

**From:** [Hughes, Tomos](#)  
**To:** [Wrexham Energy](#)  
**Subject:** NRW answers to questions for deadline 2 and confirmation of attendance at issue specific hearing  
**Date:** 20 September 2016 14:06:41  
**Attachments:** [Wrexham Energy NRW response to Examiners Questions- Deadline 2.pdf](#)

---

Dear Case Team,

Please find attached the answers to your questions which are required for deadline 2.

I would also like to confirm that two officers will be attending the issue specific hearing regarding 'Environmental and Other Issues' on the 28<sup>th</sup> and the 29<sup>th</sup> of September.

NRW will not be in attendance at the Issue Specific Hearing on the draft DCO on the morning of the 28th of September 2016:-We wish to make clear that no disrespect to the examination is intended. NRW will give consideration to the draft DCO and representations made during the course of the examination and may provide written submissions for the appropriate deadline.

NRW will not be in attendance at the Open floor Hearing on the 28<sup>th</sup> of September.

NRW will not be in attendance at the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing on the 29<sup>th</sup> of September.

NRW do not wish to attend the Accompanied Site Inspection on the 27<sup>th</sup> of September.

Kind regards,

Tomos Hughes

Development Planning Advisor

[Gwysanaeth Cyngori Cynllunio Datblygu](#) / Development Planning Advisory Service

[Rhanbarth y Gogledd](#) / North Region

[Ffon](#) / Tel: 03000 655 241

[E-bost](#) / E-mail: [tomos.hughes@cyfoethnaturiolcymru.gov.uk](mailto:tomos.hughes@cyfoethnaturiolcymru.gov.uk) / [tomos.hughes@naturalresourceswales.gov.uk](mailto:tomos.hughes@naturalresourceswales.gov.uk)

[Gwenfan](#) / Website: [www.cyfoethnaturiolcymru.gov.uk](http://www.cyfoethnaturiolcymru.gov.uk) / [www.naturalresourceswales.gov.uk](http://www.naturalresourceswales.gov.uk)

[Ein diben yw sicrhau bod adnoddau naturiol Cymru yn cael eu cynnal, eu gwella a'u defnyddio yn gynaliadwy, yn awr ac yn y dyfodol.](#)

Our purpose is to ensure that the natural resources of Wales are sustainably maintained, enhanced and used, now and in the future.

---

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.  
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

---

## Annex B

Request number	Request to	Request	NRW Response
<b>1.1</b>	<b>Air Quality and Emissions</b>		
1.1.13.	The Applicant, NRW and Mr Christopher Briggs	<p><b>Air emissions: regulation of operational effects</b>            The relevant representation from Mr Christopher Briggs [RR-005] suggests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•CO<sub>2</sub> emissions may be higher than assessed in the ES during start- up conditions; and</li> <li>•emissions may include formaldehyde, although a particular emission level is not suggested.</li> </ul> <p>Mr Briggs is requested to support his concerns about CO<sub>2</sub> and formaldehyde emissions in his written representation, or in direct response to this question at <b>Deadline 1</b>.</p> <p>A. The Applicant and NRW are requested to respond to Mr Briggs concerns at <b>Deadline 2</b> and to provide views on whether the concerns raised by Mr Briggs require any further controls, taking into account responses to question 1.1.10 and 1.1.11 above. If further controls are warranted, should these be in the DCO, in the EP or be delivered by some other mechanism?</p>	Any such impact would be assessed fully under an EP
1.1.14.	The Applicant and NRW	<p><b>Air emissions: operational effects: stack design</b>            Stack design is a key means to ensure that air emissions meet relevant standards.</p> <p>A. Are there any matters arising from responses to questions 1.1.10, 1.1.11 or 1.1.13 above that suggest a need to reconsider the stack design parameters assessed in the ES?</p>	NRW would not request a review of the stack design parameters

Request number	Request to	Request	NRW Response
		<p>B. (The respondents to this question are requested to monitor responses from others at Deadline 1 and to reconsider this question in respect of matters raised in responses at Deadline 2).</p>	
<h2>1.2 Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment (including Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA))</h2>			
1.2.3.	<p>The Applicant, NRW, NE, WCBC and any other IP with an interest in the natural environment</p>	<p><b>Natural environment: roosting bats and noise</b>  ES Paragraph 11.221 [APP-059] states that construction noise is likely to result in disturbance to roosting bats and that the noise assessment is showing that construction noise levels at Target Note 26 (TN26)(see Figure 11.5) are likely to be above ambient noise levels.</p> <p>A. The noise assessment in EA Chapter 9 [APP-057] makes no reference to TN26 and does not appear to consider ecological receptors. Can the Applicant explain what evidence supports the statement in ES paragraph 11.221 at Deadline 1?</p> <p>B. Can the other respondents to this question review and comment on the Applicant's response at Deadline 2?</p>	<p>Having reviewed the applicants response to this question at deadline 1, NRW consider that the potential noise disturbance can be adequately mitigated for through the outline measures indicated by the developer; and further specification within the Construction Environmental Management Plan to be conditioned prior to development commencing.</p>
1.2.13.	<p>The Applicant, NRW, NE and any other interested party with an interest in HRA.</p>	<p><b>HRA: no significant effects conclusion</b>  The Applicant has submitted a No Significant Effects Report (NSER) [APP-046] with the application.</p> <p>A. Setting aside your responses (if any) to questions 1.2.11 to 1.2.12 above, are there any further respects in which you disagree with the conclusions in that report?</p> <p>B. Appendix F of the NSER considers the combined effects from the gas connection and the power station site. The electrical connection is not</p>	<p>NRW have noted that the Electrical connection route has altered substantially so should be assessed here, NRW are not aware of an updated connection statement being submitted to date.</p>

