

RAG Assessment

SP696 SP785 Kingsland

Criteria		RAG Rating	Assessment	Comments	Land and Lakes' Assessment	Land and Lakes' Comments
1	Previously developed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All of the site is previously developed land (green) Part of the site is previously developed land (amber) None of the site is previously developed land (red) 		The site is largely greenfield.		
2	Flood risk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low risk (A) (green) Medium risk (B) (amber) High risk (C) (red) 		No identified fluvial flood risk.		
3	Living conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unlikely to result in a significant adverse effect (green) Potential to result in significant adverse effect (amber) Likely Significant adverse effect (red) 		The site is located immediately adjacent to Kingsland, a relatively small residential area on the outskirts of Holyhead. It is considered that there is some potential for adverse impacts on living conditions/culture as a result of the TWA.		Disagree. It has been demonstrated that the consented scheme would not have an adverse impact on living conditions. Residential amenity was not raised as a concern through the application consultation. Living conditions should encompass both environmental and social impacts.

						Indeed, the social benefits of the consented development are great, particularly the quality of the accommodation and opportunities for social cohesion.
4	Access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No known constraints (green) • Minor constraints (amber) • Major constraints (red) 		Access available to the site from the B4545 and this provides direct access to the A55 in close proximity.		
5	Ground Conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negligible contamination or instability likely (green) • Minor contamination or instability likely (amber) • Major contamination or instability likely (red) 		The site is greenfield and there are no known issues relating to ground conditions.		
6	National landscape designations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not within the designation and not adjacent (green) • Adjacent (amber) • Within designation (red) 		The site is located within the AONB.		Disagree. The site is located within the AONB, however it was demonstrated through the approved scheme that the impacts upon the AONB were acceptable subject to extensive mitigation measures proposed and

						secured through a S106 agreement. It was demonstrated that the overwhelming economic benefits of the scheme and the need for construction workers accommodation were sufficient to outweigh any harm to the AONB.
7	Local environmental designations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not within the designation and not adjacent (green) • Adjacent (amber) • Within designation (red) 		The site is situated in close proximity to a Wildlife Site in the emerging JLDP Proposals Map.		
8	National or international Environmental designations (not including landscape)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not within the designation and not adjacent (green) • Adjacent (amber) • Within designation (red) 		SSSIs are located to north west and south west.		Disagree. The Kingsland site is not within or adjacent to the Beddmanarch-Cymrian SSSI.
9	Designated heritage assets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not within the designation and not adjacent (green) • Adjacent (amber) • Within designation (red) 		The site is situated in close proximity to Ancient Monuments and the Grade II listed Kingsland Windmill.		Disagree. There are no designated heritage assets within or directly adjacent to the site. The application for the consented development demonstrated that there would be no adverse impact on heritage assets and gained the support

						of the Conservation Officer.
10	Mineral safeguarding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not within safeguarded area (green) • Partially within safeguarded area (amber) • Wholly within safeguarded area (red) 		The site is not safeguarded.		
11	Legacy potential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified potential for a legacy use (green) • No identified potential for a legacy use (red) 		Due to the sites wider planning permission the site is deemed to have a legacy use for permanent accommodation.		The scheme offers a guaranteed legacy use for permanent housing, including 50% affordable housing to meet Anglesey's housing needs.
12	Agricultural land classification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade 4 or 5 (green) • Grade 3 (amber) • Grade 1 or 2 (red) 		The site is classified as Grade 4.		
13	Visual impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negligible/minor visual impact likely (green) • Moderate impact likely (amber) • Major impact likely (red) 		The site is open, situated on greenfield land and located within the AONB. It is acknowledged that planning permission has been granted for residential use on the site and there is capacity for mitigation. However, when compared to the existing baseline, it is considered that there is potential for major impact.		Disagree. The consented development was supported by a comprehensive Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), which was also updated as part of the ES Addendum. Comprehensive mitigation measures proposed (and secured through

