunio yn ysgrifenedig erbyn Terfyn Amser 2. Bydd yr Archwiliad Safle gyda Chwmni yn cynnwys rhywfaint o gerdded a thir anwastad, felly gofynnir i unrhyw un sydd â phroblemau symudedd nodi hynny yn ei gais i

fynychu'r Archwiliad Safle gyda Chwmni a bydd y Panel yn gwneud ei orau i fodloni ei anghenion.

Dyweddodd **IACC** ei fod yn credu y bydd Gwrandawiadau Mater Penodol yn arbennig o bwysig mewn perthynas â'r cais hwn. Esboniodd **IACC** nad oedd wedi cael ymateb gan yr Ymgeisydd sawl gwaith, ac y byddai ymatebion i'w ohebiaeth o gymorth mawr; mae **IACC** yn cytuno ag ymagwedd yr ExA, ond yn amau a neilltuwyd digon o amser.

Cyfeiriodd **IACC** at amseriad y gyfres gyntaf o Wrandawiadau Mater Penodol, ac awgrymodd y dylent gael eu gohirio am wythnos er mwyn caniatáu digon o amser i baratoi.

Mynegodd **IACC** gefnogaeth i'r ymagwedd at Ddatganiadau Tir Cyffredin ac mae'n parhau i geisio ymgysylltu â'r Ymgeisydd. Ysgrifennodd **IACC** at yr Ymgeisydd o ganol mis Medi tan yn gynnar ym mis Hydref, trwy gyfres o lythyrau wedi'u seilio ar themâu a phynciau, sy'n aros am ymateb, er mwyn iddo allu cyfrannu'n sylweddol at y Datganiadau Tir Cyffredin.

Mae **IACC** yn cytuno â phwysigrwydd yr Adroddiad ar Effeithiau Lleol ac mae'n gweithio arno. Mae **IACC** yn cytuno â'r amserlen a awgrymwyd gan y Panel ar hyn o bryd; ond nid yw'n gallu cydymffurfio ag unrhyw ddyddiad cynharach a awgrymwyd, oherwydd ei fod yn gorfod ymdrin â'r cais ar gyfer Wylfa Newydd a'r cais ar gyfer Cysylltiad Gogledd Cymru.

Roedd **IACC** yn cytuno â phwysigrwydd Gwrandawiadau Caffael Gorfodol, yn enwedig oherwydd ei bod yn ymddangos bod yr Ymgeisydd yn ceisio caffael tir priffyrdd yn orfodol, sy'n wahanol i'r arfer. Dywedodd **IACC** na fu unrhyw ymgysylltiad effeithiol ynglŷn â'r mater hwn, sydd â goblygiadau negyddol i faterion fel traffig a thwristiaeth ac y mae angen rhoi sylw iddo.

Dyweddodd **IACC**, o ran yr Atodlen Mesurau Lliniaru, fod y map mesurau lliniaru yn anodd ei ddeall a'i bod yn anodd darganfod yn union beth sy'n digwydd o ran mesurau lliniaru a ble y bydd mesurau lliniaru'n cael eu gweithredu trwy'r Cod(au) Ymarfer Adeiladu.

Mynegodd **IACC** gefnogaeth i sylwadau Heddlu Gogledd Cymru ar y Cytundeb Adran 106 arfaethedig, a phwysleisiodd yr angen i neilltuo digon o amser i'w baratoi.

Gwnaeth **APP** sylwadau ar Eitem 5(a) yr Agenda, sef Cwestiynau Ysgrifenedig, a gofynnodd am ymrwymiad i lunio'r Datganiad Rheol 8 o fewn 7 diwrnod o'r Cyfarfod Rhagarweiniol. Roedd yr Ymgeisydd yn cydnabod yr angen am gyfieithu'r ddogfen hon. Fodd bynnag, mae'n credu na ddylai'r angen am gyfieithu olygu na allai'r prif gyrff y cyfeirir y cwestiynau hynny atynt dderbyn y cwestiynau cyn iddynt gael eu cyfieithu.

Ymatebodd **FF** drwy ddweud y byddai'r cwestiynau ysgrifenedig yn cael eu cyhoeddi ar yr un pryd mewn fformat dwyieithog. Fodd bynnag, dywedodd **FF** fod yr ExA wedi cyhoeddi agenda atodol ar gyfer y Gwrandawriad Caniatâd Datblygu drafft a gynhelir drannoeth, sy'n cynnwys y cwestiynau ysgrifenedig ynglŷn â'r Gorchymyn Caniatâd Datblygu drafft, a ddylai fod yn ddefnyddiol.

Esboniodd **APP**, o ran Datganiadau Tir Cyffredin ac yn enwedig y Datganiad Cyffredinedd, fod Datganiad Tir Cyffredin wedi'i gytuno â 2 barti ar hyn o bryd, a bod 20 yn cael eu trafod gyda rhanddeiliaid a chyda 3 grŵp sy'n cynrychioli'r iaith Gymraeg. Mae'r Ymgeisydd yn bwriadu darparu Datganiad Cyffredinedd drafft erbyn Terfyn Amser 5.

Esboniodd **APP**, o ran Cynrychiolaethau Ysgrifenedig ac Adroddiadau ar yr Effaith Leol, fod cyflwyno erbyn Terfyn Amser 2, fel y cynigir ar hyn o bryd, yn rhoi 2 wythnos yn unig i'r Ymgeisydd ymateb i'r cwestiynau hynny. Nododd **APP** fod canllawiau sy'n ymwneud yn benodol ag Adroddiadau ar yr Effaith Leol yn datgan y dylid rhoi o leiaf 21 diwrnod i Awdurdodau ymateb, ac ni welai unrhyw reswm pam na ddylai hyn gael ei gymhwyso i Gynrychiolaethau Ysgrifenedig hefyd. Mae llythyr yr Ymgeisydd, dyddiedig 16 Hydref 2018, yn cynnig Terfyn Amser 1(a) newydd (27 Tachwedd 2018) a fyddai 1 wythnos cyn Terfyn Amser 1 (4 Rhagfyr 2018).

Cadarnhaodd **APP** ei barodrwydd i gadw Canllaw'r Ymgeisydd i'r Cais yn fyw a'i ddiweddarau'n barhaus drwy gydol yr Archwiliad, gan gynnwys rhoi gwybod am ddogfennau sy'n cael eu disodli a'u diweddarau.

Gofynnodd **APP** am gadarnhad o'r hyn yr oedd yr ExA ei eisiau mewn perthynas â'r Atodlen Caffael Gorfodol arfaethedig, ac awgrymodd ei fod yn trafod â'r Rheolwr Achos i egluro hyn.

Cadarnhaodd **APP** nad oedd ganddo sylwadau ynglŷn â'r **Adroddiad ar y Gobjygiadau i Safleoedd Ewropeaidd** (REIS).

Roedd **APP** o'r farn bod yr Atodlen Mesurau Lliniaru yn ddogfen ddefnyddiol a oedd yn mynd i'r afael â sut y byddai mesurau lliniaru'n cael eu hymsefydlu; fodd bynnag, byddai'n ceisio cadarnhad ynglŷn â beth yn union a ddisgwylir ganddo ar y cam hwn.

Gofynnodd **APP** a oedd angen y trosolwg byr o'r Gorchymyn Caniatâd Datblygu drafft yr oedd wedi'i baratoi yn y gwrandawriad i'w gynnal drannoeth.

Nododd **APP** fod newid i fynychwyr y Gwrandawriad Llawr Agored ar 24 Hydref 2018.

Cyfeiriodd **APP** at gais Cyngor Sir Ynys Môn bod Gwrandawriadau Mater Penodol mis Ionawr yn cael eu gohirio am wythnos, a dywedodd y byddai'r Ymgeisydd yn fodlon ar hynny.

