

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

Request for further information schedule

Issued on 20 July 2016

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's requests for further information to assist with the assessment of the application. **Responses should be received by the Examining Authority (ExA) by noon on 10 August 2016.**

The Planning Inspectorate's document references in this document [in square brackets] can be found on our website by following this link: [Examination Library](#). A schedule of abbreviations is provided at the end of this document.

Column 2 of the table indicates **to which parties each request for further information is directed**. The ExA would be grateful if all parties could respond to all requests directed to them. **Please start your response by quoting the request number.**

Request number	Request to	Request
1.	Other consents	
1.1.	Applicant Gwynedd Council (GC)	<p>a) Please provide an update on progress finalising the s278 agreement with GC and Crown Estates regarding highway improvements to Ffordd Cefn Du.</p> <p>b) What matters are outstanding and when is it anticipated that the agreement will be finalised?</p> <p>c) Are the Applicant or GC aware of any reason why the agreement should not be finalised by the end of August 2016?</p> <p>GC have requested the Applicant to review the S278 drawings following the feedback received by local residents during the open event, and to undertake a safety audit of the design in order to address as many design issues as possible prior to construction.</p> <p>The Applicant has been advised to review the open culvert drainage proposals and to analyse the effects the proposals may have downstream.</p> <p>These matters have been left with the Applicant to complete. The agreement could be finalised by the end of August 2016 if all the above is submitted in good time.</p>

Request number	Request to	Request
1.2.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	<p>a) Further to the Applicant's response to the second written questions (SWOs) [REP5-005, question 6.10] please could GC comment on the progress in resolving its previous comments [REP4-026, item 11.1] regarding the Ffordd Cefn Du highway improvements and the design of the Groeslon Crossroads?</p> <p>a) The revised drawings as displayed at the recent open event satisfactorily addresses the issues raised during the previous round of questioning.</p> <p>b) Please could the Applicant and GC summarise the matters arising at the community event held on 29th July 2016, whether this resulted in any changes to the proposed mitigation measures and whether any consequent revisions are proposed to the Ffordd Cefn Du highway improvements [REP3-025] or the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [REP5-023]?</p> <p>b) please see response to 1.1</p> <p>c) If the proposed mitigation measures are changed, please confirm whether the scope of the changes would affect the conclusions in the environmental statement (ES) regarding the significance of residual effects</p>
1.3.	Applicant	<p>a) Please provide an update on discussions to provide a temporary car park for residents [REP5-005, question 6.11]?</p> <p>b) The wording in the CTMP [REP5-023, paragraph 2.4.5] states that "<i>it is intended that</i>" a temporary car park will be provided. Can this wording be amended to make the commitment more secure?</p>
1.4.	Natural Resources Wales (NRW)	<p>NRW has stated [REP6-017] that it is unable to comment on point 1(d) of the ExA's Rule 17 letter [PD-020] in the absence of a valid Environmental Permit application.</p> <p>a) Does NRW accept that the ExA's request is consistent with paragraphs 4.10.7 and 4.10.8 of the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1)?</p> <p>b) Please could NRW respond to point 1(d) without prejudice to its determination of any future Environmental Permit applications and on the basis of information currently available to it and as listed in the Examination Library, rather than any information that has not yet been provided to it in an application?</p> <p>c) Does NRW require its response to be conditional on other matters?</p>
1.5.	Applicant	<p>a) Please could NRW clarify whether the matter that it has mentioned [REP6-017] regarding "<i>the legal requirements of an operator as per the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010</i>"</p>

Request number	Request to	Request
	NRW	<p><i>(Schedule 5, paragraph 13), and Regulatory Guidance Note 13" were material to the Environmental Permits that have been granted on the scheme and, if they were, why a similar approach could not be adopted for the withdrawn Environmental Permits?</i></p> <p>b) Was NRW able to agree the Environmental Permit application for the previous T&CPA scheme and, if so, please could it clarify why it is unable to do so for the DCO application?</p> <p>c) Please could NRW clarify whether it is possible for an Environmental Permit to be granted subject to conditions relating to further information to be provided by the Principal Contractor and Operator for approval by NRW at a later date, and if not, why not?</p>
1.6.	Applicant NRW	<p>a) Please provide a copy of the "<i>Schedule 5 Notice under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010, dated 5th April 2016</i>" mentioned by NRW [REP6-017] in its response to the ExA's Rule 17 letter [PD-020].</p> <p>b) Please could the Applicant demonstrate whether it has provided, or is able to provide, the technical information requested in the Schedule 5 Notice?</p> <p>c) Please could NRW respond to the Applicant's points [REP6-001] regarding further clarity on the outstanding information, whether it would be possible for NRW to accept a certain level of information without the Principal Contractor and Operator being in place and whether the Applicant could resubmit the discharge consent applications during the course of the examination?</p>
1.7.	NRW	<p>a) Further to previous difficulties [REP5-049, question 1.35] regarding the format of comments provided by Oggy East [REP2-049] on the Applicant's Discharge Consent Supporting Statement, and in fulfilment of its role as the Statutory Nature Conservation Body and without prejudice to the determination of any future Environmental Permit applications, please could NRW comment on the Applicant's responses to those comments [REP5-005, appendix 1.35] and Oggy East's original comments that have been reformatted in the Applicant's response?</p> <p>b) In doing so, please could NRW respond to all matters relating to the application for development consent, whether or not there is some degree of overlap with the Environmental Permit?</p> <p>c) Which, if any, of the matters raised in Oggy East's comments does NRW consider are not relevant to the DCO application?</p>
1.8.	NRW	<p>a) Further to its previous response [REP5-049, question 1.36] regarding the request to comment on matters regarding the Water Discharge Consent relevant to the application for development</p>

Request number	Request to	Request
		<p>consent raised by the Snowdonia Society [REP2-051, pages 6-8] and in fulfilment of its role as the Statutory Nature Conservation Body and without prejudice to the determination of any future Environmental Permit applications, please could NRW respond both to the Snowdonia Society's comments and the Applicant's response [REP5-005, appendix 1.36] to all matters relating to the application for development consent, whether or not there is some degree of overlap with the Environmental Permit?</p> <p>b) Which, if any, of the matters raised in the Snowdonia Society's comments does NRW consider are not relevant to the DCO application?</p>

