

**From:** [Gruffudd Glyn Llewelyn \(Rh-CTGC\)](#)  
**To:** [Glyn Rhonwy Pumped Storage Scheme](#)  
**Subject:** Gwynedd Council's response to ExA's second written questions  
**Date:** 21 June 2016 10:30:00  
**Attachments:** [ExA Second Written Questions 7 June 2016.doc](#)

---

Dear Sir/Madam

Please find attached, Gwynedd Council's response to ExA's second written questions.

If you require any further information, do not hesitate to contact the service.

I would be grateful if you could confirm receipt of this e-mail and attachment.

Yours sincerely

*Glyn Llewelyn Gruffudd*

Uwch Swyddog Rheolaeth Datblygu/Senior Development Control Officer  
Ffordd y Cob  
Pwllheli  
Gwynedd  
LL53 5AA

01766 771000

-----  
Mae'r e-bost hwn ac unrhyw atodiad iddo yn gyfrinachol ac fe'i bwriedir ar gyfer y sawl a enwir arno yn unig. Gall gynnwys gwybodaeth freintiedig. Os yw wedi eich cyrraedd trwy gamgymeriad ni ellwch ei gopio, ei ddsbarthu na'i ddangos i unrhyw un arall a dylech gysylltu â'r anfonwr ar unwaith. Mae unrhyw gynnwys nad yw'n ymwneud â busnes swyddogol y corff sy'n anfon yr e-bost yn bersonol i'r awdur.

-----  
This email and any attachments are confidential and intended for the named recipient only. The content may contain privileged information. If it has reached you by mistake, you should not copy, distribute or show the content to anyone but should contact the sender at once. Any content that is not pertinent to the official business of the organisation is personal to the author.

-----  
Arbedwch bapur, ynni ac arian - Peidiwch argraffu'r neges yma oni bai ei bod yn hollol angenrheidiol. Save paper, energy and money - Do not print this message unless it is absolutely necessary.

---

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

---

**Application by Snowdonia Pumped Hydro Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Glyn Rhonwy Pumped Storage Scheme**

**The Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information**

**Issued on 7 June 2016**

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information to assist with the assessment of the application. **Responses should be received by the Examining Authority (ExA) by 21 June 2016.**

Questions are set out using a framework derived from the initial assessment of principal issues provided as Annex H to the letter of 9 February 2016. A schedule of abbreviations is provided at the end.

The Planning Inspectorate's document references in these questions [in square brackets] can be found on our website by following this link: [Examination Library](#).

Column 2 of the table indicates **to which parties questions are directed**. The ExA would be grateful if all parties named could answer all questions directed at them, providing either a substantive response, or to indicate the reason that the question is not relevant to them. **This does not prevent an answer being provided to a question by another interested party should the question be relevant to their interests.** Responsibility lies with each party to ensure that responses have been given to all questions directed to them.

Where questions can be **fully** answered within another submission then a reference to the relevant paragraph(s) of the submission will be sufficient.

**When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the question number.**

If you are answering no more than 3 questions, responses in a letter format will suffice. If you are answering several questions, it will assist the ExA if you use a table based on that used below. An editable version of this table, in Microsoft Word, is available on request from the Planning Inspectorate. Please email your request to: [GlynRhonwy@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:GlynRhonwy@pins.gsi.gov.uk).

Question number	Question to	Question
<b>1.</b>	<b>Development Consent Order (DCO) and other consents</b>	
	<b>Development Consent Order (DCO) [REP4-009]</b>	
1.1.	Applicant	Should the use of the terms ' <i>paragraph</i> ' and ' <i>sub-paragraph</i> ' (sometimes referred to as ' <i>subparagraph</i> ') be reviewed to ensure accuracy and consistency when used in the draft DCO [REP4-009]? For example, ' <i>paragraph</i> ' is generally used as the first sub-division of an Article or Requirement and ' <i>sub-paragraph</i> ' as the second sub-division. However in a number of cases references to ' <i>paragraph</i> ' refer to the Article or Requirement (in Article 19(3)(a), for example) and in others to a ' <i>sub-paragraph</i> ' (in Article 9(1), for example). Similarly ' <i>subsection</i> ' has been used instead of ' <i>sub-paragraph</i> ' (in Requirement 9(8), for example).
1.2.	Applicant	Article 2(1) – definition of ' <i>maintain</i> ' Does this definition need to be updated further to the discussions between the applicant and Gwynedd Council [REP4-016, item 1.1] regarding Requirement 25 (annual maintenance plans)?
1.3.	Applicant	Article 13 - temporary prohibition and restriction of streets Should this be titled ' <i>temporary prohibition and restriction of <u>use of streets</u></i> '?
1.4.	Applicant	Article 19 – compulsory acquisition of land Given the earlier definition of ' <i>the access land</i> ', should the text ' <i>the plot of</i> ' be deleted from Article 19(3)(c)?
1.5.	Applicant	Schedule 1 Part 1 – authorised development Should Work No 4G, which is indicated on the Works Plans [REP1-006], be included in this schedule?
1.6.	Applicant	Schedule 1 Part 1 – authorised development In order to further improve the definition of the authorised development please could the applicant allocate each of the ' <i>further development</i> ' items (a) to (j) in the draft DCO [REP4-009, Schedule 1, Part 1] to specific Work Nos?
1.7.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	Schedule 1 Part 1 – authorised development a) In order to further improve the definition of the works please could the applicant clarify the

Question number	Question to	Question
		<p><i>'further development'</i> referred to in the last 4 lines to indicate the type and extent of the other works that may be included?</p> <p>b) Please could the applicant provide examples of such works?</p> <p>c) Should the ability to introduce <i>'further development'</i> of this type be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority?</p> <p><b>c) The Council considers that detailed development carried out within the defined red line is unlikely to require further consent, works not identified or outside the red line should be discussed and agreed with the LPA.</b></p>
1.8.	Applicant	<p>Requirement 5(1) – detailed design</p> <p>a) Is Work No 1B the only location where there will be new slate mounds?</p> <p>b) If new slate mounds are to be formed in other areas then should the maximum height and volume be defined?</p> <p>c) Can the applicant demonstrate where other new slate mounds these have been considered in the ES?</p>
1.9.	Applicant	<p>Requirement 5(3)(c) – detailed design</p> <p>Should the details of the dam linings also be subject to approval?</p>
1.10.	Applicant	<p>Requirement 6(2) – code of construction practice</p> <p>What is the reasoning for detailed Requirements being provided for some plans, but not others?</p>
1.11.	Applicant	<p>Requirement 7(1) – other plans and strategies</p> <p>What is the reasoning for detailed Requirements being provided for some plans, but not others?</p>
1.12.	Applicant	<p>Requirement 7(2) – other required plans and strategies</p> <p>a) Given the progress in clarifying the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and other mitigation plans during the examination, would it be clearer and help to avoid overlap and conflict between documents if the relevant matters referred to in chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-083] were incorporated into the updated CoCP [REP2-013]?</p> <p>b) Should reference be made to the latest version of the CoCP [REP2-013 is currently the latest version] rather than the version included in the ES [APP-142]?</p>

Question number	Question to	Question
1.13.	Applicant	<p>Requirement 8 – compliance with outline plans</p> <p>a) Should the '<i>outline plans</i>' be named as such in Article (38)?</p> <p>b) Would it help to avoid confusion if it was made specific that each plan is required to comply with the provisions and address all of the matters in its corresponding outline plan?</p>
1.14.	Applicant	<p>a) Further to its response to matters arising from the Issue Specific Hearing regarding the draft DCO [REP3-013, item 31], please could the applicant explain the reasoning for compliance not being required with other plans and strategies provided and commented on during the examination, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Common, Access Land and Public Rights of Way Strategy [REP3-005]?</li> <li>• Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP3-007]?</li> <li>• Silt Management Plan [REP3-008]?</li> <li>• Water Management Plan [REP3-012]?</li> <li>• Excess Water Management Strategy [REP3-013]?</li> <li>• Biosecurity Plan [REP3-021]?</li> <li>• Outline Ordnance Management Strategy [REP4-017]?</li> <li>• Schedule of Required Plans and Strategies [REP3-024]?</li> </ul> <p>b) Does the applicant consider that the final versions of these plans should comply with the provisions of the outline/draft versions provided during the examination and, if so, how should this be secured?</p> <p>c) If there is not a Requirement for the final versions of these plans to comply with the provisions of the outline/draft versions, please could the applicant demonstrate how its proposed approach would not allow effects to occur that have not been assessed in the ES or are more adverse than those reported in the ES?</p> <p>d) In case the ExA recommends a different approach to that suggested by the applicant, please could the applicant clarify any individual measures in the above plans that it considers should not be secured and provide its reasoning in each case?</p>
1.15.	Gwynedd Council NRW	<p>a) Please could GC and NRW comment on whether it would be helpful for it to be required that the final plans referred to in the previous item incorporate the matters agreed during the examination?</p>

Question number	Question to	Question
		<p>b) Do GC and NRW have any concerns regarding the process of finalising of these plans if the plans are not required to incorporate the matters agreed during the examination?</p> <p>a) and b) For the purpose of clarity and for the avoidance of doubt, clearly identified plans should include all matters as agreed.</p>
1.16.	Gwynedd Council NRW	<p>Further to the discussions noted by the applicant [REP2-011, question 8.10] and NRW [REP3-032] and the comments provided by NRW [REP4-036 and REP4-037], do GC or NRW have any further comments on the wording of draft DCO [REP4-009] Requirement 9 (water management plan) or Requirement 11 (drainage)?</p> <p>Gwynedd Council have no further comments regarding this matter,</p>
1.17.	Applicant	<p>Requirement 11(2) – drainage</p> <p>a) Replace 'can' with 'is to'?</p> <p>b) What does 'the following' refer to?</p>
1.18.	Applicant	<p>Requirement 11(3) – drainage</p> <p>Should this refer to the 'permanent drainage <u>system</u>'?</p>
1.19.	Applicant	<p>Requirement 14(2)</p> <p>What is the difference between 'an operational noise assessment' and 'details of an operational noise assessment'?</p>
1.20.	Applicant	<p>Requirement 18 – archaeological compensation and enhancement strategy</p> <p>Should the term 'site wide written scheme' be used in paragraph (1) as well as paragraph (5)?</p>
1.21.	Applicant	<p>Requirement 19(3) – construction hours</p> <p>Replace 'will' with 'must'?</p>
1.22.	Applicant	<p>Please could the applicant advise whether it wishes to amend this requirement in respect to its previous comments [REP4-013, item 34] regarding the penstock works?</p>
1.23.	Applicant	<p>Requirement 20(3) – construction compound and temporary structures</p> <p>Could 'cessation of construction' be made more specific to the relevant phase for which the temporary building and structures were used?</p>

Question number	Question to	Question
1.24.	Applicant	Requirement 24(2) – fencing Replace ' <i>agreed</i> ' with ' <i>approved</i> '?
1.25.	Gwynedd Council NRW	Requirement 26(1) – decommissioning plan Are GC and NRW content with the 124 years specified? <b>Yes</b>
1.26.	Applicant	Requirement 26(1) – decommissioning plan Replace ' <i>following permanent cessation</i> ' with ' <i>following the expiry of that period or following permanent cessation</i> '?
1.27.	Applicant	Requirement 26(1) – decommissioning plan Should (2)(iii) be at the same level as (2)?
1.28.	Applicant	Schedule 8, paragraph 3(1) – provision of information by Consultees Should the text ' <i>Unless sub paragraph (2) of this paragraph applies</i> ' be at the start of paragraph 3(1)?
1.29.	Applicant	Schedule 8, paragraph 4(1) Replace ' <i>these</i> ' with ' <i>those</i> '?
1.30.	Applicant	Schedule 8, sub-paragraph 4(2)(c) Should 4(2)(c) be at the same level as 4(2) and not the same level as (a) and (b), as it is text that governs both 4(2)(a) and (b)?
1.31.	Applicant	Please could the applicant respond to NRW's comments [REP4-036 and OD-008] on the draft DCO [REP4-009] regarding the Outline Water Management Plan, the Outline Silt Management Plan, Drainage, Excess Water Management Strategy and Schedule 8 (Discharge of Requirements)?
1.32.	Gwynedd Council	a) Please could GC advise which internal and external resources it would draw expertise from when discharging requirements associated with ordnance management, land contamination, matters related to blasting (including noise, vibration, air overpressure, dust deposition and fly rock) and matters related to operational noise (including low frequency noise) and ground-borne vibration?