Gofynnodd **APP** hefyd i agendâu gwrandawriad gael eu llunio cyn y Nadolig, ac os nad oedd hyn yn bosibl, fod y gwrandawiadau'n cael eu gohirio am wythnos.

Gofynnodd **APP** i'r gwrandawiadau a drefnwyd ar gyfer 4-7 Mawrth gael eu cynnal wythnos yn gynt, sef 25 Chwefror 2018, o ganlyniad i faterion rheoli dyddiadur a esboniwyd yn llythyr yr Ymgeisydd, dyddiedig 16 Hydref 2018 [EV-006], mewn ymateb i lythyr Rheol 6 yr ExA.

Nid oedd gan **APP** unrhyw sylwadau ynglŷn ag Archwiliadau Safle Di-Gwmni; ond dywedodd y canlynol mewn perthynas â'r Archwiliad Safle gyda Chwmni:

1. Bydd angen i'r Ymgeisydd gael caniatâd tirlfeddianwyr ar gyfer rhai safleoedd os nad oes ganddo ganiatâd eisoes, ac felly byddai gofynion diogelwch yn berthnasol.
2. Fel arfer, y ffordd orau o gynnal ymweliadau safle yw mewn cerbyd gyriant pedair olwyn, er mwyn cyrraedd golygfannau nad yw'n bosibl eu cyrraedd mewn cerbydau safonol. Gall yr Ymgeisydd ddarparu 3 cherbyd oddi ar y ffordd yn unig, felly; 3 gyrrwr a 3 chynrychiolydd yr Ymgeisydd, gyda lle i 11 teithiwr arall. Ar ôl cyfrif am y 5 Arolygydd, mae hynny'n gadael lle i 6 chynrychiolydd o grwpiau eraill. Dywedodd **APP** y byddai'n ddefnyddiol gwybod pwy fyddai'r bobl eraill hynny cyn gynted â phosibl ac y byddai'n ddymunol cael gwybod pwy fyddai'n mynychu'r Archwiliad Safle gyda Chwmni erbyn Terfyn Amser 1 yn hytrach na Therfyn Amser 2.

Dywedodd **IACC** ei fod wedi gweld y cais am derfyn amser newydd ar gyfer yr Adroddiad ar yr Effaith Leol ac wedi rhoi ystyriaeth iddo; fodd bynnag, rhwng dechrau mis Medi a dechrau mis Hydref, anfonodd Cyngor Sir Ynys Môn 13 llythyr manwl a phenodol i bwnc at yr Ymgeisydd, yn amlinellu ei safbwynt ar y prif faterion yn ymwneud â'r Adroddiad ar yr Effaith Leol, ond nid oedd wedi derbyn ymateb. O ganlyniad, mae'r Ymgeisydd yn ymwybodol o'r materion a fydd yn cael eu codi yn yr Adroddiad ar yr Effaith Leol ac oherwydd ei lwyth gwaith a'r problemau adnoddau a grybwyllwyd yn gynharach yn y cyfarfod, nid yw Cyngor Sir Ynys Môn yn gallu cytuno â dyddiad cynharach ar gyfer cyflwyno'r Adroddiad ar yr Effaith Leol.

Roedd **LIC** yn cefnogi safbwynt Cyngor Sir Ynys Môn ynglŷn â pheidio â newid dyddiad Terfyn Amser 2.

Esboniodd **LIC** ei chefnogaeth i'r pwyntiau a wnaed gan Gyngor Sir Ynys Môn a Heddlu De Cymru ynglŷn â'r Cytundeb Adran 106 arfaethedig a'r angen am ymgysylltiad cynnar a Gwrandawriad Pwnc Penodol ynglŷn â'r mater hwn.

Roedd **LIC** hefyd yn cefnogi pwyntiau Cyngor Sir Ynys Môn ynglŷn â'r map mesurau lliniaru yn yr Atodlen Mesurau Lliniaru. Mae'r manylion yn bwysig ac mae angen i Lywodraeth Cymru eu cael yn fuan.

Roedd **LIC** yn cefnogi gohirio dyddiadau gwrandawiadau mis Ionawr am wythnos oherwydd y byddai gwyliau'r Nadolig yn sicr o amharu â'r amserlen. Fodd bynnag, pe na byddai modd gohirio'r gwrandawiadau hyn am wythnos am unrhyw reswm, mae Llywodraeth Cymru'n cytuno y byddai'n bwysig iawn o leiaf gwybod pa bynciau a fyddai'n cael eu trafod er mwyn caniatáu amser i baratoi, cyn gwyliau'r Nadolig.

Esboniodd **LIC**, o ran gwrandawiadau mis Mawrth, na fyddai Mr Corner ar gael pe byddent yn cael eu cynnal wythnos yn gynt, sef 25 Chwefror 2018,. At hynny, trwy ohirio gwrandawiadau mis Rhagfyr am wythnos a chynnal gwrandawiadau mis Mawrth wythnos yn gynt, byddai rhai problemau rhaglennu'n codi a fyddai'n anodd eu datrys.

Dywedodd **NRW** pe byddai dyddiadau gwrandawiadau mis Ionawr yn cael eu newid, na fyddai adfocad Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru ar gael i gynrychioli'r corff ar y dyddiadau arfaethedig newydd. Gofynnodd Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru hefyd i bynciau'r gwrandawriad gael eu cyhoeddi cyn gwyliau'r Nadolig.

Dywedodd **NWP** y byddai'n gwneud ei orau i fodloni Terfyn Amser 2 o ran ei Ddatganiad Tir Cyffredin, ond ni allai ddweud pe allai gytuno ar lawer cyn hynny.

Gofynnodd **FF** a hoffai unrhyw barti wneud sylwadau ychwanegol ar yr hyn a ddywedwyd am gyflwyniadau ysgrifenedig, gwrandawiadau neu archwiliadau safle.

Dywedodd **Teresa Hughes**, ar ran **Ymddiriedolaeth Bywyd Gwylt Gogledd Cymru** (NWWT), na fyddai'n gallu bodloni dyddiad cynharach ar gyfer Terfyn Amser 2 o ran y cwestiynau ysgrifenedig oherwydd diffyg adnoddau, a chredai y byddai sefyllfa debyg yn berthnasol i bartion â buddiant eraill annibynnol.

8. Materion Trawsffiniol

Esboniodd **PB** fod y Panel yn ymwybodol bod y rheoliadau **Asesu Effeithiau Amgylcheddol** (EIA) yn gosod cyfrifoldebau ar yr Ysgrifennydd Gwladol dros Fusnes, Ynni a Strategaeth Ddiwydiannol o ran effeithiau trawsffiniol y datblygiad arfaethedig hwn ar yr amgylchedd mewn gwladwriaethau eraill yr **Ardal Economaidd Ewropeaidd** (EEA). Mae'r dyletswyddau hyn ar wahân i rai'r ExA wrth archwilio'r cais am ganiatâd datblygu ac wrth wneud argymhelliad i'r Ysgrifennydd Gwladol.

Dyweddodd **PB** fod yr Arolygiaeth Gynllunio (ar ran yr Ysgrifennydd Gwladol) wedi dilyn y prosesau sgrinio a hysbysu trawsffiniol a amlinellir yn ei Nodyn Cyngor 12, sy'n cynnwys trefniadau arbennig ar gyfer **Prosiectau Seilwaith o Arwyddocâd Cenedlaethol** (NSIP) gorsaf cynhyrchu trydan niwclear. Mae'r trefniadau arbennig hyn yn mynnu bod yr holl wladwriaethau EEA perthnasol a llofnodwyr confensiynau UNECE Espoo ac Aarhus yn cael gwybod bod ganddynt hawl i gymryd rhan ym mhroses archwilio'r DCO os hoffent wneud hynny.

