



## Wylfa Newydd Project

### Post Oral Hearing Summaries for Monday 4th March

PINS Reference Number: EN010007

---

14 March 2019

Revision 1.0

Examination Deadline 7

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

[This page is intentionally blank]

# 1 HORIZON NUCLEAR POWER WYLFA LIMITED – WYLFA NEWYDD PROJECT – DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER APPLICATION

## 1.1 Written summary of Horizon's oral submissions at the ISH held on 4 March 2019

### *Introduction*

- 1.1.1 This note summarises submissions made on behalf of Horizon Nuclear Power Wylfa Limited (Horizon) at the Issue Specific Hearing on the proposed Wylfa Newydd Development Area held on 4 March 2019.
- 1.1.2 Oral submissions by all parties attending the hearing were made pursuant to the agenda published by the Examining Authority (ExA) on 28 February 2019. In setting out Horizon's position on the issues raised in the agenda, as submitted orally at the hearing, the format of this note follows that of the agenda.
- 1.1.3 In addition to covering the agenda items as noted above, this note also relates to the Examining Authority's list of action points arising from the hearing.

| ExA's Agenda Item   | Summary of Horizon's Oral Submission made in the hearing   | Relevant document references  |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Item 3 – Strategic and over-arching for the WNDA as a whole</b>  |  |   |
| 3(a) Landscape reconfiguration including<br><br>(i) Construction and phasing of the proposed mounds, including watercourses, drainage and proposed planting | At the request of the Examining Authority, Mr Michael Humphries QC on behalf of Horizon provided a brief update of matters since the hearings in January 2019 with reference to the draft DCO [REP5-003] and Summary Table of Amendments to the draft DCO [REP5-006].<br><br>Mr Humphries explained that a number of changes had been made to the requirements in the draft Order as well as to the control documents following comments from Interested Parties about the lack of detail in those documents. The changes made are as a result of a number of meetings with those Interested Parties. The Code of Construction | Draft DCO [REP5-003]<br><br>Summary Table of Amendments to the draft DCO [REP5-006]<br><br>Code of Construction Practice Progress Update [REP6-014] |

| ExA's Agenda Item                 | Summary of Horizon's Oral Submission made in the hearing  | Relevant document references  |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| <p>timetable and maintenance;</p> | <p>Practice Progress Update submitted at Deadline 6 (19 February 2019) [REP6-014] sets this out in more detail.</p> <p>In recognition of the fact that some detail cannot be provided at this time, Mr Humphries explained that Horizon is now also proposing a new element to the requirements whereby a number of detailed schemes must be submitted to Isle of Anglesey County Council ("<b>IACC</b>") for approval. The intention is that these detailed schemes will be brought forward in accordance with control documents. Where there are to be consultees in respect of these schemes, this is recorded in the requirements.</p> <p>Mr Charlie Tasker on behalf of Horizon gave an overview of the revised Construction Method Statement submitted at Deadline 5 (12 February 2019) [REP5-018] and the time slices presented in that.</p> <p>In response to a query from Welsh Government regarding the timing of works having an impact on Kitchen Garden, Mr Tasker confirmed that Horizon will not develop on the Kitchen Garden during Work No.12 SPC Works. It was confirmed, however, that the site would be levelled during Main Construction.</p> <p>It was also confirmed by Mr Humphries that Horizon would clarify the use of the terminology "First Nuclear Construction" and "First Nuclear Concrete" in the draft Order and the control documents.</p> <p>In response to a comment from the Welsh Government regarding the sequencing of works, Mr Humphries confirmed that the Phasing Strategy set defined triggers for the delivery of key mitigation, whereas the Construction Method Statement was an indicative sequencing of construction works. Requirement PW3 which requires construction works be carried out "in general accordance with the Phasing Strategy</p> | <p>Construction Method Statement [REP5-018]</p> <p>Wireline Visualisations [REP6-018]</p> <p>Illustrative Construction Visualisations [REP6-019]</p> <p>Phasing Strategy [REP5-039]</p> <p>Landscape and Habitat Management Strategy [REP5-036]</p> |