Question number	Question to	Question
		<p>a) GC will be drawing on internal officer knowledge and expertise in the first instance when discharging requirements listed. There is no intention to draw on external knowledge at this time however this could be an option if it is felt that additional expertise is required.</p> <p>b) Is GC confident that it will have sufficient resources to fulfil its responsibilities as discharging authority for the DCO?</p> <p>b) It is not currently envisaged that the Council cannot fulfil its responsibilities.</p>
	<b>Other consents</b>	
1.33.	Applicant	<p>a) Please provide an update on discussions regarding the route options study, consenting options and form of construction of the grid connection.</p> <p>b) Please clarify any knock-on implications for the cumulative assessment provided in the ES taking into account any information which has been obtained further to the finalisation of the cumulative assessment presented in the ES.</p> <p>c) Are any of the routing considerations likely to affect the design of the proposed development for which development consent is sought, or the design of the mitigation strategy it is relying on?</p>
1.34.	NRW	Further to the applicant's response to the first written questions (FWQ) [REP2-011, question 8.3], is NRW content that a separate 'DSCO' consent will not be required?
1.35.	Applicant NRW	<p>a) Please respond to the matters relevant to the application for development consent raised by Oggy East [REP2-049] in the form of comments on the applicant's Discharge Consent Supporting Statement, dated January 2016?</p> <p>b) Does the applicant consider that some of the matters do not relate to the application for development consent?</p> <p>c) If so, please could the applicant set out its reasoning and how this relates to the reliance placed on the discharge consent for mitigation of the proposed development and for the HRA conclusions?</p>
1.36.	Applicant NRW	<p>a) Please respond to the matters regarding the Water Discharge Consent relevant to the application for development consent raised by the Snowdonia Society [REP2-051, pages 6-8].</p> <p>b) Does the applicant consider that some of the matters do not relate to the application for</p>

Question number	Question to	Question
		<p>development consent?</p> <p>c) If so, please could the applicant set out its reasoning and how this relates to the reliance placed on the discharge consent for mitigation of the proposed development and for the HRA conclusions?</p>
1.37.	Applicant NRW	<p>a) Following NRW's responses to the FWQ [REP2-047, questions 8.5 and 8.38] please could the applicant outline how it intends to meet the requirements of the Reservoirs Act 1975 and what confidence can be provided that this is capable of being achieved?</p> <p>b) There is no reference to the Reservoir Act 1975 in the draft DCO [REP4-009]. Are there any provisions/ requirements in the draft DCO [REP4-009] which relate to measures required under the Reservoir Act 1975?</p> <p>c) Is it intended to secure the Onsite Emergency Plan in the draft DCO [REP4-009] or would this be secured by other means?</p> <p>d) There is no reference to the Reservoir Act 1975 in the Other Consents and Licence Status document [REP3-024]. Should this be included in this Schedule to clarify how this sits alongside the DCO consent and progress made/timescales for securing this consent?</p> <p>e) Do NRW have any views on what information needs to be included in the draft DCO [REP4-009] and what information can be appropriately provided outside of the DCO process in respect to compliance with the Reservoir Act 1975?</p>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Environmental Statement, mitigation plans and strategies</b>	
	<b>Environmental Statement (ES) – general matters</b>	
2.1.	Applicant	<p>a) Further to its response to the FWQ [REP2-011, question 1.22] please could the applicant justify the need for the north easterly extent of the Order and Works limits, particularly Work No 4C and the need for its proximity to Lake View Hotel given the distance from the existing Q6 quarry wall and the adjacent spoil mounds that may require re-profiling?</p> <p>b) Do the limits simply follow ownership boundaries or does consideration of the actual works to be undertaken and of the results of the 2015 ground investigation [REP2-011, question 2.8] allow the Order and Works limits to be pulled away from Lake View Hotel?</p>

Question number	Question to	Question
2.2.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	<p>A description of the anticipated material and waste volumes is provided in appendix 2.12 of the applicant's response to the FWQ [REP2-011, question 2.12]. The applicant has stated that information cannot be provided on materials other than slate/rock.</p> <p>a) If there are no estimated calculations on materials other than slate/rock, how is it possible to demonstrate that sufficient space is available on site for the reuse of all excavated materials for example in landscaping works, and that all waste materials that need to be removed have been factored into the transport assessment?</p> <p>b) Does the applicant intend to quantify waste/materials requirements once the detailed design of the proposed development has been agreed to inform the Waste Management Plan (WMP) and the Materials Management Plan (MMP)?</p> <p>c) Does GC consider this necessary information to include in the final WMP and MMP and are amendments required to the draft DCO [REP4-009] and/or Outline CoCP [REP2-013] to secure this?</p> <p>c) It is considered that the WMP and MMP will allow for sufficient recording in relation to the movement of materials and as such, it is not considered that further amendments are required as this will be secured via the CoCP.</p>
2.3.	Applicant	<p>a) Further to the FWQ [REP2-011, question 2.15], please provide an indication of the maximum extent, size and location of acoustic screening, including earth/soil bunds anticipated?</p> <p>b) Will the acoustic screening be temporary or permanent?</p> <p>c) How have the potential impacts on biodiversity, landscape impact, visual impact and the historic environment arising from the construction and removal of acoustic screening been considered in the ES?</p>
2.4.	Applicant	<p>a) The applicant has noted [REP2-011, question 2.17] that the alternative location for the pumping station away from the shore of Llyn Padarn near the toilet block is the favoured site. In its response to matters raised at the Issue Specific Hearing [REP4-014, item 7.2] the applicant noted that the location would be resolved post consent. Is the applicant able to commit to submitting an appraisal of the relative merits of the alternatives before then requiring the relevant planning authority's approval for the final location, in consultation with NRW?</p> <p>b) Can the applicant suggest how this commitment could be secured in the draft DCO [REP4-009]?</p>

Question number	Question to	Question
<b>Mitigation plans and strategies – general matters</b>		
2.5.	Applicant	Please respond to GC's comments [REP4-026, action no 34] on the various mitigation plans and strategies.
2.6.	Gwynedd Council NRW Interested Parties	<p>Please comment on the Outline Ordnance Management Strategy [REP4-017] submitted by the applicant at deadline 4 and indicate whether you are satisfied that the necessary mitigation measures are covered appropriately.</p> <p><i>Gwynedd Council is satisfied with the mitigation measures covered in the Outline Ordnance Management Strategy and believe section 3.2 (Liaison with Local Community and Authorities) to be particularly important. We recommend the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) is made aware of this strategy.</i></p>
2.7.	Applicant	Further to its responses to matters raised at the Issue Specific Hearing [REP4-014, item 8.1(d)], and for the avoidance of doubt, please could the applicant's commitment to transport spoil material between Q6 and Q1 by conveyor be included in the next version of the Outline CoCP [REP2-013]?
2.8.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	<p>Referring to the Schedule of Other Required Plans and Strategies [REP3-024] and the Schedule of Mitigation [REP2-011, appendix 2.26], applicant has stated [REP4-014, item 11.3(a)] that '<i>The revised documents reflect on-going dialogue with GC and NRW and updates required as a result of the Examination process</i>'. However, the applicant has stated [REP4-014, item 11.3(a)] that these documents are not intended to have any formal status.</p> <p>a) Please comment on whether the Schedule of Other Required Plans and Strategies [REP3-024] and the Schedule of Mitigation [REP2-011, appendix 2.26] include mitigation measures identified during the examination that are not otherwise secured in the draft DCO [REP4-009]?</p> <p>b) Please comment on whether the Schedule of Other Required Plans and Strategies [REP3-024] and the Schedule of Mitigation [REP2-011, appendix 2.26] correct some discrepancies between mitigation measures mentioned in the ES with those subsequently developed during the examination?</p> <p>c) Please could the applicant demonstrate that if these documents are not secured, the draft DCO [REP4-009] would not allow effects to occur which have not been assessed in the ES or are more adverse than those reported in the ES?</p> <p>d) Please could applicant clarify the differences between the mitigation measures included in the</p>

Question number	Question to	Question
		<p>Schedule of Other Required Plans and Strategies [REP3-024] and those included in the Outline CoCP [REP2-013] and clarify how those differences justify the documents being treated differently by the draft DCO [REP4-009]?</p> <p>e) If the Schedule of Other Required Plans and Strategies [REP3-024] is not to be certified and secured by the draft DCO [REP4-009] then should the key mitigation measures included in it be included in a Requirement in the draft DCO [REP4-009]?</p> <p>f) The applicant has stated [REP4-014, item 11.3(a)] that '<i>The Applicant considers that the Schedule of Mitigation will evolve past that provided in the ES and respond to any further comments received from GC, NRW and interested parties. Therefore this will be updated at Deadline 5 and at each subsequent Deadline in the examination phase as necessary.</i>' Is it necessary to update the wording of Requirements 6 and 7 in the draft DCO [REP4-009] to confirm that it is the measures set out in the updated Schedule of Mitigation [REP2-011, appendix 2.26] which must be included in the final plans, now that the applicant has confirmed this supersedes the measures set out in the ES?</p> <p>g) Given the progress in clarifying the Outline CoCP and other mitigation plans during the examination, would it be clearer and help to avoid overlap and conflict between documents if the relevant matters referred to in the Schedule of Mitigation [REP2-011, appendix 2.26] were incorporated into the updated Outline CoCP [REP2-013]?</p> <p>a) to g) GC and the applicant are in the process of discussing and agreeing specific management plans covering air quality, construction noise and operational noise which contain mitigation measures as identified in the ES and any further mitigation measures identified during the examination process.</p>
2.9.	Applicant	<p>The applicant has suggested [REP4-014, item 11.3(c) and 11.4(a)] that it is not necessary to list all mitigation plans in the draft DCO [REP4-009, Article 38] as they are listed in the Schedule of Other Plans and Strategies [REP3-024]. For the sake of clarify could all relevant plans be listed in Article 38, particularly if the Schedule of Other Plans and Strategies [REP3-024] is to have no formal status?</p>
2.10.	Gwynedd Council NRW Interested Parties	<p>The applicant has indicated [REP4-014, items 8.14 and 11.3] that various plans and an updated Schedule of Mitigation will be submitted at deadline 5. Please provide written comments on these by deadline 6, indicating whether you are satisfied that the necessary mitigation measures are covered appropriately.</p> <p>Comments will be provided as specified, at deadline 6.</p>

