



3/18 Eagle Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Bristol, BS1 6PN

Customer Services: 0303 444 5000  
e-mail: clocaenogwindfarm@infrastructure.gsi.gov.uk

---

To all interested parties

Your Ref: Sent via email

Our Ref: EN010013

Date: 23 September 2013

---

Dear Sir/Madam

**Planning Act 2008 (as amended) – Section 89 and The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 (as amended) – Rule 8**

**Application by RWE Npower Renewables for an Order Granting Development Consent for the proposed Clocaenog Forest Wind Farm**

**Notice of procedural decisions made at and following the Preliminary Meeting**

I am writing to inform you about the procedural decisions made by me at and following the Preliminary Meeting held on Thursday 12 September 2013 in Denbigh Town Hall, Crown Lane, Denbigh, Denbighshire, LL16 3TB. Annexed to this letter is the timetable for the examination of the application, and the first round of questions that I am asking in the Examination.

The note of the Preliminary Meeting is also enclosed at Annex D and will be made available for inspection at the venues listed in Annex F. An audio recording of the Preliminary Meeting has also been published on our website.

**1. Procedural decision and timetable**

I am very grateful to all those who attended and for the views expressed at the Preliminary Meeting. All matters have been carefully considered.

I have now made some procedural decisions about the way in which the application is to be examined. The timetable setting this out is attached as Annex B. If I consider it necessary to vary the timetable, I will write to you and inform you of the changes. I will also do this if the date, time or place of any hearing is changed, except in the event of an adjournment.

## 2. Written questions

I have decided to ask a number of questions and to receive further information about matters relevant to the application. These questions are set out in Annex C, and responses must be received on or before **Monday 21 October 2013**.

I also invite all interested parties to submit Written Representations and evidence on any matters concerning the application, and on Relevant Representations which they have already submitted. Please send your representations to us using the email or postal address at the top of this letter quoting reference EN010013 and your unique reference number, if one is quoted on this letter or covering email. Please also clearly state in your email or letter that it is your Written Representation. All such Written Representations must also be received on or before **Monday 21 October 2013**.

## 3. Guidance for the submission of Written Representations

Representations can deal with any relevant matter. They are not restricted to the matters set out in my initial assessment of principal issues which was discussed at the Preliminary Meeting, nor restricted to the questions set out in Annex C. Please note if you are submitting a Written Representation, you should identify those parts of the application or specific matters with which you agree and those parts with which you do not agree. You must state the reasons for your agreement or disagreement.

There is no prescribed form for Written Representations. In accordance with Government guidance (Planning Act 2008: Guidance for the examination of applications for development consent. DCLG April 2013), participants should also provide with their written statements, *“any data, methodology and assumptions used to support their submissions”*.

Any Written Representation that exceeds 1500 words should also be accompanied by a summary. This summary should not exceed 10% of the original text. The summary should set out the key facts of the Written Representation and must be representative of the submission made.

To assist in the timely processing of Written Representations we request that interested parties send, where practicable, electronic copies of their submissions as email attachments to [clocaenogwindfarm@infrastructure.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:clocaenogwindfarm@infrastructure.gsi.gov.uk) by 11:59 pm on **Monday 21 October 2013**. Electronic attachments should be clearly labelled with subject title and not exceed 12MB for each email. Should electronic submissions include documents of 300 pages or more, interested parties are advised to send to us, by post, an additional full paper copy of their submission<sup>1</sup>.

## 4. Availability and inspection of representations and documents

Written Representations, responses to Relevant Representations and to questions, Local Impact Reports, comments or any other requested documents or information about the application sent to the Planning Inspectorate will be made available to all interested parties and to anyone who requests an opportunity to inspect and take copies of them.

---

<sup>1</sup> Subject to Examination Procedure Rule 10(6)(a), we request the Applicant to supply 7 paper copies of their Written Representation(s) for the Examining Authority to use and make available for public inspection under Rule 21.

This letter provides notification to all interested parties that at each stage of the Examination set out in the timetable at Annex B and as soon as practicable, we will make these available by publishing them on the National Infrastructure, Clocaenog Forest Wind Farm project pages on the Planning Portal website (<http://infrastructure.planningportal.gov.uk/clocaenog>). We will also provide an opportunity for inspection and copying at a number of locations in the vicinity of the application site. The notification of the deposit locations is at Annex F.

## **5. Deadlines for receipt of documents; requests for and holding of hearings**

Timely submissions in advance of the deadlines set in the timetable are encouraged and welcomed. It is important to note that if Written Representations, responses to Relevant Representations and to written questions, Local Impact Reports, further information or requests for hearings are not received by the dates specified in the timetable, I may disregard them.

If no written requests are received by the identified deadline for open floor hearings or compulsory acquisition hearings I am not required to hold any such hearings, although I may choose to do so. For issue specific hearings, dates have been reserved in the timetable, and I have provided an indication of the issues which may be covered. However, the Examination is primarily a written procedure and therefore I will only hold an issue specific hearing when there are matters which I wish to explore more fully following consideration of all the evidence submitted in writing.

Once I decide to hold any hearing, the time, date and place of the hearing will be confirmed in writing to all registered interested parties in accordance with the timetable at Annex B, providing at least 21 days notice. An agenda for each hearing will be published at least one week in advance.

Os hoffech gwneud cyfraniadau drwy gyfrwng y Gymraeg yn ystod yr ymweliadau safle neu'r gwrandawliadau dylech nodi hyn ynghyd â'ch cadarnhad i fod yn bresennol neu i siarad yn y digwyddiadau hyn.

## **6. Award of costs**

I also draw your attention to the possibility of the award of costs against interested parties who behave unreasonably. You should be aware of the relevant Costs Policy that applies to National Infrastructure Projects. The policy is available on the National Infrastructure pages of the Planning Portal website (<http://infrastructure.planningportal.gov.uk/>).

## **7. Power to amend the project**

Mr Tilby raised a query concerning changes to the scheme in terms of whether the Examining Authority (ExA) would have the power to recommend to the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change (DECC) that the Applicant should remove/reduce the number of turbines. In answer to that query, an ExA does not have the power to substitute an alternative proposal for the application proposal and recommend that alternative proposal to DECC even if the alternative, on the face of it, may appear to be more acceptable or give rise to fewer objections.

## 8. Future notifications

If you are an interested party you will continue to receive notifications from the Planning Inspectorate about the Examination throughout the process. If you have received this letter because you attended the Preliminary Meeting but you are not an interested party you will **not** receive any further communication from us relating to this application. You can, however, visit the project pages on the Planning Portal website as set out above to stay informed of the progress of the examination of the application. If you are a statutory consultee who has not made a Relevant Representation but wishes to become an interested party, you should inform us by Monday 21 October 2013. **Statutory consultees who have not made a Relevant Representation and do not notify us of their wish to become an interested party will not receive any further correspondence.**

Finally, I look forward to all participants' cooperation to ensure the examination of this application proceeds smoothly.

Yours faithfully

*Wendy Burden*

**Wendy Burden  
Examining Authority**

Advice may be given about applying for an order granting development consent or making representations about an application (or a proposed application). This communication does not however constitute legal advice upon which you can rely and you should obtain your own legal advice and professional advice as required.

A record of the advice which is provided will be recorded on the Planning Inspectorate website together with the name of the person or organisation who asked for the advice. The privacy of any other personal information will be protected in accordance with our Information Charter which you should view before sending information to the Planning Inspectorate.

**Annexes:**

- A. Examining Authority's Procedural Decisions
- B. Timetable for Examination of the Application
- C. Examining Authority's First Written Questions and requests for information
- D. Note of the Preliminary Meeting
- E. Revised list of matters to be covered in Statements of Common Ground (SoCG)
- F. Availability of Representations and Application Documents

## **Annex A**

### **Examining Authority's Procedural Decisions**

#### ***Principal issues***

In response to the Rule 6 letter, dated 1 August 2013, comments have been made about the range of topics set out in my initial assessment of principal issues contained in Annex D to the Rule 6 letter. I note the Natural Resources Wales (NRW) submission that the Outline Habitat Management Plan (OHMP) should be a separate issue, but I have identified this as a matter which should be covered by a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG). It is also a mitigation measure and as such it will be considered in that part of the Examination dealing with mitigation and requirements. I do not therefore consider it necessary to identify the OHMP specifically under the list of principal issues.

In terms of the matters raised by Mr Hopkinson under the heading of Policy Issues, it is open to any interested party to make submissions on the points he raises, and those submissions will fall to be tested against the relevant policies. As a result I do not consider it necessary to add to the principal issue under the heading of Policy.

A number of parties raised the matter of private water supplies during the operational life of the wind turbines. Other matters were also raised such as effects on television and radio, the future of the turbine foundations, and danger of turbine disintegration. These are all matters which can be raised in detail in written submissions and which I will take into account without a need to change the principal issues.

Landscape and visual impact are listed under the main heading of the Environment and the effect of the project in relation to all those locations referred to by interested parties will be considered through the Examination process.