| ExA's Agenda Item | Summary of Horizon's Oral Submission made in the hearing   | Relevant document references |
|-------------------|--|------------------------------|
|                   | <p>and the Construction Method Statement" was a deliberate turn of phrase to enable a certain level of flexibility within the construction programming within the envelop of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Reference was made to the Wireline Visualisations and the Illustrative Construction Visualisations submitted at Deadline 6 (19 February 2019) ([REP6-018] and [REP6-019] respectively). Mr Steve Knott on behalf of Horizon explained that the Illustrative Construction Visualisations were intended to depict how the site could look during construction.</p> <p>Using Viewpoint 20 as an example, Mr Knott explained that the viewpoint depicts the activities that would have the most visual impact on the environment such as tower cranes, temporary mounding and the power station building parameters. The illustrations represent the worst case scenario at the height of construction; that is, all activities taking place at once time. In reality, there would be less activity taking place at any given time than what is shown.</p> <p>A number of the parties including the North Wales Wildlife Trust ("<b>NWWT</b>"), IACC and National Trust queried the mounds, how these were to be planted and the effects that these would have on neighbouring receptors.</p> <p>Mr Knott provided the following response:</p> <p><u>Mound B</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mount B is proposed during construction to mitigate noise and visual impacts. The mound would be delivered within the first 10 months of construction as secured by the Phasing Strategy [REP5-039] and would be planted at the earliest practical opportunity in accordance</li> </ul> |                              |

| ExA's Agenda Item | Summary of Horizon's Oral Submission made in the hearing  | Relevant document references |
|-------------------|---|------------------------------|
|                   | <p>with the Landscape and Habitat Management Strategy [REP5-036] ("LHMS"), .</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The indicative design of the proposed slope is 1:2 with a slightly greater slope at the back of the filling station due to utilities in the area. A 1:2 slope is not uncommon but it was accepted that anything steeper would require reinforcement.</li> <li>• The distance from the boundary of the WNDA to the edge of the mound is approximately 50 metres at the Tregale Service Station.</li> <li>• There would be no reason to remove or rework the outer slope of this mound including planting, to avoid further disturbance to Tregale residents.</li> </ul> <p><u>Mound E</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LHMS provides for some materials to be temporarily stored in Mound E which would be taken for final landscaping of the western laydown area on what is Mound D.</li> <li>• The phasing of this mound it yet to be worked up in detail and there may be possibilities to minimise the reworking of this mound. Mr Tasker confirmed that it had been agreed that Horizon would not rework the western side of Mound E near Cemlyn Lagoon. However, some areas would need reinstating towards the end of construction once drainage was working effectively.</li> </ul> <p><u>The need to rework the mounds once originally created</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr Tasker stated that the need to rework the mounds was a construction matter. The construction of the power plant will involve considerable earthworks that will require backfilling (i.e. cut and fill).</li> </ul> |                              |

| ExA's Agenda Item   | Summary of Horizon's Oral Submission made in the hearing  | Relevant document references   |
|---|---|--|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By storing and recovering these materials onsite it would minimise the environmental impact that exporting and importing such materials may have.</li> </ul> <p><u>The sourcing of planting species</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr Knott referred to the LHMS which includes specific principles that require planting materials to be of local, native provenance. Further, the Requirements of the draft Order specify that the replacement of any failed planting must also be of provenance approved by IACC.</li> <li>Mr Knott confirmed that Horizon is keen to engage with local suppliers regarding its planting needs to ensure sufficient numbers of an appropriate provenance will be available when planting is required.</li> </ul>  |  |
| <p>3 (a) Landscape reconfiguration including: (ii) Dame Sylvia Crowe Woodland</p> | <p>In response to comments from IACC regarding the cumulative effects of the proposed power lines of the National Grid's North Wales Connection, Mr Humphries reiterated the Examining Authority's comment that National Grid's DCO application has been withdrawn. However, Mr Humphries acknowledged that some form of connection would have to be brought forward when this Project was delivered and those effects have been assessed on a cumulative basis.</p> <p>In response to comments about the need for an arboricultural management plan for the retained part of the Dame Sylvia Crowe woodland, Mr Knott confirmed that a management plan is secured through the Main Power Station Site sub-CoCP [REP5-022] (paragraph 11.19.2) in line with the LHMS principles.</p> <p>Horizon agreed to consult further with IACC regarding these management plans.</p> | <p>Main Power Station Site sub-CoCP [REP5-022]</p> <p>Landscape and Habitat Management Strategy [REP5-036]</p> |