Question number	Question to	Question
<b>3.</b>	<b>Biodiversity, ecology and geological conservation</b>	
	<b>Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA)</b>	
3.1.	Applicant	Table 3.4 of the updated No Significant Effects Report (NSER) [REP1-001] confirms that ' <i>disturbance to species</i> ' has been assessed in respect to Glynllifon SAC and the Meirionnydd Oakwoods and Bat Sites SAC; however the screening matrices confirm that ' <i>disturbance to species</i> ' is only relevant to the Glynllifon SAC and thus is not reflected in the Meirionnydd Oakwoods and Bat Sites SAC matrix. As the HRA has assessed this potential impact on the Meirionnydd Oakwoods and Bat Sites SAC (paragraph 4.9.3), please could the applicant reflect this in the corresponding screening matrix [REP1-001, appendix B]?
3.2.	Applicant	<p>a) Appendix A (Tables showing the assessed Natura 2000 sites qualifying features, conservation objectives, site condition and threats to site integrity) of the updated NSER [REP1-001] only identifies Oystercatchers (<i>Haematopus ostralegus</i>) as a qualifying feature of the Traeth Lafan/ Lavan Sands, Conway Bay SPA (Table 8.13). Please could the applicant revise Table 8.13 in appendix A to include the missing qualifying features of the Traeth Lafan/ Lavan Sands, Conway Bay SPA as identified on the Natura 2000 data form for this European site, and confirm how these features have been considered within the assessment?</p> <p>b) Please could the applicant update the corresponding screening matrix in appendix B to include this information?</p>
3.3.	Applicant	Please can the applicant update the screening matrix for Y Twyni o Abermenai i Aberffraw/ Abermenai to Aberffraw Dunes SAC in appendix B of the updated NSER [REP1-001] to include 'Humid dune slacks' which is missing from the relevant screening matrix.
3.4.	Applicant	Appendix A of the NSER [REP1-001] includes interests which are not designated due to international importance. Please could the applicant update the screening matrix to ensure it does not include features designated for national importance only, for example by only including two rows reflecting Ramsar Criterion 1 and 3 into the matrix?
3.5.	Applicant	Effects on the flow regime (Effect 3 in the screening matrices [REP1-001, appendix B]) has only been assessed in respect to the Afon Gwyrfa i Llyn Cwellyn SAC, yet this is included in the matrices for all European sites screened into the assessment with the corresponding footnote confirming that this effect is only relevant to the Afon Gwyrfa i Llyn Cwellyn SAC. Should this

Question number	Question to	Question
		Effect be removed from all matrices where it has not been assessed in respect to that particular European site?
3.6.	Applicant	Please could the applicant update the screening matrix [REP1-001, appendix B] for the Glynllifon SAC to include reference to the mitigation/enhancement measures referenced in the main text of the NSER (paragraph 4.6.4)?
3.7.	Applicant	The applicant has not provided the revised screening matrices [REP1-001, appendix B] in the revised AN10 template (January 2016) as they consider it appropriate to maintain the same template as was relevant at the time they submitted the DCO application. To ensure that these matrices include the necessary information for use within the Report on the Implications for European Sites (RIES), please could the applicant add the relevant site codes into the matrices?
3.8.	Applicant	The screening matrices [REP1-001, appendix B] all are currently named Matrix A. Please could they be renamed Matrix A, B, C, etc. to assist with cross-referencing purposes in the RIES?
3.9.	Applicant	Please could the applicant provide a separate Word version of the updated screening matrices to assist in the production of the RIES?
3.10.	NRW	The European sites screened into the assessment remained unaltered in the updated NSER [REP1-001]. NRW list all the European considered relevant to the assessment in Part 3.N.1 of their Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) with the exception of the Traeth Lafan / Lavan Sands, Conway Bay SPA, and confirm ' <i>that adequate and sufficient consideration for potential impacts on...statutory designated sites has been undertaken.</i> ' Do NRW's conclusions reached in respect to the other European sites also apply to the Traeth Lafan/ Lavan Sands Conway Bay SPA?
3.11.	NRW	In their response to the FWQ NRW confirmed [REP2-047, question 3.11] that Likely Significant Effects (LSE) on European sites could be excluded providing the mitigation measures identified in the Schedule of Mitigation [APP-085], the various plans and statements necessary under the requirements and the conditions within any future discharge consents are met. Is NRW content that the mitigation to be delivered through the draft DCO [REP4-009] has been adequately defined and secured?
3.12.	Applicant NRW	The updated NSER [REP1-001, paragraph 4.2.22 and footnote D of corresponding matrix] confirms that the conditions of the Environmental Permit in respect to discharges from the Q1 spillway will ensure that there would be no LSE on the Afon Gwyrfa a Llyn Cwellyn SAC as a result of potential changes to the flow regime. The applicant has yet to obtain an Environmental Permit for discharge

Question number	Question to	Question
		<p>consent and therefore at present this mitigation measure is not secured.</p> <p>a) Please could the applicant NRW advise on progress made to determine the application for a discharge permit?</p> <p>b) Please could the applicant and NRW clarify whether the conclusion of no LSE on the Afon Gwyrfai a Llyn Cwellyn SAC is reliant on the conditions imposed through the Environmental Permit?</p> <p>c) Do NRW envisage any impediments to their ability to grant the discharge license, should this not be obtained during the course of the examination?</p> <p>The applicant should note that the ExA may be unable to advise the Secretary of State to conclude no LSE on a site (and that the site may therefore need to be subject to appropriate assessment) without the certainty that all required mitigation measures have been secured, or it has been confirmed with the relevant statutory nature conservation body that there is no likely impediment to the security of the required measures.</p>
3.13.	NRW	<p>In its response to the FWQ [REP2-047, question 3.6] regarding indirect impacts on lesser horseshoe bats linked to the Glynllifon SAC, NRW agreed with the with the applicant's assessment that <i>'the impact of noise from blasting and drilling would not have a significant effect on the bats using the tunnels to be maintained as roosts'</i>.</p> <p>a) Please could the NRW comment on other potential indirect impacts on the bats using the tunnels as well as due to noise from blasting and drilling (including vibration, air overpressure and lighting) and as well as the maintenance of the tunnels as roosts (including foraging)?</p> <p>b) Is NRW (still) content with the level of the detail provided on the mitigation/enhancement measures for lesser horseshoe bats, including the use of other tunnels?</p> <p>c) Please confirm whether you consider that these measures constitute mitigation relied on to reach the conclusion of no LSE, <b>or</b> enhancement measures which are not required to reach the conclusion of no LSE?</p> <p>d) Is NRW (still) satisfied that the measures are appropriately secured in the draft DCO [REP4-009]?</p>
3.14.	Applicant NRW	<p>The Other Consents and Licences Status Document [REP3-022] confirms that a European Protected Species Licence has been granted for lesser horseshoe bats, but the applicant intends to submit a variation to this licence to reflect the results of an additional bat survey of Tunnel 16 undertaken in summer 2015 and January/February 2016 for completeness (response to the ExA's</p>

Question number	Question to	Question
		<p>FWQ [REP2-011, question 3.13]).</p> <p>a) Please could the applicant confirm when this variation will be submitted and whether this is anticipated before the close of the examination?</p> <p>b) Does this affect NRW's view that there are no LSE on any European sites screened into the assessment?</p> <p>c) Do NRW envisage any impediments to their ability to grant the variation to the bat licence, should this not be obtained during the course of the examination?</p> <p>The applicant should note that the ExA may be unable to advise the Secretary of State to conclude no LSE on a site (and that the site may therefore need to be subject to appropriate assessment) without the certainty that all required mitigation measures have been secured, or it has been confirmed with the relevant statutory nature conservation body that there is no likely impediment to the security of the required measures.</p>
3.15.	NRW	Please could NRW provide comments on the updated NSER and screening matrices at deadline 6?
<b>Other biodiversity, ecology and geological conservation</b>		
3.16.	Gwynedd Council Applicant	<p>In its Local Impact Report [REP2-037, paragraph 7.5.4], GC referred to the need for a method statement <i>'which will clearly detail all measures taken (including those described in part 8 and 9 of the Mollusc Survey Report - Cambrian Ecological Partnership 07.02.12) in order to avoid a harmful impact on the favourable conservation status of mollusc species. The statement must be submitted in written form for the Local Planning Authority to agree upon with Natural Resources Wales before the development permitted through this commences'</i>.</p> <p>a) Does GC expect this to be included in the Outline CoCP [REP2-013]?</p> <p>a) <b>Yes, unless NRW advise otherwise</b></p> <p>b) If so, please could the applicant update the Outline CoCP [REP2-013] accordingly?</p>
3.17.	Applicant	<p>The applicant has stated [REP2-011, question 3.8] that <i>'runoff from the site would not be allowed to drain into any watercourse'</i>.</p> <p>a) Does this apply during all stages of the development, including pre-commencement and operation?</p> <p>b) How is this secured in the draft DCO [REP4-009] or other consents?</p>

Question number	Question to	Question
3.18.	Applicant	With reference to the applicant's response to the FWQ [REP2-011 question 3.21] regarding tree loss, the Outline CoCP [REP2-013, paragraph 4.65] indicates that tree works/mitigation will be included as part of the Landscape Management Plan and not the Habitat Management Plan. Please could the applicant clarify how these two plans will be coordinated?
3.19.	Gwynedd Council NRW	Further to the FWQ [REP2-011, question 3.21] are GC and NRW content that the draft DCO [REP4-009, Article 30] does not require agreement in advance with the relevant planning authority for the felling or lopping of trees or shrubs not subject to a Tree Preservation Order?  Gwynedd Council is content that agreement in advance is not required for the felling or lopping of trees or shrubs not subject to a TPO. Although, GC would be happy to be consulted should the need arise.
3.20.	NRW	Further to its responses to the FWQ [REP2-047, questions 3.24, 3.2.5 and 3.2.6] is NRW content with the provisions for pre-commencement surveys and tree replacement included in the Outline CoCP [REP2-013]?
3.21.	Applicant	Please could the applicant update the Outline CoCP [REP2-013] to include reference to all pre-commencement ecological surveys required, included those mentioned in its response to the FWQ [REP2-011 question 3.25]?
3.22.	Applicant	Some of the pre-construction surveys listed in the response to the FWQ [REP2-011, question 3.25] are included in the Outline CoCP [REP2-013], but not all. Please could the applicant clarify and update the Outline CoCP [REP2-013] where necessary?
3.23.	Applicant Gwynedd Council NRW	In its response to the FWQ [REP2-011, question 3.26] the applicant advised that tree loss will be quantified and appropriate mitigation provided in the Habitat Management Plan, that a tree survey will be undertaken once the detailed design is finalised and that calculations for tree replacement will be made in agreement with GC.  a) Please could the applicant clarify the securing mechanism for the need for a tree survey? b) Please could the applicant clarify the securing mechanism for the need to quantify and agree tree loss? c) Please could the applicant, GC and NRW comment on what tree replacement calculations are required to demonstrate that an appropriate level of mitigation will be provided?  c) GC suggest a replacement formula of 2:1