Dyweddodd **PB** fod nifer o Gynrychiolaethau Perthnasol wedi cael eu gwneud gan unigolion a sefydliadau o'r tu allan i'r Deyrnas Unedig, a bod yr unigolion a'r sefydliadau hynny'n cael cyfle i gymryd rhan yn yr Archwiliad fel Parti â Buddiant.

Esboniodd **PB** fod y Panel hefyd wedi achub ar y cyfle i estyn gwahoddiad i'r cyfarfod rhagarweiniol hwn i asiantaethau'r llywodraeth a oedd wedi mynegi dymuniad i gymryd rhan o dan weithdrefnau EIA trawsffiniol ond a ddewisodd beidio â chofrestru fel Parti â Buddiant, ymhlith eraill. Byddai eu cyfranogiad pellach yn ôl disgrisiwn yr ExA, ond trwy eu gwahodd i'r Cyfarfod Rhagarweiniol, byddent hefyd yn cael copi o amserlen yr Archwiliad (ac unrhyw amrywiadau iddi).

Nododd **PB** fod y rhwymedigaethau o dan y confensiynau Espoo ac Aarhus yn parhau, ac y byddant yn dod i ben dim ond pan fydd yr Ysgrifennydd Gwladol, sef yr awdurdod penderfynu ar gyfer y DCO, yn gwneud y penderfyniad. Roedd y camau a ddilynwyd yn cydymffurfio â'r trefniadau arbennig ar gyfer gorsafedd cynhyrchu trydan niwclear ac fe'u cymerwyd i geisio hwyluso cyfranogiad llawn partion ac unigolion o'r tu allan i'r Deyrnas Unedig yn y broses archwilio os oeddent yn dymuno.

Caeodd **PB** yr eitem trwy ofyn a oedd unrhyw gwestiynau ynglŷn â threfniadau'r ExA ar gyfer ymdrin ag effeithiau trawsffiniol.

Nid unrhyw gwestiynau ynglŷn â materion trawsffiniol.

9. Unrhyw Faterion Eraill

Cyfeiriodd **APP** at ei bwynt blaenorol ynglŷn ag ymgynghori â chyrrff sy'n cynrychioli'r iaith Gymraeg, sy'n byw yn Ynys Môn ac y byddai'r datblygiad arfaethedig yn effeithio arnynt. Mae'r Ymgeisydd wedi amlygu 3 chorff ar hyn o bryd, ond nododd fod nifer o gynrychiolwyr eraill yr iaith Gymraeg yn ffurfio Datganiad Tir Cyffredin hefyd. Mae'r rhain yn cynnwys Cyngor Sir Ynys Môn, Llywodraeth Cymru, Partneriaeth Cynghorau Gogledd Ynys Môn, Cynghorau Cymuned Llanbadrig a Mechell a Bwrdd Uchelgais Economaidd Gogledd Cymru.

Dyweddodd **JD** fod yr ExA wedi amlygu cyrff penodol sy'n cynrychioli'r iaith Gymraeg a fethwyd gan yr Ymgeisydd, fel Fforwm Iaith Strategol Ynys Môn, Menter Iaith Môn a Chymdeithas yr Iaith Gymraeg.

Cydnabu **APP** fod y cyrff hyn, ac yn enwedig Fforwm yr Iaith Gymraeg a Chymdeithas yr Iaith Gymraeg, wedi cael eu hepgor o'r rhestr o ganlyniad i bryderon ynglŷn â ph'un a ellid cytuno ar Ddatganiadau Tir Cyffredin o fewn y raddfa amser a roddwyd gan y Panel. Esboniodd **APP** fod Fforwm yr Iaith Gymraeg, er enghraifft, yn gymdeithas sy'n cynrychioli nifer o wahanol grwpiau. Ailadroddodd **APP** fod croeso i'r partion hyn gyflwyno cynrychiolaeth ysgrifenedig; yr unig gwestiwn yw p'un a fyddant yn llunio Datganiadau Tir Cyffredin. Esboniodd **APP** pam yr oedd yn credu mai'r cyrff sy'n cynrychioli'r iaith Gymraeg a ddewiswyd ganddo oedd y rhai mwyaf priodol; ond mae'n fodlon trafod ag unrhyw un arall sy'n cynrychioli'r iaith Gymraeg.

Roedd **Nia Wyn Thomas**, a oedd yn cynrychioli **Menter Iaith Môn** (MIM), eisiau siarad yn Gymraeg a darparwyd cyfieithiad ar y pryd. Roedd **MIM** eisiau gwahodd yr Ymgeisydd i sgwrs i esbonio nad yw'n ystyried y fenter iaith Gymraeg fel cymdeithas ond fel menter ragweithiol, a'i bod eisiau cyfrannu fel grŵp at y trafodaethau hyn.

Tynnodd **IACC** sylw at Baragraff 1.4 llythyr Mr Williams, dyddiedig 9 Awst 2018, ynglŷn â chyfranogiad dwyieithog ac i bwysleisio pwysigrwydd y mater hwn i Gyngor Sir Ynys Môn. Pwysleisiodd **IACC** bwysigrwydd sicrhau na fyddai unrhyw un sy'n cyflwyno cynrychiolaeth yn Gymraeg yn cael ei roi dan anfantais gan y rheiny nad ydynt yn gyfarwydd â'r iaith; deall beth mae'r cynrychiolaethau hyn yn ei ddweud a bod yr ExA ystyried sut y gellid ymdrin â hyn. Dywedodd **IACC** fod oddeutu 70,000 o bobl yn byw ar Ynys Môn. Byddai adeiladu'r prosiect hwn yn gofyn am oddeutu 40,000 o unigolion a fyddai'n cyrraedd i weithio ar yr ynys. Byddai llawer ohonynt yn cael eu lletya ar ran ogleddol yr ynys. Mae'r effaith yn arwyddocaol o bosibl ac yn haeddu ystyriaeth arbennig.

Roedd **LIC** yn cefnogi pwysigrwydd y pwynt a wnaed yn flaenorol gan Gyngor Sir Ynys Môn ynglŷn â'r iaith Gymraeg.

Esboniodd **LIC**, o ran trafodion y gwrandawriad Gorchymyn Caniatâd Datblygu drafft ar 24 Hydref 2018, fod Llywodraeth Cymru wedi gosod ei phrif bwyntiau ynglŷn â geiriad y Gorchymyn Caniatâd Datblygu drafft mewn nodyn a anfonwyd at yr Ymgeisydd, ac roedd yn meddwl tybed a fyddai'n ddefnyddiol i'r ExA ei weld cyn y gwrandawriad drannoeth.

Cytunodd **FF** y byddai'n ddefnyddiol, a gofynnodd i Lywodraeth Cymru ei anfon at y Tîm Achos i'w gyhoeddi ar wefan yr Arolygiaeth Gynllunio y noson honno, fel y byddai pawb yn cael cyfle i'w ddarllen cyn y gwrandawriad.

Diolchodd **FF** i bawb am gymryd rhan yn y cyfarfod. Dywedodd **FF** y byddai'n anfon llythyr (llythyr Rheol 8) cyn gynted ag y bo'n ymarferol

bosibl, a fydd yn cadarnhau'r amserlen ac unrhyw benderfyniadau gweithdrefnol eraill a allai gael eu gwneud gan yr ExA o ganlyniad i'r trafodaethau yn y Cyfarfod Rhagarweiniol.

Daeth y Cyfarfod Rhagarweiniol i ben am 12:15pm.

WYLFA NEWYDD PROJECT

PRELIMINARY MEETING NOTE

Summary of Key Points Discussed and Advice Given

Application	Proposed Wylfa Newydd Nuclear Power Station
Reference	EN01007
Time and Date	10.00am 22 October 2018
Venue	Anglesey Showground, Gwalchmai, Holyhead, LL65 4RW

This meeting note is not a full transcript of the Preliminary Meeting. It is a summary of the key points discussed and responses given. An audio recording of the event is available on the National Infrastructure Planning website.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Frances Fernandes (FF), lead member of the Panel forming the **Examining Authority** (ExA) opened the Preliminary Meeting, welcomed those present and explained the practical arrangements for the meeting, including arrangements for simultaneous translation from Welsh to English.