| ExA's Agenda Item   | Summary of Horizon's Oral Submission made in the hearing   | Relevant document references   |
|---|--|--|
| 3 (a) (iii) Soil management measures and (iv) Remediation strategy  | In response to comments made by IACC regarding soil management and remediation, it was noted that the Wylfa Newydd CoCP [REP5-020] had been updated to address these matters further.  | Wylfa Newydd CoCP [REP5-020]   |
| <p>3(b) Landscape and visual, including:</p> <p>(i) Llwybr Arfordir Cymryu/Wales Coast Path and Trywydd Copr/Copper Trail;</p> <p>(ii) Illustrative Construction Visualisations submitted at D6</p> <p>(iii) Pre-commencement surveys;</p> <p>(iv) Protection of retained landscape elements – including monitoring;</p> <p>(v) Effects on receptors outside communities;</p> <p>(vi) Isle of Anglesey Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) including:</p> | <p>IACC raised concerns about the lack of information about the proposed diversion of the Wales Coast Path and Copper Trail routes as well as proposed boundary planting and retained features.</p> <p>In response, Mr Knott confirmed that the proposed diversions were available and that Horizon has made a commitment to retain boundary features. Further mitigation would be in place for those using the diversions including measures such as opaque fencing fitted to the perimeter fence. It was also confirmed that the Public Rights of Way plans submitted at Deadline 5 (12 February 2019) [REP5-012] show the existing footpath network and whether this connects to the wider network.</p> <p>Natural Resources Wales ("<b>NRW</b>") raised concerns with respect to the Design and Access Statement ("<b>DAS</b>") [REP4-016 to REP4-019] and its treatment of the AONB. Mr Humphries in response confirmed that the Environmental Statement recognises that there are likely to be adverse environmental impacts on the AONB but Horizon's case remains that those effects are outweighed by the benefits of the Project.</p> <p>Mr Knott acknowledged that it's difficult to get to a position where significant visual impacts are eliminated entirely and the most appropriate mitigation to address this is at source (on site). The</p> | <p>Public Rights of Way plans submitted at Deadline 5 [REP5-012]</p> <p>Design and Access Statement [REP4-016 to REP4-019]</p> |



| ExA's Agenda Item  | Summary of Horizon's Oral Submission made in the hearing   | Relevant document references |
|--|--|------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the extent of the significant effects and mitigation.</li> <li>• Mound E</li> </ul> | <p>comments made by NRW concern landscape enhancement as opposed to mitigation measures.</p>   |                              |
| <p>3(c). Seascape, including North Anglesey Heritage Coast</p>   | <p>No response from Horizon on this matter.</p>  |                              |
| <p>3(d). Off-site historic environment impacts</p>   | <p>No response from Horizon on this matter except to acknowledge that IACC has raised concerns about the potential adverse impact on the listed heritage buildings at Felin Gafnan and that more detailed responses will follow.</p>   |                              |
| <p>3(e). Over-arching on-site historic environment including archaeology.</p>  | <p>Welsh Government referred to its submission published on Friday 1 March 2019 regarding archaeology and the concerns it has about how materials from the excavation works that have already been undertaken are being dealt with given Horizon's impending suspension.</p> <p>Mr Humphries confirmed on behalf of Horizon that the materials that had been recovered from these archaeological investigations were being appropriately stored. Some of these materials are perishable, some are not. Horizon is awaiting proposals from third party companies regarding the appropriate storage of these materials going forward. Horizon accepts that the greatest concern is the perishable materials that need to be processed more quickly. The timescales are longer for those materials that are non-perishable. However, Horizon is</p> |                              |