Question number	Question to	Question
3.24.	Applicant Gwynedd Council NRW	<p>a) Following its response to the FWQ [REP2-011, question 3.27] regarding the timing of the works, please could the applicant identify precisely which species and times where works should be avoided in consultation with NRW and reflect this information in the Outline CoCP [REP2-013]?</p> <p>b) If the applicant intends to carry out works in the specified sensitive periods, should this be agreed in advance with NRW and GC?</p> <p>c) Please could GC and NRW comment?</p> <p><b>NRW and GC should be consulted in advance if the applicant intends to carry out works in specified sensitive periods.</b></p>
3.25.	Gwynedd Council	<p>a) Is GC content with the applicant's impact assessment and proposed mitigation measures for the potential indirect impacts on biodiversity due to noise, vibration, air overpressure and deposited dust?</p> <p><b>a) Yes GC is content</b></p> <p>b) Is GC content with the relevant mitigation measures secured in the draft DCO [REP4-009] and Outline CoCP [REP2-013]?</p> <p><b>b) Yes GC is content</b></p>
3.26.	NRW	<p>It it's SoCG with the applicant [REP3-010, ID 3.I.1] NRW agreed that the applicant's approach to any potential noise impact on protected species as a result of the development is suitable, and any residual impact can be mitigated with the Outline COCP and Breeding Bird Method Statement</p> <p>a) Is NRW content with the applicant's impact assessment and proposed mitigation measures for the potential indirect impacts on protected species due to vibration, air overpressure and deposited dust?</p> <p>b) Is NRW content with the relevant mitigation measures secured in the draft DCO [REP4-009] and Outline CoCP [REP2-013]?</p>
3.27.	Applicant	<p>Following its response [REP3-026] to Tony Grant's Written Representation [REP2-052], please could the applicant clarify the potential for the continuity of habitats to be impacted by increases in traffic on the construction route to Q1 and for this to cause adverse impacts on protected species such as badgers, otters, as well as stoats, toads and low flying barn owls and bats?</p>

Question number	Question to	Question
3.28.	Applicant	It is unclear why the applicant does not consider a separate requirement specifying the content of the Outline Biosecurity Plan [REP3-021] in the draft DCO [REP4-009] necessary; this is the approach taken for other draft plans/strategies specified in Requirement 7 of the draft DCO [REP4-009]. Please could the applicant clarify and consider either the inclusion of a Requirement in the draft DCO [REP4-009] which sets out the minimum measures relied on, or alternatively that the Outline Biosecurity Plan [REP3-021] (subject to any suggested alterations) is secured in draft DCO [REP4-009] Requirement 8 (Compliance with outline plans)?
3.29.	Applicant	Please could more details of the monitoring programmes (e.g. frequency, recording methods, suitably qualified staff) be provided in the Outline Biosecurity Plan [REP3-021, paragraph 3.2.19]?
3.30.	Applicant	Should there be a provision in the Outline Biosecurity Plan [REP3-021, paragraph 3.3.21] for any reports over the course of the INNS control action to be provided to GC and any amendments to the Plan during the construction/operation of the development to be approved in writing?
3.31.	Applicant	<p>a) It is unclear what further information will be provided in the final Biosecurity Plan – stage specific method statements for example? Please could the applicant amend the Outline Biosecurity Plan [REP3-021] to clarify (if required) specifically what further information will be provided in the final version for sign off by GC?</p> <p>b) Please could GC and NRW comment on any additional information that they would like to see in the final version?</p>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Landscape and visual impacts, good design</b>	
4.1.	SNPA	Further to its comments in the SoCG with the applicant [REP3-009, D7], is SNPA content that the draft DCO [REP4-009, Requirements 20 and 22] secures the mitigation required for potential impacts on dark sky status due to light overspill?
4.2.	NRW	Further to its response to the FWQ [REP2-047, question 4.1(a) and 4.9] please could NRW comment on the cumulative landscape and visual impact with an underground grid connection?
4.3.	Applicant	<p>a) Please could the applicant clarify what is meant by '<i>considered holistically throughout the assessment</i>' [REP2-011 question 4.3] with respect to how impacts to trees, vegetation and landscape works have been included in the LVIA [APP-073]?</p> <p>b) Have these impacts been represented in the photomontages [APP-179 to APP-190]?</p>

Question number	Question to	Question
4.4.	Applicant	<p>a) In its response to the FWQ [REP2-011, questions 4.11 and 5.9] the applicant referred to a Landscape and Restoration Plan to be prepared in consultation with Gwynedd Council and Cadw. The Outline CoCP [REP2-013, paragraph 4.6.4] states that the Landscape and Reinstatement Plan will be submitted to GC and NRW for approval prior to construction commencing. However, there is no reference in section 4.6 of the Outline CoCP [REP2-013] to the Landscape and Reinstatement Plan being prepared in consultation with Cadw. Please could the applicant clarify?</p> <p>b) Should the draft DCO [REP4-009, Requirement 6] be updated to require the relevant planning authority to consult with Cadw on the Landscape and Reinstatement Plan?</p>
4.5.	Applicant	Please could the applicant clarify how the Explosive Ordnance Disposal Facility [REP4-007, paragraphs 2.5.3 to 2.5.6], which appears to be a potentially large structure, has been considered in the LVIA [APP-073]?
<b>5. Historic environment</b>		
5.1.	Applicant	Further to GC's response to the FWQ [REP2-011, question 5.5(b)] has the applicant consulted with Cadw on whether an assessment of the impacts on the tentative World Heritage Site is required and whether any weight should be given to the tentative World Heritage Site status, taking a future proofing approach?
5.2.	Applicant Gwynedd Council Cadw	<p>Contrary to the applicant's response to the FWQ [REP2-011, questions 5.13 and 5.14], the LVIA [APP-073] and the ExA's unaccompanied site inspections undertaken in May 2016 [EV-026] both indicate that there are views of the proposed development from Dolbadarn Castle.</p> <p>a) Please could the applicant reconsider its response to the first written question?</p> <p>b) Please could the applicant clarify the impacts on the setting of Dolbadarn Castle?</p> <p>c) Please could the applicant clarify interrelating impacts between the LVIA and the heritage assessment?</p> <p>d) Please could GC and Cadw comment on the conclusions of the applicant's assessment?</p> <p>d) <b>The ASIDOHL made an assessment of the impact on the setting of Castell Dolbadarn and acknowledged that some of the development would be visible in distant views from the castle. Obviously the importance of the castle cannot be overstated however the views in this direction would not be substantially altered by the elements that would be visible and the impact was</b></p>

Question number	Question to	Question
		consequently assessed as very slight.
5.3.	Gwynedd Council	<p>In its comments on GC's response to the FWQ [REP3-026, question 5.11] the applicant stated that the development will not affect the existing bomb store. Does GC still consider that a detailed survey of the bomb store is required before the construction of the spillway infrastructure?</p> <p>The following comments have been received from Gwynedd Archaeological Planning Service:</p> <p>"The bombstore is a nationally significant structure which needs to be protected from any impact by this development. Although the main structure falls outside the red line boundary the full extent of elements associated with the bombstore has not been assessed since no detailed survey has been undertaken to date. It is possible that the spillway will impact on extramural features associated with the bombstore e.g. former railway infrastructure adjacent to Llyn Peris and I would therefore feel it is appropriate to undertake pre-commencement survey of the bombstore and any associated features. In addition, the public interest in the bombstore is great and there are significant opportunities for interpretation and public engagement which could form part of the archaeological mitigation and enhancement strategy if a detailed survey is completed".</p>
5.4.	Gwynedd Council	<p>a) Following its comments on the FWQ [REP2-041, question 5.21(a)] is GC content with the revisions made by the applicant to the measures suggested for an Archaeological Compensation and Enhancement Strategy in the Schedule of Required Plans and Strategies [REP3-024]?</p> <p>b) Is GC content with the provisions for the Archaeological Compensation and Enhancement Strategy in the draft DCO [REP4-009, Requirement 18]?</p> <p>c) Should Cadw be consulted on the Archaeological Compensation and Enhancement Strategy [REP4-009, Requirement 7]?</p> <p>a) It is agreed with the wording for the 'Schedule of Other Required Plans and Strategies'. However, this section should include a paragraph to ensure that the archaeological advisor to Gwynedd Council will maintain curatorial monitoring / oversight of all works agreed within the WSI. This would involve monitoring the archaeological programme on behalf of Gwynedd Council to ensure compliance with the agreed WSI and in order to maintain standards of archaeological investigation. It would also involve the written approval and sign off of the archaeological programme.</p> <p>b) The reference to the watching brief is confusing as a Requirement as detailed in Schedule 1 Part 2 of the draft DCO. The archaeological requirements are likely to include historic building recording, topographic survey and a range of other types of mitigation (as set out in the</p>

Question number	Question to	Question
		<p>schedule). As such, Schedule 1 Part 2 of the draft DCO ought to refer to a 'programme of archaeological work' agreed through a WSI rather than referring to a 'watching brief' which is a specific type of archaeological mitigation.</p> <p>c) Cadw do not need to agree the mitigation and enhancement strategy as they are not normally involved at this level. However, this question is probably best directed at them.</p>
<b>6. Traffic and transport</b>		
6.1.	Applicant	<p>In its response to the FWQ [REP2-011, question 6.10] the applicant stated that the tonnage of material to be imported and exported has been calculated. This appears to conflict with a response to another question [REP2-011, question 2.12] where it was stated that information of the anticipated material and waste volumes cannot be provided on materials other than slate/rock. Please could the applicant clarify?</p>
6.2.	Applicant	<p>Further to its response to the FWQ [REP2-011, question 6.13], please could the applicant clarify the impacts of the temporary closures of Ffordd Clegir, including during blasting?</p>
6.3.	Applicant	<p>a) Further to its response to the FWQ [REP2-011, question 6.24], please could the applicant clarify how the Travel Plan will be secured?</p> <p>b) Could the minimum measures to be secured into the Travel Plan be drafted into the wording of the draft DCO [REP4-009] either within the Requirement itself or within the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)?</p> <p>c) Should the Travel Plan include operational traffic movements, as mentioned by GC in their response to the FWQ [REP2-041, question 6.24]?</p>
6.4.	Gwynedd Council	<p>a) In its response [REP4-014, item 4.3] to a request to provide further detail on cumulative traffic impacts with the grid connection, the applicant referred to the ES [APP-084]. The relevant paragraph of the ES [APP-084, paragraph 17.8.8] states that '<i>this high level assessment considers that the inter-project effects from construction traffic travelling to the Development (deliveries of plant and materials and construction workers) will be limited as there are alternative access routes to the A4244 from Llanberis, Cwm y Glo and Caernarfon</i>'. Is GC content that the potential impacts of the use of these alternative construction routes during the construction of the grid connection have been fully considered in the ES?</p> <p>a) Yes, Gwynedd Council is content that the potential impacts of the use of these alternative</p>