#### ***Accompanied Site Visits (ASV)***

I confirm my intention to carry out a visit to the site and the surrounding area accompanied by representatives of the Applicant and the local authorities, and by representatives of interested parties, on Wednesday 30 and Thursday 31 October 2013. The ASV will begin at Llyn Brenig Visitors' Centre from 08.30am on Wednesday 30 October 2013. An itinerary is being prepared which will incorporate a number of the locations identified by interested parties and which will be posted on the National Infrastructure, Clocaenog Forest Wind Farm project pages on the Planning Portal website. I propose to undertake an ASV to the Tir Mostyn Wind Farm in the company of the Applicant and MEAG on Friday 1 November 2013. This will begin at the Tir Mostyn and Foel Goch Wind Farm Switchgear House at the following address at 09:30am and details of arrangements for that visit will also be posted on the website: Tir Mostyn and Foel Goch Wind Farm Switchgear House, Cerrig Road, Nantglyn, Denbigh, LL16 5RN.

In the event of poor weather conditions and bad visibility, Thursday 6 February 2014 is reserved for any further ASV, and I will be making unaccompanied visits to the area in the course of the Examination.

The Applicant will provide a limited level of transport for the ASV, primarily for the ExA and statutory consultees. Other interested parties who wish to attend the ASV

will be responsible for providing their own transport. I remind all parties that the ASV is not an opportunity to make any representations or discuss evidence. It is an opportunity for me to look at physical features only. I would therefore encourage interested parties to liaise together and appoint one or two persons to represent them in order to avoid an excessive number of vehicles at the ASV.

### ***Examination Timetable***

Eversheds submitted requests for additions to the draft timetable set out as Annex F to my letter of 1 August 2013. A deadline for proposed amendments to the Development Consent Order (DCO) is identified in the Timetable, and to avoid the issue of further iterations of the DCO, this will also be the deadline for the correction of errata or typographical errors. The deadline of 21 October 2013 has been set for the receipt of the schedule of mitigation and associated requirements which I requested in the Rule 6 letter dated 1 August 2013. Whilst I have not added a deadline for the production of an agenda for each confirmed hearing, it is my intention to produce an agenda as soon as possible after notification has been sent out that a hearing is to be held, and at least one week in advance of the hearing.

The Applicant requested that any party wishing to appear at a hearing should submit an outline statement of case in advance. However, a statement of each party's case should already be set out in their Relevant Representations or Written Representations and therefore no deadlines are set for outline statements to be submitted.

No other comments were made about proposed deadlines, so I confirm that the Examination will proceed in accordance with the timetable set out in Annex B of this letter. For the avoidance of doubt, those hearings concerning the draft DCO will be on a without prejudice basis, and my decision to hold such hearings does not imply that any view has been taken about whether the Order should be granted. At this stage, no other hearings are proposed, but provision is made in the timetable to hold issue specific hearings on particular topics if I consider it is necessary to complete the Examination. Time is also reserved for any compulsory acquisition and open floor hearings which may be requested at the appropriate stage later in the Examination.

I confirm my request for SoCG, and a revised list of matters to be covered is set out at Annex E to this letter. The deadlines for the submission of SoCG are set in the Timetable as 21 October 2013, for all SoCG apart from on DCO Requirements, and 14 November 2013 for SoCG on DCO Requirements.

Other than reaffirming the important next major deadline of Thursday 21 October 2013 for the submission of Local Impact Reports from the local authorities, responses to my first written questions set out in Annex C of this letter, and Written Representations by all interested parties, amongst other matters for submission by that date, I do not intend to issue reminders of subsequent deadlines for submission of comments or responses. It is important therefore for all interested parties to make sure they note the various stages of the confirmed Examination Timetable accordingly.

There is provision in The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 (Rules 13/17) for me to amend the timetable if required, but no power for me to change the date for the closure of the Examination.

The Examination will close on or before Wednesday 12 March 2014.

## ***Status of Natural Resources Wales (NRW)***

Forestry Commission Wales (FCW) has been merged within NRW. The question was raised by Prof Peter Cobbold as to whether in view of the pecuniary interest of the former FCW in the application project, NRW should remain as an independent and impartial consultee on the application. Prof Cobbold considered that some other independent organisation should be called upon to provide advice on environmental issues.

I have included a question in my first round of questions, under Other Matters, which seeks clarification from NRW as to whether or not any provision has been made within NRW to deal with the potential for conflict of interest within the new administration. Meanwhile NRW is the statutory consultee for this project, and I am seeking responses from NRW in regard to relevant issues in my first round of questions.

## Annex B

### Timetable for the Examination of the Application

The Examining Authority (ExA) is under a duty to complete the examination of the application by the end of the period of 6 months beginning with the day after the start day, which in this case is 13 September 2013. In addition to the timetable set out below, please note that I may at any time before the completion of the examination of the application or specified matters, request further information or written comments from an interested party to be supplied by a specified date and in a manner which I may set out. All deadlines will close at 23.59pm on all dates. Amendments may be made to the Examination Timetable under The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 (Rules 13/17).

Item	Matters	Due Dates
1	Start of the Examination	Friday 13 September 2013
2	Issue of Rule 8 letter following Preliminary Meeting, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedural decisions</li> <li>• Procedural timetable</li> <li>• Examining Authority's (ExA) first set of written questions</li> <li>• Confirmation of request for Statements of Common Ground (SoCG)</li> </ul>	Monday 23 September 2013
3	Deadline for receipt by the ExA of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notification of wish to attend the ExA's inspection of the site in the company of interested parties</li> </ul>	Thursday 3 October 2013
4	Deadline for receipt by the ExA of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responses to ExA's first written questions</li> <li>• Comments on Relevant Representations (RRs)</li> <li>• Summaries of RR's exceeding 1500 words</li> <li>• Written Representations (WRs) by all interested parties</li> <li>• Summaries of all WRs exceeding 1500 words</li> <li>• Schedule of mitigation works with associated DCO Requirement</li> <li>• Statements of Common Ground (apart from SoCG on Development Consent Order (DCO) Requirements)</li> <li>• Local Impact Reports (LIR) from local</li> </ul>	Monday 21 October 2013

	<p>authorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notification by interested parties of wish to make oral representations at Open Floor or any Issue Specific<sup>2</sup> Hearings</li> <li>• Notification by affected persons of wish for a Compulsory Acquisition Hearing to be held</li> </ul>	
<b>5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First Issue Specific Hearing on DCO: confirmed hearing</li> <li>• Any requirement for Applicant to update Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Matrices to be issued by ExA</li> </ul>	Tuesday 29 October 2013
<b>6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accompanied Site Visits (ASV) (Itinerary to be published on project website in due course)</li> <li>• ASV to Tir Mostyn Wind Farm</li> </ul>	<p>Wednesday 30 October and Thursday 31 October 2013 (08:30am)</p> <p>Friday 1 November 2013 (09:30am)</p>
<b>7</b>	<p>Deadline for receipt by the ExA of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SoCG on DCO Requirements</li> <li>• Comments on WRs and responses to comments on RRs</li> <li>• Comments on the LIRs</li> <li>• Comments on response to ExA's first written questions</li> <li>• Comments on Statements of Common Ground</li> <li>• Written summaries of cases put orally at DCO hearing</li> <li>• The correction of errata or typographical errors within the DCO and Explanatory Memorandum (EM), and any proposed amendments to the draft DCO</li> <li>• Submission by the Applicant of assessment of impact on tranquillity</li> <li>• Submission by the Applicant of updated HRA Matrices if required by ExA</li> </ul>	Thursday 14 November 2013
<b>8</b>	Issue by ExA of second set of written questions	Thursday 21 November 2013
<b>9</b>	<p>Deadline for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response to ExA's second set of written questions</li> <li>• Comments on proposed amendments to the draft DCO</li> <li>• Comments on the Applicant's assessment of impact on tranquillity</li> <li>• If required, a RIES will be issued by the ExA on</li> </ul>	Thursday 12 December 2013

<sup>2</sup> The Issues which may be the subject of a hearing include: Policy; Environment; Health and Safety; Mitigation and Requirements. An Issue Specific Hearing will only be held where the ExA considers that there are matters outstanding which are not covered by written submissions. At least 21 days notice will be given for each hearing.

	this date <sup>3</sup>	
<b>10</b>	<p>Deadline for receipt by ExA of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments on responses to second set of written questions</li> <li>• Comments on responses to Applicant's assessment of impact on tranquillity</li> <li>• Comments on the RIES (if issued)</li> </ul>	Thursday 9 January 2014
<b>11</b>	<p>Dates reserved for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issue Specific Hearing on Policy</li> <li>• Issue Specific Hearings on the Environment</li> </ul>	<p>Tuesday 21 January 2014 (PM)</p> <p>Wednesday 22 and Thursday 23 January 2014</p>
<b>12</b>	<p>Dates reserved for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issue Specific Hearing on Mitigation and Requirements</li> <li>• Second Issue Specific Hearing on DCO</li> <li>• Compulsory Acquisition Hearing</li> </ul>	<p>Wednesday 29 January 2014</p> <p>Thursday 30 January 2014 (am) and (pm)</p>
<b>13</b>	<p>Dates reserved for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open Floor Hearing (if required)</li> <li>• Issue Specific Hearing (if required, issue to be notified)</li> </ul>	Tuesday 4 and Wednesday 5 February 2014
<b>14</b>	<p>Date reserved for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final Accompanied Site Visit (if required)</li> </ul>	Thursday 6 February 2014
<b>15</b>	<p>Deadline for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission to ExA of final draft DCO and requirements and completed S106 undertakings</li> <li>• Written summaries of cases put orally at all hearings in January and February 2014</li> </ul>	Thursday 13 February 2014
<b>16</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deadline for comments on final draft DCO and requirements</li> </ul>	Thursday 20 February 2014

<sup>3</sup> Based on the matrices provided with the Applicant's HRA report and evidence from the examination, the Planning Inspectorate will produce a Report on the Implications for European Sites (RIES). The purpose of the RIES is to provide the SoS with a complete factual account of the information and evidence available for the purposes of undertaking the HRA. Comments on the RIES will be invited, and a minimum of 21 days will be allowed within the Examination Timetable to enable parties to respond to this consultation. Any comments received will be taken into account in the ExA's report and recommendation to the SoS but the RIES will not be revised or amended following consultation.