| ExA's Agenda Item   | Summary of Horizon's Oral Submission made in the hearing  | Relevant document references |
|---|---|------------------------------|
|   | <p>continuing to look for mechanisms for bringing forward the assessment and appropriate storage of these materials.</p> <p>With respect to the areas of land that have been exposed as a result of these investigative works, Mr Humphries confirmed that all existing trenches had been restored or backfilled.</p> |                              |
| <p>3 (f) Mitigating light pollution during construction particularly at Cemaes and Tregelle</p> | <p>Mr Humphries confirmed that Horizon has committed to submitting for approval site specific construction lighting schemes in accordance with the requirements in schedule 3 and schedule 21 of the draft Order [REP5-003].</p>  | <p>Draft DCO [REP5-003]</p>  |
| <p>3 (g) Air quality issues<br/>- Air quality summary</p>                                       | <p>In response to comments from NRW about the dust mitigation measures in the Wylfa Newydd CoCP, Mr Humphries accepted that the trigger points for monitoring dust effects needed to be discussed with some additional parties.</p>   |                              |
| <p>3 (h) Noise and vibration including blasting strategy</p>                                    | <p>No response from Horizon on this matter.</p>   |                              |
| <p>3 (i) Waste management considerations</p>  | <p>No response from Horizon on this matter.</p>   |                              |

| ExA's Agenda Item  | Summary of Horizon's Oral Submission made in the hearing  | Relevant document references  |
|--|---|---|
| <b>Item 4 – Marine Off Loading Facility and Breakwater</b>   |   |   |
| <p>4(a) Design, including materials;</p> <p>4(b) Historic environment including off-shore archaeology;</p> <p>4(c) Landscape and visual, including seascape impacts.</p> | <p>In response to comments raised by IACC, NRW and National Trust regarding the materials to be used on the breakwater, Mr Bromley for Horizon confirmed that the breakwater had been engineered to function in a manner that could withstand the difficult conditions but still deliver optimum design, by minimising crest height and footprint.</p> <p>Numerical and physical modelling of the marine facilities had helped to define the optimum design of the breakwater. This modelling had demonstrated that concrete armour, for example, Xblocks were needed on the outside of the breakwater to withstand the wave conditions and minimise the crest height and footprint of the breakwater. Rock armour has, however, been provided for in sections on the inside of the western breakwater, the leeward side, where conditions are calmer and appropriate sized rock armour can be placed without being moved or adding to the overall dimensions of the breakwater. Mr Bromley confirmed that a summary of the breakwater design is provided in the Ecological Enhancements Mitigation Report submitted at Deadline 4 (17 January 2019) [REP4-023].</p> <p>In response to questions regarding the weathering of the breakwater, Mr Bromley confirmed that given the large tidal range, the breakwater would most likely be a two-tone colour. Natural colonisation of seaweed and kelp etc. would be different to the concrete colours of the Xblock and while the Xblock may weather over time eventually, this would not be substantial.</p> | <p>Ecological Enhancements Mitigation Report [REP4-023]</p> <p>Design and Access Statement [REP4-016 to REP4-019]</p> |

| ExA's Agenda Item   | Summary of Horizon's Oral Submission made in the hearing  | Relevant document references   |
|---|---|--|
| <b>Item 5 – Main Power Island Site</b>  |   |  |
| <p>5(a)(i) Visual impacts – construction phase</p> <p>5(a)(ii) Visual impacts – Materials</p> <p>5(a)(iii) Visual impacts – Colour</p> <p>5(a)(iv) Boundary treatment</p> | <p>By way of an introduction, Mr Jones for Horizon provided an overview of the Wylfa Newydd Development Area and Power Station Site Plans that were produced at Deadline 5 (12 February 2019) [REP5-013 and REP5-014], including the site layout plan which is an illustrative drawing, not for approval.</p> <p>Mr Jones explained that the draft Order prescribes various parameters relating to buildings within the WNDA, placing controls on the location of certain buildings and imposing maximum and minimum building dimensions (such as heights). The DAS then sets out design principles that guide how the authorised development will be constructed.</p> <p>Mr Jones explained that the design principles in the DAS take two different approaches:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Those that concern buildings within the Main Power Station Island which are by their nature heavily constrained by their nuclear design elements. As such, the design principles set out the primacy of the nuclear case that need to relate to those buildings.</li> <li>ii. Those that concern other buildings that are typically situated outside of the main site security fence. The design principles are more detailed, recognising that these are more public facing buildings and as such warrant a higher quality of design.</li> </ol> <p>Following comments from IACC and NRW, the Examining Authority queried whether the following processes might be used to deliver a very high quality of design: a design champion; a design code developed</p> | <p>Wylfa Newydd Development Area and Power Station Site Plans [REP5-013 and REP5-014]</p> <p>Draft DCO [REP5-003]</p> <p>Design and Access Statement [REP4-016 to REP4-019]</p> <p>WNDA Plans [REP5-013]</p> |