Question number	Question to	Question
		<p>construction routes during the construction of the grid connection have been adequately considered in the ES.</p> <p>b) If so, should the potential alternative routes be included in the Outline CTMP [REP3-007]?</p> <p>b) Not necessarily. As any traffic management required for the grid connection work would be subject to discussions and agreements with the Council's Street Works Unit, the Council would be willing to discuss alternative routes at a later stage. Potential alternative routes could be affected by other road works or schemes in the local vicinity and therefore it is considered more appropriate to agree such routes nearer the time.</p>
6.5.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	<p>a) Please could the applicant update the Outline CTMP [REP3-007] to incorporate the matters referred to the Issue Specific Hearing [REP4-014, paragraphs 3.8(a), 8.4(b) and 12.1(c)], including the monitoring of vehicles and construction traffic, measures in relation to potential vibration impacts and the timing and notice needed for any abnormal loads?</p> <p>b) Limited information is provided on the content of the CTMP [REP3-007] in the draft DCO [REP4-009, Requirement 12]. Does the applicant or GC consider that more information should be provided in the draft DCO [REP4-009] to specify the minimum measures to be included in the final CTMP?</p> <p>b) Gwynedd Council considers the information provided in the draft DCO to be sufficient.</p> <p>c) Should the final version of the Outline CTMP [REP3-007] be certified under Article 38 and secured into the draft DCO [REP4-009]?</p>
<b>Construction route from the A4085 to Q1 (Ffordd Cefn Du)</b>		
6.6.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	<p>a) Further to its confirmation of the construction route from the A4085 to Q1 [REP4-014, item 3.2], please could the applicant suggest how this can be secured in the draft DCO [REP4-009] and the next version of the Outline CTMP [REP3-007]?</p> <p>b) Is GC content that the route beyond the A4085 would be determined by the Principal Contractor and should the Outline CTMP [REP3-007] set out the alternatives that can be considered based on what has been assessed in the ES?</p> <p>b) Gwynedd Council is content that the route beyond the A4085 would be determined by the principal contractor. The route beyond the A4085 is mostly A roads and is considered suitable for the type and level of traffic proposed.</p>

Question number	Question to	Question
6.7.	Applicant	<p>a) Please could the applicant respond to GC's comments [REP4-026, item 3.7] regarding the potential for a 20mph speed limit from the A4085 to the Groeslon crossroads, and a 10mph speed limit from the Groeslon crossroads to Q1?</p> <p>b) Following responses from the applicant [REP4-014, item 3.7] and GC [REP4-026, action no 5] please could the applicant include a speed limits for construction traffic from the A4085 to the Q1 agreed with GC in the next version of the Outline CTMP [REP3-007]?</p>
6.8.	Applicant	<p>The applicant has stated [REP4-014, item 3.8(a)] that <i>'The Environmental Manager (EM) would then meet regularly with the Local Authority to discuss the levels of traffic and should these exceed the levels predicted, a strategy for reducing vehicle movements would be agreed with Gwynedd Council'</i> and also [REP4-014, item3.9(c) that <i>'the Contractor will be required to keep a log of all construction vehicle movements as part of a standard construction management process. These will then be made available to the Local Authority upon request'</i>. Please could these commitments be included in the Outline CTMP [REP3-007]?</p>
6.9.	Applicant	<p>a) Further to comments from GC [REP4-026, item 3.9] please could the applicant reconsider its response [REP4-014, item 3.9] to the suggestion to place a cap on HGV movements? A cap was included in the 2012 T&amp;CPA approval [APP-086, Condition 31].</p> <p>b) Please could the applicant agree with GC suitable wording to be included in the Outline CTMP [REP3-007]?</p>
6.10.	Applicant	<p>Please could the applicant respond to comments from GC [REP4-026, item 11.1] regarding the Ffordd Cefn Du Highway Improvements [REP3-025] and provide revised drawings as necessary to address these.</p>
6.11.	Applicant	<p>a) Further to its response [REP3-026] to Christine Jordan's Written Representation [REP2-025] and with reference to measures included in the Outline CTMP [REP3-007], please could the applicant provide an update on progress in establishing a temporary car park for residents?</p> <p>b) Please could the applicant clarify the temporary car park provisions made for the elderly, disabled and those with children?</p> <p>c) How will this be secured in the draft DCO [REP4-009] and can further detail be provided in the Outline CTMP [REP3-007]?</p>
6.12.	Applicant	<p>a) Please respond to the concerns raised by Cherry Bartlett [REP4-020] regarding the Institute of Environmental Assessment's guidelines regarding fear and intimidation in relation to road</p>

Question number	Question to	Question
	Gwynedd Council	<p>traffic and clarify how this has been addressed in the assessment and in the mitigation proposals.</p> <p>b) Please could GC comment?</p> <p><b>b) Gwynedd Council considers that the concerns raised by Cherry Bartlett are sufficiently addressed and / or mitigated in the outline CMTP.</b></p>
6.13.	Gwynedd Council	<p>a) Further to the applicant's response [REP3-026] to a Written Representation from Dr Jane Huuse [REP2-028], further concerns raised by Dr Jane Huuse [REP4-021] and comments made by Cherry Bartlett [REP4-020] regarding the section between the cattle grid and the A4085, is GC content that concerns regarding safety for school children and safety at blind bends and 'pinch points' on the construction route from the A4085 to Q1 have been appropriately addressed?</p> <p><b>a) Gwynedd Council considers the concerns raised by Cherry Bartlett and Dr Jane Huuse are addressed or mitigated to a degree in the outline CMTP, i.e. by introducing suitable speed limits, instruction for all construction traffic to give way to all other users, and scheduling or using banksmen for abnormal loads. The additional concerns raised on specific events such as safety of school children can be address in full detail in the final CMTP.</b></p> <p>b) Does GC consider that there are any measures that should reasonably be added to the mitigation proposals to help address the community's safety concerns?</p> <p><b>b) No.</b></p>
6.14.	Applicant	<p>Further to a Written Representation from Dr Jane Huuse [REP4-021] regarding the potential to have to 'engage in lengthy law suits to repair the damage' to residences along the access road, please could the applicant suggest a mechanism by which this can be avoided, including (for example) if a construction vehicle damages a residence?</p>
6.15.	Applicant	<p>Further to a Written Representation from Dr Jane Huuse [REP4-021], please could the applicant clarify how the potential for construction traffic to take short cuts rather than use the construction route proposed by the applicant from the A4085 is prevented within the draft DCO {REP4-009}?</p>
6.16.	Gwynedd Council NRW Interested Parties	<p>Please comment on the Alternative Access to Q1 document [REP4-015] submitted by the applicant at deadline 4, and specifically on the potential impacts of these alternatives compared to the construction route to Q1 currently proposed by the applicant.</p> <p><b>The use of alternative routes would require substantial engineering works to create either a new</b></p>

Question number	Question to	Question
		roadway directly from Glyn Rhonwy towards Q1 or by upgrading the existing unclassified road which crosses over from the Chwarel Fawr site (Q1) towards Llanberis. The impact of these works would be substantial in terms of visual amenities, loss of habitat, loss of archaeological features etc. The use of these routes were and would not be seen as being a realistic option. The existing road towards Q1 from the Waunfawr side is in place, it is recognised that upgrading works will be required and the impact of these works and its use will inevitably affect local residents, however the alternative of creating a new roadway or the substantial works required to upgrade the existing unclassified mountain road are not considered to be a viable option in this instance.
6.17.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	<p>a) Please could the applicant clarify whether the timescales of the grid connection are likely to affect or cause diversions of construction traffic to quarry Q6 and the contingencies that would be in place to deal with this?</p> <p>b) Please could GC comment on the interaction between the two schemes and whether this is satisfactorily mitigated within the Outline CTMP [REP3-007]?</p> <p>b) The outline CMTMP does not refer to the grid connection scheme, however, It is assumed that the grid connection would be one of the last elements of the schemes. The CTMP indicates that Total Daily Traffic levels drop from month 30 onwards therefore it is envisaged that any interaction between both schemes would be manageable and unlikely to have a significant effect. Clarity on timescales for the grid connection scheme would help to confirm whether there would be any further affects.</p>
6.18.	Applicant	The Outline CTMP [REP3-007, paragraph 2.4.1] provides a brief description of the works required at Groeslon crossroads. However, the applicant has confirmed [REP4-014] that the highways improvement works are to be delivered through a s278 agreement with GC and not through the draft DCO [REP4-009]. Does the Outline CTMP [REP3-007] need to be updated to clarify where measures are to be secured through the s278 agreement?
<b>7.</b>	<b>Noise, vibration and air overpressure</b>	
7.1.	Applicant Gwynedd Council NRW	a) Further to its comments [REP4-014, item 6.3(b)] regarding ' <i>the potential for some noise and vibration effects from piling works</i> ' associated with the construction of the outfall to Llyn Padarn, please could the applicant clarify the potential impacts from these works on a worst case basis, proposed mitigation measures and how these are secured in the draft DCO [REP4-009]?

Question number	Question to	Question
		<p>b) Please could GC comment on whether it is appropriate for the applicant to use the s61 of the Control of Pollution Act process as a means to restrict construction noise impacts in this location, and whether more information should be included in the proposed mitigation strategy secured in the draft DCO [REP4-009] in respect to works in this location?</p> <p>b) A prior consent for construction noise under Section 61 of COPA74 is an appropriate means of controlling noise and vibration impact from the potential piling operations during the construction of the outfall into Llyn Padarn and we would encourage the developer to submit such an application. Reference to a S61 for this construction activity has been included in a newly drafted Draft Construction Noise Management Plan by the applicant. This information will be expanded once the PC has been appointed and more information is available at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>c) Will a piling risk assessment [REP4-014, item 6.3(b)] be included in the Outline Noise Management Plan [REP3-006]?</p> <p>d) Please could GC and NRW comment?</p> <p>d) As stated above, the new Draft Construction Noise Management Plan includes reference to a Piling Construction Statement, piling noise and vibration limits, method, duration and the need to consider undertaking these works under a S61 prior consent.</p>
7.2.	Applicant	Further to its response to matters raised at the Issue Specific Hearing [REP4-014, item 8.7(b)], please could the applicant clarify the impacts on human receptors of vibration and air overpressure at the proposed limits?
7.3.	Applicant	<p>In its response to the FWQ [REP2-011, question 2.2(b)] the applicant stated that <i>'noise contours are based on a 'worst case' scenario (e.g plant working at its closest approach to nearby noise sensitive receptors (NSRs), all plant operating simultaneously)'</i>.</p> <p>a) Please demonstrate that this worst case closest approach has been followed for predicted noise levels at Lake View Hotel and that this includes all works permitted by the draft DCO [REP4-009, Schedule 1, Part 1] in Work No 4C, including all <i>'further development'</i> identified in Work No 4C in the table and all <i>'further development'</i> items (a) to (j)?</p> <p>b) Please demonstrate that this worst case closest approach has been followed for predicted noise levels at Glyn Peris Guest House and Glyn Peris Cottage and that this includes all works permitted by the draft DCO [REP4-009, Schedule 1, Part 1] in Works No 4A, 4B, 4D and 4E, including all <i>'further development'</i> identified in Works No 4A, 4B, 4D and 4E in the table and all <i>'further development'</i> items (a) to (j)?</p>

Question number	Question to	Question
		c) Please could the applicant clarify the monitoring proposals for noise levels at these locations and update the Outline Noise Management Plan [REP3-006] to include more detail on the monitoring proposals?
7.4.	Applicant	Please could the applicant respond to concerns raised by Emily Wood in her Written Representation [REP2-032] regarding the potential for low frequency hum from the pumping station and the noise impacts on recreational users ' <i>directly adjacent</i> ' to the pumping station?
7.5.	Applicant	Further to its response to the FWQ [REP2-011, question 7.12], please could the applicant clarify the impact assessment undertaken for noise from concrete batching plant and the potential for this plant to be operational outside normal working hours?
7.6.	Applicant	a) Should the Outline Noise Management Plan [REP3-006] be updated to include the measures set out in the response to the FWQ [REP2-011, question 7.13]; ' <i>Measurements of vibration at the foundations of buildings considered to be at high risk should be taken to establish whether construction traffic vibration levels would be likely to exceed the threshold values or increase PPV levels to more than 0.3 mm/s. Vibration measurements of existing traffic along these particular routes should also be undertaken to determine the existing vibration levels.</i> ' b) How will ' <i>high risk</i> ' buildings be identified?
7.7.	Applicant Tony Grant	a) In its response [REP4-011] to a Written Representation from Tony Grant [REP3-033, question 7.4] the applicant stated that it intends to undertake structural surveys of all concerned properties, to undertake vibration surveys before, during and after construction and to undertake ' <i>any appropriate mitigation measures</i> '. How is this mitigation secured through the draft DCO [REP4-009]? b) In its response to matters arising at the Issue Specific Hearing [REP4-014, item 3.11(a)] the applicant stated that ' <i>a suitably qualified and independent structural surveyor will first assess which properties along Ffordd Cefn Du may be potentially vulnerable to vibration effects, and then these properties will be contacted and offered an independent structural survey at the cost of the Applicant. If they agree to the survey it will then be carried out prior to construction start. A final survey will be undertaken post construction and when the Development is in operation</i> '. Please could the applicant update the Outline Noise Management Plan [REP3-006] to include these measures? c) Please could Tony Grant comment on the updated Outline Noise Management Plan at deadline 6?