						planning condition) will moderate any of the minor adverse effects assessed on the environment and landscape.
14	Does the shape of the site constrain development?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No – ample space for all development (green) • Possible – irregular shape but reasonable available space (Amber) • Yes – irregular shape and close to site size criterion limit (red) 		The site is large enough that the shape of the land is not considered to be a constraining factor.		
15	Consultation feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Largely positive (green) • Balanced feedback or no feedback received (amber) • Largely negative (red) 		The site was proposed by Horizon as a preferred site for TWA at the January 2016 update consultation and also PAC2. Consultation feedback was mixed. IACC supported this location for temporary workers accommodation, with the caveat that development should have regard to landscape impacts. Several other stakeholders expressed support for this site due to anticipated economic and legacy benefits, and the utilisation of existing infrastructure. Members of the public expressed mixed views about the Kingsland and		Disagree. Statutory Consultation feedback on the planning application for the consented scheme was largely positive. Through detailed discussions and revisions, Land and Lakes were able to gain support from key consultees. In addition, the majority of feedback received during the community consultation process was

				<p>Cae Glas proposals. Some expressed support because the area already benefits from a planning permission and also noted the access to existing facilities, and a perceived reduction on the impact on existing housing. Others expressed opposition because of the distance to the WNDA and the need to transport workers, in addition to the environmental sensitivity of the area which is reflected by nearby environmental designations.</p>		<p>positive or requests for further information/clarity rather than objections.</p>
16	<p>Opportunities for cohesion with the local community</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – facilities within walking distance (green) • Yes – via public transport (amber) • No or not applicable (red) 		<p>The site is adjacent to Kingsland and there should be facilities within walking distance.</p>		<p>Disagree. The site is directly adjacent to the settlement of Holyhead where a range of facilities can be accessed, thus promoting cohesion with the local community. Land and Lakes also consider that proximity to facilities is not a sufficient measure of community cohesion. It is noted that whilst Horizon acknowledge there are facilities in walking distance they rate this criteria Amber</p>

						contrary to their own methodology
17	Support and enhance the Welsh language and culture?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unlikely to result in a significant adverse effect (green) Potential to result in significant adverse effect (amber) Likely significant adverse effect (red) 		The site is not situated within a settlement and there would be suitable facilities available on-site.		Disagree. The proposed development has been subject to a Welsh Language Assessment in accordance with the Welsh Language SPG published by IOACC. The proposed development offers the potential to improve the viability of Welsh speaking communities by providing a significant number of direct job opportunities and high-quality housing.
18	Is the site available?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Available – held by developer/ willing owner/ public sector/on the market (green) Unknown (amber) Unavailable complex/multiple ownership or subject to ransom strip (red) 		The site is held by a developer (Land and Lakes) and is available.		
19	Commercial viability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good viability (green) Moderate viability (amber) 		Horizon has undertaken further analysis since PAC2 and the site is considered unviable. The main reasons		The main reasons given for why the site is considered unviable are

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Poor viability (red)		<p>are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Transporting workers to the Wylfa Newydd Development Area adds significant additional cost, which was resulting in an unviable project;The resultant impact in terms of NAECI allowances was further adding to the lack of viability of the proposals; together with the transport of workers, this was increasing the cost of the Project from approximately £25m to £30m per 1,000 workers;The proposed legacy use and Horizon use of the site are not complimentary, with the provision of over -sized units that would not meet local housing need after they are no longer required by workers;The consented scheme does not include the		<p>fundamentally flawed and are addressed in full at Chapter 4 of this Report. Horizon has failed to adequately justify how it has reached these conclusions including security costs, what shifts have been assumed for the workers, nuclear industry work rate, per worker and what has been used to reflect actual labour mix.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--	---