FF introduced herself as the lead member of the Panel, appointed by the Secretary of State for the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government and the other members of the Panel: **Peter Braithwaite** (PB), **Joanna Dowling** (JD), **Michael Hayes** (MH) and **Clive Sproule** (CS).

FF explained that this was the Preliminary Meeting for the application made by Horizon Nuclear Power for the Wylfa Newydd project and explained that all five Panel members would participate in the meeting and that each would be fully engaged and active in the examination through consideration of written material, listening to oral submissions and leading subsequent hearings.

FF explained that a five person panel has been appointed by the Secretary of State for the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government to be the ExA for this examination. The panel has a wide range of experience; including working in different planning regimes. in examinations of other national infrastructure projects in both Wales and England and one Panel member had taken part in the examination of the Hinkley Point C nuclear power station application.

FF explained that **CS** is an inspector from the Planning Inspectorate Welsh office. He is a Welsh speaker as are two of the Case Team. A Welsh language translator was also present and was introduced. The Welsh and English languages have equal status in Wales and people were welcome

to participate in Welsh and simultaneous translation to English was available via the headsets in the room. An audio recording of the proceedings will be available on the Planning Inspectorate website soon after the meeting.

FF explained that the purpose of the meeting was to consider procedural issues in relation to the way the examination should be run, including the timetable, only, and not to discuss the merits of the proposal.

FF explained that the Panel had read the application documents and all the Relevant Representations, and that these were very helpful in enabling them to prepare for the meeting.

FF announced that **the Applicant** (APP) had made a submission regarding possible changes to the application and this would be discussed as an additional item at the end of Item 3 of the agenda.

2. Remarks about the Examination Process

FF explained that the Planning Act 2008 (PA2008) brought in a distinct regime for the consideration of proposed Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects and, because not everyone would be familiar with the PA2008 procedures, outlined how the Panel would proceed.

FF explained that the Panel will consider both the application and all representations made to them about it. They will investigate matters they think are important and relevant to their final conclusions and recommendation; particularly those that are contentious, during the next 6 months. At the close of the examination the ExA has 3 months to report to the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy with their conclusions and recommendation as to whether consent should be given. It is the Secretary of State who will take the final decision. No decisions have been taken by the Panel about the merits of the application.

FF made clear that it is an inquisitorial process, in which the Panel takes the lead in establishing what is important and relevant to the decision which the Secretary of State needs to take and is also a largely written process.

FF explained that following the PM she would issue the Rule 8 letter, made under The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010, which would include the Panel's written questions to a range of parties, drawn on the Panel's own examination of the application documents and the Relevant Representations made by many Interested Parties and Statutory Consultees and organised according to the Panel's Initial Assessment of Principal Issues. It was noted that if the Panel asks a question which covers the same ground as a point which an Interested

Parties wished to make in their Written Representation, then they should ensure that they answer the question in the terms that is asked. Interested Persons may still include the point in their Written Representation, but consistency of response is important.

FF pointed out that the Rule 8 letter sets a deadline for the receipt of responses to those questions. Once responses are received, they will be published on the Project page of the Planning Inspectorate website.

FF confirmed the intention to hold a number of hearings, the first of these on Wednesday (24 October 2018) to consider the draft Development Consent Order and then two Open Floor hearings on Thursday (25 October 2018).

FF explained that these hearings should be understood as building on the foundations of the Written Representations, questions and comments. Interested parties should seek to engage fully throughout the written processes rather than wait for a particular hearing as an opportunity to influence the proceedings. Parties should also follow the documentation of evidence as it appears on the Project page of the Planning Inspectorate website so that they can see how the examination is progressing.

FF explained that it is the ExA's duty to ensure that the examination is even-handed and rigorous. There will be a significant number of written questions. These will be wide-ranging, some of them focussed on quite fundamental issues, some of them addressing quite detailed points.

FF announced that the ExA will undertake site inspections during the next 6 months of the examination which can either be accompanied or unaccompanied. Yesterday (22 October 2018), the ExA undertook a full day of unaccompanied site inspections, in order to familiarise themselves with elements of the application. The ExA visited amongst other places:

- The proposed park and ride site at Dalar Hir;
- Caergybii (including Parc Cybi);
- Porth-y-Pistall and Cemlyn Bay; and
- Wylfa Head, Tregele, Cemaes and Amlwch.

A short note of the areas the ExA visited, the time of day and the weather conditions will be published on the Project page of the Planning Inspectorate website.

FF explained that the report which goes to the Secretary of State will have as its core the ExA's recommendation as to whether the draft Development Consent Order should be approved. It will also contain recommendations on what land should be subject to compulsory acquisition if the Secretary of State approves the Development Consent Order. Even if the ExA does not recommend that consent should be given, it is still required to put forward what it considers to be the most appropriate Development Consent Order in the event that the Secretary

of State goes against that recommendation. The important point is that all matters relating to the draft Development Consent Order are integral parts of the Examination.

FF explained that the ExA does not intend to duplicate matters that fall within the remit of the bodies responsible for nuclear regulation in Wales. These bodies include the Office for Nuclear Regulation and Natural Resources Wales. The National Policy Statement for Nuclear Power Generation EN-6, section 2.7, sets the responsibilities of these organisations out in more detail. It is not within the ExA's remit to look at or question government policy on nuclear power.

FF explained that recent events, the examination library and the examination timetable can all be found on the Planning Inspectorate website. Access to the website can be found across North Wales and Anglesey via various libraries.

3. Additional information in response to s51 advice and procedural requests

PB explained that in response to advice given under s51 of the PA2008 the Planning Inspectorate accepted the application as fit for examination. Subsequently, the Applicant has submitted several updated documents. These include:

- Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment Report Addendum [AS-010],
- updated Book of Reference [AS-012, AS-013, AS-014],
- updated Land Plans [AS-009]; and
- updated Explanatory Memorandum to the draft Development Consent Order [AS-011].

These documents have been formally accepted by the ExA into the Examination. If any interested party wishes to make comments on these specific documents, they are asked to do so as part of their Written Representations by Deadline 2 (4 December 2018).

PB outlined a number of procedural decisions made by the ExA as set out in Annex E of the Rule 6 letter. These include:

- Notification of the Development Consent Order hearing and two Open Floor hearings.
- Request for a Statements of Common Ground with organisations representing the Welsh Language.
- Requests to become interested parties under s102B(4) of PA2008.

Additional Item – Proposed changes to the application

FF explained that on 17 October the Applicant notified the ExA that it wished to make two changes to the application in relation to the Blasting Strategy and Marine Vessel Movements. Furthermore, it was considering three further changes to be submitted later in the examination. The Applicant's letter is published on the Project page of the Planning Inspectorate website.

FF pointed out that the ExA are appointed to examine and report on the application as submitted and cannot examine a materially different project. To explain the context further, paragraph 106 of the Examination Guidance states:

"When an Applicant submits a proposed change to a proposal, the Secretary of State will need to decide on the materiality of the change and whether it is of such a degree that it constitutes a new project or whether it can still be considered under the existing application."

FF introduced the two written requests for what the Applicant describes as non-material changes to the Blasting Strategy and Marine Vessel Movements as set out in Appendix 1 and 2 of the Applicant's letter of 17 October 2018 [AS-019].

FF asked the Applicant to briefly confirm what was set out in Appendix 1 and 2.

Michael Humphries QC (APP), representing the Applicant stated that the two requests for non-material changes relate to detailed aspects of the construction of the power station. In relation to the Blasting Strategy, the Applicant wished to change the current proposed blasting from between 10:00-16:00 Monday-Friday and 10:00-13:00 on to 09:00-19:00 Monday-Friday and 09:00-13:00 on Saturdays.