Question number	Question to	Question
7.8.	Applicant	Please could the applicant address the discrepancy in working hours between the Outline Noise Management Plan [REP3-006] and the Outline Construction Traffic Management [REP3-007] identified by GC [REP4-026, action no 8(b)]?
7.9.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	<p>a) Requirement 19 of the draft DCO [REP4-009] specifies that working hours may be extended for specified works. There is no indication that this limited to underground works. Given the applicant has clarified [REP3-026, question 7.19] that GCs understanding that these works would be limited to underground works only is correct, should Requirement 19 of the draft DCO [REP4-009] be amended to include this?</p> <p>a) It is GC's understanding that surface construction works are limited by the working hours as specified in Requirement 19(1) of the draft DCO. Any surface construction works outside these hours can only be undertaken under the control of a S61 COPA74. Further it is GC's understanding that underground working is permitted 24 hours a day save as per restrictions in Condition 40 of the 2012 consent which we believe should be secured in the Construction Noise Management Plan. For clarity, Requirement 19 of the Draft DCO may benefit from being expanded to include these additional working hour restrictions.</p> <p>b) Please could the applicant clarify what the ES has assessed for extended working hours, on a worst case basis and whether any amendments are required to the wording of the draft DCO [REP4-009] to ensure that the nature and extent of the effects would not go beyond what has been assessed in the ES?</p> <p>c) Please could GC comment on the applicant's assessment for extended working hours?</p> <p>c) GC is not aware that the applicant has included an assessment specifically of the construction works which may be undertaken outside of normal working hours within the ES.</p> <p>d) Is GC content that the earlier concerns raised in its response to the FWQ [REP2-041, question 7.19] regarding extensions to working hours have been addressed?</p> <p>d) GC is satisfied that concerns with regards to construction outside normal working hours have been addressed.</p>
7.10.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	<p>a) Following GC's response to the FWQ [REP2-041, question 7.23] please could the applicant clarify the extent to which operational vibration has been considered, including the identification of operational vibration sources, any mitigation measures required and how these have been secured in the draft DCO [REP4-009]?</p> <p>b) Does GC consider that '<i>further investigation and assessment</i>' is necessary in addition to the</p>

Question number	Question to	Question
		<p>measures set out in the Outline Noise Management Plan [REP3-006]?</p> <p>b) A Draft Operational Noise Management Plan (ONMP) is in the process of being drafted and agreed between GC and the applicant. This ONMP includes and outlines further investigations and assessment of operational ground borne vibration and operational ground borne vibration noise from the development.</p>
7.11.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	<p>a) Further to its responses to the FWQ [REP002-011, questions 7.16(c) and 7.20(b) please could the applicant clarify its level of confidence (e.g. high, medium or low) that residual impacts from blasting, noise and vibration will be no worse than determined in the ES?</p> <p>b) Please could GC comment?</p> <p>b) Given the information currently to hand, GC have no reason to believe that residual impact from blasting activities will be any worse than the applicant has determined in the ES.</p>
7.12.	Applicant	Please respond to Mike Vitkovitch's representations [REP4-033 and REP4-034] regarding low frequency noise and ground borne vibration and noise.
<b>Noise, vibration and air overpressure limits</b>		
7.13.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	<p>a) Are the proposed limits for noise, vibration and air overpressure during any period greater than those which informed the assessment in the ES?</p> <p>a) GC is not aware that any limits on noise, vibration and air overpressure will be greater than those which informed the assessments in the ES.</p> <p>b) What contingencies does the applicant have to ensure that the limits proposed are achievable?</p> <p>c) Please clarify that you do intend to agree limits for noise, vibration and air overpressure within the final plans once further design information and assessment data is available at the post consent stage (if consent is granted) in order to have a quantifiable basis on which to monitor the potential effects?</p> <p>c) It is preferred to agree and secure noise, vibration and over pressure limits within the final construction and operational noise management plans once detailed design information and further baseline monitoring data is available. For clarity, it has been recommended and agreed that specific limits and conditions be included and secured in the individual plans as a specific Appendix to the plans.</p> <p>d) Please explain how the ExA can be confident that the agreed limits would not allow for effects which are greater or materially different to those assessed in the ES, and demonstrate how this</p>

Question number	Question to	Question
		<p>commitment is secured in the draft DCO?</p> <p>d) Current noise limits are based on the lower of the 2012 and 2015 baseline monitoring data survey results and this approach should be continued with the further assessments and surveys to be undertaken prior to the start of the development.</p> <p>e) Please could the applicant clarify what information it intends will be agreed at the post consent stage (if consent is granted), what trigger mechanisms will be used to determine whether any limits are breached, and the measures that would be taken (and by whom) to ensure that the necessary mitigation measures are in place to avoid effects which are greater or materially different to those assessed in the ES?</p>
7.14.	Applicant	With reference to Mike Vitkovitch's representations [REP4-033 and REP4-034], please clarify how potential low frequency noise and ground borne vibration and noise been taken into account for the proposed construction noise and vibration limits?
7.15.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	<p>a) Could trial blasts help to ensure that limits proposed for noise, vibration and air overpressure during blasting are not exceeded?</p> <p>b) If so, how should trial blasts be specified and secured?</p> <p>a) &amp; b) Trial blasting may be a useful method of blast design to ensure that blasting limits are not exceeded during the construction of this development and should be included and considered in the PC's detailed blasting assessment.</p>
7.16.	Applicant	<p>a) Further to its response to matters raised at the Issue Specific Hearing [REP4-014, item 8.5], please could the applicant clarify the potential durations that normal daytime and night time noise and vibration limits will be exceeded and, specifically, whether the extent of any exceedances are anticipated to be within MPG 11 guidelines (70 dB LAeq,1 hr for up to 8 weeks per year)?</p> <p>b) Please could the applicant summarise any exceedances of limits that are anticipated and demonstrate how these were taken into account in the overall assessment of significance noise effects in the ES?</p>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Water resources, contaminated land, flood risk and climate change</b>	
	<b>Water Frameworks Directive</b>	

Question number	Question to	Question
8.1.	NRW Applicant	a) Following its response to the FWQ [REP2-047, question 8.29] please could NRW clarify that what they consider the <u>relevant</u> mitigation measures to be and whether it is satisfied that these are appropriately secured in the draft DCO [REP4-009] or by other means? b) Please could the applicant demonstrate specifically how all of these measures have been secured in the draft DCO [REP4-009]?
<b>Water resources and contaminated land</b>		
8.2.	Applicant	Further to its response to matters raised at the Issue Specific Hearing [REP4-013, item 22], please could the applicant clarify, with reference to the Reservoirs Act 1975, if is there a possibility that the parameters specified in Schedule 1 and Requirement 5 of the draft DCO [REP4-009] could be exceeded for design safety reasons, or has the applicant already accounted for this?
8.3.	Applicant	a) Following its response to the FWQ [REP2-011, question 8.5] please could the applicant clarify the scope of any further groundwater investigation work which may be required to be conducted by the principal contractor? b) If further investigation work is required, please could the applicant demonstrate how this is secured in the draft DCO [REP4-009] and whether the scope of this work would be agreed with GC and NRW?
8.4.	Applicant	a) Following the its responses to the FWQ [REP2-011, questions 8.6 and 8.11], when does the applicant intend to carry out site visits to properties which have not responded to mail shots regarding private water supplies? b) If post consent, how is the need to do this secured in the draft DCO [REP4-009] and how will the results be taken into account when designing the final mitigation strategy? c) Is the applicant able to undertake this work and make any necessary updates to the proposed mitigation strategy during the examination period?
8.5.	Applicant	Following the its response to the FWQ [REP2-011, questions 8.8], please could the applicant clarify that all the necessary works required within quarry Q5 can be carried out within the order limits?
8.6.	NRW	a) Further to the applicant's further response [REP4-011] to NRW's comments [REP3-032] regarding the proposal to form a drain between Q5 and Q6, does NRW still consider that an amendment to the discharge consent application is required? b) If an amendment to the discharge consent is required, what confidence is there that this can

Question number	Question to	Question
		<p>be granted before the close of the examination?</p> <p>c) Do NRW consider that that the content of the revised discharge consent permit could affect the conclusions of the HRA?</p>
8.7.	Applicant	Further to its responses to the FWQ [REP2-011, question 8.16] and matters raised at the Issue Specific Hearing [REP4-014, item 6.6(b)], please could the applicant clarify the specific mitigation measures proposed to address potential impacts from fine particulates during operation, including from new spoil heaps 10m from the Nant-y-Betws, and how these measures are secured in the draft DCO [REP4-009]?
8.8.	Applicant	The applicant has stated [REP4-014, item 6.6(a)] that the greatest silt risk into the Nant-y-Betws is from the access tracks that will be required to cross it and will be managed in accordance with the Outline Water Management Plan (WMP) and drainage strategy. The Outline WMP [REP3-012] does not mention the access tracks for the PRoW diversions; should it be amended to clarify how the effects of these works will be mitigated?
8.9.	NRW	Further to its response to matters raised in the Issue Specific Hearing [OD-007, item 6.6], please could NRW clarify whether it is content with the applicant's mitigation measures for fine particulates leaching from the development?
8.10.	Applicant	<p>a) Following its response to the FWQ [REP2-011, questions 8.18 and 8.36], please could the applicant secure within the draft DCO [REP4-009] a Requirement for the detailed design of all surface water infrastructure, including the spillway and scour into the Nant-y-Betws, to be approved by the local planning authority in consultation with NRW?</p> <p>b) Can the applicant suggest how the Outline Excess Water Management Strategy [REP3-013] can be tied into draft DCO [REP4-009] Requirement 23 and can it be listed in Requirement 7?</p>
8.11.	NRW	Further to the applicant's response to the FWQ [REP2-011, question 8.37] does NRW require the discharge rate for pumping during the initial dewatering exercise to be specified within the Outline CoCP [REP2-013] or otherwise secured in the draft DCO?
8.12.	Applicant	Please respond to GC's comments [REP4-026, item 11.1] regarding the Outline Water Management Plan [REP3-012].
8.13.	Applicant	The Outline CoCP [REP2-013 paragraph 4.9.10] refers to the reuse of excavated materials subject to geotechnical testing. Should the frequency and scope of testing, acceptance criteria, relevant