2.	Environmental Statement, management plans and strategies	
	Environmental Statement – general matters	
2.1.	Applicant Gwynedd Council NRW	<p>The Applicant has referred [REP5-005, question 1.8] to the potential reprofiling of existing slate mounds in Work 1G and Work 4C. Please clarify how the final height and plan extent of the reprofiled mounds are anticipated to compare with the existing and, if they are different, demonstrate how the impacts have been assessed and how the detailed design dimensions and other parameters are secured?</p> <p>Although photomontages in Chapter 16 of the ES represent the re-profiling of the existing slate tips under work 1G & 4C, It is agreed that further details are required as to how the final height, configuration and plan extent of the re-profiled mounds will compare with the existing but also, any specific impacts on the character and attributes of the Dinorwig Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest. Detailed landscaping proposals should take account of historic landscape interests but also the local biodiversity of the surrounding slate waste tip environment.</p>
2.2.	Applicant Gwynedd Council NRW	<p>a) Further to the Applicant's response to the SWQs [REP5-005, question 2.4], could an appraisal of the alternative locations for the pumping house near Llyn Padarn be undertaken once further information is available on the consents required to pass the gas pipeline and following any further ground investigations, further investigations of the background noise levels at the alternative locations and the detailed design and if so, please comment on the manner in which this appraisal could be secured in the draft DCO [REP6-012]?</p> <p>a) Yes, once further information is provided, it is considered that this can be further agreed via</p>

		<p>formal requirements.</p> <p>b) In finalising the position of the pumping station please could the Applicant demonstrate how it intends to minimise impacts as well as ensure that they are not significant?</p> <p>c) Please could the final location, as well as the detailed design, be submitted for approval by the relevant planning authority in consultation with NRW and please could the applicant suggest how this is secured?</p>
2.3.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	<p>a) Please clarify [REP6-007, paragraph 5.4.3] whether incidents involving an environmental impact will be reported to the relevant planning authority as well as NRW?</p> <p>b) Please could GC comment and, if appropriate, provide contact information for inclusion in the draft CoCP [REP6-007]?</p> <p>a) & b) It would be prudent for GC to be informed of any incidents involving an Environmental Impact. Reporting should be to Regulatory Services which includes the Planning and Public Protection Departments.</p>
2.4.	Applicant	Further to its response to the SWOs [REP5-005, question 8.3] please could the Applicant clarify how further ground investigation work and the need for liaison with, submissions to and approvals from the relevant planning authority and NRW are secured in the draft DCO [REP6-012]?
Management plans and strategies – general matters		
2.5.	Applicant	Please provide both clean <u>and</u> tracked change copies of any future submissions of management plans and strategies that are updated from the versions submitted at or before deadline 6.
2.6.	Gwynedd Council	<p>a) GC has confirmed [REP5-036] that it is in agreement with the Construction Noise Management Plan, Operational Noise Management Plan, Dust Management Plan and Baseline Air Quality Monitoring Plan submitted by the Applicant for deadline 5. Please could it comment on the other management plans and strategies submitted by the Applicant at deadline 5 [REP5-014, REP5-015, REP5-016, REP5-017, REP5-020, REP5-021, REP5-022, REP5-023, REP5-024] and the outline CoCP [REP6-007] and outline Excess Water Management Strategy [REP6-009] submitted by the Applicant at deadline 6?</p> <p>a) GC is in agreement with the following additional plans and do not have any additional comments: Materials Management Plan (REP5-014), Land Discovery Strategy (REP5-015), Health & Safety Plan (REP5-017), Water Management Plan (REP5-020), Silt Management Plan (REP5-021), Construction Traffic Management Plan (REP5-023), Outline Ordnance Management Strategy (REP5-024), Outline CoCP (REP6-007), Excess Water Management Strategy (REP6-009).</p> <p>b) Further to its previous comments [REP5-044, question 1.15], is GC content that the plans</p>

		<p>include all matters as agreed?</p> <p>b) GC is satisfied that plans include all matters as agreed.</p>
2.7.	NRW	<p>a) Please can NRW, with respect to the mitigation of potential impacts on receptors within its remit as the Statutory Nature Conservation Body, comment on the following management plans and strategies submitted by the Applicant at deadlines 5 and 6 [REP5-009, REP5-010, REP5-011, REP5-012, REP5-021 and REP6-009] and the Breeding Bird Method Statement in the outline CoCP [REP6-007, section 4.7].</p> <p>b) Further to its previous concerns [REP5-049, question 1.15], is NRW content that its comments made in previous representations are reflected in the plans?</p>
2.8.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	<p>Should the outline management plans and strategies refer to the relevant planning authority, rather than Gwynedd Council, throughout?</p> <p>Yes</p>
2.9.	Applicant	<p>a) Please update all references to the draft DCO [REP6-012] in the outline management plans and strategies to reflect the latest numbering of Articles and Requirements.</p> <p>b) In case the eventual recommended draft DCO changes again, please could the various plans make clear that DCO references in them are to the Applicant's final draft DCO insofar as the equivalent provision is included in any DCO that is made?</p>
2.10.	Applicant	<p>Please update the schedule [REP6-007, table 1.1] setting out where the conditions in the 2012 T&CPA approval [APP-086] have been covered in the outline CoCP [REP6-007] and elsewhere in light of amendments to the various documents quoted?</p>
2.11.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	<p>a) The 2012 T&CPA approval [APP-086, condition 55] requires that no topsoil or subsoil be removed without the prior written permission of the relevant planning authority. Is this valid for the current scheme and, if so and for clarity and the avoidance of doubt, should this be included in the outline CoCP [REP5-018] and other relevant management plans and strategies?</p> <p>b) Similarly for the storage of vegetation, topsoil and subsoil [APP-086, condition 10]?</p> <p>c) Similarly for trafficking on unstripped ground [APP-086, condition 56]?</p> <p>The Code of Construction Practice and/or Construction Environment Management Plan should identify all of the ancillary construction land required for the project including haul roads, materials, vehicle & equipment storage areas, impervious bases for equipment /site infrastructure and temporary buildings/structures etc. An assessment of specific site characteristics should be included for such areas including ecology/biodiversity, any archaeological features where there is a</p>