APP explained that the first proposal times reflected Welsh Government's Minerals Technical Advice Note, the second proposal relates more to the British Standards for mineral working. **APP** emphasised that there would be no additional blasting beyond the maximum of the three blasts per day originally proposed.

APP explained that the second proposed change relates to the use of the Marine Off Loading Facility (MOLF) in order to increase accessibility from the sea, during the construction phase. **APP** stated that originally 2 vessels a day were to be the average; however, in reality this would not be the case and there could be up to 8 vessels (16 movements) every day. The second request is therefore to increase movements to a maximum of 16 per day. It was emphasised that the total of weekly movements would remain the same overall, some days might see several movements and others none; it would be an average.

FF asked the Applicant whether it had any questions on the timetabling with respect to the two changes. **APP** explained that although there was

no statutory requirement for consultation in regard to these changes, it did so anyway and that it was now for the ExA to decide.

FF requested a timescale from the Applicant with regard to the potential further change requests. **APP** responded that in order to finalise the work and allow 28 days for consultation the target was mid-January (Deadline 4).

FF asked if any other party wished to comment in relation to the Applicant's proposed timing in respect of these two change requests; no comments made.

FF requested the Applicant to summarise the three changes proposed, in relation to shift patterns, heavy goods deliveries and main site work hours, as set out in paragraphs 9-30 of the Applicant's letter dated 17 October 2018.

APP explained that consideration was being given to the following possible change submissions:

1. Shift patterns

The previous proposed shift patterns were found to overlap and the Applicant was advised by Menter Newydd that this would be unproductive. Originally three shift patterns of 10 hour shifts were proposed and the Applicant was now proposing 2 staggered day shifts and 1 night shift both 10.5 hours in 2020 and three day shifts (10.5 hours) and 2 night shifts (10 hours) in 2023 [REP1-014]

2. Main site working hours

The Applicant was proposing extended hours in respect of general earth works, marine piling, MOLF construction, site establishment, deep excavation and support facilities in order to provide more flexibility and efficiency during construction.

3. HGV movements

Proposed request to extend hours for HGV movements during the week and add an additional Saturday delivery window. Emphasis again that the number of HGV movements would remain the same, the extended hours would allow for greater flexibility and efficiency.

FF explained the ExA would consider the submissions from the Applicant and would set out how it intends to proceed in its Rule 8 letter.

4. Initial Assessment of Principal Issues

MH explained the Panel's initial assessment of principal issues arising from the application was circulated as Annex B of the Planning Inspectorate letter dated 25 September 2018. Paragraph 43 of the

Planning Act 2008: *Guidance for the Examination of Applications for Development Consent* (MHLG 2015) makes clear 'it will not be a definitive statement of the issues to be considered' since the ExA must be free to hear all evidence that it believes is relevant to its consideration of the case.

MH explained that the list of principle issues was broadly based on the matters set out in the National Policy Statements for Energy (EN-1) and for Nuclear Power Generation (EN-6) and the ExA's own initial assessment. It was a preliminary list, presented in alphabetical order without any priority weighting. Whilst this list is likely to form the basis of the ExA's report, it may not necessarily ask for information on each of these issues during the examination. The ExA will only ask questions where it has a query or wishes to seek further information. If the examination is quiet on certain subject areas, it does not mean that they are being ignored.

APP confirmed it had no comments to make on the principle issues set out in Annexe B.

MH explained that the ExA had received a number of submissions in relation to their initial assessment of principle issues, from amongst others the **Isle of Anglesey County Council, Welsh Government, Mr Roger Dobson (RD)** and **North Wales Police**. Following remarks from each of these, other parties in attendance would then be invited to each briefly outline their submission.

Timothy Corner QC (WG) introduced himself as the advocate for the Welsh Government and stated that it had raised in their Relevant Representation:

- flood risk;
- IT and broadband;
- traffic – particularly that it might be appropriate to make clear in the list of issues that the highway network referred to in the list includes the Strategic Trunk Road Network; and
- cumulative impact.

Martin Kingston QC (IACC) introduced himself as the advocate for Isle of Anglesey County Council. **IACC** drew attention to Mr Williams' letter of 12 October 2018 to the Planning Inspectorate [EV-003]. It wished to underline the concerns raised in the letter. **IACC** commented how, although there are many topics, currently there were no spatial specific considerations. The Isle of Anglesey County Council was particularly concerned about impacts on North Anglesey where the burden of many of the issues raised in the letter are born. **IACC** suggested a topic which would relate spatially and specifically to North Anglesey and, further, that cumulative impacts are a significant concern for the region and especially North Anglesey.

IACC then referred to socio economic effects, which, from the Council's point of view, are extraordinarily important issues; many headings within 'Socio Economic Effects' are considered major issues in themselves, for example, employment, training, housing, tourism and Welsh language. Isle of Anglesey County Council believes the implication of the Welsh legislative context, principally the Wellbeing of Future Generations Act 2015, will require specific consideration.

IACC stated there is also a need for consideration of the up-to-date Joint Development Plan and supplementary planning guidance, which have specifically considered Wylfa Newydd and its implications and which Isle of Anglesey County Council believe should be identified for consideration.

IACC referred again to Mr Williams's letter, and emphasised the importance to the Council of delivering a legacy from Wylfa Newydd. The Isle of Anglesey County Council's support is predicated on the assumption that in the end there will be appropriate benefit to employment and other issues and it believes that how that legacy plays out will be a very significant matter.

IACC made a final point in relation to the North Wales Connection Project, which had recently been accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate. The County Council's concern lies with the extent to which these two projects are appropriately meshing with one another.

Mr Roger Dobson (RD) introduced himself as representative for not just himself, as an owner of a property within close proximity to the Wylfa Newydd development site, but also as a representative for Llanbadrig Community Council.

RD stated that because he recognised that he may hold a personal bias and potential prejudicial view on the development he had been given a special dispensation by the Standards Committee of Isle of Anglesey County Council to speak on behalf of the Community Council.

RD raised the following issues:

1. North Anglesey Partnership of Community and Town Councils have concerns about the lack of information provided by Horizon, in particular impacts on 67 receptors in Tregele and Cemaes, which would suffer adverse effects for 8 years; and about potential serious vibrations; **RD** wrote to Horizon regarding this on 01 July 2018, but has not received a response.
2. The Horizon Neighbourhood Support Scheme (2014) which Mr Dobson and those he represents believe to be out of date.
3. The impact on local communities, in particular Cemaes, Tregele and Llanfechell, from the 4,000 contractors anticipated to be living on site and the 9,000 working on site.
4. Traffic impacts on the A5025.

5. Changing shift patterns – there is no suggestion about changing the number of working hours, which are considered to be excessive and unsafe.

Jennifer Holgate representing **North Wales Police** (NWP) stated that **NWP** were concerned about:

1. Draft Development Consent Order (Principle Issue 5) should require specific time on more than one occasion for discussion of the proposed Section 106 Agreement and its relationship to achieving the mitigation identified in the draft Development Consent Order.
2. Socio Economic Effects –North Wales Police support previous comments by the Isle of Anglesey County Council and have prepared a detailed assessment of the development on the police force which will be submitted at Deadline 1.
3. Traffic and Transport –North Wales Police is concerned that data utilised in the submitted transport assessment may be underestimated. North Wales Police have instructed an independent transport consultancy to fully review this information and test its accuracy. It requests an Issue Specific Hearing as soon as possible into whether the transport assessment is indeed fit for purpose.
4. Cumulative effects between Wylfa Newydd and the North Wales Connection DCO should be a principle issue in their own right. North Wales Police as well as other parties are carrying out a more detailed cumulative assessment to ensure that it is robust. Consideration should be given as to whether this should be allocated as an Issue Specific Hearing at an earlier stage if possible.