<b>17</b>	Deadline for <b>close of Examination</b>	On or before Wednesday 12 March 2014
-----------	--	--

## Annex C

### Examining Authority's First Written Questions and requests for information

Responses to the Examining Authority's (ExA) first written questions and requests for information should be received by the ExA on or before Monday 21 October 2013.

Unless otherwise stated, the questions are generally addressed to the Applicant. However the ExA invites all interested parties to consider whether they have evidence on the issues raised, and to provide answers to any questions where they can.

Where questions are relevant to the Applicant, relevant planning authorities or statutory bodies or undertakers, it is expected that answers will be given by each party unless an agreed position on relevant matters is to be included in a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG).

#### 1 Development Consent Order

*A number of matters require clarification or possible amendment. The Applicant is requested to prepare an outline statement with a view to exploring these matters at the first hearing into the DCO on 29 October 2013.*

a) Description of the authorised development and ancillary development:

The description of authorised development in Schedule 1 Part 1 includes the widening of PR1 within both work no 3 and work no 4A and PR5 within both work no 3 and no 4B. On the Works Plan, PR1 and PR5 work no 3 are shown but works no 4A and 4B are not. Can the Applicant please clarify.

b) The conformity of the Order with the project and the works plans:

It is not clear from the Works Plan what the extent of the public road widening is e.g. only PR1 and PR5 are shown in brown, the continuation of PR1 and PR2 and PR3 are only shown as coloured pink. The key shows the pink colouring to indicate installation of cable only and no widening of the highway. This is inconsistent with Schedule 1 Part 1 where PR1, PR2 and PR3 are described as public roads subject to widening and identified as works no 3, 4A and 4B. Can the Applicant please clarify.

c) The Book of Reference: including whether all the persons or bodies with an interest in land or rights to be acquired have been identified in the Book of Reference:

Please explain why on the Land Plan parcels 9, 10, 12 are shown as owned by Denbighshire County Council (DCC), in the Book of Reference they are described as owned by Conwy County Borough Council (CCBC). Parcel 11 is not shown coloured on the Land Plan yet it is included in the Book of Reference and described as owned by CCBC. It is not identified at all on the Works Plan.

On the Land Plan Parcel no 8 is described as being land subject to interference with private rights of way. These private rights of way are described in Part 2a and Part

3 of the Book of Reference. Please explain why the Works Plan however describes this area as not required for the development.

Please identify Parcel no 7 on the Plans. Regulation 5(2) (i) (i) of The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedures) Regulations 2009 (the APFP Regs) requires land "required for, or affected by" the development to be identified on the Land Plan.

Please provide areas in square metres in the Book of Reference as required by Regulation 7(1) (e) of the APFP Regs.

d) Compulsory Acquisition (CA) powers re private rights, highways land, Crown land, and new rights:

Could the Applicant identify which parcels of land (referring to the Book of Reference and the Land Plans) they are seeking to compulsorily acquire?

Could the Applicant identify which rights over land (referring to the Book of Reference and the Land Plans) they are seeking to extinguish by way of CA?

Could the Applicant identify which new rights over land they are seeking to compulsorily acquire (referring to the Book of Reference and the Land Plans). Please describe exact location and nature of the rights and justification for their creation.

What works (temporary or permanent) does the Applicant wish to carry out to public highways?

Does Article 10 street works provide them with the powers they need to carry out these works?

e) Consistency with the Environmental Statement (ES).

Could the Applicant demonstrate that the development parameters proposed through the DCO are the same as those in the ES and that they are adequately assessed in the ES?

*Having regard to the DCO Model Provisions, the following detailed questions are raised:*

1.1 **Applicant** Article 4 applies Town and Country Planning Act (TCPA) procedures to applications for approvals made to the local planning authorities (LPAs) under the requirements in Sch 1 Part 3. In the Brechfa Forest West DCO, a simpler form of this Article was included. Can the Applicant indicate whether the wording of the Brechfa article would be suitable here?

1.2 **Applicant:** Article 7(1) authorises the transmission of electricity in addition to the generating of electricity. Is this correct? Can the Applicant explain why this has been included since the equivalent article in the Brechfa Forest West Wind Farm DCO referred only to generating electricity?

1.3 **Applicant:** Under Article 11, there is no provision for extinguishment of rights of way yet the compensation provision is included. Can the Applicant confirm that it is intending merely to suspend/interfere with rights of way and not to extinguish them?

1.4 **Highway Authority (HA):** Is the HA satisfied as to the acceptability of Article 13 as proposed by the Applicant? Would the HA wish to see a provision in the Article requiring a written plan to be agreed with the Applicant which deals with the standard to which any new public rights of way should be created?

1.5 **Highway Authority:** Article 14 follows Model Provision (MP) 11 but in addition states that consent of the street authority shall not be unreasonably withheld and deemed consent shall be granted if notification of the decision is not received within 28 days of receipt of the application for consent. The HA's views on this provision are sought.

1.6 **Applicant, Conwy County Borough Council (CCBC), Denbighshire County Council (DCC), Highway Authority:** Article 15 (1) states that the LPA's approval is not to be unreasonably withheld. It also adds that the undertaker can strengthen, improve or reconstruct any street under the powers in the Order. There appears to be a drafting error at the beginning of the sub clause (c), in that words requiring the approval of the LPA and consultation with the HA (replicating (b)) have been omitted. 15(2) grants deemed approval if a decision is not received within 28 days of receipt of the application for approval. It refers to a highway authority but should this be Local Planning Authority? Could the Applicant confirm the precise drafting of this Article. The ExA also requires the views of the LPA and HA on this provision.

1.7 **Natural Resources Wales (NRW):** Article 18 deals with discharge of water into watercourses and public sewers and drains. Sub clause (8) deals with deemed consents and approvals. The ExA seeks the view of NRW on this provision.

1.8 **Highway Authority:** Article 19 includes a provision for deemed consent in relation to trial holes in highways and private streets. The ExA seeks the view of the HA on this provision.

1.9 **Applicant:** Article 20 follows MP18 but does not provide for a general overarching extinguishment of all encumbrances as does the MP. Does the Applicant wish to refer to 24(2) here which deals with the extinguishment of all private rights over land?

1.10 **Applicant:** Article 22 follows MP19 but adds in an additional modification 22(1)(c). Why has this addition been made, together with 22(2) which appears to have the effect of repeating the exclusion of mines and mineral rights from any compulsory acquisition already provided for in 22(1).

1.11 **Applicant:** Article 23 follows MP21 but refers to the new rights being acquired as being defined in Schedule 6 but there are no new rights described in Sch 6. Can the Applicant please clarify this, and also explain why there is a need for 23(2)(b) as extinguishment of rights is dealt with in Article 24? In addition, 23(3) applies MP 21(3) to new rights rather than existing rights. There is no provision corresponding to MP 21(2) or 21(4). Can the Applicant explain why these are not needed?

1.12 **CCBC, DCC, Applicant:** Article 29 authorises the undertaker to remove hedgerows without obtaining consents under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997. Can the Applicant specify the hedgerows to be removed in a Schedule to the DCO? If not, can

the Applicant provide justification for the inclusion of such a general consent within the DCO? The ExA also seeks the views of the LPAs on the drafting of this Article.

1.13 **Applicant:** Article 30 amends MP31 to give the undertaker the power to remove or reposition Statutory Undertakers apparatus underneath streets specified in Schedule 6. However, there are no streets specified in Schedule 6. Should this refer to Schedule 2? It also authorises the creation of and CA of a new right for this purpose but the new right is not described or shown on the Land Plans. Please clarify why this power is needed here when Article 10 includes the right to break open streets and change the position of apparatus. The ExA requests the Applicant to provide justification for this power in 30(1) (b).

1.14 **Applicant:** Article 31 - follows the MP32 but there is a typo in 31(2) (b) replace "anti" with "and"?

1.15 **Applicant:** Article 35 should reflect s135 of the 2008 Act with regard to Crown land. The ExA requests that the Applicant clarify its intentions with regard to Crown land. Is it intending to acquire Crown land by agreement? If so, what stage have negotiations reached? Is it intending to acquire compulsorily third party rights over Crown land by the use of this Article in the DCO? If so, has it obtained the consent of the Crown to the inclusion of this Article? Has it obtained the consent of the Crown to the inclusion of all Articles in the DCO which affect Crown land? The Applicant is invited to redraft Article 35 to reflect the answers to these questions.

## 2 Policy Issues

### ***National Policy Statement (NPS) EN1***

2.1 **Applicant, interested parties:** NPS EN1 sets out the framework for energy policy in England and Wales. It establishes the need for low carbon energy infrastructure, with a particular emphasis on the role of onshore wind farms in meeting this need. Having regard to para 4.1.2 of the NPS, are there any specific and relevant policies set out in either this or any other NPS which would clearly indicate that the ExA should not start with a presumption in favour of granting consent to the Clocaenog Forest Wind Farm proposal?