| ExA's Agenda Item  | Summary of Horizon's Oral Submission made in the hearing   | Relevant document references                       |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>according to the design principles of the DAS; and/or an independent design review.</p> <p>In response, Mr Humphries on behalf of Horizon noted that the design of a large number of the buildings on the WNDA will very much be driven by their function. The parameters detailed in the draft Order generally fix certain elements of those buildings including their location and their broad massing etc.</p> <p>Horizon is, however, considering a new design principle within the DAS that provides for the Design Commission for Wales to have input into the final design of particular buildings. Further, the final design depends so much on materials and colours which, at this present time, are yet to be finalised. Horizon has introduced a process where it has to apply to IACC as the planning authority for final approval of these matters, to be in accordance with the overall design principles.</p> <p>Mr Humphries acknowledged that Horizon would consider whether the colours and materials of the main Power Station building should be run through an external review process. However, it was clarified for IACC that the proposed visitors centre is outside the scope of the Order and therefore would be dealt with according to the ordinary planning permission processes.</p> <p>Ms Sasha Davies provided a brief update on the status of the visitors' centre noting that the location was still to be determined but that Horizon had had positive discussions with IACC regarding this. Horizon's preferred location was at the main entrance to the WNDA.</p> |  |
| 5 (b) Design – architectural form, materials, colour, sustainability | The Examining Authority acknowledged that the spent fuel and intermediate level waste storage buildings would be brought online approximately 10 years after commercial operations begin at the Power  | Design and Access Statement [REP4-016 to REP4-019] |

| ExA's Agenda Item   | Summary of Horizon's Oral Submission made in the hearing   | Relevant document references |
|---|--|------------------------------|
| <p>and processes for achieving good design including:</p> <p>(i) Spent fuel and intermediate level waste storage buildings – including construction timescale;</p> <p>(ii) Administration, main gatehouse and associated building and outage building</p> | <p>Station. Further, these buildings may have a very long life. The Examining Authority was therefore concerned with how the design of these buildings might sit within the existing environment over time.</p> <p>Mr Humphries acknowledged the Examining Authority's concerns relating to longevity of the buildings, the design of the buildings, and the imposition of construction after the conclusion of main construction. In respect of these matters, Mr Humphries noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design of the buildings was largely constrained by their functional requirements. The spent fuel storage building, for example, needs to be a large and tall building. Through design principles Horizon has sought to lay the foundations for that building to ensure good design. For example, the colour related design principles require an approach that blends with the surrounding landscape and seascape. Further, the design of this building will be subject to input from the Design Commission for Wales following the addition of a further design principle at Deadline 8 (25 March 2019).</li> <li>• However, it is very difficult to give a meaningful answer as to what the buildings will look like 140 years into the future. To address concerns regarding longevity, design principles have been provided requiring maintenance of the external quality finish. Further, the design life of the building will be very long to match its very long functional life. But to know how the building will be perceived that far into the future is very difficult to know.</li> <li>• Nevertheless, Mr Humphries confirmed that Horizon would consider whether it could produce an illustrative plan depicting what these buildings might look like within the surrounding environment in the future.</li> </ul> | <p>WNDA Plans [REP5-013]</p> |