		requirement for vegetation removal, soil stripping & storage and further mitigation such as land drainage, restriction of trafficking on unstripped ground together with any temporary landscaping and/or permanent reinstatement proposals.
2.12.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	The 2012 T&CPA approval includes conditions relating to measures to promote natural growth throughout the site [APP-086, condition 7] and restrictions on materials used to form the new slate tips [APP-086, condition 53]. Do these apply to the current scheme and, if so and for clarity and the avoidance of doubt, should they be replicated in the draft DCO [REP6-012] or relevant management plans and strategies? If the Exa is in agreement with the previous conditions, it is considered that they may be replicated in the DCO requirements.
3.	Biodiversity, ecology and geological conservation	
	Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA)	
3.1.	NRW	a) Please could NRW comment on the Applicant's response [REP6-002, page 6.10] to its earlier submission regarding the potential impacts of air overpressure and light illumination on lesser horseshoe bats? b) Is NRW satisfied with the Applicant's assessment that hibernating bats in tunnels will not be impacted by air overpressure? c) Does NRW have any other concerns regarding potential impacts on lesser horseshoe bats?
3.2.	Applicant NRW	a) Please provide an update on the application for an amended European Protected Species License for lesser horseshoe bats referred to in the Applicant's response to the SWQs [REP5-005, question 3.14] and the likely timescales for this to be determined? b) Based on the information currently available to it and without prejudice to its determination of any applications, does NRW have any reason to believe that this will not be granted?
	Other biodiversity, ecology and geological conservation	
3.3.	Gwynedd Council NRW	a) Please could GC and NRW respond to the Applicant's statements [REP5-005, question 3.16] [REP6-002, page 4-5] that it cannot find the report quoted by GC and that the ES did not identify molluscs in the vicinity of the spillway infrastructure? b) Please could NRW comment on the likelihood of impacts on molluscs and whether it is necessary to secure a method statement to avoid a harmful impact on their favourable

		<p>conservation [REP2-037, paragraph 7.5.4]?</p> <p>After searching, Gwynedd Council cannot find the report either. As no molluscs were identified in the vicinity of the spillway infrastructure GC no longer request that measures described in part 8 and 9 of the Mollusc Survey Report - Cambrian Ecological Partnership 07.02.12) be included in the method statement</p>
3.4.	Applicant NRW	<p>a) Is it intended that the Reptile Method Statement [REP6-007, paragraph 4.6.13] is to be submitted to the relevant planning authority in consultation with NRW prior to the commencement of the works and, if so, please could this be clarified?</p> <p>b) Please could the applicant expand this section of the outline CoCP [REP6-007, paragraph 4.6.13] to include the minimum measures which they intend to include in the final Reptile Method Statement?</p> <p>c) Please could NRW comment on the minimum measures they wish to see secured in this section of the outline CoCP [REP6-007, paragraph 4.6.13]?</p>
3.5.	Applicant Gwynedd Council NRW	<p>Further to Applicant's response to the SWOs [REP5-005, question 3.23], please add the need to quantify and agree tree loss with the relevant planning authority in consultation with NRW to the Habitat Management Plan section of the outline CoCP [REP6-007, section 4.6].</p> <p>Agree</p>
3.6.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	<p>a) Please could GC comment on the Applicant's response [REP6-002, page 4-6] to GC's earlier comment [REP5-044, question 3.23(c)], suggesting that it is not possible to agree to a 2:1 ration for replacement trees until the tree survey [REP6-007, paragraph 4.6.4] has been undertaken?</p> <p>a) GC agrees with the Applicant's response that it is not possible to agree to a 2:1 ration for replacement trees until the tree survey has been undertaken</p> <p>b) Do criteria for the replacement of trees need to be secured in the outline CoCP [REP6-007, section 4.6]?</p> <p>b) GC would be content with their inclusion in the Tree Survey and subsequent Landscape & Reinstatement Plan</p> <p>c) Has sufficient commitment been demonstrated in line with the policy requirements of paragraph 5.3.18 of the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1)?</p> <p>c) GC believe sufficient commitment has been demonstrated</p>
3.7.	Gwynedd Council	<p>Is GC content that the monitoring of mitigation following the tree survey may be undertaken by a Clerk of Works rather than a suitably qualified Arboriculturist? The 2012 T&CPA approval [APP-086,</p>

		condition 55] required that this be undertaken by a suitably qualified Arboriculturist. GC is content for the mitigation to be monitored by the Environmental Clerk of Works provided the actual implementation of the mitigation is supervised by a qualified arboriculturist
3.8.	Applicant	Further to responses to the SWQs from GC [REP5-044, question 3.24] and NRW [REP5-049, question 3.24], please secure measures to notify and consult with the relevant planning authority and NRW in advance of works to be carried out in sensitive areas be secured in the outline CoCP [REP6-007, section 4.6].
3.9.	Applicant Gwynedd Council NRW	a) The Applicant has stated [REP5-005, question 3.27] that noise and vehicle movement on Ffordd Cefn Du will not create a barrier to the continuity of habitats. Please justify this for the predicted increases in traffic during construction [APP-079]. b) Please could GC and NRW comment? GC believes that noise and vehicle movement on Ffordd Cefn Du will not create a barrier to the continuity of habitats. GC concurs with the Applicant's comments in [REP5-005, question 3.27]
3.10.	Applicant NRW	a) Please clarify the risks of Nuttall's waterweed in Llyn Padarn being disturbed during construction or operation and the risks of it being abstracted to the reservoirs, either during the initial filling or in the future. b) Please could the specific relevant mitigation measures be described more fully in the outline Biosecurity Plan [REP5-022, section 3.6]?
4.	Historic environment	
4.1.	Cadw	Is Cadw content with the Applicant's statement [REP5-005, question 5.1] that " <i>no significant adverse effects to historic features are anticipated including the tentative World Heritage Site</i> "?
4.2.	Cadw	Is Cadw content with the Applicant's response [REP5-005, question 5.1] regarding potential impacts on the setting of Dolbadarn Castle?
4.3.	Cadw	Please could Cadw comment on the Applicant's outline Archaeological Compensation and Enhancement Strategy [REP5-016]?
4.4.	Gwynedd Council Applicant	a) Further to the Applicant's response to the SWQs [REP5-005, question 5.1] and it's Statement of Common Ground with Cadw [REP5-026], is GC content with the Applicant's assessment of no significant adverse effects on the tentative World Heritage Site? a) Currently, it is considered that the assessment is sufficient as the extent and details of the