Question number	Question to	Question
		standards, who would carry out the testing and any requirements for approval be clarified and included in the Outline CoCP?
8.14.	Applicant	The Outline Waste Management Plan, Outline Ordnance Management Plan [REP4-017] and Outline Land Discovery Strategy [REP3-024] are all intended to include details of how land contamination will be dealt with. Please could the applicant clarify where the overlaps between these plans will be, and how the ExA can be confident that these plans will compliment, and not contradict each other?
8.15.	Applicant	Further to comments from Jeff Taylor [REP4-029], please respond to the matters raised in his earlier representation [REP2-035] regarding risk of loss of containment, understanding of flow paths and the potential for collapse of the existing bomb store.
<b>Flood risk and climate change</b>		
8.16.	NRW	Following its response to the FWQ [REP2-047, question 8.31(b)], is NRW content that the applicant has considered the worst case scenario for the Flood Consequence Assessment?
8.17.	Applicant NRW	a) NRW has stated [REP2-047, question 8.33(a)] that it usually requires that ' <i>post development run off rates to watercourses reflect those of pre-development</i> '. Please could the applicant clarify whether this is achievable? b) What are the consequences if it is not - for flood defence consent, for example?
8.18.	Applicant	Further to comments from NRW [OD-007, item 11.2] please could the applicant update the draft DCO [REP4-009, Requirement 23(1)] to indicate that NRW are to be consulted on the Excess Water Management Strategy [REP3-013]?
8.19.	Applicant	Please could the applicant respond to the concerns expressed by Louise Tully [REP2-043] that ' <i>Residents downstream of the Dinorwig scheme are already subject to rapid river level changes from unannounced releases of water into the system. These risks are not adequately addressed for the Glyn Rhonwy scheme</i> '?
<b>9.</b>	<b>Ordnance</b>	
9.1.	NRW	a) Further to the applicant's comments on NRW's response to the FWQ [REP3-026, question 8.7], is NRW content with the applicant's proposals for intrusive site investigation in the quarries?

Question number	Question to	Question
		<p>b) If not, what further clarification is required from the applicant?</p> <p>c) Please could NRW clarify its advice regarding the need for radiological surveys during the site investigations?</p>
9.2.	Applicant Gwynedd Council NRW	<p>a) Please could the applicant respond to the queries raised by the Snowdonia Society [REP4-040] and Jeff Taylor [REP4-031] regarding the sampling undertaken in the quarry Q6 and clarify the extent of sampling and testing undertaken to date?</p> <p>b) Do GC and NRW have any concerns regarding the extent of sampling and testing undertaken?</p> <p>b) GC do not have any comments to make at this time and would be grateful if the ExA could provide GC with the applicant's response to part 9.2a for further consideration.</p> <p>c) Please could GC and NRW comment on the concerns expressed [REP4-040 and REP4-031] regarding 'self-regulation'?</p> <p>c) GC do not have any comments to make regarding self regulation in this regard.</p>
9.3.	Applicant	<p>a) Further to representations from Jeff Taylor [REP4-030 and REP4-032] and Ann Lawton [REP4-018] and the applicant's response [REP4-011] to earlier representations from Jeff Taylor [REP3-034], please could the applicant clarify the potential impacts regarding chemical weapons contamination, including mustard gas, hexachloroethane and references to 'smoke floats' and 'dirty areas'?</p> <p>b) In its response [REP4-011] to representations from Jeff Taylor the applicant stated that '<i>Direct evidence of Y3 mustard-filled containers has only recently been corroborated. This documentary evidence had not previously been provided to Zetica by the archives staff (it is suspected that it was overlooked but found when the records were more formally catalogued by the archive staff)</i>'. What confidence does the applicant have that all potential types of weapons-related contamination (including chemical and radiological) and UXO have been identified and what are the risks of their being weapons related contamination for which there is no documented evidence or for which documented evidence has not been found or referred to in the examination?</p> <p>c) Please could the applicant detail the specific mitigation measures for chemical and radiological weapons-related contamination that have been identified or not identified to date, including with regard to health and safety issues and clarify how these are secured in the draft DCO [REP4-009] and the Outline Ordnance Management Strategy [REP4-007]?</p> <p>d) Should specific measures with respect to Y3 containers / mustard gas be included in the</p>

Question number	Question to	Question
		Outline Ordnance Management Strategy [REP4-007]? e) Please could the applicant comment on the risks to the feasibility of the development due to both identified and unidentified ordnance and weapons-related contamination?
9.4.	Applicant	Please comment on the risks of weapons-related contamination or UXO not being identified during the site investigations (due to it being buried deep in crevices, for example) and of this being released or activated during blasting and clarify the mitigation measures proposed to address this?
9.5.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	<p>a) Please could GC further comment on the applicant's impact assessment and mitigation proposals for ordnance in the light of the clarifications provided by the applicant and Interested Parties during the examination?</p> <p>a) Having assessed the Outline Ordnance Management Strategy [REP-017] Gwynedd Council has no further comment regarding the impact assessment and mitigation for ordnance. As stated in the response to question 2.6, Section 3.2 of the strategy is of high importance and the HSE should be notified of the strategy.</p> <p>b) The applicant has stated [REP4-014, item 5.4] that '<i>a recent review of historical records relevant to the scheme by the MoD has not resulted in any indication that they would need to be involved in any future works at the Development</i>'. Please could the applicant and GC comment on the value of the ExA writing to the MoD to request a clarification on the potential for chemical or radiological contamination or UXO?</p> <p>b) GC agrees that as much information as possible should be sought on the potential for chemical or radiological contamination or UXO and so agree that the ExA should write to the MoD in this regard.</p>
9.6.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	<p>Responding to concerns expressed by Dr Dawn Wimpory [REP2-027] on the potential for health or developmental problems linked to munition-related chemicals arising from discharges to Llyn Padarn the applicant stated [REP4-014, item 6.5(b)] that NRW has confirmed that the implementation of the Water Management Plan and Silt Management Plan will be sufficient to avoid significant effects. However, NRW has stated [OD-007, item 6.5] that '<i>the health impacts of any discharges are outside of the remit of NRW</i>'. Please could the applicant and GC comment?</p> <p>GC wishes to enquire whether the applicant has sought expert advice from Public Health Wales on whether any evidence exists on the potential health effects.</p>
9.7.	Applicant	Please could the applicant comment on the risks of weapons-related contamination originally deposited in quarry Q6 leaching into other areas since it was deposited and how any potential

Question number	Question to	Question
		impacts are mitigated?
9.8.	Applicant	<p>a) In its responses to the FWQ [REP2-011, question 8.7] the applicant stated that the Ordnance Management Strategy would be developed in consultation with the HSE. Please could the applicant clarify whether this has, or should be, secured in the draft DCO [REP4-009]?</p> <p>b) How can the applicant be confident that the measures set out in the Outline Ordnance Management Strategy [REP4-007] are appropriate and realistic, and would be deliverable alongside the other relevant regulations if the views of HSE on the draft plan have not been sought?</p>
9.9.	Applicant	Further to its comments [REP4-013, item 21] that the detailed design of the water treatment facility is unknown, please could the applicant provide clarity on the assumptions made in respect to this facility in order to conduct a robust assessment, including the alternative options, and demonstrate how these have been assessed in the ES and secured in the draft DCO [REP4-009]?
9.10.	Applicant	It is unclear why the applicant does not consider a separate requirement specifying the content of the Outline Ordnance Management Strategy [REP4-007] in the draft DCO [REP4-009] necessary; this is the approach taken for other draft plans/strategies specified in Requirement 7 of the draft DCO [REP4-009]. Please could the applicant clarify and consider either the inclusion of a Requirement in the draft DCO [REP4-009] which sets out the minimum measures relied on, or alternatively that the Outline Ordnance Management Strategy [REP4-007] (subject to any suggested alterations) is secured in draft DCO [REP4-009] Requirement 8 (Compliance with outline plans)?
9.11.	Applicant	The Outline Ordnance Management Strategy [REP4-007, paragraph 2.3.1] refers to UXO detection and observational mapping. Please could the applicant clarify what type of practical considerations will be taken into account; whether stage specific method statements would be followed to carry out this work; whether the commitment to produce method statements should be reflected in the Outline Ordnance Management Strategy [REP4-007, paragraph 2.3.1]; and the timescales of this work; prior to the commencement of construction or during, and how this has been factored into the assessment presented in the ES?
9.12.	Applicant	<p>a) The Outline Ordnance Management Strategy [REP4-007, section 2.5] refers to procedures for exploding ordnance. Does the applicant anticipate the need to carry out any controlled explosions outside of standard construction working hours?</p> <p>b) If yes, please explain how assessed; or, if not, can this restriction be written into the Outline</p>

Question number	Question to	Question
		Ordnance Management Strategy [REP4-007]?
9.13.	Applicant	Please could the applicant clarify whether the Explosive Ordnance Disposal Facility [REP4-007, paragraphs 2.5.3 to 2.5.6] would only be in place during construction?
9.14.	Applicant	Should the Outline Ordnance Management Strategy [REP4-007] include details of relevant security arrangements?
9.15.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	<p>a) Should the Outline Ordnance Management Strategy [REP4-007, section 3.2] provide detail on the methods to be used to communicate with the various parties and on the nature and extent of communications that should be carried out?</p> <p>b) Please could GC comment?</p> <p><b>b) It is suggested that communication in respect of ordnance management should be through the ELO as with the other Management Plans.</b></p>
9.16.	Applicant	It is unclear what further information will be provided in the final Ordnance Management Strategy – stage specific method statements for example? Please could the applicant amend the Outline Ordnance Management Strategy [REP4-007] to clarify (if required) specifically what further information will be provided in the final version for sign off by GC?
<b>10.</b>	<b>Air quality</b>	
10.1.	Gwynedd Council	<p>Further to the applicant's comments on GC's response to the FWQ [REP3-026, question 9.2(b)], please could GC clarify what further monitoring and assessment information and details associated with blasting activities will be required, and whether the Outline CoCP [REP2-013] should be amended to include any additional detail?</p> <p><b>A Draft Dust Management Plan has been produced on behalf of the applicant and agreed with GC in principal. The content of this document will cover the air quality monitoring and assessment associated with blasting. We recommend that table 3 of the outline CoCP be amended to include a summary of these details.</b></p>
10.2.	Applicant	<p>The applicant's response to the FWQ [REP2-011, question 9.4] referred to dust mitigation controls during blasting in the Dust Management Plan. The Outline CoCP [REP2-013, page 38] states that '<i>blasting should be avoided where possible</i>'.</p> <p>a) Please could the applicant identify the locations and circumstances where blasting will be</p>