| ExA's Agenda Item  | Summary of Horizon's Oral Submission made in the hearing  | Relevant document references   |
|--|---|--|
| <p>5.(c)(i) Historic environment impacts individually and in combination:</p> <p>(i) Cestyll Registered Park and Garden – including the kitchen garden (HLT2); impact on the essential setting, the adjoining laydown area and its restoration and after-use;</p> <p>(ii) Grade II Listed Felin Gafnan Corn Mill (Porth y Felin) (Asset 137);</p> <p>(iii) Grade II Corn Drying House (Felin Gafnan) (Asset 141);</p> <p>(iv) Grade II Mill House (Felin Gafnan, Cylch-y-Garn) (Asset 144)</p> | <p>Mr David Bull for Horizon provided a brief overview of Horizon's position with respect to safeguarding and mitigating the impact on the setting and structures of this designated heritage asset.</p> <p>Mr Bull explained that the assessment of effects on Cestyll Garden looks primarily at noise and visual intrusion from construction and the removal of part of the essential setting of the garden; the effects on air quality; the effects on setting during operation as well as the impact of decommissioning. Post mitigation, the significance of effects on Cestyll Garden is considered to be major adverse during construction, and moderate adverse during decommissioning.</p> <p>The draft DCO s.106 agreement [REP6-004] provides for the preparation of a conservation management plan for Cestyll Garden which will include the Valley Garden and the Kitchen Garden.</p> <p>In respect of the Kitchen Garden, it was confirmed that Horizon intends to replicate the Kitchen Garden to the extent possible. To this end, the conservation management plan will identify the location of the demarcation of the former site, as close as possible to its original location subject to site security and safety considerations. The height and style of the walls used to demarcate the garden will mirror those used in the original garden subject to site security and safety considerations. Horizon is considering its options for the provision of public access to these gardens (either managed or unmanaged); as well as opportunities for landscaping and planting to reflect the connectivity with the former garden. Interpretation boards will also be provided.</p> <p>Turning to Felin Gafnan and the Corn Mill, Mr Bull recognised the potential risk of damage to the building due to vibration. To mitigate</p> | <p>Chapter D11 Cultural Heritage [APP-130]</p> <p>Appendix D11-6 Effects on Heritage Assets [APP-213]</p> <p>Draft DCO s.106 agreement [REP6-004]</p> <p>Horizon's responses to Examining Authority's First Written Questions [REP2-375]</p> |

| ExA's Agenda Item | Summary of Horizon's Oral Submission made in the hearing   | Relevant document references |
|-------------------|--|------------------------------|
|                   | <p>this risk, Horizon is proposing a photographic survey of the mill and associated buildings as well as dilapidated surveys before and after construction. In the event that these surveys identified any damage to these buildings, Horizon would undertake to repair those. Horizon would also undertake historic building recording of mill and provision has been made for this as well as interpretation boards in the draft DCO s.106 agreement [REP6-004].</p> <p>Mr Bull explained that a conservation management plan is not proposed for the historic buildings at Felin Gafnan because the land on which they sit is not in the same ownership as the Cestyll Garden. However, in response to comments by the Interested Parties, Horizon said it would consider whether there was some way it could produce or coordinate a conservation management plan for these assets recognising the ownership constraints.</p> <p>In response to concerns raised about the location of the waste water treatment plant, Mr Tasker for Horizon confirmed that this plant needs to be located somewhere on site that drains naturally to avoid pumping. The proposed location allows for this. Horizon confirmed that it would consider whether illustrative drawings could be produced showing the likely site scaling up of the waste water treatment plant, noting however, that the design of the treatment plant was undecided.</p> <p>In response to further comments from the Interested Parties, Mr Humphries confirmed that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Horizon would consider visualisation of the Power Station from Felin Gafnan as requested by National Trust and Ms Hayward. However, Horizon could not be sure of timing.</li> </ul> |                              |



| ExA's Agenda Item   | Summary of Horizon's Oral Submission made in the hearing  | Relevant document references |
|---|---|------------------------------|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response to Question 8 of the Site Visit should read a daily rate of 990m<sup>3</sup> (not 990m<sup>3</sup> per second).</li> <li>Appendix 1-6 Wnda Site Drainage and Flood Risk in the Afon Cafnan, Cemaes Stream and Nant Cemlyn at paragraph 3.2.13 [REP6-010] makes it clear that Horizon would deal with any over pumping by increasing the storage volume to avoid impacts on Afon Cafnan.</li> </ul>  |                              |
| 5.(d) Flood risk: Flood modelling impacts on Afon Cafnan, Nant Cemlyn and Nant Cemaes | It was acknowledged that Horizon has now committed to providing a detailed drainage scheme for approval.  |                              |
| 5.(e)(i) Biodiversity: Tre'r Gôf Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)           | <p>In response to concerns raised by National Trust regarding the ongoing monitoring of reptiles given the suspension decision, Mr James Cook for Horizon confirmed that principally, Horizon intends to continue this monitoring.</p> <p>Mr Humphries confirmed that funding for the baseline monitoring referred to by National Trust has already been secured and as such this monitoring will be undertaken. Therefore, the suspension decision should not affect those baseline assessments.</p> <p>Mr Humphries acknowledged that Horizon would confirm this in writing.</p> <p>NRW raised a number of concerns relating to the potential impact on Tre'r Gof SSSI. Its concerns related to the conceptual modelling of the SSSI; the proposed approach to monitoring and mitigating effects on it; and drainage.</p> | Draft DCO [REP5-003]         |