				<p>necessary requirements for worker accommodation, including the necessary power requirements and transport infrastructure. For instance, the scheme does not include a bus terminus or other infrastructure requirements, which would reduce the level of bed spaces that could actually be delivered. This would also require changes to the consented scheme, which would be likely to require a fresh consent; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Following review, it is considered unlikely that the site can provide for the target number of 1,500 worker bed spaces within the site using the chosen form of housing (suitable for post operational use) and at the same time provide for the requisite		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>operational amenities and other infrastructure. In order to achieve the upper target numbers the house forms require closer spacing and more units than shown on the consented schemes and would result in a very dense layout, which may not be acceptable in urban design or commercial terms. Please refer to Section 7 of this report for more detail.</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

SP784 Cae Glas

Criteria		RAG Rating	Assessment	Comments	Land and Lakes' Assessment	Land and Lakes' Comments
1	Previously developed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All of the site is previously developed land (green) Part of the site is previously developed land (amber) None of the site is previously developed land (red) 		The site is largely greenfield.		Agree.
2	Flood risk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low risk (A) (green) Medium risk (B) (amber) High risk (C) (red) 		Low Risk (A).		
3	Living conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unlikely to result in a significant adverse effect (green) Potential to result in significant adverse effect (amber) Likely Significant adverse effect (red) 		Parts of the site are located within 150 m of residential properties and there is considered to be some potential for adverse impacts.		Disagree. It has been demonstrated that the consented scheme would not have an adverse impact on living conditions. Residential amenity was not raised as a concern through the application consultation. Living conditions should encompass both environmental and social impacts. Indeed, the social benefits of the consented development are

						great, particularly the quality of the accommodation and opportunities for social cohesion. Horizon have not specified any particular type or scale of impact, in contrast with our comprehensive ES which provides evidence to demonstrate there will be no adverse impacts.
4	Access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No known constraints (green) • Minor constraints (amber) • Major constraints (red) 		Access available to the site from a number of existing road networks including A55 and Parc Cybi.		
5	Ground Conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negligible contamination or instability likely (green) • Minor contamination or instability likely (amber) • Major contamination or instability likely (red) 		The site is greenfield and there are no known issues relating to ground conditions.		
6	National landscape designations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not within the designation and not adjacent (green) • Adjacent (amber) • Within designation (red) 		The site is located within the AONB.		Disagree. The site is located within the AONB, however it was demonstrated through the approved scheme that the impacts

						upon the AONB were acceptable subject to extensive mitigation measures proposed and secured through a S106 agreement. It was demonstrated that the overwhelming economic benefits of the scheme and the need for construction workers accommodation were sufficient to outweigh any harm to the AONB.
7	Local environmental designations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not within the designation and not adjacent (green) • Adjacent (amber) • Within designation (red) 		No local designations identified.		
8	National or international Environmental designations (not including landscape)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not within the designation and not adjacent (green) • Adjacent (amber) • Within designation (red) 		Beddmanarch-Cymyran SSSI is located to the east of the site.		The impacts on the SSSI have been fully assessed and considered and are capable of mitigation.
9	Designated heritage assets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not within the designation and not adjacent (green) • Adjacent (amber) • Within designation (red) 		There is an Ancient Monument within the site and a Listed Building within 200 m.		Disagree. The proposed development at Cae Glas will be sensitively designed to enhance the setting of the Trefignath Burial Chamber which is a

						designated Scheduled Ancient Monument. The application for the consented development demonstrated that there would be no adverse impact on heritage assets and gained the support of the Conservation Officer.
10	Mineral safeguarding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not within safeguarded area (green) • Partially within safeguarded area (amber) • Wholly within safeguarded area (red) 		The site is not safeguarded.		
11	Legacy potential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified potential for a legacy use (green) • No identified potential for a legacy use (red) 		Due to the site's wider planning permission the site is deemed to have a legacy use for permanent accommodation.		Agree. The site offers a guaranteed legacy to create a step change in Anglesey's tourism offer.
12	Agricultural land classification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade 4 or 5 (green) • Grade 3 (amber) • Grade 1 or 2 (red) 		The site is classified as Grade 4.		
13	Visual impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negligible/minor visual impact likely (green) • Moderate impact likely (amber) • Major impact likely (red) 		The site is open, situated on greenfield land and located within the AONB. It is acknowledged that planning permission has been granted for residential use on the site and there is		Disagree. The consented development was supported by a comprehensive Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), which was also