Question number	Question to	Question
		permitted? b) How can this be secured in the draft DCO [REP4-009]?
10.3.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	Should the Outline CoCP [REP2-013] be updated to include details of the baseline air quality survey and monitoring during construction described in the applicant's response to the FWQ [REP2-011, question 9.9]?  GC believes that the Outline CoCP should be updated to include details of the Baseline Air Quality Monitoring Plan as outlined in the applicant's response. We have recently received a draft of this document.
10.4.	Applicant	a) Further to the its comment on GC's response to the FWQ [REP3-026, question 9.10(b)], please could the applicant clarify how regular air quality updates will be provided during construction? b) How will this be secured in the draft DCO [REP4-009]?
10.5.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	Should the Dust Management Plan paragraph in the draft DCO [REP4-009, Requirement 13] refer to mitigation measures and monitoring as well as the measures to be taken if there is a failure of dust controls?  It is GC's opinion there is no need to expand on condition 13 of the draft DCO concerning the Dust Management Plan. Mitigation measures, monitoring and measures to be taken if there is a failure of dust controls are all within the management plan itself.
<b>Dust deposition limits</b>		
10.6.	Applicant	a) Are the proposed limits for dust deposition greater than those which informed the assessment in the ES? b) What contingencies does the applicant have to ensure that the limits proposed are achievable? c) Please clarify that you do intend to agree limits for dust deposition within the final plans once further design information and assessment data is available at the post consent stage (if consent is granted) in order to have a quantifiable basis on which to monitor the potential effects? d) Please explain how the ExA can be confident that the agreed limits would not allow for effects which are greater or materially different to those assessed in the ES, and demonstrate how this commitment is secured in the draft DCO? e) Please could the applicant clarify what information it intends will be agreed at the post consent

Question number	Question to	Question
		stage (if consent is granted), what trigger mechanisms will be used to determine whether any limits are breached, and the measures that would be taken (and by whom) to ensure that the necessary mitigation measures are in place to avoid effects which are greater or materially different to those assessed in the ES?
<b>11.</b>	<b>Other health impacts, safety and security</b>	
11.1.	Applicant	Following from its response to the FWQ [REP2-011, question 9.12] regarding adherence with ICNIRP guidelines, please could the applicant clarify how this is secured, for example in a relevant mitigation plan that is secured by the draft DCO [REP4-009]?
11.2.	Applicant	Further to its response to matters arising from the Issue Specific Hearing [REP4-014, item 12.4], please could the applicant clarify the potential impacts on health associated with odour and increases in pests?
<b>12.</b>	<b>Socio-economics, land use, accessibility, tourism and recreation</b>	
	<b>Socio-economics</b>	
12.1.	Applicant	Please could the applicant provide an update on the community 'trust fund' contribution discussions with Gwynedd Council mentioned in its response to the FWQ [REP2-011, question 10.14(a)]?
12.2.	Gwynedd Council	<p>Please could GC provide an update on measures that are being, or should be, undertaken outside the draft DCO to realise the social and economic benefits of the development, through measures such as the '<i>meet the buyer</i>' events, tender weighting criteria and the use of local labour mentioned by the applicant [REP2-011, question 10.14]?</p> <p><i>Gwynedd Council welcomes the approach taken by the applicant to maximise the local benefit associated with the proposed investment, and would be able to provide input in the development of specific measures. In particular, the Council would be interested in discussing the proposed procurement strategy and associated work packages. Such details are normally discussed following the confirmation of planning permission and in line with the developer/operator selection process. Gwynedd Council would be able to assist in promoting procurement opportunities to local businesses; and co-ordinate the activities of various agencies in the development of the local</i></p>

Question number	Question to	Question
		labour market.
12.3.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	Do any socio-economic obligations satisfy EN-1 paragraph 4.1.8 such that they can be taken into account by the ExA?  It is known that a Community Trust Fund is being arranged as part of the details of a Lease agreement between SPH and Gwynedd Council (as the landowner). This arrangement is made outside of any Planning procedure.
	<b>Land use and accessibility</b>	
12.4.	Gwynedd Council	Further to the applicant's response to the FWQ [REP2-011, question 6.3], is GC aware of any suitable standards for the construction and maintenance of PRoW's that do not fall within a highway boundary, e.g. public footpaths, bridleways, etc?  Gwynedd Council would refer to the requirements of British Standard 5709 : 2006 "Gaps, gates and stiles" in terms of gateways on public footpaths, however, it is not considered that there are specific standards for the creation and maintenance of public footpaths. It is advised that any developer contacts Gwynedd Council's Countryside and Access Unit in order to agree a suitable specification of works relating to public rights of way.
12.5.	Applicant	The applicant has stated that the updated Common, Access and PRoW Strategy [REP3-005] is for information purposes only and it not intended to be secured in the draft DCO [REP4-009]. Please could the applicant demonstrate how all measures referenced in this document are secured in the draft DCO [REP4-009] where relied on to reach the assessment conclusions?
12.6.	Applicant	Following its comment on Cherry Bartlett's response to the first written question [REP3-026, question 10.17], please could the applicant clarify how the proposed mitigation measures for the North Wales Pilgrim's Way are secured in the draft DCO [REP4-009]?
12.7.	Applicant	Please could the applicant clarify how the commitment to follow British Horse Society guidelines for gates or fences [REP3-026, question 10.21(a)] is secured in the draft DCO [REP4-009]?
12.8.	Applicant	Please could the applicant respond to the concern raised in the Written Representation from Dr Jane Huuse [REP2-028] that ' <i>the severing of this stretch of road with the footpaths coming up from the village round the Hafod Oleu's has not been given adequate consideration</i> '?
	<b>Tourism and recreation</b>	

Question number	Question to	Question
12.9.	Gwynedd Council NRW	<p>a) Following the applicant's comments on GC's response to the FWQ [REP3-026, question 10.10(b)], is more information required to allow GC to gain a better understanding of the energy involved with water abstraction for it to comment on the possibility of entrapment or snagging on infrastructure in Llyn Padarn or is sufficient control on this provided through the abstraction license?</p> <p>b) Please could NRW comment on whether the abstraction and discharge licenses include consideration of the safety of water users?</p> <p>GC is satisfied with the response as given and considers that sufficient control will be gained through an NRW approved abstraction licence.</p>
12.10.	Applicant	Further to its responses to matters raised at the Issue Specific Hearing [REP4-014, item 7.3 and 7.4], please could the applicant include in the Outline CoCP [REP2-013] the mitigation measures to maintain access, for the works to avoid summer school holidays and for the timing of construction works to avoid the dates of competitions in Llyn Padarn?
12.11.	Applicant	Further to its response to the FWQ [REP2-011, question 10.12] please could the applicant clarify the impacts of noise from blasting, including on PRow, permissive routes and cycle routes, camping and caravanning sites and on events?
12.12.	Gwynedd Council	<p>a) Further to the applicant's response to the FWQ [REP2-011, question 10.23], is GC content with the mitigation measures for recreation and tourism secured through the draft DCO [REP4-009]?</p> <p>a) Gwynedd Council is content with the proposed mitigation measures and requirements as secured through the draft DCO (including associated Schedules).</p> <p>b) Please could GC comment on any measures being taken outside the draft DCO [REP4-009]?</p> <p>b) GC have no further comments regarding this matter.</p>
12.13.	Applicant	<p>a) Please could Ceris Meredith and Paul Haydock comment on the applicant's Property-Specific Mitigation Plan for the Glyn Peris Guest House [REP4-014, Appendix 12.1]?</p> <p>b) Does the applicant consider that a similar plan would be appropriate for any other properties with similar potential impacts or in similar proximity to the proposed works?</p>
12.14.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	a) Further to its response to matters raised at the Issue Specific Hearing [REP4-014, item 12.1(c)], does the applicant consider whether potential economic impacts on tourism-related

Question number	Question to	Question
		<p>businesses could be mitigated by measures focussed on tourism (e.g. marketing, etc.) in addition to those mentioned for traffic, noise, dust, etc.?</p> <p>b) Please could GC comment?</p> <p>b) The potential impacts on tourism-related businesses - and additional to those specified by the applicant - may be difficult to quantify due to a number of inter-related factors (both micro and macro). However, supporting measures could also be considered as part of the proposed Community Fund. However and as previously referred to, this arrangement is made outside any Planning procedure.</p>

<b>Abbreviations</b>			
<b>ALA 1981</b>	Acquisition of Land Act 1981	<b>LMP</b>	Landscape Management Plan
<b>AP</b>	Affected Person	<b>LPA</b>	Local Planning Authority
<b>AONB</b>	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	<b>LSE</b>	Likely Significant Effects
<b>BoR</b>	Book of Reference	<b>LVIA</b>	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
<b>BPM</b>	Best Practicable Means	<b>MMP</b>	Materials Management Plan
<b>BS</b>	British Standard	<b>MW</b>	Megawatts
<b>CA</b>	Compulsory Acquisition	<b>NRW</b>	Natural Resources Wales
<b>CoCP</b>	Code of Construction Practice	<b>NPS</b>	National Policy Statement
<b>COPA</b>	Control of Pollution Act 1974	<b>NSER</b>	No Significant Effects Report
<b>CRoW</b>	Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000	<b>NSIP</b>	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
<b>CTMP</b>	Construction Traffic Management Plan	<b>PA2008</b>	The Planning Act 2008
<b>DCO</b>	Development Consent Order	<b>PINS</b>	The Planning Inspectorate
<b>EIA</b>	Environmental Impact Assessment	<b>PM</b>	Preliminary Meeting
<b>EM</b>	Explanatory Memorandum	<b>PPV</b>	Peak Particle Velocity
<b>EN-1</b>	Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy	<b>PRoW</b>	Public Rights of Way
<b>EPA</b>	Environmental Protection Act 1990	<b>RIES</b>	Report on the Implications for European Sites
<b>EPS</b>	European Protected Species	<b>RR</b>	Relevant Representation
<b>ES</b>	Environmental Statement	<b>SAC</b>	Special Area of Conservation
<b>ExA</b>	Examining Authority	<b>SI</b>	Statutory Instrument
<b>FWQ</b>	First Written Questions	<b>SoCG</b>	Statement of Common Ground
<b>GAPS</b>	Gwynedd Archaeological Planning Services	<b>SoS</b>	Secretary of State
<b>GC</b>	Gwynedd Council	<b>SNPA</b>	Snowdonia National Park Authority
<b>GLVIA3</b>	Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Assessment 3rd Edition	<b>SPA</b>	Special Protected Area
<b>HGV</b>	Heavy Goods Vehicle	<b>SSSI</b>	Site of Special Scientific Interest
<b>HMP</b>	Habitat Management Plan	<b>TAN</b>	Technical Advice Note
<b>HRA</b>	Habitats Regulation Assessment	<b>T&amp;CPA</b>	Town and Country Planning Act 1990
<b>HSE</b>	Health and Safety Executive	<b>TPO</b>	Tree Preservation Order
<b>IAQM</b>	Institute of Air Quality Management	<b>UXO</b>	Unexploded Ordnance
<b>ICNIRP</b>	International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection	<b>WFD</b>	Water Frameworks Directive
<b>IP</b>	Interested Party	<b>WMP</b>	Waste Management Plan
<b>ISH</b>	Issue Specific Hearing	<b>WR</b>	Written Representation
<b>L&amp;RP</b>	Landscape and Reinstatement Plan	<b>WSI</b>	Written Scheme of Investigation
<b>LIR</b>	Local Impact Report	<b>WWII</b>	World War II