		<p>tentative World Heritage site it is not known.</p> <p>b) Please could a requirement to undertake a detailed assessment of impacts on the tentative World Heritage Site and mitigate the potential impacts be included in the outline Archaeological Compensation and Enhancement Strategy [REP5-016]?</p> <p>c) Does GC have, or is it aware of, any concerns that the development area being included as part of Slate Industry of North Wales [REP5-026] area could affect a future bid?</p> <p>c) GC do not have any major concerns at present.</p>
4.5.	Gwynedd Council	<p>a) Following the Applicant's response [REP5-006, page 6-1] to GC's earlier comments [REP4-025], is GC content that the Archaeological Compensation and Enhancement Strategy [REP5-016] now addresses its concerns?</p> <p>a) It is confirmed that REP5-016 now addresses the concerns.</p> <p>b) Further to the Applicant's comments [REP6-002, page 4-8] is GC content that the outline Archaeological Compensation and Enhancement Strategy [REP5-016] addresses its earlier concerns [REP5-044, question 5.4] regarding approval of the archaeological work and programme and monitoring?</p> <p>b) Approval, monitoring and sign off has not been explicitly mentioned in REP5-016.</p> <p>c) Further to its earlier comments [REP4-025] is GC confident that it will have sufficient resources to fulfil its monitoring and approval responsibilities?</p> <p>c) It is not currently envisaged that the Council cannot fulfil its responsibilities.</p> <p>d) Please could the Applicant provide any comments that it referred to [REP5-006, page 6-1] from Cadw and any responses to those?</p>
4.6.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	<p>a) It is unclear what further information will be provided in the final Archaeological Compensation and Enhancement Strategy. Please could the Applicant update the outline Archaeological Compensation and Enhancement Strategy [REP5-016] to clarify specifically what further information will be provided in the final version for sign off by the relevant planning authority?</p> <p>b) Please could GC comment on any additional information that they would like to see in the final version?</p> <p>b) As stated in previous correspondence the strategy ought to provide details of the mitigation (archaeological recording, reporting, publication, dissemination, archiving) and the enhancement measures (access, interpretation, conservation, management, public engagement, etc) proposed. Exactly what mitigation and enhancement will be done, where, when and by whom.</p>

4.7.	Applicant	Please update the outline Archaeological Compensation and Enhancement Strategy [REP5-016, paragraph 2.1.13] to clarify the relevant archaeological standards that will be met.
4.8.	Gwynedd Council Applicant	<p>a) Please could GC respond to the Applicant's response [REP6-002, page 4-8], to its earlier comments [REP5-044, question 5.3] suggesting that a watching brief of any investigation rather than a pre-construction survey is appropriate to safeguard the existing bomb store that GC has stated [REP5-044, question 5.3] is "<i>nationally significant</i>"?</p> <p>a) A watching brief would be appropriate mitigation if there are guarantees / mechanisms in place to ensure that there will be no impacts on the bombstore (see question 4.8b).</p> <p>b) Please could the Applicant clarify how it can be confident that a fully structural survey and assessment is not required to identify any risks of damage to the bomb store from the development and to identify the risks of a structural failure of the bomb store structure affecting the stability of the tailpond dam?</p> <p>c) Please could GC and the Applicant comment on any permission required to undertake a full structural survey and assessment of the bomb store and for the resulting report and any consequent mitigation measures that may be required to be reviewed and approved?</p> <p>c) From an archaeological perspective, landowner permission might be required to obtain access to the bombstore in order to undertake detailed survey work but the work itself would be non-intrusive, involving photographic / topographic / survey techniques. The scope of archaeological work would require agreement and the resultant report would require approval. Any mitigation would be dependent on possible impacts that might be identified either through the archaeological or a structural survey, or both.</p>
5.	Traffic and transport	
5.1.	Gwynedd Council Applicant	<p>a) Please could GC comment on the Applicant's summary [REP5-005] of potential impacts to around 20 properties that would require a 8.5km diversion to Llanberis during the proposed temporary closure of Ffordd Clegir for safety reasons and on the mitigation measures proposed?</p> <p>a) GC considers the Applicant's summary to be a fair reflection of the potential impacts. As stated by the Applicant the frequency is foreseen as being low and liaison via the ELO with local residents is deemed to be the most appropriate means of selecting suitable times and dates, and the alternative access via Ffordd Bryngwyn (not Ffordd Byngwn) would still be available to residents. For the majority of dwellings the diversion is nearer 6km, as they are already approximately 2 km</p>

		<p>distance from Llanberis .</p> <p>b) Please could the Applicant secure it's suggested mitigation (of liaising with local stakeholders to minimise disruption by selecting appropriate times for these works to take place) in the outline CTMP [REP5-023]?</p>
5.2.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	<p>Please update the outline CTMP [REP5-023] to set out the timing and notice needed for abnormal loads to travel to the development [REP4-014, paragraph 12.1(c)].</p> <p>The applicant will have more information on this matter.</p>
5.3.	Gwynedd Council	<p>Further to the Applicant's response to the SWQs [REP5-005, question 6.7], is GC content that the speed limit from the A4085 to Q1 during construction should be 20mph rather than 10mph?</p> <p>GC is content that an advisory 'construction traffic - 20 mph' speed limit is more suitable than 10mph. A reduction down to 10mph normally requires convoy working, whereby vehicles are kept to that speed limit by a lead vehicle. A speed limit of 10mph without a convoy working arrangements may lead to construction vehicles being overtaken by general traffic, where possible between the A4085 and the Groeslon crossroads. 20mph is considered to be a reasonable compromise in reducing construction traffic speed without leading to frustration by other road users.</p>
5.4.	Applicant	<p>The Applicant has stated [REP5-005, question 6.9] that a cap on the number of HGV movements is not required. If a cap is not placed at the level assessed in the ES how will it be ensured that the residual impacts will be no greater than identified in the ES?</p>
5.5.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	<p>In order to limit the possible duration of any exceedances of vehicle movements, please update the CTMP [REP5-023, section 2.12] to clarify the frequency of monitoring and report of vehicle movements and the timing of agreement and implementation of any strategy to reduce movements where necessary?</p> <p>Applicant to update</p>
5.6.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	<p>a) Please could the Applicant's proposed methodology for any direct damage caused by construction vehicles to property [REP5-005, question 6.14] [REP5-023, paragraph 2.8.1] address the possibility of an incident not being reported by a driver (if, for example, the driver did not observe the incident) and clarify who would be liable for cost of any repairs?</p> <p>b) Please comment on Dr Jane Huuse's suggestion [REP4-021] for surveillance cameras?</p> <p>Applicant to respond. GC have no objections to Dr. Jane Huuse's suggestion to install cameras on the crossroads and other key sections.</p>