				capacity for mitigation. However, when compared to the existing baseline, it is considered that there is potential for major impact.		updated as part of the ES Addendum. Comprehensive mitigation measures proposed (and secured through planning condition) will moderate any detrimental effects that the development may have on the environment and landscape.
14	Does the shape of the site constrain development?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No – ample space for all development (green) • Possible – irregular shape but reasonable available space (Amber) • Yes – irregular shape and close to site size criterion limit (red) 		The site is large enough that the shape of the land is not considered to be a constraining factor.		
15	Consultation feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Largely positive (green) • Balanced feedback or no feedback received (amber) • Largely negative (red) 		The site was proposed by Horizon as a preferred site for TWA at the January 2016 update consultation and also PAC2. Consultation feedback was mixed. IACC supported this location for temporary workers accommodation, with the caveat that development should		Disagree. Consultation feedback on the consented scheme was largely positive. Through detailed discussions and revisions, Land and Lakes were able to gain support from key consultees. In addition, the majority of

				<p>have regard to landscape impacts. Several other stakeholders expressed support for this site due to anticipated economic and legacy benefits, and the utilisation of existing infrastructure. Members of the public expressed mixed views about the Kingsland and Cae Glas proposals. Some expressed support because the area already benefits from a planning permission and also noted the access to existing facilities, and a perceived reduction on the impact on existing housing. Others expressed opposition because of the distance to the WNDA and the need to transport workers, in addition to the environmental sensitivity of the area which is reflected by nearby environmental designations.</p>		<p>feedback received during the community consultation process was positive or requests for further information/clarity rather than objections.</p>
16	<p>Opportunities for cohesion with the local community</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – facilities within walking distance (green) • Yes – via public transport (amber) • No or not 		<p>There are facilities available, but the distance suggests that public transport would be necessary.</p>		<p>Disagree. Land and Lakes consider that proximity to facilities is not a sufficient measure of community</p>

		applicable (red)			cohesion. In addition, the proposed development at Cae Glas includes a number of on-site facilities that can be utilised by local people, thus promoting community cohesion.
17	Support and enhance the Welsh language and culture?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unlikely to result in a significant adverse effect (green) • Potential to result in significant adverse effect (amber) • Likely significant adverse effect (red) 		The site is not situated within a settlement and there would be suitable facilities available on-site.	The proposed development has been subject to a Welsh Language Assessment in accordance with the Welsh Language SPG published by IOACC. The proposed development offers the potential to improve the viability of Welsh speaking communities by providing a significant number of direct job opportunities and high-quality housing.
18	Is the site available?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available – held by developer/ willing owner/ public sector/on the market (green) 		The site is held by a developer and available.	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unknown (amber) • Unavailable complex/multiple ownership or subject to ransom strip (red) 				
19	Commercial viability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good viability (green) • Moderate viability (amber) • Poor viability (red) 		<p>Horizon has undertaken further analysis since PAC2 and the site is considered unviable. The main reasons are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transporting workers to the Wylfa Newydd Development Area adds significant additional cost, which was resulting in an unviable project; • The resultant impact in terms of NAECI allowances was further adding to the lack of viability of the proposals; together with the transport of workers, this was increasing the cost of the Project from approximately £25m to £30m per 1,000 		<p>The main reasons given for why the site is considered unviable are fundamentally flawed and are addressed in full at Chapter 4 of this Report. Horizon has failed to adequately justify how it has reached these conclusions including security costs, what shifts have been assumed for the workers, nuclear industry work rate, per worker and what has been used to reflect actual labour mix.</p>

				<p>workers;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The proposed legacy use and Horizon use of the site are not complimentary, with the provision of over -sized units that would not meet local housing need after they are no longer required by workers;• The consented scheme does not include the necessary requirements for worker accommodation, including the necessary power requirements and transport infrastructure. For instance, the scheme does not include a bus terminus or other infrastructure requirements, which would reduce the level of bed		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

spaces that could actually be delivered. This would also require changes to the consented scheme, which would be likely to require a fresh consent; and