Request number	Request to	Request	NRW Response
		<p>referred to in either Appendix F or the list of projects in Table 5.1. Can the Applicant provide an updated statement about the in-combination effects for the project which includes the electrical connection at Deadline 1? Other interested parties may respond to this at Deadline 2</p> <p>C. If you disagree with any of the conclusions reached in the NSER, please identify which conclusion(s) you disagree with, your reasons for disagreement and the evidence on which your reasons are based.</p>	
<b>1.3 Combined Heat and Power (CHP) Readiness</b>			
1.3.2.	The Applicant, NRW and WCBC	<p><b>Heat export: effects on combustion performance</b> If the response to question 1.3.1 above records that the active take-up and export of heat will materially affect combustion performance, at Deadline 3:</p> <p>C. Please identify how the revised combustion performance of the electricity generating station together with active CHP has been or should be secured to ensure that it remains within the Rochdale Envelope?</p>	NRW response not required for Deadline 2
<b>1.17 Water Environment</b>			
1.17.6.	WCBC, NRW and DC/WW	<p><b>Water environment: flood risk and drainage: construction phase</b> WCBC is the lead flood authority. Relatively little detail is provided in the ES or the draft CEMP [APP-152] on the content of the construction drainage strategy. The delivery of the CEMP is secured under Requirement 4 of the draft DCO which states that no construction can begin before the CEMP has been approved by the local authority, must be substantially in accordance with the draft CEMP provided in Appendix 19.1 of the ES and</p>	NRW response not required for Deadline 2

Request number	Request to	Request	NRW Response
		<p>must include a construction drainage strategy. Further to the issue raised in question 1.17.5 above and taking information provided by the Applicant at <b>Deadline 2</b> into account together with information about the construction drainage strategy in the ES at appendix 14.3 [APP-148] (where a proposal for a permeable laydown area is set out in paragraph 5.19), <b>WCBC are requested to address the following question at Deadline 3:</b></p> <p>A. Is the proposed construction drainage strategy appropriate?</p> <p>B. Are WCBC and NRW satisfied with the current level of information about the content of the construction drainage strategy?</p> <p>C. Is more detail needed in an updated outline CEMP?</p> <p>D. Does DCO requirement 4 provide sufficient security that appropriate surface water drainage arrangements will be made?</p> <p>E. Is any change required to DCO requirement 4?</p>	
1.17.7.	WCBC, NRW and Dwr Cymru/ Welsh Water (DC/WW)	<p><b>Water environment: flood risk and drainage: operational phase</b>  WCBC is the lead flood authority.</p> <p>The surface water drainage strategy during operation is Work No. 3 in the draft DCO [APP-033]. The draft DCO also includes requirement 12 which states that Work No. 1 must not commence until the details of the foul and surface water drainage strategies have been approved by Wrexham CBC. These details must be 'substantially in accordance with the illustrative foul and surface water drainage plan' [APP-015]. Other measures to avoid contaminants affecting the water environment (such as bunding of fuel tanks) would be delivered through the design of the project and through the controls imposed through the Environmental Permit (EP) (ES Chapter 19</p>	NRW response not required for Deadline 2

Request number	Request to	Request	NRW Response
		<p>[APP-067]). This means that the application proposal appears to rely on mitigation which is not secured in the DCO and will be delivered pursuant to the EP process under the oversight of NRW.</p> <p>Further to the issue raised in question 1.17.5 above and taking information provided by the Applicant at Deadline 2 into account together with information about the operational drainage strategy in the ES referred to above and at appendix 14.3 [APP-148], WCBC are requested to address the following questions at Deadline 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Is the proposed operational drainage strategy appropriate?</li> <li>B. Is WCBC content with the division of matters and responsibilities between its own role and that of NRW pursuant to the EP?</li> <li>A. Are there any matters relevant to the surface water drainage strategy that require input from DC/WW and if so, is that body content with the arrangements and distribution of responsibility on this topic as currently proposed?</li> </ul>	