5.7.	Applicant	Please could the requirement for penalties for vehicles not following the construction route from the A4085 to Q1 [REP5-005, question 6.15] be included in the outline CTMP [REP5-023]?
5.8.	NRW	Further to its response to the SWQs [REP5-049, question 6.16], please could NRW comment on the potential impacts of the Applicant's consideration of the Alternative Access to Q1 [REP4-015] on biodiversity?
5.9.	Gwynedd Council	<p>a) Please could GC comment on the concerns regarding safety on the construction route between the Groeslon crossroads and the cattle grid expressed by Waunfawr Community Council [REP4-019], Cherry Bartlett [REP4-020] [REP6-023] and Dr Jane Huuse [REP4-021] and please could GC comment on the Applicant's responses [REP5-006]?</p> <p>a) The Applicant's CTMP incorporates a number of mitigation measures such as the 20 mph speed restriction and restricted traffic times which address some of the concerns. Whilst GC acknowledges local residents concerns regarding the safety of pedestrians and passing vehicles this scenario already exists to a certain level, and also acknowledges that appropriate mitigation has been proposed to deal with the increase in traffic that will result from the development.</p> <p>b) Are sufficient measures included in the draft DCO [REP6-012] and the s278 agreement for the Ffordd Cefn Du highway improvements to mitigate those concerns?</p> <p>b) Opportunities to improve the highway between the crossroads and cattle grid are very limited due to the narrow corridor along this section.</p> <p>c) Should any other mitigation measures be considered, e.g. HGV travel hours to avoid school children walking to and from home, further measures to increase visibility or refuges for walkers, cyclists and horse riders to allow HGV to pass?</p> <p>c) Natural refuge points such as driveways already present – little opportunities to provide any further points, particularly within the highway corridor. Hours could be restricted to avoid school times, particularly the morning pick up where children could be standing for long periods of time.</p> <p>d) With reference to comments from Dr Jane Huuse [REP4-021], does GC have any suggestions how the Applicant's commitment [REP5-023, paragraph 2.4.5] that "<i>construction vehicles on Ffordd Cefn Du will give way to other users</i>" can be enforced?</p> <p>d) Very difficult to enforce on a daily basis and would recommend the commitment is written in codes of practice for the Applicant's contractor. Additionally a record of complaints of non-compliance could be kept by the Applicants TM or public Liaison Officer.</p>
5.10.	Applicant	Please provide, summarise and comment on vibration surveys undertaken during the preliminary ground investigation works [REP3-026] [REP5-006, page 4-3].

5.11.	Applicant	<p>a) The outline CoCP [REP6-007, paragraphs 2.5.1 and 2.6.1] refer to the provision of welfare facilities to minimise the need for offsite trips by staff during the working day. Will these facilities include a canteen?</p> <p>b) Is it intended to control the number of offsite trips during the working day, including to Waunfawr for meals or snacks; and, if so, can this be set out in the outline CoCP [REP6-007]?</p> <p>c) If the number of offsite trips during the working day are controlled, are there any implications for the indirect economic benefits for the local area in respect to expenditures such as food and drink that the ES has concluded would be a temporary, local, minor, beneficial effect (para 15.7.13) [APP-082, paragraph 15.7.13]?</p>
5.12.	Applicant	<p>Further to the Applicant's response to the SWQs [REP5-005, question 2.3(b)], please update the outline Materials Management Plan [REP5-014] to include measures for the recording and auditing of the movement of materials.</p>
5.13.	Applicant	<p>a) Please advise when discussions regarding the timescales for the grid connection are likely to reach a conclusion?</p> <p>b) Is GC correct to assume that the grid connection would be one of the last elements of the scheme [REP5-044, question 6.17]?</p>
5.14.	Applicant	<p>Notwithstanding that the grid connection would be a separate application and that the Caernarfon and Bontnewydd bypass will be delivered by others, if the Applicant agrees that it has a duty to demonstrate how they intend to effectively mitigate any cumulative effects which may arise then please could it agree the outline of any necessary mitigation measures with GC and include these in the outline CTMP [REP5-023]?</p>
5.15.	Gwynedd Council	<p>Is GC content that measures necessary to mitigate cumulative impacts with the grid connection and with the Caernarfon and Bontnewydd bypass have been adequately secured?</p> <p><i>Yes. Whilst it is assumed the grid connection would be undertaken nearer the end of the main Glyn Rhonwy project's programme, and therefore at a period when the peak in construction traffic levels has passed, other measures such as the requirement for consents to work within the highway and permits for traffic management through GC's Streetworks Unit gives ample opportunity for GC to minimise the cumulative impact.</i></p> <p><i>The schedule for the Caernarfon and Bontnewydd bypass has not been finalised therefore GC is unable to fully assess any cumulative impacts, but would emphasise much of the bypass' construction is proposed to be 'offline' in order to minimise it' effects on the local highway</i></p>