- Following review, it is considered unlikely that the site can provide for the target number of 1,500 worker bed spaces within the site using the chosen form of housing (suitable for post operational use) and at the same time provide for the requisite operational amenities and other infrastructure. In order to achieve the upper target numbers the

				house forms require closer spacing and more units than shown on the consented schemes and would result in a very dense layout, which may not be acceptable in urban design or commercial terms. Please refer to Section 7 of this report for more detail.		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

Option A, Wylfa Newydd Development Area

Criteria		RAG Rating	Assessment	Comments	Land and Lakes' Assessment	Land and Lakes' Comments
1	Previously developed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All of the site is previously developed land (green) Part of the site is previously developed land (amber) None of the site is previously developed land (red) 		The site is greenfield.		
2	Flood risk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low risk (A) (green) Medium risk (B) (amber) High risk (C) (red) 		Low risk (A).		
3	Living conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unlikely to result in a significant adverse effect (green) Potential to result in significant adverse effect (amber) Likely Significant adverse effect (red) 		The site is remote from settlements and residential properties.		In setting the criteria for assessing living conditions, Horizon's Site Selection Report (REF: 8.24.4) refers to Policy PS9 of the JLDP which states that the accommodation requirements of construction workers should be met in a way that does not result in unacceptable adverse social or environmental impacts. On this basis, there are considerable

						negative social impacts of this option, notably the poor quality of accommodation and facilities, lack of integration and therefore difficulty retaining workers. Furthermore, analysis of Horizon's noise assessment reveals a number of deficiencies and inconsistencies and lack of mitigation, which will result in significant disturbance for shift workers.
4	Access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No known constraints (green) • Minor constraints (amber) • Major constraints (red) 		Access directly to/from the A5025.		The TWA proposals at Wylfa Campus comprise 769 car parking spaces within an overall on-site provision of 3800 car parking spaces. Drivers will pass through rural areas where roads have constrained geometry. Notwithstanding some mitigation on the A5025 route is identified, drivers will elect to follow alternative routes across the island to

						access the Menai Bridge crossings. Such impacts have to date not been quantified or assessed.
5	Ground Conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negligible contamination or instability likely (green) • Minor contamination or instability likely (amber) • Major contamination or instability likely (red) 		Greenfield and no known issues in terms of ground conditions.		
6	National landscape designations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not within the designation and not adjacent (green) • Adjacent (amber) • Within designation (red) 		The site is not located within or immediately adjacent to the AONB.		
7	Local environmental designations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not within the designation and not adjacent (green) • Adjacent (amber) • Within designation (red) 		No local designations identified. However, the site is located in close proximity to ancient woodland and an existing bat barn. Whilst not technically comprising 'designated sites', these assets are considered when drawing final conclusions in Section 7 of this report.		
8	National or international Environmental designations (not including landscape)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not within the designation and not adjacent (green) 		Tre'R Gof SSSI is located to the south of the site.		

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjacent (amber) • Within designation (red) 				
9	Designated heritage assets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not within the designation and not adjacent (green) • Adjacent (amber) • Within designation (red) 		None within or immediately adjacent.		
10	Mineral safeguarding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not within safeguarded area (green) • Partially within safeguarded area (amber) • Wholly within safeguarded area (red) 		The site is not safeguarded.		
11	Legacy potential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified potential for a legacy use (green) • No identified potential for a legacy use (red) 		There is no identified legacy use.		The proposed site campus is modular in nature and will be completely removed following the construction of the power station, leaving no physical legacy. There will also be no associated infrastructure, facilities or services that can be used by future generations.
12	Agricultural land classification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade 4 or 5 (green) • Grade 3 (amber) • Grade 1 or 2 (red) 		The site is classified as Grade 3.		
13	Visual impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negligible/minor visual impact likely (green) 		There could be a visual impact on the sensitive seascape and on the		The site is in a highly rural, remote location with