MH thanked North Wales Police and emphasised the importance of the Statement of Common Ground and of submitting documents that are not yet in examination as early as possible; in particular the supplementary planning guidance in relation to North Anglesey (*Wylfa Newydd : Supplementary Planning Guidance*; May 2018) and the reports regarding socio economic issues.

Natural Resources Wales (NRW) were represented by advocate **Gwion Lewis** who raised 2 matters:

1. Flood risk – Natural Resources Wales agree with Welsh Government’s views on this issue.
2. Impact on water bodies – in particular issues arising under the Water Framework Directive.

Stephanie Hall, counsel for **Land and Lakes Limited** (LaL) stressed the need to assess reasonable alternatives – especially in relation to an off-site campus for temporary accommodation, rather than an on-site

campus, and that **LaL** will be scrutinising traffic impacts and socio economic effects in accordance with relevant local planning policy.

5. Draft timetable for the examination of the application

JD proposed to outline the ExA's draft timetable with regards to written submissions; **CS** would then outline the draft timetable for Hearings and **JD** would conclude by covering how the ExA propose to deal with Site Inspections.

JD explained that, in order to ensure everyone present understood the process, she proposed to proceed on the basis that this is the first experience of a nationally significant infrastructure project examination for all those present.

JD explained that the Examination is the period during which the ExA gather evidence and test information about the application from Interested Parties. The Examination process is primarily carried out in writing. However, where it is considered necessary or it is requested there is the opportunity for the ExA to hold Hearings

JD explained the ExA will issue written questions on the application. The aim of the written questions is to gather and clarify information about the application. They will be primarily for the Applicant, but there may also be questions for statutory bodies, local authorities and interested parties. Consequently, the ExA asks parties to look at the questions in their entirety. Should parties wish to contribute or comment on a question that is not directed to them they are more than welcome to do so. The Panel are happy to receive comments in Welsh or English for all written or oral submissions that parties may wish to make.

JD explained that if the ExA consider it necessary, they may issue more than one round of questions. As parties will see from item 14 on the draft timetable, a further round of written questions, if required, is currently pencilled in for January 2019. The ExA can also, if they consider it necessary, issue a specific request for information from named parties.

JD made parties aware that Deadline 2 is pencilled in for Tuesday 4 December 2018. On Deadline 2 amongst other things the ExA will expect the Statements of Common Ground and a Statement of Commonality of Statements of Common Ground to be submitted. A Statement of Common Ground is produced jointly by the Applicant and another interested party (usually a statutory body) setting out the areas of agreement and/or dispute between the parties. Statements of Common Ground are useful, even if there are only a few areas of agreements, as they enable the Panel to identify matters which are not in dispute or need not be the subject of further evidence.

JD stated that the Panel were aware that the applicant is in the process of preparing Statements of Common Ground with a number of organisations and further details of these can be found in the Statement of Common Ground Position Statement [APP-443/8.25] submitted with the application.

JD pointed out that in Annex E of the Rule 6 letter the Panel have requested that the Applicant explore the submission of a Statement of Common Ground with organisations that represent the Welsh language and who have submitted a Relevant Representation. **JD** noted that recent correspondence from the Applicant indicates that that they have started this process.

JD then asked the Applicant, in relation to point 22 of its letter of 16 October 2018, how it chose the 3 organisations to enter into a draft Statement of Common Ground on the Welsh language as the ExA notes that there are other organisations who have also made representations.

APP indicated it would have to take instructions on how the three organisations were identified and asked whether more time could be given in order to formulate a response. **JD** agreed and suggested that the Applicant might wish to co-ordinate with Isle of Anglesey County Council and Gwynedd County Council in responding to this question.

JD stated that the list of Statements of Common Ground may be added to during the course of the examination and should not be taken as precluding any interested party and the Applicant drafting a Statement of Common Ground that had not already been identified.

JD requested that the Applicant submit a Statement of Commonality of Statements of Common Ground, which provides a full list of all the Statements of Common Ground and their current status; what has been agreed; what remains outstanding and an indicative deadline for when agreement will be reached. All these documents are 'live' documents and the Panel expect that as negotiations and discussion progress that they will change. As a result the ExA have requested an update at Deadline 5 and the submission of the final Statements of Common Ground and Statement of Commonalty at Deadline 8.

JD pointed out that Deadline 2 is also when Interested Parties will need to submit their Written Representations. This is an opportunity for parties to set out their case and expand on any views provided in their Relevant Representations. Advice on this, and other matters pertaining to the examination, can be found in the Planning Inspectorates Advice Note 8 (*Overview of the nationally significant infrastructure planning process for members of the public and others*) which is available on the Planning Inspectorate website:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Advice-note-8.0.pdf>

JD added that if parties wish to speak at any of the Hearings or attend an Accompanied Site Inspection they will need to notify the Planning Inspectorate in writing by Deadline 2. At this Deadline the Panel will also expect the response to the ExA's first written questions and the submission of the Local Impact Reports.

JD explained that Local Impact Reports are prepared by local authorities affected by the application. It allows them to use their local knowledge and set out both the positive and negative impacts that they think the proposal would have on the local area and communities. A Local Impact Reports has a special status and, subject to it being submitted by the agreed deadline, the ExA must have regard to it.

JD asked the Applicant to note the request for the submission of a Compulsory Acquisition Schedule and a Schedule of Mitigation. These documents have been helpful at other examinations by providing an update on the progress of negotiations on these 'live' matters. A Compulsory Acquisition Schedule would provide an update on current objections and agreements on the land that the Applicant wishes to compulsorily acquire and where negotiations have been successfully completed.

JD explained that a Schedule of Mitigation would be very similar to the Mitigation Route map that the Applicant has already submitted with the application. However, this would bring together all embedded mitigation measures into one 'live' document, capturing the progress being made and providing a one stop update to the Panel as to where negotiations are; where agreement has been reached and what remains outstanding.

JD explained that the draft timetable indicates the ExA are requesting the Compulsory Acquisition Schedule to be updated at Deadlines 3, 4 and 5 with a final version being submitted at Deadline 8; and the Schedule of Mitigation to be updated at Deadline 5 with the final schedule being submitted at Deadline 7.

JD requested that parties review all other items under Deadline 2, and make note of any comments they may wish to make. There are a further eight deadlines where the Panel require information to be submitted. **JD** asked that parties review these deadline requirements and make notes of any comments that they may wish to make.

JD explained that a Report on the Impact on European Sites can be issued where there are likely significant effects on such sites. If there are no such effects then a No Significant Effects Report will be issued. The purpose of a Report on the Impact on European Sites is to set out what is agreed and what is still contentious in respect of sites of European significance and their protected characteristics – the purpose is not to reach a judgement about the merits of the application.

JD pointed out that item 25 on the draft timetable indicates the Report on the Impact on European Sites would be published on Wednesday 27 March 2019, and comments on the Report on the Impact on European Sites would be expected by Deadline 9, which would be Wednesday 10 April 2019.

JD stated the ExA proposes that the Applicant submit at each deadline a guide to the application. This is a working document which provides a colour coded list of the documents submitted at that date; citing both the Applicant and the Inspectorates document numbers and indicating either the latest version or when a new document was submitted and which documents it superseded.

6. Hearings

CS explained the PA2008 enables three different types of hearing to be held during the Examination:

- Open Floor Hearings;
- Issue Specific Hearings; and
- Compulsory Acquisition Hearings.

CS asked parties to note that it will be the ExA's intention to issue agendas for all hearings on the infrastructure pages of the Planning Inspectorate website about 5 days in advance of that hearing. **CS** then explained the purpose of each of the three hearing types.