		network.
6.	Noise, vibration and air overpressure	
6.1.	NRW	Further to its response to the [SWQs REP5-049, question 7.1], please could NRW comment on the Applicant's response [REP5-005, question 7.1] regarding potential noise and vibration impacts from piling works in Llyn Padarn?
6.2.	Applicant Gwynedd Council NRW	<p>a) Further to the Applicant's response to the SWQs [REP5-005, question 7.1(c)], should the requirement for the Piling Method Statement and associated noise and vibration limits to be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority in consultation with NRW be secured in the outline Construction Noise Management Plan (CNMP) [REP5-011]?</p> <p>a) The requirement for agreement on piling limits and method is already included within the Construction Noise Management Plan.</p> <p>b) Please include more information on the minimum measures to be included in the Piling Method Statement in the outline CNMP [REP5-011].</p> <p>b) To be answered by the Applicant.</p>
6.3.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	<p>a) In its response to the SWQs [REP5-005, question 7.3(b)] the Applicant stated that the works areas for plant considered in the ES construction noise assessment [APP-080] do not fully correspond to the Works areas in the draft DCO [REP5-029]. Please could the Applicant clarify the discrepancies and comment on how consistency can be ensured between the activities in each Works area permitted by the draft DCO and those assessed in the ES?</p> <p>b) The Applicant has stated [REP5-005, question 7.3(a)] that the ES construction noise assessment [APP-080] considered plant in fixed locations for all noise sensitive receptors. Please could the Applicant provide a plan to indicate the location of plant considered in the ES?</p> <p>c) Please could the Applicant clarify and demonstrate whether it is, or is not, likely to be possible for mitigation measures to ensure that construction noise levels are below the permitted limits at Glyn Peris Guest House, Glyn Peris Cottage, Lake View Hotel and the other identified locations where exceedances have been identified?</p> <p>d) Please could GC comment on whether it would assist with the enforcement of noise limits if further restrictions were placed on the activities permitted by the draft DCO [REP6-012] in the vicinity of Glyn Peris House, Glyn Peris Cottage and Lake View Hotel?</p> <p>d) GC will provide all reasonable assistance and advice with regards to noise limits should further restrictions be put in place in the vicinity of Glyn Peris & Lake View Hotel bearing in mind that GC</p>

		has an enforcement role with regards to construction noise.
6.4.	Applicant	Further to its response [REP5-006, page 5-11] to concerns raised by Glyn Peris Guest House [REP4-023], please could the Applicant confirm that both baseline and construction noise monitoring will be carried out to both the front and rear of Glyn Peris Guest house and secure this in the outline CNMP [REP5-011]?
6.5.	Applicant	Further to the Applicant's response to the SWQs [REP5-005, question 7.6(a)], please could the proposals to establish whether construction traffic vibration levels at buildings considered to be high risk are likely to exceed the threshold levels, and to take measurements of vibration from existing traffic, [REP2-011, question 7.13] be included in the outline CNMP [REP5-011]?
6.6.	Applicant	Please clarify where potential impacts of construction works outside normal working hours have been assessed and mitigated, noting the comment from GC [REP5-044, question 7.9(c)] that it is not aware of an assessment.
6.7.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	<p>a) The Applicant has stated [REP5-005, question 7.16] that it is not possible at this stage to identify the durations of any potential exceedances of normal day time and night time noise and vibration limits at this stage. Please could the Applicant clarify and justify whether, in the worst case scenario, the limits are likely to be exceeded for more than 8 weeks per calendar year?</p> <p>b) If the Applicant is not able to provide this information at this stage, please could it suggest how the ExA can be confident in advising the Secretary of State that the significance of the effects reported in the ES will not be exceeded?</p> <p>c) Please could GC comment?</p> <p>d) Does GC consider that appropriate restrictions should be put in place in the CNMP [REP5-011] to ensure that significant impacts will not arise?</p> <p>e) Does GC consider that the outline CNMP [REP5-011] should include any commitments to restricting the number/durations of potential exceedances?</p> <p>c), d) & e): GC is not unduly concerned with regards to potential exceedances of noise and vibration limits at this stage. Chapter 13 of the ES outlines durations of worst case noise levels from unmitigated works on local NSR's. As the applicant has stated, further clarification and information will become available as the PC is appointed and further noise and vibration assessments will be undertaken. It is reasonable to expect that incidences where noise and vibration limit breaches may occur can be identified mitigated against during the detailed design phase of the development. We do not feel that additional mitigation or restrictions are required to be identified and included within the CNMP at this stage. Neither do we consider it necessary to</p>

		include a restriction on number / duration of exceedances in the CNMP at this stage.
6.8.	Applicant	Following the Applicant's response to the SWQs [REP5-005, question 7.5], please include the mitigation measures outlined for concrete batching plant in the outline CNMP [REP5-011].
6.9.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	Further to the Applicant's response to the SWQs [REP5-005, question 10.2(a)] and to ensure consistency with the ES [APP-080][APP-081], please could the potential locations for blasting be secured in the outline CoCP [REP6-007] and/or outline CNMP [REP5-011]? To be answered by the Applicant.
6.10.	Applicant	Further to the Applicant's response to the SWQs [REP5-005, question 12.11] please update the outline CNMP [REP5-011, paragraph 3.3.5] to clarify that blasting will not take place at weekends or on Bank Holidays?
6.11.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	a) Please update the outline CNMP [REP5-011] to include a process for identifying activities that could result in noise, vibration or air overpressure limits being exceeded, and for this information together with programme dates to be included in the CNMP. b) Where there is a risk that limits could be exceeded during blasting, or other construction activities, please could the outline CNMP [REP5-011] set out a process for identifying alternative construction methods and for the decision on the preferred option to explicitly account for noise, vibration and air overpressure impacts? c) Please could such a consideration of options be submitted to the relevant planning authority for approval before the relevant works progress? a), b) & c): For action by the Applicant. GC supportive of addition of such processes in the CNMP.
6.12.	Applicant	Please clarify the statement in the outline CoCP [REP6-007, paragraph 2.12.1] and the outline CNMP [REP5-011, paragraph 3.3.1] regarding the means by which normal construction hours may be extended, and refer to the approvals required and update these documents accordingly.
6.13.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	a) The outline CNMP [REP5-011] suggests a construction vibration limit of 1 mm/s PPV for tunnelling works. Is this limit proposed for both daytime and night time? b) What is the risk of disturbance to sleep if this limit is applied at night time? a) & b): The 2012 T&CP consent for the 50MW development included planning consent condition 37 which was for vibration resulting from tunnelling works as follows: "The level of vibration resulting from tunnelling works shall not exceed a vibration dose value of 0.2 m/s 1.75 at any of the residential properties identified (in table 3) over any 8hour period." This originates from BS6472 for vibration does values in residential buildings which may draw adverse comment from

