

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Wrexham Energy](#)
Subject: Resume of points raised during meeting at Redwither Tower in September 2016
Date: 06 October 2016 21:37:55

Dear Examiner,

I understand that I have more time to complete my on going discussions with NRW, the EA and WCBC about noise issue from Wrexham Industrial Estate and start up and shutdown emissions from CCGTs. I note that I have until 4th November 2016 to complete that process and put my thoughts in writing. I intend to honour that extended deadline.

I note that the local school's (St Paul's) Head and Governor gave quite passionate speeches about the fragility of the school and the potential closure, if parents decide to remove their children from the school if this Plant gets granted and built. I trust that they have communicated their thoughts in writing to yourself. If not then I feel that verbal representation should be taken into account, as that is potential a real effect on real lives and our local community.

There are still large safety concerns within the community about this potential Plant, especially given that it will use non odourised gas and we have asked on several occasions what early warning detection will be in place to detect leakage from either the Plant or the connecting pipeline. I have asked WCBC for their formal risk assessment of the pipeline and for their MAH plans, both of which I believe are legal requirements. I want to know what plans that they have for the local community in the event of an emergency. I would like the opportunity to have some input into the process. So far I haven't received any documentation.

Speaking of safety I understand that the accompanied tour entered a gas works and that non of the members of the tour de-matched, switched off mobile phones, surrendered other sources of ignition, or checked to see if they had anti-static footwear All of these are basic standard precautions for entering a gas site and I would have thought that WPL would have been aware of this. If not, then it only highlights further our safety concerns.

Several members of the community have questioned the validity of the photomontage and the standard answer seems to be "it's the industry standard approach". As an amateur photographer it is my understanding that the human eye sees what is photographically the equivalent of a 50mm lenses on a 35mm SLR camera, or digital full frame equivalent. I further understand that sometimes there is a multiplier used for frame size reduction in lower model digital SLRs. The photomontage appears to be a compilation of several frames that are stitched together, so I don't see how the photomontage is representative of what impact this potential Plant will have. I would like to see the potential Plant superimposed on to 50mm equivalent photographs so that the real impact can be visually assessed.

I further note that you have indeed asked for further clarification of the photomontage and have asked for clarification of the vertical scaling of some of the images.

I believe it was also agreed that cross sectional representations would be produced to show the potential visual impact that this Plant will have. It was further agreed that these would be done, but with the local hedgerows shown in their current state, as they are large in the local area. Can I point out that the local residents, or receptors as some prefer to call us, are not directly in control of the height of the local hedges and so we are at the mercy of the relevant landowner. I would like to see the cross sections and visual impact report reflect the current situation and a worst case scenario (?Rochdale Envelope) with the hedges reduced to a height of say 1m, which is what the highways enforce for leaving a property / junction in the local area.

On your local tours you will have no doubt noted that there are several new build properties in the area, some of which are on going. In fact there is a property currently being erected next door to mine. All of the new builds have been built since the demolition of the fibreglass silos / towers that dominated the skyline for around 30 years. These new build developments provide real local employment for local tradesmen. The gent who is building next door, lives at the opposite end of the local 30mph Zone. This is around a half mile commute for him.

I believe that there is a real sense of community in the area, as you may have noticed by the degree of resistance that is shown at the meetings. The development of this Plant will no doubt

mean that residents will move away from the area, which put very simply would be travesty. In you want feedback on the meetings, then in my opinion, they are far to short to allow any degree of scrutinisation of this project. The fact that a half day meeting is still unfinished and about to start third day, clearly enforces my point.

I also note that the point has been raised about the applicants level of finance, I am led to believe that they are a loss making company with no visible earnings. I further believe that you have asked that their finances be put in place. Is this correct?

I believe that the Hirwaun Project was also brought into the mix. Having looked at their web page, I note that it too is a 299MWe Plant, but their web page says that they do not have their finances in place and that they haven't won an award under Capacity Market Auction and so the Plant will not be built in 2016 despite being granted a DCO in July 2015. They further state that they intend to bid in the 2016 auction, but I suspect that if unsuccessful, then that will be another year of uncertainty for that community.

I also asked at the last meeting if the applicants had broken the ground on the granted 299MWe Meaford Power Station. I don't remember that question being answered. Given that the applicant keeps making a case for the need for gas fired Plant to be within the Nation's mix of power (EN1, EN2, etc), I note that there doesn't seem to be a rush to start building such Plant.

I note that Kellogg's have made written representation about their concerns about the impact that this project will have on their existing business. I would like the examiner to consider a "what if" scenario, around Kellogg's deciding to relocate their business. This would have a massive effect on local employment and if they are duty bound to demolish the Plant, then I feel that this would then leave WPL's argument that they are constructing a Plant against an industrial skyline in tatters.

Going back to the similar Hirwaun Power Station I note that since the granting of their DCO, that they are now requesting that the configuration of the Plant be reconsidered and as I understand it, they are asking for buildings to be made 10m wider and 10m deeper. I would imagine that such a change will change the visual impact of the Plant, if it ever gets built. Is there a possibility that similar changes could be made to this project, if it gets granted?

I also asked about the initial claims that WPL made that the Plant would protect the electrical supply to Wrexham Industrial Estate and it would provide an opportunity for local industry / businesses to procure electricity. Given that the electrical export is currently to be routed via the proposed SPEN underground connection to Legacy substation and by definition direct to the National Grid, then I still don't see how the proposed Plant can for fill its original marketing. WPL did state that the provision to the estate was still on the table. Can they explain how?

We live in an ever changing World and I note that today, the Government has granted that fracking can take place in England. Given that fracked gas is known to contain both sulphur dioxide and hydrogen sulphide, which oxidises to sulphur dioxide during combustion, as impurities, then I feel that my neighbour who questioned the potential for sulphur dioxide emissions from this potential Plant has a valid point. She did question what effect that this would have on the local newt population, the local community and the wider area of Cheshire. Has sulphur dioxide and its contribution to acid deposition been considered? If not, then should it now be included?

Kind regards,

Chris Briggs

Sent from my iPad

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