1. Open Floor Hearings:

Under s.93 of the Planning Act 2008, Open Floor Hearings must be held if requested by any Interested Party. Their purpose is to enable each Interested Party to make oral representations about the application. As such the topics at an Open Floor Hearing are usually wide ranging. Anyone who speaks at an Open Floor Hearing should expect that the Panel will wish to ask them questions in respect of their representation.

Requests from Interested Parties to speak at any future Open Floor Hearing should be made by Deadline 2, 4 December 2018.

2. Issue Specific Hearings:

Issue Specific Hearings are held if the Panel decides that they are necessary to ensure adequate examination of the issue in question, or to ensure that an Interested Party has a fair chance to put their case.

3. Development Consent Order Hearings:

Held on a number of occasions during the examination to consider amendments to the draft Development Consent Order.

CS explained that the first Issue Specific Hearing would be the next day (23 October 2018) and would address the draft Development Consent Order. The purpose of the hearing would be to understand how the draft Development Consent Order is intended to work and what concerns the various parties might have in relation to it.

CS explained Development Consent Orders start as the Applicant's document, but the ExA must address its contents and make recommendations in relation to it, regardless of whether or not it recommends acceptance of the proposed scheme. It is important to understand that no party's position is disadvantaged by the discussions on the draft Development Consent Order, as it is a matter that must be addressed by the ExA in writing its report. All parties are encouraged to comment on the draft Development Consent Order even if they object to the proposal itself.

CS asked if any party wished to speak at any future Development Consent Order Issue Specific Hearing to notify the Planning Inspectorate by Deadline 2, 4 December 2018.

CS explained that further Issue Specific Hearings are expected to be held in the two weeks reserved for hearings in January and March 2019, and that the details of these Issue Specific Hearings would be notified to Interested Parties and the Applicant accordingly. Notification of a wish to speak at any future Issue Specific Hearing should be given by Deadline 2, 4 December 2018.

CS explained that Compulsory Acquisition hearings, must be held if requested by any affected person. The ExA anticipate that these hearings would be held in the second reserved week (March 2019). **CS** drew parties attention to the deadline for notifying the Panel of their wish to have a Compulsory Acquisition hearing by Deadline 2, 4 December 2018.

CS pointed out that details of all these dates, including the dates by which Interested Parties must give notice of their wish to be heard at any further Open Floor Hearing, Issue Specific Hearing or Compulsory Acquisition Hearing are given in Annex C of the ExA's letter, of 25 September 2018. Asking questions at any Issue Specific or Compulsory Acquisition hearing is at the Panel's discretion. Occasionally, the ExA may decide that cross-examination is desirable in a particular hearing even if they have had no submissions on that particular point. **CS** made it clear that the Panel would not be making any decisions at the Preliminary Hearing, but would decide on the day of the Hearing what the appropriate approach.

7. Site Inspections

JD explained the ExA undertook an unaccompanied site inspection on Monday 22 October 2018, where they observed the site and surroundings from a number of vantage points, all of which were on public land. It was intended that a note setting out what the Panel saw and when will be published on the project website later that day.

JD explained that the ExA propose to undertake further Unaccompanied Site Inspections over the next few months and an Accompanied Site Inspection. The ExA have set time aside for this Accompanied Site Inspection either in January (items 8-12 on the draft timetable) or March (items 18-22 on the draft timetable). One of the aims of the Accompanied Site Inspection would be to enable the Panel to visit and view sites that are not publicly accessible.

JD drew attention to Deadline 2 and asked parties to note a request for the submission of suggested location/sites for the Panel to include in either further Unaccompanied Site Inspections or as part of the Accompanied Site Inspection including the issues to be observed there, information on whether the site can be accessed from public land and the reasoning for why the Panel would need to visit each nominated site. Once the Panel have this information they will then be in a position to decide when it would be best to undertake these Inspections.

JD reiterated that if any Interested Parties wish to attend the Accompanied Site Inspection, they need to notify the Planning Inspectorate in writing by Deadline 2. The Accompanied Site Inspection will include some elements of walking and uneven terrain so anyone with mobility issues is asked to indicate this in their request to attend the Accompanied Site Inspection and the Panel will do what they can to accommodate their needs.

IACC commented that in this particular application they believe the Issue Specific Hearings will have an especially important role. **IACC** explained that they had failed to receive a response from the Applicant on numerous occasions, and that responses to their correspondence would be of great help to the Council; **IACC** agree with the ExA's approach, but question whether enough time has been set aside.

IACC commented on the timing of the first set of Issue Specific Hearings and suggested putting them back one week in order to ensure sufficient time for preparation.

IACC indicated support for the approach to Statements of Common Ground and continue to seek engagement with the Applicant. **IACC** wrote to the Applicant from the middle of September to early October, with a series of thematic and topic based letters, which are awaiting response, in

order to allow them to contribute substantially to the Statements of Common Ground.

IACC agreed with the importance of the Local Impact Report and are working on it. **IACC** agree with the timetable currently suggested by the Panel; but are not able to comply with any suggested earlier date, as a consequence of having to deal with both the application for Wylfa Newydd and the application for the North Wales Connection.

IACC agreed with the importance of Compulsory Acquisition Hearings, particularly because the Applicant appeared to be attempting to compulsorily acquire highway land, which is not the usual way of proceeding. **IACC** stated that there has been no effective engagement on this issue, which has negative implications on matters such as traffic and tourism and requires attention.

IACC stated in relation to the Schedule of Mitigation, that the mitigation map is difficult to understand and discover what exactly is happening with mitigation and where mitigation will be implemented through the Code(s) of Construction Practice.

IACC expressed support for the North Wales Police comments on the proposed Section 106 Agreement and stressed the need for adequate time to be set aside for its preparation.

APP commented on Agenda Item 5(a), Written Questions and requested that a commitment be made to producing the Rule 8 Statement within 7 days of the Preliminary Meeting. The Applicant recognised the need for translation of this document. However it believes the need for translation should not mean the principal bodies to which those questions are directed could not receive the questions prior to translation.

FF responded that the written questions would be published simultaneously in bilingual format. **FF** observed, however, that the ExA had published a supplementary agenda for the draft Development Consent Hearing on the following day, which contained the written questions in relation to the draft Development Consent Order and this ought to be helpful.

APP explained in relation to Statements of Common Ground and in particular the Statement of Commonality that currently there is a Statement of Common Ground agreed with 2 parties, 20 are under discussion with stakeholders and with 3 Welsh language representative groups. The Applicant is looking to provide a draft Statement of Commonality at Deadline 5.

APP explained with regard to Written Representations and Local Impact Reports, that submission by Deadline 2 as currently proposed gives the Applicant only 2 weeks to respond to the those questions. **APP** pointed out that guidance specifically relating to Local Impact Reports states that

Authorities should be given at least 21 days to respond and saw no reason why this should not be applied to Written Representations also. The Applicant's letter of 16 October 2018 proposes a new Deadline 1(a) (27 November 2018) which would fall 1 week before Deadline 1 (4 December 2018).

APP confirmed its willingness to keep the Applicants Guide to the Application live and updated through the examination, including notice of documents being superseded and updated.

APP asked for conformation of what the ExA required in relation to the proposed Compulsory Acquisition Schedule and suggested that they confer with the Case Manager to clarify this.

APP confirmed they had no comment with regard to the **Report on the Implications for European Sites** (REIS).

APP expressed the view that the Schedule of Mitigation was a useful document that did address how mitigation would be embedded; however, it would seek clarification on what exactly is needed from them at this stage.

APP asked whether the short overview of the draft Development Consent Order that they had prepared was need at the hearing to be held the following day.

APP identified a change in attendees for the Open Floor Hearing on 24 October 2018.

APP referred to the Isle of Anglesey County Council request that the January Issue Specific Hearings be moved back a week and explained that the Applicant would be content with that.

APP further requested that hearing agendas be produced before Christmas and if this was not possible that the hearings be moved back one week.