| ExA's Agenda Item                          | Summary of Horizon's Oral Submission made in the hearing   | Relevant document references |
|--|--|------------------------------|
|  | <p>In response, Mr Humphries confirmed that Horizon is proposing a new Hydrogeological Monitoring and Mitigation Scheme both Tre'r Gof and Cae Gwyn SSSI, for approval. Further, in recognising that there could be a residual effect on the SSSI, Horizon has provided three compensation sites. Horizon considers that this approach is appropriate, recognising that damage to a SSSI is not a bar to development and the site is a designated site as per NPS EN-6.</p> <p>From a drainage perspective, Mr Humphries clarified that there is already a requirement for an overall drainage scheme to be approved in respect of the Power Station area and the Site Campus. If something more bespoke is needed Horizon could consider it, however, Horizon remains of the view that this is already provided for.</p> <p>As for the conceptual model, Mr Jones confirmed that Horizon would be willing to engage with NRW further to understand what changes that would seek to the model.</p> |                              |
| <p>5. (e)(ii) Biodiversity:<br/>Chough</p> | <p>Mr Cook was invited to respond to the comments by the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds ("<b>RSPB</b>") suggesting that the baseline chough surveys were inaccurate.</p> <p>In response, Mr Cook confirmed that the chough surveys were considered representative of the site. Mr Cook explained that the 2018 chough surveys show a large increase in the use of Wylfa Head habitats following habitat management work there. Chough in 2018 bred successfully utilising primarily habitats on Wylfa Head and areas west of the Existing Power Station, all of which are retained.</p> <p>Horizon consider that continued management of Wylfa Head will be sufficient to support the existing pair of breeding chough through the</p>  | <p>LHMS [REP5-036]</p>       |

| ExA's Agenda Item  | Summary of Horizon's Oral Submission made in the hearing   | Relevant document references   |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>construction period. Core foraging habitat at Wylfa Head will be retained and enhanced.</p> <p>In the long-term, foraging opportunities will be further enhanced for chough by the creation of approx. 25ha of suitable close sward grassland (in addition to continued management of Wylfa Head).</p> <p>In response to a query from the Examining Authority, Mr Humphries confirmed that there would be no greater effect on the chough population if removal of the Site Campus was delayed. It would simply mean the additional grassland would not become available until later.</p> <p>In response to comments from the Environmental NGOs, Mr Cook confirmed that Horizon was in a position to amend the various proportions of the different types of habitats it was proposing to deliver i.e. coarse sward v close-sward and that Horizon would be willing to discuss this further with Interested Parties.</p> |  |
| 5. (e)(iii) Biodiversity:<br>Section 7 habitats  | The parties agreed this had been addressed earlier.  |  |
| <b>Item 6 – Site Campus / Temporary Workers Accommodation (TWA)</b>                                  |  |  |
| 6(a) Design in respect of:<br>(i) Layout;<br>(ii) Facilities;<br>(ii) Materials;<br>(iv) Appearance; | Mr Humphries was invited to provide an update as to any changes proposed to the provision of the Site Campus. Mr Humphries confirmed that while there was no change to the start date for the delivery of the Site Campus, changes have been made to the Phasing Strategy [REP5-039] to tie the delivery of certain phases of development to the number of construction works. The different phases of the Site Campus, for example, is now proposed to be tied to the number of non-home-based workers.   | Phasing Strategy [REP5-039]<br><br>Horizon's responses to Examining Authority's Further Written Questions [REP5-002] |