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate impact likely (amber) • Major impact likely (red) 		<p>Cemeas Conservation Area. However, the site would be set in the context of the existing power station and also the Project construction site.</p>		<p>potential for adverse visual impacts. As the proposal is temporary, there is no long-term landscaping or other mitigation proposed that will screen the site.</p>
14	Does the shape of the site constrain development?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No – ample space for all development (green) • Possible – irregular shape but reasonable available space (Amber) • Yes – irregular shape and close to site size criterion limit (red) 		<p>The site is large enough that the shape of the land is not considered to be a constraining factor.</p>		
15	Consultation feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Largely positive (green) • Balanced feedback or no feedback received (amber) • Largely negative (red) 		<p>The site was proposed for TWA at the January 2016 project update and PAC2 (for 500 bed spaces). The site was then proposed to accommodate up to 4,000 TWA bed spaces at PAC3. Consultation feedback was mixed. For example, IACC suggested that there may be other locations within the Wnda that might be more suitable than Option A and insufficient justification has been provided for use of the site. Other</p>		

				organisations expressed support for the use of Option A; noting that it would reduce traffic congestion and reduce the social impact on local communities.		
16	Opportunities for cohesion with the local community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – facilities within walking distance (green) • Yes – via public transport (amber) • No or not applicable (red) 		Access should be possible via public transport.		The site is in a very remote part of the island and there are no nearby facilities that are accessible by foot or public transport. Even the nearest settlement of Cemaes has limited facilities. There is therefore limited opportunity for cohesion with the local community. Horizon states in the Site Campus Planning Statement (Appendix C of the Planning Statement 8.1) at paragraph 4.3.42 that: <i>“the strong likelihood is that there will be very limited interaction between the construction workforce and the local community during the</i>

						<i>construction phase."</i>
17	Support and enhance the Welsh language and culture?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unlikely to result in a significant adverse effect (green) • Potential to result in significant adverse effect (amber) • Likely significant adverse effect (red) 		The site is not situated within a settlement and there would be suitable facilities available on-site.		Horizon's proposals for a Site Campus have been presented, through their Welsh Language Impact Assessment (WLIA), as having an overall neutral effect at the construction stage. The conclusion of a neutral impact is based upon the consideration of population, quality of life, economic, infrastructure and social factors. Of these five categories, only economic factors were shown see a positive impact. It is Land and Lakes view that the mitigation proposed is insufficient to offset the impacts of the entire Wylfa Newydd project on the Welsh Language.
18	Is the site available?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available – held by developer/ willing owner/ public sector/on the market (green) • Unknown (amber) 		The site is owned by Horizon and is available.		

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unavailable complex/multiple ownership or subject to ransom strip (red) 				
19	Commercial viability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good viability (green) Moderate viability (amber) Poor viability (red) 		<p>The site is viable for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The location on-site would reduce daily travel times and benefit worker welfare, with associated reduced daily traffic flows, emissions and being inherently more sustainable; For each worker living at the Site Campus, the Project would save (i) travel/radius allowance (NAECI) payments and (ii) transport costs (buses). These amount to a circa £87-105m saving based on up to 4,000; The site is 		<p>The main reasons given for why the Site Campus is considered viable are flawed and are addressed in full at Chapter 4 of this Report.</p>

				<p>located adjacent to the Existing Power Station and also the main construction site for the new Power Station. It will therefore be set in this context and there are also advantages in terms of delivery/availability of construction plant and materials;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• An on-site scheme offers maximum flexibility in terms of size. Other sites not owned by Horizon do not have this level of flexibility; and• Locating TWA on-site leads to a substantial reduction in bus movements along the A5025 compared to		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>TWA at, for example, Holyhead or EZ10 Rhosgoch. The site has good access to the A5025 and benefits from the A5025 improvements Horizon is promoting (EZ10 Rhosgoch would not). Please refer to Section 7 of this report for more detail.</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--