		residents and could be included in the noise and vibration conditions to cover tunnelling activities at night.
6.14.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	Should a vibration dose value limit be set? A limit was included in the 2012 T&CPA approval [APP-086, condition 37]. See question 6.13.
6.15.	Applicant	Please clarify who piling noise and vibration limits are to be agreed with [REP5-011, paragraph 4.3.2 and appendix A] and that they are to be submitted with a method statement to the relevant planning authority in consultation with NRW for approval?
6.16.	Applicant	Please could the description of investigations at building considered to be at high risk from vibrations [REP5-011] be extended to include the matters previously identified [REP2-011, question 7.13] regarding consideration of " <i>whether construction traffic vibrations would be likely to exceed the threshold values</i> " and that " <i>vibration measurements of existing traffic ... should also be undertaken to determine the existing vibration levels</i> "?
6.17.	Applicant	With reference to maintaining road surfaces, please include the requirement stated in the ES [APP-080, paragraph 13.9.35] that road irregularities are not to exceed 20mm in the outline CNMP [REP5-011, paragraph 5.11].
6.18.	Applicant	Please could references to daytime and night time limits in the outline CNMP [REP5-011, appendix A] clarify the limits on Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays?
6.19.	Applicant	Please could any proposals to increase limits in up to 8 weeks per year [REP5-011, paragraph 4.2.8] be notified to both the relevant planning authority <u>and</u> local residents at least 2 weeks prior to commencement?
6.20.	Applicant	Please could Applicant justify its statement [REP5-006, page 8-11] that " <i>The nearest receivers to the turbine house are located at distances of over 400m. It is anticipated that the ground-borne vibration from the operation of the turbine will not be of a sufficient level to be detectable by the occupants and therefore will not cause disturbance.</i> "
6.21.	Applicant	Please could the Applicant provide justification for its belief [REP5-006, page 8-17] that " <i>any potential LFN can be addressed during the detailed design stage via appropriate design and mitigation if required</i> "?
6.22.	Gwynedd Council	Further to responses to the SWOs from the Applicant [REP5-005, questions 7.4, 7.12 and 7.14] and the Applicant's response [REP6-002, section 5] to further representations from Mike Vitkovitch, does GC have any reason to believe that low frequency noise or ground borne vibration

		<p>and noise during construction would result in any significant adverse impacts and is it content that the necessary mitigation measures have been secured in the outline CNMP [REP5-011]?</p> <p>GC is not unduly concerned regarding LFN and GBV and GBVN from construction of the scheme at this stage and we are satisfied that all identified mitigation is included in the CNMP. Should further issues concerns arise during detailed design stage, further assessments of LFN, GBV and GBVN should be undertaken at that time.</p>
6.23.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	<p>Are the Applicant and GC content mitigation measures for potential noise and vibration impacts on recreational users are addressed in the outline CNMP [REP5-011] and in the outline ONMP [REP5-012]?</p> <p>GC are satisfied that both residential properties and recreational users are protected by mitigation measures within the CNTP.</p>
6.24.	Gwynedd Council	<p>Further to responses to the SWQs from the Applicant [REP5-005, question 7.10(a)] and GC [REP5-044, question 7.10(b)] does GC have any reason to believe that operational vibration would result in any significant adverse impacts and is it content that the necessary mitigation measures have been secured in the outline ONMP [REP5-012]?</p> <p>GC does not have reason to believe at this time that operational vibration will result in adverse impacts and are satisfied that mitigation measures have been secured; however, further investigation and assessment will be undertaken at the detailed design stage.</p>
6.25.	Applicant	<p>a) Please update the incident procedure flowchart in the outline CNMP [REP5-011, appendix B] and outline Operational Noise Management Plan (ONMP) [REP5-012, appendix B] to clarify relevant planning authority and local resident notification and involvement.</p> <p>b) Please could GC comment?</p> <p>b) Following a review of the revised documents, GC is in agreement with contents of the revised plan.</p>
6.26.	Gwynedd Council	<p>Based on the information currently available to it, does GC consider that the overall residual impact from noise and vibration is significant or not significant?</p> <p>Based on information currently to hand, GC do not consider overall residual impact from noise and vibration to be significant. Further assessment and investigations will be undertaken at the detailed design phase of the development to better understand the potential impacts noise and vibration from this development.</p>

7.	Water resources, contaminated land, flood risk and climate change	
7.1.	NRW	Please could NRW comment on the Applicant's suggestion [REP6-002, page 6-18] that the proposal to form a drain between Q5 and Q6 should not require an amendment to the drainage consent application?
7.2.	Applicant	Further to its response to the SWQs [REP5-005, question 8.4(c)] please clarify why it is not possible to carry out site visits to properties which have not responded to mail shots regarding private water supplies during the examination period?
7.3.	NRW Applicant	<p>a) Further to the Applicant's response [REP6-002, page 6-19] to NRW's earlier comments [REP5-049, question 8.11] is NRW satisfied with the Applicant's suggestion that the Environmental Permit is the appropriate place to secure discharge rates?</p> <p>b) Please could the Applicant clarify the reason for increasing the pipe diameter for the Q1 scour/discharge infrastructure from 800mm to 900mm [REP6-012] and whether there are any consequences for the impact assessment or for the Environmental Permit?</p>
7.4.	Applicant	<p>a) Please could post construction water quality monitoring [REP5-020, paragraph 4.4.7] include the water quality of the reservoirs in the long term?</p> <p>b) Is the outline Water Management Plan the correct place for post-construction monitoring or should these matters be secured directly in the draft DCO [REP6-012] or in a separate plan for the operational phase?</p>
7.5.	Gwynedd Council	<p>Is GC content with the updates to the outline Water Management Plan [REP5-020] that the Applicant has provided in response to GC's earlier comments [REP4-026, item 11.1]?</p> <p>GC is satisfied with the updated Water Management Plan with regards to issues raised.</p>
7.6.	Applicant	<p>a) Further to the Applicant's response to the SWQ [REP5-005, appendix 1.36, page 7] please could an updated version of the water sampling plan previously agreed with NRW [APP-142] be included in the outline Water Management Plan [REP5-020]?</p> <p>b) Similarly for the sediment testing suite that it is noted [REP5-20, paragraph 4.4.26] was agreed with NRW in 2015?</p>
7.7.	Applicant	Please justify why the proposed water quality sampling and monitoring locations REP5-020, table 2 and figure 1] do not include the private water supply identified by the applicant at Glyn Peris Cottage?