APP asked that hearings scheduled for 4-7 March be moved a week earlier, to the 25 February 2018 due to diary management issues as explained in the Applicants letter of 16 October 2018 [EV-006] responding the ExA's Rule 6 letter.

APP had no comment in relation to Unaccompanied Site Inspections; but pointed out in relation to the Accompanied Site Inspection that:

1. For some sites, the Applicant will require consent from land owners if they do not already possess consent and there would be safety and security requirements.
2. Site visits are normally best practiced in a four-wheel-drive vehicle, in order to reach points of elevation not normally achieved in standard

issue vehicles. The Applicant can only provide 3 off-road vehicles indicating; 3 drivers and 3 representatives of the Applicant, resulting in space for 11 other passengers. Once 5 inspectors are accounted for, that leaves space for 6 representatives from other groups. **APP** said it would be useful to know who those other people would be as early as possible and that it would be preferable to have notification of attendees for the Accompanied Site Inspections on Deadline 1 rather than Deadline 2.

IACC stated that they had seen the request for a new deadline for the Local Impact Report and had given it consideration; however, between early September and beginning of October, Isle of Anglesey County Council wrote to the Applicant 13 detailed and topic specific letters, setting out their position on the main issues regarding the Local Impact Report, but had not received a response. Consequently the Applicant is apprised of the issues that will be raised in the Local Impact Report and because of its workload and resource issues outlined earlier in the meeting Isle of Anglesey County Council is not able to agree an earlier date for the Local Impact Report submission.

WG expressed support for the Isle of Anglesey County Council's view on not altering the date of Deadline 2.

WG explained their support for the points made by the Isle of Anglesey County Council and North Wales Police regarding the proposed Section 106 Agreement and the need for early engagement and an Issue Specific Hearing on this subject.

WG further expressed support for the Isle of Anglesey County Council's points made in relation to the mitigation map in the Schedule of Mitigation. The detail is important and the Welsh Government need to have it soon.

WG expressed support for pushing the dates of the January hearings back by a week as the reality is that the Christmas break would materially interfere with the timetable. However, if for any reason these hearings could not be moved back by a week, Welsh Government agree that it would be of significant importance to at least know the topics that would be covered to allow time for preparation, before the Christmas break

WG explained in relation to the March hearings, that if they were to be moved forward a week to the 25 February 2018, Mr Corner would not be available. Furthermore, by moving the December hearings back one week and the March hearings forward one week, some programming issues would arise which would be difficult to accommodate.

NRW pointed out that if the hearing dates for January were changed, the advocate for National Resources Wales would not be available to represent the body on the new proposed dates. National Resources Wales

also requested that the hearing topics to be published prior to the Christmas break.

NWP explained they would do their best to meet Deadline 2 with regards to their Statement of Common Ground, but could not say if they could agree on much before that.

FF asked whether any party wished to comment further on what had been said about written submissions, hearings or site inspections.

Teresa Hughes for **North Wales Wildlife Trust** (NWWT) said that it would not be able to meet a brought forward Deadline 2 date in respect of the written questions due to lack of resourcing and she considered that this would be a similar situation for other independent interested parties.

8. Transboundary Matters

PB explained that the Panel was aware that the **Environment Impact Assessment** (EIA) regulations place responsibilities on the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy in respect of transboundary effects of this proposed development on the environment in other **European Economic Area** (EEA) states. These duties are distinct from those of the ExA when examining the application for development consent and in making a recommendation to the Secretary of State.

PB stated that the Planning Inspectorate (on behalf of the Secretary of State) has followed the transboundary screening and notification processes set out in their Advice Note 12, which contains special arrangements for nuclear electricity generating station **Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects** (NSIP). These special arrangements require that all relevant EEA states and signatories to the UNECE Espoo and Aarhus conventions are informed of their ability to participate in the DCO examination process should they wish to do so.

PB pointed out that there had been a number of Relevant Representations made by non-UK individuals and organisations, and those individuals and organisations are now provided the opportunity to participate in the examination as an Interested Party.

PB further explained that the Panel has also taken the opportunity to invite to this preliminary meeting, amongst others, government agencies who had expressed a wish to participate under the transboundary EIA procedures but who had chosen not to register as an Interested Party. Their further participation would be at the discretion of the ExA but by inviting them to the Preliminary Meeting, they would also receive a copy of the examination timetable (and any variations to that timetable).

PB pointed out that the obligations under the Espoo and Aarhus conventions are ongoing and will only conclude when the Secretary of State makes the decision as the determining authority for the DCO. The steps followed were in adherence with the special arrangements for nuclear electricity generating stations and were done so in attempt to facilitate a full participation of non-UK parties and individuals in the examination process where they wish to do so.

PB closed the item by asking if there were any questions related to the ExA's arrangements for dealing with transboundary effects.

There were no questions in relation to trans-boundary matters.

9. Any other Matters

APP referred to their previous point on consultation with those bodies that represent the Welsh language, who are residents of Anglesey and who would be affected by the proposed development. The Applicant identified 3 bodies currently but also pointed out that there are a number of other Welsh language representatives that are entering into a Statement of Common Ground. These include Isle of Anglesey County Council, Welsh Government, North Anglesey Councils Partnership, Llanbadrig and Mechell Community Councils and the North Wales Economic Ambition Board.

JD pointed out that the ExA had identified certain bodies that represent the Welsh language that had been missed by the Applicant, such as Forwm Iaith Strategol Ynys Môn, Menter Iaith Môn and Cymdeithas yr Iaith Gymraeg.

APP acknowledged that these bodies and in particular the Welsh Language Forum and the Welsh Language Society were missed off the list due to concerns as to whether agreeing Statements of Common Ground would be achievable in the timescale provided by the Panel. **APP** explained that the Welsh Language Forum, for example, is a society representing multiple groups. **APP** reiterated that there is absolutely no issue in these parties submitting a written representation; it is simply case a question of whether they enter Statements of Common Ground. **APP** explained how they believe the bodies' representative of the Welsh language they had chosen were the most appropriate ones; but are willing to discuss negotiations with any other Welsh language representative.

Nia Wyn Thomas representing the Welsh language initiative; **Menter Iaith Môn** (MIM) wished to speak in Welsh and a simultaneous translation was provided. **MIM** wished to invite the Applicant for a conversation to explain that they do not see the Welsh language initiative

as a society but as a proactive initiative and it wishes to be involved as a group in these discussions.

IACC drew attention to Paragraph 1.4 of Mr Williams letter of 9 August 2018 regarding bilingual participation and to stress the singular importance of this issue to the Isle of Anglesey County Council. **IACC** stressed the importance of anybody making a representation in Welsh to not be disadvantaged by those who are not familiar with the language; of understanding what these representations are saying and for the ExA to consider how this might be handled. **IACC** stated that Anglesey's population is around 70,000 people. Construction of this project would require around 40,000 individuals who would arrive to work on the island. Many of them would be accommodated on the Northern part of the island. The impact is potentially significant and deserves special consideration.

WG expressed support for the importance of the point Isle of Anglesey County Council previously made in relation to the Welsh language.

WG explained in relation to the proceedings of the draft Development Consent Order hearing on 24 October 2018 that Welsh Government had put their main points regarding the draft Development Consent Order wording in a note which they had sent to the Applicant and wondered whether it would be of use for the ExA to see this prior to the hearing on the subsequent day.

FF agreed that it would be helpful and requested Welsh Government to send this to the Case Team to enable it to be published on the Planning Inspectorate website that same night; so that everybody would have an opportunity to read it before the hearing.

FF thanked all for their engagement at the meeting. **FF** stated that she would send out a letter (Rule 8 letter), as soon as practicably possible, which will confirm the timetable and any other procedural decisions the ExA may take as a result of discussions made at the Preliminary Meeting.

Preliminary Meeting closed at 12:15pm.