| ExA's Agenda Item  | Summary of Horizon's Oral Submission made in the hearing   | Relevant document references  |
|--|--|---|
| <p>(b) Quality of accommodation and timescales for delivery;</p> <p>(c) Visual impacts and mitigation;</p> <p>(d) Access and parking arrangements;</p> <p>(e) Noise monitoring;</p> <p>(f) Lighting strategy;</p> <p>(g) Biodiversity impacts on species rich grassland, chough, fungi</p> | <p>Following a question from the Examining Authority, Mr Tasker confirmed that the Site Campus would not be occupied until after blasting and open cut tunnelling had ceased.</p> <p>A number of Interested Parties raised concerns about the Site Campus including IACC's concerns about inadequate provision of car parking and the location of the MUGA near bat barns, the Welsh Government's concerns about delivery and timing of the Site Campus and NRW's concern about the design of the site campus. Land and Lakes also passed comment.</p> <p>In response, Mr Tasker for Horizon made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussions as to the appropriate phasing of the Site Campus have been ongoing. Horizon will continue to consult with IACC and others as to the appropriate timing of delivery of different stages.</li> <li>• The DCO Transport Assessment [APP-101] confirms that a total of up to 1900 car parking spaces would be provided across the WNDA. The location and phasing of those car parks is detailed in that assessment.</li> <li>• Horizon had understood that light levels from the MUGA was not an issue.</li> <li>• Horizon would reconsider the phasing triggers in the Phasing Strategy in light of Welsh Government's comments to ensure it is appropriate.</li> <li>• The design of the Site Campus would be consistent with the Power Station, noting however that there will only be a brief overlap between those two buildings.</li> </ul> | <p>Construction Method Statement [REP5-018]</p> <p>Design and Access Statement [REP4-016 to REP4-019]</p> <p>Site Campus [REP4-028]</p> <p>DCO Transport Assessment [APP-101]</p> |

| ExA's Agenda Item | Summary of Horizon's Oral Submission made in the hearing  | Relevant document references |
|-------------------|---|------------------------------|
|                   | <p>In response to Land and Lakes' submissions, Mr Humphries reiterated the many benefits of the onsite Site Campus and the disadvantages that an off-site temporary workers accommodation such as that proposed by Land and Lakes would result in.</p> <p>In response to Land and Lakes' comments about adverse noise effects at the Site Campus, Mr Sam Williams for Horizon noted that transformer noise mapping had been undertaken in 2012 and explained how the proposed mitigation would be effective in this respect. The octave band noise modelling demonstrates that the noise effects at the Site Campus will be acceptable.</p> <p>Recognising the onsite benefits of the Site Campus, and the strenuous attempts by Horizon to mitigate any adverse effects on it, the Examining Authority asked Horizon to respond to a situation where the Examining Authority thought it beneficial to impose an upper limit on the number of units at the Site Campus, for example 500.</p> <p>Mr Humphries queried the legalities of such a decision. Further, Mr Humphries stressed that such a restriction on the face of the Order would be in effect a refusal of the application. Mr Humphries urged the Examining Authority to consider the implications of such a decision on the UK's energy market. In terms of how Hitachi, Ltd. would respond to such a decision, Mr Humphries reminded the Examining Authority that Horizon is in a suspended state. If the Site Campus was restricted to 500 workers, leaving 3500 workers without accommodation, Horizon does not have a scheme. Mr Humphries reiterated that this was not a situation where a decision maker could pick and mix.</p> |                              |

| ExA's Agenda Item   | Summary of Horizon's Oral Submission made in the hearing                     | Relevant document references |
|---|--|------------------------------|
| <b>Item 7 – Other on-site development</b>   |  |                              |
| <p>7. (a) Design – architectural form, materials, colour, sustainability and processes for achieving good design in relation, but not limited to:</p> <p>(a) Simulator and Training Building;</p> <p>(b) Plant Logistics Warehouse;</p> <p>(c) Vehicle Inspection Bay;</p> <p>(d) Update on proposed Visitor Centre and implications (if any) for the Examination</p> | <p>It was acknowledged that these matters have been addressed elsewhere.</p> |                              |