2.2 **NRW, interested parties:** NPS EN1 refers to the importance of design. In particular, para 4.5.3 refers to the good design in terms of existing landscape character, landform and vegetation. To what extent does the Applicant demonstrate that the best design in these terms has been achieved? (EN3 para 2.7.48-49)

2.3 **Applicant, NRW, CCBC, DCC:** It is accepted in paras 4.9.1 – 4.9.3 of EN1 that an application for grid connection may not accompany an application for an electricity generation plant such as a wind farm. No such application has been made to connect the Clocaenog Forest Wind Farm. In these circumstances, is there sufficient information submitted as part of the application to demonstrate that there is no obvious reason why a grid connection should not be achieved? If not, what further information should be required?

2.4 **NRW:** EN1 states at para 4.10.1 that issues which affect air quality, or water quality or which include noise and vibration may be subject to separate regulation under the pollution control framework or other consenting and licensing regimes. In this case there are issues raised about the impact of the scheme on the quality of

private water supplies during both construction and operation, and on air quality. Are these matters which would be subject to controls under other legislation? If so, are the relevant pollution control authorities satisfied that potential impacts can be adequately regulated?

**2.5 NRW, CCBC, DCC:** EN1 para 4.13.1 recognises that the production and distribution of energy may have negative impacts on some people's health. Are there any potential health issues which could arise from the application proposal which are not subject to regulation under other legislation and which are not currently dealt with in the requirements of the draft DCO?

**2.6 NRW:** Para 5.3.6 recognises the need to protect the most important biodiversity and geological conservation interests. However, the benefits of nationally significant low carbon energy infrastructure may include benefits for biodiversity and geological conservation interests and these benefits may outweigh any harm to those interests. In this case, has the Applicant adequately assessed the impact of the proposal on the most important biodiversity and geological conservation interests, and is NRW satisfied that any harmful impacts can either be adequately mitigated, or that any particular harmful impact is such that it must weigh against the benefits of the proposed wind farm?

**2.7 NRW, Cadw, Clwyd-Powys Archaeological Trust (CPAT):** Section 5.8 of EN1 is concerned with the Historic Environment. Are NRW, Cadw and CPAT satisfied that the Applicant has fully assessed the impact of the proposed scheme on heritage assets, and that the proposed mitigation and monitoring (including micrositing) would avoid any significant harm? (see also EN3 para 2.7.42-45)

**2.8 CCBC, DCC, NRW, interested parties:** Section 5.9 is concerned with landscape and visual impacts. To what extent do the LPAs, NRW and interested parties consider that the assessment carried out by the Applicant meets the requirements set out in paras 5.9.5 – 5.9.7 of EN1?

**2.9 CCBC, DCC:** To what extent do the LPAs and NRW consider that the Applicant has met the requirements of para 5.9.12 of EN1 (and para 2.5.33 of EN3)?

**2.10 CCBC, DCC:** Having regard to advice in para 5.10.13 of EN1, which are the most up to date development plan documents which the LPAs consider to carry weight in the determination of the DCO application?

**2.11 CCBC, DCC, NRW:** Having regard to Section 5.11 of EN1 relating to noise, are the LPAs and NRW satisfied that the Applicant has carried out an adequate assessment of noise impacts of both the wind farm during operation and the noise impacts likely to occur during construction which identify all potential harmful effects? Does the assessment of the operation of the wind farm demonstrate compliance with ETSU-R-97? (EN3 paras 2.7.57-61)

**2.12 CCBC, DCC, Welsh Government:** Having regard to Section 5.12 of EN1 relating to Socio-economic issues, are the LPAs and the Welsh Government (WG) satisfied that the Applicant has carried out an adequate assessment of all relevant impacts?

**2.13 CCBC, DCC, Welsh Government/Highways Agency:** Having regard to Section 5.13 of EN1 are the local highways authorities satisfied that the Applicant has carried out an adequate assessment of the transport implications of construction, and if not,

what additional work may be required in order to inform the ExA's report to the SoS? (EN3 paras 2.7.75-77)

2.14 **CCBC, DCC, NRW:** Having regard to Section 5.15 of EN1 are NRW and the local authorities satisfied that the Applicant has carried out an adequate assessment of the likely effect of the proposal on water quality and resources, including private water supplies? Would the scheme have any adverse effect on the achievement of the Water Framework Directive? Is any additional work required in order to inform the ExA's report to the SoS?

### ***NPS EN3***

2.15 Has the Applicant demonstrated that the proposed wind farm would be resilient to storms as required in para 2.3.4 of EN3?

2.16 Has the Applicant included the full extent of the works required to provide access for construction of the wind farm, together with an assessment of their effects, as required in para 2.7.12 of EN3?

2.17 **NRW:** To what extent is NRW satisfied that the Applicant has carried out an adequate assessment of the potential for the rotating blades of the proposed wind turbines to strike birds and adversely affect bats? (para 2.7.33)

2.18 **NRW:** To what extent is NRW satisfied that the Applicant has carried out an adequate assessment of the impact arising from the disturbance of important habitats, including peat? (para 2.7.36)

2.19 **NRW:** To what extent is NRW satisfied that the Applicant has carried out an adequate assessment of the carbon balance of the scheme, having regard to any disturbance to peat as a result of building and maintaining roads and tracks, turbine bases and any other infrastructure? (para 2.7.37)

2.20 **NRW:** To what extent is NRW satisfied that the Applicant has incorporated adequate proposals for monitoring (and making the results publically available) during the construction and operational phases of the wind farm? (para 2.7.40)

2.21 **Interested parties:** Para 2.7.60 states that there is no evidence that ground transmitted low frequency noise from wind turbines occurs at a sufficient level to be harmful to human health. This reflects the advice in the companion guide to PPS22. Not only does this not apply in Wales, that document is no longer Government policy. The ExA therefore wishes to be informed whether any party to the Examination has any evidence to refute this position?

2.22 **CCBC, DCC:** Are the relevant LPAs satisfied that the Applicant has carried out an adequate assessment of any potential impact from shadow flicker in accord with para 2.7.66-67 of EN3?

### ***TAN 8 and Minister's letter of July 2011***

2.23 **Applicant, CCBC, DCC, NRW:** The potential capacity of the proposed wind farm is 96MW. What is the capacity of other wind farms which have either been granted planning permission, or which have been constructed in Strategic Search Area A (SSA(A)), and would the scheme together with consented and operational wind farms

exceed the indicative target of 212 MW SSA(A) as identified in the 2005 Garrad Hassan "Energy Assessment of TAN8 wind energy Strategic Search Areas".

2.24 **Applicant, CCBC, DCC, NRW:** What is your view of the status of the indicative target? Having regard to the approach taken in the Garrad Hassan study, should the target be regarded as a limit on environmental capacity or does it relate to the maximum energy yields likely to be achieved within the SSA, subject to the constraints of noise and air safety issues?

### Development Plan

2.25 Can **CCBC DCC** please confirm that the Applicant has identified the relevant development plan policies in the Planning Statement (CF/AppDoc17)? If not, can any additional policies please be identified and can reasons for their relevance be provided.

### 3 The Environment

3.1 **Applicant:** The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) identifies significant and cumulative impacts on landscape and visual amenity. Has the Applicant agreed with the **LPAs, NRW, Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (CPRW), Snowdonia National Park Authority** and **interested parties** those viewpoints from which the most significant impacts can be seen, in order to inform the ExA's visits to the site and surrounding area?

3.2 **Applicant:** Major adverse effects are also identified in relation to the visual impacts on the setting of certain Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAMs). Has the Applicant agreed with the **LPAs, Cadw, CPAT, NRW and interested parties** which SAMs are most likely to be subject to those impacts, in order to inform the ExA's visits to the site and surrounding area?

3.3 **Applicant:** The LVIA indicates that the assessment assumes clear winter conditions and leafless trees, but a number of the photomontages of viewpoints do not show leafless trees, such as the view of Cyffylliog and Ruthin. Do such photomontages accord with the worse case assumptions set out in the Environmental Statement (ES), or if not, how was this taken into account in the LVIA?

3.4 **Applicant:** To what extent does the design and layout of the scheme reflect landform, topography and valued landscape features of the site and its surrounding area, and how has the layout been refined in order to minimise cumulative visual and landscape impacts in combination with other existing and proposed wind turbines in the vicinity?

3.5 **Applicant:** Having regard to the CPRE publication "Mapping Tranquillity", the Applicant is requested by the ExA to carry out an assessment of the effect of the proposal on tranquillity within the Clocaenog forest and its surroundings. (An extended deadline of 14 November 2013 is provided for this assessment)

3.6 **Applicant:** In relation to the protection of known historical monuments, the ExA notes that a registered Standing Stone (Maen Cred) has not been found, so how does the Applicant propose to secure the monument, what steps are to be taken?

**3.7 NRW, CCBC, DCC and interested parties:** has the Applicant carried out an adequate assessment of the impact of the scheme on private water supplies both during the construction phase and subsequent operation? Is any further evidence required to enable impacts on private water supplies to be fully considered?

**3.8 NRW, NWWT and interested parties:** the bird surveys were undertaken between 2008 and 2009. The Applicant states that the habitats present on the site have not altered significantly and the abundance and distribution of species is therefore unlikely to have changed. Are the consultees satisfied that the data used by the Applicant to inform the ES is robust?

**3.9 NRW, North Wales Wildlife Trust (NWWT) and interested parties:** the Applicant identifies a potential negative impact (ES para 10.9.3.30) from the noise of the turbines on the breeding habits of nightjar. Has an adequate assessment of the potential impact been carried out (see paras 10.9.3.35-37 and 10.9.3.65)?

**3.10 NRW, NWWT and interested parties:** Habitat surveys for non-avian species were undertaken between 4 and 5 years ago. The Applicant states that the abundance and distribution of species is unlikely to have changed. Are the consultees satisfied that the data which has been used to inform the ES is robust?

**3.11 Applicant:** have any changes to the project boundary been made during the course of survey work, and if so, have any such changes been the subject of consultation with statutory consultees?

**3.12 NRW, NWWT and interested parties:** ES paras 9.10.5.1 and 9.9.3.32 identify some uncertainty in relation to the effects of wind farms on bats. Have the Applicants used the most up to date methodologies to identify and assess potential impacts?

**3.13 NRW, NWWT and interested parties:** are the conclusions in the ES (para 9.9.3.27) based on reasonable and appropriate assumptions such that the conclusions are reliable with regard to the potential for harm to bats by barotrauma?

**3.14 Applicant, NRW, NWWT and interested parties:** A number of off site works are likely to be required in the form of off-site highway improvements to enable the transport of abnormal indivisible loads, as outlined in para 12.7.4. These may need to be the subject of separate planning applications. How have potential environmental effects resulting from these improvements been considered in the ES, and are consultees satisfied that the potential effects have been adequately considered?

**3.15 NRW, NWWT:** The need for a European Protected Species (EPS) License is identified in respect of dormice. Are there any other species for which EPS Licenses may be required? Is the licensing authority aware of any issues that may prevent a license from being granted?

**3.16 NRW:** As a result of the need to fell trees for the construction of the project, NRW (formerly Forestry Commission Wales) is to review its Forest Design Plan (FDP). Can NRW confirm that the normal tree clearance programme would be modified to ensure that normal production forest volumes would be maintained? In the longer term I note that the FDP will not be finalised until the project is constructed. Does this have any implications for the ES in terms of potential transport and other environmental impacts?

**3.17 Public Health England, CCBC, DCC:** The ES does not consider the inter-relationship between transport impacts and potential changes to air quality (eg in terms of emissions from vehicles generated by the project). Are the measures prescribed in the draft Construction Environmental Management Plan adequate to minimise air quality impacts during construction to acceptable levels?

**3.18 Applicant** In relation to the future grid connection for the project, the high level assessment of the two route options in the ES does not include Traffic and Transport which is not considered to be significant (15.7.2). Can the Applicant justify this conclusion? Furthermore the connection route is not included in the cumulative effects assessment in any of the topic specific chapters of the ES, such that there is no assessment of the cumulative effects of the grid connection with the application project. What is the justification for this approach?

**3.19 NRW, Clocaenog Community Council, CCBC, DCC and interested parties:** To what extent will the Recreation and Access Management Plan mitigate any disruption to recreation and tourism during construction, followed by the operation of the wind turbines within the forest?

**3.20 NRW, Clocaenog Community Council, CCBC, DCC and interested parties:** Is there evidence to demonstrate that the impacts on residential and visitor amenity during the construction phase in terms of noise, dust, water supply and traffic; and during the operational phase in terms of noise and vibration, water supply and shadow flicker have not been adequately assessed by the Applicant?

**3.21 Applicant, NRW, Clocaenog Community Council, CCBC, DCC and interested parties:** in the assessment of noise impacts, have the appropriate methodology and models been applied to inform the assessment? Since the application was submitted a "Good practice guide to the application of ETSU-R-97 for the assessment and rating of wind turbine noise" (IOA, 2013) has been published. What are the implications of this new guidance for the assessment which has been carried out, and to what extent does the assessment accord with the latest guidance?

**3.22 NRW, Clocaenog Community Council, CCBC, DCC:** The assessment of noise has been based on a number of turbine parameters. Is it necessary to set limits relating to these parameters in the DCO in order to ensure that any variation in the detailed design does not lead to a worse case than that assessed in the ES, or would the use of noise limits within the DCO requirements ensure that the worse case predicted within the assessment would not be exceeded?

**3.23 NRW, CCBC, DCC:** has the consideration of noise emissions resulting from existing turbines and those likely to arise from turbines with planning permission been adequately addressed in the assessments and what implications, if any, does this have for the absolute and individual noise limits?

**3.33 NRW, CCBC, DCC, Clocaenog Community Council, interested parties** does the noise monitoring data used in the ES (Table 11.4) remain valid, and are the 14 locations used to represent the noise environment at the 55 properties identified in Table 11.6 appropriate? Are there any further properties which should be added to the assessment?

3.34 **Applicant** The figure for maximum potential noise increase given at para 11.6.2.7 of the ES does not accord with the figure in Table 11.11. Can the Applicant please indicate the correct figure.

3.35 **NWR, NWWT** Para 11.3.2.5 refers to noise from blasting operations and considers impact on humans. Could there be any potential effects on ecological receptors?

3.36 **Applicant** Has the effect of micrositing been taken into consideration in the assessment of environmental impacts?

## 4 Health and Safety

4.21 **Public Health England and interested parties:** To what extent is adequate provision made for the protection of the public during tree felling and construction; and would the turbines be positioned at sufficient distance to avoid any risk of collapse onto any area of public access, public right of way or residential property?

4.22 **Public Health England, North Wales Fire and Rescue, and interested parties:** What risk assessment has been carried out of potential for fire hazards arising during construction and operation and have any discussions been held with the relevant fire authority?

## 5 Mitigation and Requirements

5.1 **CCBC, DCC and NRW:** The Applicant has been requested to provide a schedule of all matters identified in the ES, and any other documents, (with references) which require mitigation, and to identify the corresponding provisions within the DCO which would deliver that mitigation. Are there any matters identified for mitigation in the ES which are not covered by requirements in the DCO?

5.2 **CCBC, DCC and NRW:** The ES identifies key mechanisms for the delivery of mitigation that include detailed design and management plans, including the Construction Method Statement which incorporates a Construction Environmental Management Plan, a Waste Management Plan and an Emergency Response Plan. In addition to these, the Outline Habitat Management Plan, and a number of other Plans, are required to be agreed by the relevant planning authority prior to commencement of any development. In a number of cases the relevant requirements on the DCO demand that the plans are based on the principles set out in the ES (e.g. the Construction Method Statement). Are the requirements that the plans be based on the 'principles' set out in the ES or its appendices adequate to ensure that the mitigation relied upon in the ES can confidently be secured and/or delivered in accordance with how it has been set out in the ES? Would it be necessary to include a specific requirement or more detailed elaboration of requirements and not rely only on the 'principles' to be incorporated into detailed strategies and statements?

5.3 **CCBC, DCC:** Do you consider the requirements proposed in the draft DCO to be in accord with the advice set out in Circular 11/95? In particular do you consider the drafting of the requirements to be sufficiently clear to enable them to be implemented and enforced if necessary?

5.4 Can **NRW**, in discussion with the **Applicant**, **Cadw** and **CPAT**, outline what further steps could be taken to mitigate the impact of the scheme on the historic environment surrounding the application site?

5.5 **NRW, NWWT and various interested parties**: Outline mitigation proposals are proposed to prevent any harmful impact on the population of nightjar within the application site. The proposed monitoring does not refer to any thresholds that might be used to determine whether potential impacts could be significant. Whilst these might be determined in the proposed post consent study, how will such measures be agreed and secured through the DCO. Are the provisions set out in requirement 15(2)(g) sufficiently precise to prevent a significant harmful impact on the population and productivity of nightjars?

5.6 **CCBC, DCC** In relation to the assessment of Construction effects, a number of assumptions are made to form the basis on which the effects have been assessed. To what extent do the requirements in the DCO ensure that the scheme would not result in a worse effect than has been assessed within the ES?

5.7 **CCBC, DCC** Limits in terms of ground vibration resulting from blasting operations are proposed to be set following on site testing in consultation with the LPAs. Is it necessary to require through the DCO that emissions from blasting are maintained within the limits set out at section 11.3.3.2 of the ES?

5.8 **CCBC, DCC**: Are the mitigation measures set out at 11.8.1.2 adequately secured through requirements in the DCO?

5.9 **CCBC, DCC** Having regard to the potential for the timing of construction to coincide with construction periods for other wind farm development, would it be appropriate to include a requirement to agree a programme of construction with the Local Planning Authority to ensure that periods of construction do not coincide, or if they do, that trips are coordinated in a way that would minimise disturbance?

5.9 **CCBC, DCC** Do the relevant requirements in the DCO incorporate the provisions set out in para 11.6.4.2 of the ES?

5.10 **CCBC, DCC** In relation to the sub-station, if a STATCOM unit was incorporated this could produce additional noise emissions (para 11.6.8.2), is a requirement necessary to control noise from the substation to within the limit that formed the basis of the assessment?

5.11 **CCBC, DCC** Are the measures proposed for control of cumulative noise emission levels satisfactory or would it be appropriate for monitoring to be required to identify any exceedances at the earliest opportunity?

5.12 **NRW, CCBC, DCC, interested parties**: On the basis that all mitigation measures are implemented, what residual environmental impacts would remain?

## 6 Habitats Regulation Assessment

6.1 **NRW**: Has the Applicant identified in the Report to Inform Habitats Regulations Assessment (the HRA Report) all the European sites which could be affected by the application project?

6.2 **Applicant:** The HRA report identifies and assesses likely effect on European sites within 15km of the application site, on the basis that significant effects are unlikely except where direct hydrological connections exist. However, it is not clear what potential connectivity or environmental pathways have been considered. There is no summary of mobile species identified through site surveys, and no reference is made to consideration of ranges and connectivity of species to European sites with mobile qualifying features, for example birds, in the identification of European sites. Can the Applicant provide further evidence to support the assertion of unlikely significant effects having regard to the behavioural characteristics of qualifying species which are mobile at European sites beyond 15km?

6.3 **Applicant:** In relation to hydrological connections, Figure 4 of the HRA report presents boundaries for catchments within which the application site is located and identifies watercourses within these catchments. This figure does not show European Sites superimposed against watercourses and catchment areas on one figure or drawing, so it is difficult to verify the statement that no hydrological connections with European sites exist. Can such a figure or drawing be produced?

6.4 **Applicant:** In relation to the likely impact on the Migneint-Arenig-Dduallt Special Protection Area (SPA), and the Berwyn SPA, can the Applicant provide evidence or reasoned justification for the conclusion that, given the distance involved, a functional link between this European site and the application site is unlikely. For example evidence on the behavioural characteristics of the relevant species such as foraging ranges could usefully inform the assessment.

6.5 **Applicant:** In the assessment of the River Dee and Bala Lake Special Area of Conservation (SAC), a significant effect on River Lamprey and Sea Lamprey is excluded on the basis of distance from the application site. Can information be provided on the behavioural characteristics of these species to indicate whether watercourses upstream of the SAC and nearer to the application site have any importance in maintaining the population within the SAC?

6.6 **NRW** Is the data relied upon to determine that otter are not present at the application site, which was gathered through surveys undertaken in 2008 (ES paragraph 9.6.2.19), adequate for the purpose of the HRA? Should pre-commencement surveys be required by the DCO to confirm the presence / absence of otter in the area?

6.7 **NRW** Is the only site requiring an integrity matrix, and which may therefore require to undergo appropriate assessment, the River Dee and Bala Lake SAC?

6.8 **NRW, CCBC, DCC** Are the Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies (SNCB) confident that the mitigation measures proposed in the HRA appropriate and adequate to ensure that no significant effect would occur, and does the wording of requirements in the DCO adequately secure the mitigation prescribed in the HRA report?

6.9 **NRW, CCBC, DCC** A number of mitigation measures require works to be conducted in accordance with guidelines (for example UK Forestry Standard Guidelines), are the guidelines as prescribed appropriate and adequate to ensure that no significant effect would occur?

6.10 **NRW, CCBC, DCC** Paragraph 6.2.1.2 refers to restocking of areas felled, stating that this is at the discretion of FCW (now NRW). To what extent is restocking being

relied upon in arriving at a conclusion of no significant effect. If restocking is necessary to be able to conclude no significant effect, how would it be secured since it would seem to fall outside the powers within the DCO?

6.11 **Applicant:** Paragraph 6.2.2.19 states that “works will be programmed to avoid pre-development tree clearance and construction works occurring at the same time in any of the Alwen sub-catchments which drain directly into the SAC”. Does this mean that works will not occur concurrently in each individual sub-catchment area or that they will not occur concurrently across the sub-catchment areas?

6.12 **Applicant:** What measures will be put in place if monitoring identifies that water quality or quantity is not being maintained, including in particular emergency measures to deal with pollution incidents (para 6.2.2.20 HRA)?

6.13 **Applicant:** How will the assumption be secured that infrastructure will be constructed so that the runoff rates mimic current rates and where necessary attenuation ponds will be used?

6.14 **NRW, CCBC, DCC** With regard to mitigation measures which are proposed, a number rely on detailed strategies based on the outline plans included in the ES which are to be agreed post consent. Does this approach provide adequate certainty that appropriate measures will be implemented and that they will be adequate to ensure that no significant effects occur, or is there a need to agree a set of minimum measures to be secured in the DCO?

6.15 **NRW, CCBC, DCC:** Where detailed strategies are required, have the appropriate consultees been identified to agree the detailed strategies post consent?

6.16 **NRW, CCBC, DCC:** In terms of in combination effects, are there other potential forestry operations outside of Clocaenog Forest but within the River Dee and Bala Lake catchments areas that could result in an in combination effect and that have not been considered as part of the Applicant’s assessment? Are there other types of development, other than wind farms, which could result in similar effects to the European site but that have not been considered within the HRA report?

6.17 **Applicant, NRW:** Even though there is uncertainty as to the route for the future grid connection, how can the concern of NRW that there is not sufficient information available to assess all likely cumulative effects which include the grid connection, be addressed?

## 7 Other matters

7.1 **Applicant, CCBC, DCC, Mr J Hopkinson:** The ExA requests views on the need for a S106 agreement or unilateral undertaking by the Applicant for the developer of the wind farm to make payments in the form of community payments, direct payments to local authorities, or the provision of electricity bill discounts for local residents.

7.2 MEAG Evidence is sought to demonstrate the extent to which the proposed turbines would affect the operation of the existing turbines at Tir Mostyn. In particular which turbines would affect the efficiency of the Tir Mostyn wind turbines?

7.3 **NRW** The former Forestry Commission Wales has a pecuniary interest in the application project, and has now been merged within NRW. Can NRW please explain what internal or other controls have been put in place to ensure that NRW may perform the role of a statutory consultee in the application process in an independent and impartial manner.

## Annex D

### Note of the Preliminary Meeting

**File Reference:** EN010013 Clocaenog Forest Wind Farm  
**Date:** 12 September 2013  
**Venue:** Denbigh Town Hall, Crown Lane, Denbigh, Denbighshire

**Please note:** *This meeting note is not a full transcript of the Preliminary Meeting but a summary of key points discussed and responses given. A complete audio recording of the event is available on the Planning Inspectorate's website.*

#### List of participants:

NAME	ORGANISATION
Wendy Burden	Examining Authority (ExA) – The Planning Inspectorate
Iwan Davies	Planning Inspectorate
Emre Williams	Planning Inspectorate
Dean Alford	Planning Inspectorate
James Bunten	Planning Inspectorate
Martin Cole	RWE Npower Renewables
Paul Maile	RWE Npower Renewables
Karl Cradick	RWE Npower Renewables (Savills)
Alex Blake	RWE Npower Renewables
Lucy Holloway	RWE Npower Renewables
David Watson	Conwy County Council
Neil Walters	Denbighshire County Council
Denise Shaw	Denbighshire County Council
Jan Rogers	Clocaenog Community Council
Jonathan Gilpin	Natural Resources Wales
Ian Gorton	Natural Resources Wales
Andrew Batteredton	MEAG MUNICH ERGO (Squire Sanders LLP)
Barbara Saller	MEAG MUNICH ERGO
Sven Konrad	MEAG MUNICH ERGO
Tim Matthews	MEAG MUNICH ERGO (Wind Prospect Group Ltd.)
Michael Williams	Clocaenog Against Wind Turbines
Michael Skuse	Joint Advisory Committee for the Clwydian Range AONB/Ramblers Association
Gareth Lloyd	Snowdonia National Park Authority
Bryan Wilcox	Local resident
Jonathan Hopkinson	Local resident
Ian Rogers	Local resident
David Heath	Local resident
Richard Tilby	Local resident
Prof. Peter Cobbold	Local resident
Jane McCormack	Local resident
Andrew Jedwell	Local resident

## **Welcome and Introductions**

The Examining Authority (ExA) welcomed everybody and introduced herself as Mrs Wendy Burden, appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to conduct the Examination. She advised that RWE Npower Renewables – the Applicant - have submitted, under the Planning Act 2008 regime, an application for Development Consent for the proposed Clocaenog Forest Wind Farm. The ExA explained that she will be writing a recommendation to the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change (DECC) as to whether the Development Consent should be granted.

The ExA noted that the proposed scheme includes:

- up to 32 turbines with a maximum blade height of 145 metres
- two anemometry masts of a maximum height of 100 metres
- associated access tracks, underground cabling and other infrastructure
- generating a total electricity capacity of 64 – 96 MW

The ExA set out the housekeeping matters and after introducing the Planning Inspectorate case team, invited attendees who wished to speak to introduce themselves. The ExA noted that anyone who did not introduce themselves at the start of the meeting were still able to speak.

## **Examining Authority's remarks about the examination process**

The ExA advised that the Preliminary Meeting is a procedural meeting to discuss how the application will be examined and how the Examination Timetable will be set out. She advised that no views or merits could be discussed at the meeting and noted that there would be further opportunities for people to voice their concerns later in the Examination.

The ExA advised that the Examination will be a six month period starting the day after the Preliminary Meeting closes and noted that she will issue a procedural decision known as a 'Rule 8 letter' setting out the Examination Timetable following discussions held at the Preliminary Meeting. She emphasised that no procedural decisions would be made in the meeting itself.

The ExA stated that an agenda for the meeting had been circulated in Annex B of her letter dated 1 August 2013 and noted that the Applicant had requested for some additional items to be added to the agenda. It was advised that the order of the meeting would differ slightly from the order in the agenda.

## **Deadlines for Submissions**

The ExA advised that the Examination period will start tomorrow and would last for six months, with a period of three months following the Examination for her to write her report to DECC with her findings, conclusions and recommendations. A further period of three months will then follow for DECC to write their decision as to whether Development Consent should be granted.

It was noted that all matters that raise issues during the Examination will be taken into account even if the issues were not included in the ExA's initial assessment of principle issues. The ExA advised that the Examination will be an inquisitorial process,

where she will be testing evidence from relevant and important submissions to help her build conclusions to write her recommendation to DECC.

The ExA stressed that the Examination is mainly a written process, noting that hearings may not be held if the required evidence is obtained by written submissions, and encouraged all interested parties to engage during the written stages to avoid missing the chance to voice their views. The ExA also noted that all interested parties will have the opportunity to comment on all accepted submissions during the Examination.

The ExA highlighted that her Rule 8 letter will also include her first set of written questions, that will be in-depth and numerous, which she will draw from submitted Relevant Representations and her own examination of the application documents. The ExA noted that all responses and representations will be published, as they are received, on the project page of the Planning Portal website, as well as sent in paper form to the five deposit locations listed in her letter dated 1 August 2013. There will be a further period for interested parties to comment on the responses to her first round of questions as well as any Written Representations received. A second round of written questions will also be issued following the same process as the first.

It was noted that interested parties should follow the Examination Timetable on the project webpage so that deadlines are not missed. All the submissions will be published on the project webpage; therefore any comments should clearly reference the document they are commenting on. The ExA also advised that she may request further information during the Examination if it is needed.

Michael Williams queried who the ExA's questions will be addressed to. The ExA advised that her questions will be addressed to specific people, although generally the Applicant, noting they are open for all interested parties to comment on. The ExA emphasised that interested parties should respond if they feel they have something to contribute in order that she considers all relevant evidence.

## **Hearings**

The ExA explained the three types of hearings which may be held during the Examination:

- Open Floor Hearings – held if requested by interested parties
- Issue Specific Hearings – held if the ExA decides it is necessary
- Compulsory Acquisition Hearings – held if requested by affected parties

The ExA advised that a date will be reserved at the beginning of February 2014 for an Open Floor Hearing if it is required. The ExA also advised that all matters relating to the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) are an integral part of the Examination and therefore she has included two draft DCO Issue Specific Hearings in the draft timetable.

It was advised that two Accompanied Site Visits (ASV) have been included in the draft timetable. The ExA highlighted that she conducted an unaccompanied site visit in July 2013, when visibility was not affected, which included a tour of the forest as well as a large part of the surrounding area. She noted that comments received regarding the draft ASV itinerary had been taken into consideration and a revised itinerary would be produced.

Richard Tilby queried whether correspondence between local residents and the Applicant have been seen by the ExA. The ExA noted that she has read all the application documents, including the Statement of Community Consultation, and the Relevant Representations which had been submitted. However, she advised that any other correspondence could be submitted as an appendix to a Written Representation to ensure it is taken into consideration.

### **Initial Assessment of Principal Issues**

The ExA advised that the initial assessment of principle issues is not comprehensive or exclusive and noted that the headings are broad. Other matters had been raised, including the impact on private water supplies during the operation as well as the construction of the turbines and the matter of the grid connection (which does not form part of the application). The ExA confirmed that, all important and relevant issues would be included in the Examination.

### **Statements of Common Ground**

The ExA explained that Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) agree factual information and identify where there is agreement, as well as points which remain in dispute. It was emphasised that she will still investigate matters in which SoCG have been submitted.

The ExA requested that the Applicant takes the lead in producing SoCG. Paul Maile advised that the Applicant has already sent SoCG to Local authorities, Natural Resources Wales (NRW), Welsh Government and Cheshire Police, noting that matters are in hand.

There was discussion regarding Annex D – Initial identification of matters for SoCG - of the ExA's letter dated 1 August 2013. Some corrections were made, and it was stated that a revised list would be annexed to the ExA's Rule 8 letter.

There was discussion regarding how the Applicant wishes to produce the SoCG, with Paul Maile noting that they wish to create a single statement for each organisation; rather than for a particular issue. This is to avoid having a SoCG with multiple organisations regarding one topic. The ExA advised that the Applicant would need to include a summary under the heading of each of the plans so that the documents are easier to reference.

Andrew Jedwell queried whether it would be appropriate for the Applicant to synthesise and summarise the views of a diverse group of people, including people who do not share their views. The ExA explained that any differences have to be included in the SoCG, stressing that the statements will also include disagreements. Paul Maile advised that the summaries will be a faithful representation of the statements and noted they are open for comments in the process if anyone wishes to flag their concerns. The ExA concluded that the summaries would be helpful, emphasising that the statements would be read in full.

Andrew Batterton noted that MEAG have an interest in entering into a SoCG with the Applicant regarding traffic management, construction method and access. It was queried whether discussions separately might be an alternative solution as the outcome would have a bearing on the operation of Tir Mostyn Wind Farm.

There was some further discussion of SoCG and which parties would contribute in the production of the SoCG.

The ExA asked the Applicant for an update regarding the preparation of a schedule of all matters for which a requirement for mitigation has been identified in the Environmental Statement. Paul Maile advised that the work is under way and asked when it should be submitted. The ExA noted that a deadline for its submission would be included in the timetable.

There was further discussion regarding how the Applicant's approach to producing the SoCG would cover the matters that the ExA has identified. Paul Maile advised that the SoCG with NRW would cover the majority of the range of environmental issues including the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) and noted that the SoCG with local authorities will also cover HRA matters. It was advised that the Applicant will include a summary document to highlight any differences between the two SoCG, as requested by the ExA. It was stressed that all the SoCG will be open for comments during the Examination.

Prof. Peter Cobbold voiced his concern regarding NRW's status as both a Statutory Consultee and as an organisation that would be a beneficiary of the scheme. He considered that an independent body should be consulted on environmental issues. Jonathan Gilpin confirmed NRW are a beneficiary and noted that a formal written response will be issued to the ExA / Planning Inspectorate during the Examination, which will be published on the project webpage.

The ExA advised that her Rule 8 letter will confirm all the ExA's requests for SoCG and noted that some of the matters relating to issues that are covered by the SoCG might also be raised within the first round of written questions. The ExA noted that if any answers to her first written questions are contained within a SoCG, the answer should be given to that effect when answers are provided. It was also noted that any parties who are not participating in the production of a SoCG may answer any questions which they can make a contribution to whether or not those matters are to be covered in any of the SoCG.

### **Timetable for the Examination**

The ExA advised that the draft Examination Timetable had been circulated as Annex F of her letter dated 1 August 2013 and stated that she will go through the draft timetable explaining each deadline. The ExA highlighted Item 16 which identifies the deadline for close of the Examination as the 12 March 2014. She stressed that this is a statutory deadline and that no submissions will be accepted after this date. The ExA also noted that the close of the Examination may be earlier if sufficient evidence has been gathered for her to be able to write the report to the SoS for DECC.

The ExA confirmed that the Rule 8 letter which would be issued following the Preliminary Meeting would include her first set of written questions, the list of SoCG and the confirmed ASV dates.

The ExA advised that the additional viewpoints submitted, following the draft itinerary included in her letter dated 1 August 2013, have been passed to the Applicant and noted that a revised draft itinerary for the ASV had been produced. The ExA then invited the Applicant to discuss the revisions.

Martin Cole advised that as the ASV dates are now known to be in October, with limited daylight, it would be more feasible to extend the ASV to two days. It was advised that due to a number of responses Moel Famau and Jubilee Tower would be included, noting that at certain locations, some walking could be expected so appropriate clothing should be worn. Martin Cole indicated that the first day would include areas to the west and north of the site and the second day would include areas to the south and east of the site, including the Clwydian Range. It was noted that viewpoints along the B5105 would also be included.

The ExA concluded that she is happy with suggestions for the revised ASV itinerary and noted that she will also be conducting unaccompanied site visits during the Examination in addition to the ASV. The ExA emphasised that there would be no opportunity for submissions to be made during the ASV, noting that it will be a factual exercise for looking at physical features only. The ExA encouraged those interested parties who have similar views to get together and choose one or two persons to represent them at the ASV.

It was noted that members of the local authorities and NRW will be attending the ASV. The ExA advised that any interested parties who wish to attend the ASV, or suggest additional viewpoints to be visited on an unaccompanied basis, should contact the case team by 3 October 2013, stating which days they wish to attend.

Jane McCormack queried the ExA's criteria for making any judgements at the ASV. The ExA pointed to Annex E in her letter dated 1 August 2013 and advised that that section would explain what she will be taking into account during the ASV.

Prof. Peter Cobbold highlighted that tree felling should be taken into account during the site visits, noting that he will address his concerns with additional material as part of his Written Representation.

There was discussion regarding the ASV dates, with requests from interested parties to bring the dates forward due to potential poor visibility. It was decided that the original dates of 30 and 31 October 2013 should be kept, with the addition of 1 November 2013. It was advised that 6 February 2014 was reserved for any additional ASV if visibility is poor for the October 2013 ASV. The ExA stressed again that her unaccompanied site visit was conducted during a sunny day with excellent visibility.

There was discussion regarding a visit to the Tir Mostyn Wind Farm which could potentially be separate from the ASV. The ExA noted that it could be added to the Examination Timetable. The ExA confirmed that she has been to the wind farm already during an unaccompanied site visit.

Jan Rogers requested that the ExA looks at the location of the properties contained in, and surrounding, the development site and the impact on residential visual amenities including felling. The ExA advised that she has already identified some of the properties in the application site during the unaccompanied site visit and ensured that this matter will be taken into account. Bryan Wilcox queried whether the ExA will be considering fire risk during the ASV. The ExA confirmed that fire risk is included in her written questions and confirmed that it will be considered as part of the Examination.

There was discussion regarding the provision of transportation for the ASV. The ExA clarified that the Applicant would provide transportation for the ExA, the case officer and any Statutory Consultees attending the ASV. Interested parties, who are not

Statutory Consultees, will need to supply their own transport. The advice was repeated that interested parties choose one or more representative to attend on their behalf.

The ExA continued to discuss the draft timetable noting 17 October 2013 as the deadline for receipt of Local Impact Reports (\*please note this deadline has since been amended to 21 October 2013). The local authorities confirmed that it was a realistic date for submission. Ian Gorton asked what time submissions should be sent in by on deadline days as set out in the timetable. Iwan Davies confirmed it would be 23.59pm on the day of the deadline.

There was discussion regarding the draft DCO Issue Specific Hearing and the ExA advised that if interested parties wish to speak at the hearing scheduled for 29 October 2013, they must inform the case team as required in the timetable. It was confirmed that an agenda would be issued before the hearing.

The ExA noted that dates for Issue Specific Hearings had been reserved in the draft timetable on:

- Policy
- Environment
- Mitigation requirements
- Second draft DCO
- Compulsory Acquisition

The ExA advised that hearings would only be held if she considered that it was necessary to probe the evidence further, and as the Examination continues, all hearing topics and dates will be confirmed. There was discussion regarding the order of the Issue Specific Hearings with Paul Maile querying whether the hearing on Policy should be last due to potential issues being raised in other hearings regarding Policy. The ExA recognised his concern but noted that a SoCG on Policy between the Applicant and the local authorities would be beneficial and that a hearing on Policy may not be necessary.

There was discussion concerning the Examination Timetable being open for comments once it has been issued in the Rule 8 letter. The ExA confirmed that there will not be an opportunity to comment, however the ExA does have the discretion to make amendments to the Examination Timetable once it has been issued.

The ExA reiterated that if she is satisfied that all the matters have been covered in written questions and submissions, then a hearing on that issue would not be necessary. It was also noted that an Issue Specific Hearing on Compulsory Acquisition would only be held if it proves to be necessary or is requested.

Michael Skuse queried the difference between Relevant Representations and Written Representations. Iwan Davies explained that a Relevant Representation is submitted as part of registering to be an interested party, and is an opportunity to submit principle concerns about the scheme to the ExA. These concerns can then be expanded and supported with evidence as a Written Representation during the Examination.

The ExA advised that the Open Floor Hearing (OFH) will only be held if there are requests from interested parties to be heard. The ExA highlighted that interested

parties should group together and appoint a spokesperson to submit their case in order to avoid repetition of the same points during any OFH. The ExA also noted that anyone who speaks should be prepared to be asked questions by the ExA regarding their oral submission.

The ExA noted that the final comments on the draft DCO and the requirements could be put at a later date, having regard to the close of Examination on 12 March 2014.

The ExA noted that submissions should ideally be electronic and advised that weblinks should not be used, instead submitting the document or extract as a PDF or paper document so that hard copy documents can be made available.

Paul Maile requested an additional step in the timetable for correction of typographical errors in the DCO and EM, suggesting the deadline of 17 October 2013. The ExA agreed to consider that.

Michael Skuse asked if all submissions should be submitted to the project email address of [clocaenogwindfarm@infrastructure.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:clocaenogwindfarm@infrastructure.gsi.gov.uk). Iwan Davies agreed that it is the correct address and requested that an interested party reference be included in all submissions. The ExA concluded that submission of paper documents is also acceptable.

Andrew Jedwell queried whether the cumulative visual impact of the proposal together with the three consented, but not yet built, wind farms would fall under the ExA's remit. The ExA confirmed it did.

The Applicant confirmed that sections 127 and 138 of the Planning Act 2008 are not relevant for the application. The ExA advised that the Applicant should alert the case team of any s127 matters should they arise.

Richard Tilby queried how the recommendation would be written by the ExA and asked whether consent could be given to a reduced scheme. The ExA advised that she would consider the matter before providing an answer to the query.

The ExA closed the meeting at 12.27pm.

## Annex E

### Revised list of matters to be covered in Statements of Common Ground (SoCG)

The ExA requests the preparation of Statements of Common Ground (SoCG), with an early start on their preparation. The date for their submission is set in the Examination Timetable.

A SoCG should identify, at an early stage of the Examination, the areas of agreement between the interested parties and where the differences lie. It should identify those matters which need not be in dispute or the subject of further evidence, and state where and why there may be disagreement about the interpretation and relevance of the information. The reasons for the differences and the interpretation of the implications of a difference can then be expanded in the evidence.

Unless otherwise stated or agreed, the SoCG should be agreed between the Applicant and the other relevant interested party(ies), and submitted by the Applicant.

This is an initial list of matters to be covered by the SoCG. Wherever possible, all parties should seek confirmation through the SoCG on areas of agreement and disagreement and seek to narrow and focus the areas for detailed examination in the interests of the effective use of resources and proper examination of the application.

- SoCG on **Construction Method Statement**, Environmental Statement (ES) Annex 3.1, including the following Outline Plans:
  - Construction Environmental Management Plan
  - Waste Management Plan
  - Emergency Response Plan

And the following Plans proposed to be finalised post consent but before development commences:

- Outline Habitat Management Plan (ES Annex 9.10)
  - Relevant Species Protection Plan
  - Surface Water Management Plan
  - Soil and Peat Management Plan
  - Borrow Pit design and Site Restoration Plan
  - Construction Traffic Management Plan.
- SoCG on **Recreation and Access Management Plan**.
  - SOCG on **Report to inform Habitats Regulation Assessment**, ES Annex 9.15, including scope, methodology, approach, conclusions, adequacy and securing of mitigation and **whether or not there is a need for an appropriate assessment to be undertaken by the decision maker**.
  - SoCG re **Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL)** route including with North West (NW) and Cheshire Police.
  - Following the preparation of a schedule on matters which require mitigation: SoCG re the **DCO Requirements** including whether any further requirements should be added and the extent to which those proposed would meet the tests in Circular 11/95.

- SoCG re **cultural heritage**: whether the relevant assessments are covered in the ES, whether the conclusions are agreed, and whether any further mitigation measures are required, and if so, what they are.

### **Additional matters for SoCG**

- Policy
- Grid Infrastructure
- Water supplies
- Operational impacts on Tir Mostyn Wind Farm

The additional matters have been put forward by interested parties and it would assist the Examination for discussions to take place between the Applicant and the relevant interested parties in order to identify areas of agreement or dispute.

## Annex F

### Availability of Representations and Application Documents

On the National Infrastructure pages of the Planning Portal's website at:

<http://infrastructure.planningportal.gov.uk/projects/Wales/Clocaenog-Forest-Wind-Farm/>

For inspection and copying at the following locations:

a. **Conwy Planning Office**, Planning Services, Conwy County Borough Council, Civic Offices, Colwyn Bay, Conwy, LL29 8AR

Opening hours: 9am – 5pm Monday to Friday

Copy charges: 10p per black and white A4, £1 per colour A4, 20p per black and white A3, £1.50 per colour A3 sheet, £1.10 per black and white A2, £1.50 per black and white A1 and £2.50 per black and white A0.

Copying charges quoted are indicative costs as at July 2013.

b. **Denbigh Planning Office**, Development Control, Caledfryn, Smithfield Road, Denbigh, LL16 3RU

Opening hours: 9am-5pm Monday to Friday

Copy charges: 10p per black and white A4, £1 per colour A4, 20p per black and white A3, £1.50 per colour A3 sheet, £1.10 per black and white A2, £7 per colour A2, £1.50 per black and white A1, £8 per colour A1, £2.50 per black and white A0 and £10 per colour A0.

Copying charges quoted are indicative costs as at July 2013.

c. **Denbigh Library**, Hall Square, Denbigh, LL16 3NU

Opening hours: 9:30am – 7pm Monday, 9:30am – 5pm Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday, 1pm – 5pm Thursday, 9:30am – 12:30pm Saturday

Copy charges: 5p per black and white A4 side and 10p per black and white A3 side.

Copying charges quoted are indicative costs as at July 2013.

d. **Ruthin Library**, Record Street, Ruthin, LL15 1DS

Opening hours: 9:30am – 5pm Monday, Thursday and Friday, 9:30am – 7pm Tuesday, 9:30am – 1pm Wednesday, 9:30am – 12:30pm Saturday

Copy charges: 5p per black and white A4 side and 10p per black and white A3 side.

Copying charges quoted are indicative costs as at July 2013.

e. **Llanrwst Library**, Station Road, Llanrwst, LL26 0DF

Opening hours: 10am – 5:30pm Monday, Tuesday and Friday, 10am – 7pm Wednesday, 10am – 1pm Saturday

Copying charges: 10p per black and white A4 side and 20p per black and white A3 side.

Copying charges quoted are indicative costs as at July 2013.