7.8.	Applicant	Should the outline Silt Management Plan [REP5-021, paragraph 2.3.3] refer to the excess spoil disposal area south west of Q6 rather than south east of Q1?
7.9.	Applicant Gwynedd Council NRW	Further to a statement in the outline Silt Management Plan [REP5-021, paragraph 3.5.28], and for clarity and the avoidance of doubt, please could it be secured directly in the draft DCO [REP6-012] or in a separate plan for the operational phase that crossings of the Nant-y-Betws are to be culverted? GC do not have any additional comments in this regard.
7.10.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	The 2012 T&CPA approval [APP-086, conditions 9, 11 and 12] includes conditions regarding contamination, remediation strategy and verification reports. Are these valid for the current scheme and, if so and for clarity and the avoidance of doubt, please could they be included in the outline Land Discovery Strategy [REP5-015]? These conditions are valid for the current scheme and GC do not have any objections to them being secured within the Land Discovery Strategy.
7.11.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	a) It is unclear what further information will be provided in the final Land Discovery Strategy. Please could the Applicant update the outline Land Discovery Strategy [REP5-015] to clarify specifically what further information will be provided in the final version for sign off by the relevant planning authority? b) Please could the Applicant respond to NRW's comments [REP6-017] regarding the outline Land Discovery Strategy [REP5-015] and update it accordingly? c) Please could GC comment on any additional information that they would like to see in the final version? GC do not have any additional comments in this regard at this time.
7.12.	Applicant	a) Further to the Applicant's response to the SWQs [REP5-005, question 8.13], please clarify the testing of reused excavation materials (frequency and scope of testing, acceptance criteria, relevant standards, who would carry out the testing and any requirements for approval) in the outline CoCP [REP6-007] where this testing is required to mitigate against contamination. b) Similarly, please add further detail to the geotechnical testing mentioned in the outline Materials Management Plan [REP5-014, paragraph 2.1.7]? c) Please respond to NRW's comments [REP6-017] regarding the outline Materials Management Plan [REP5-014] and update it accordingly?
7.13.	Applicant	Please confirm whether the advice provided by NRW in their response to the SWQs [REP5-049,

		question 8.16] has been followed in the Flood Consequences Assessment [APP-131]?
7.14.	NRW	Please could NRW comment on the Applicant's response [REP6-002, page 6-22] to its earlier comments [REP5-048, agenda item 11.1] and clarify whether they expect any amendments to be made to the outline Excess Water Management Plan [REP6-009] secured in the draft DCO [REP6-012], or whether they are content that the matters they comment on can be addressed at the post consent stage (if consent is granted) once the detailed design is finalised?
8.	Ordnance	
8.1.	Gwynedd Council Applicant	<p>a) Is GC content with the Applicant's response [REP6-002, page 4-3] to comments [REP5-044, question 2.6] regarding the need to make HSE aware of the Ordnance Management Strategy?</p> <p>b) Please could the Applicant comment on the risk that any stipulations requested by HSE at a later stage could mean that the scheme is not deliverable within the parameters of the DCO?</p> <p>GC believes it would be good practice and prudent to inform and involve the HSE with regards to the Ordnance Strategy who may have an opinion or improvements to offer.</p>
8.2.	Gwynedd Council	<p>Further to its earlier comments [REP5-044, question 9.2(b)] and the Applicant's response [REP5-006] to queries raised by the Snowdonia Society [REP4-040] and Jeff Taylor [REP4-031], does GC have any concerns regarding the extent of sampling and testing undertaken in quarry Q6?</p> <p>GC have no concerns regarding the extent of sampling and testing undertaken in quarry 6, and believe NRW should provide further comment as the principal concern is the dewatering of quarry 6 into the SSSI of Llyn Padarn.</p>
8.3.	Applicant	Please provide the recent formal response anticipated from the MoD regarding ordnance records [REP5-005, question 9.3(b)] together with the previous correspondence [REP5-005, question 9.5(b)] that the Applicant has received from the MoD.
8.4.	Applicant	Further to its response [REP6-002, page 4-17] to an enquiry from GC [REP5-044, question 9.6], please consult with Public Health Wales on the potential for health or developmental problems linked to munition-related chemicals arising from discharges to Llyn Padarn that have arisen during the examination, including the comments expressed by Dr Dawn Wimpory [REP2-027], and provide a copy of the correspondence or a summary of the outcome of the consultation that is agreed with Public Health Wales.
8.5.	Applicant	Please could the following measures mentioned in the Applicant's response to the SWQs be included, and where necessary expanded on, in the outline Ordnance Management Strategy

		<p>[REP5-024]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of Chemical Agent Monitors [REP5-005, question 9.3(c)]? • Methodology to locate ordnance in quarry crevices [REP5-005, question 9.4]? • Security arrangements [REP5-005, question 9.14]?
8.6.	Applicant	Please update the outline Ordnance Management Strategy [REP5-024] to clarify, for each type of ordnance, when the relevant planning authority, NRW, HSE, Public Health Wales, the Police, MoD, etc are to be informed when ordnance is found and where detailed methods for ordnance clearance and disposal are to be submitted to and approved by each body.
8.7.	Applicant	<p>a) Further to the Applicant's response to the SWQs [REP5-005, question 9.12(b)], please update the outline Ordnance Management Strategy [REP5-024] to clarify that any controlled explosions will not be carried out outside normal working hours or, if appropriate, at weekends or on Bank Holidays.</p> <p>b) In order to reduce impacts, could any controlled explosions be restricted to set time periods in any one day, similar to those proposed for blasting [REP5-011, paragraph 3.3.5]?</p>
8.8.	Applicant	Please could the outline Ordnance Management Strategy [REP5-024, paragraph 1.1.3] clarify the timing of approval of the "definitive" plan in relation to relevant construction activities and which, if any, activities are not to progress prior to approval?
8.9.	Applicant	Further to the Applicant's response to the FWQs [REP2-011, question 2.16] and SWQs [REP5-005, question 9.11] please could it comment on the allowances for ordnance mitigation in the length of the construction programme, the confidence that it will not be exceeded, the principal risks of delay and the contingencies that have been included?
8.10.	Applicant	Please could the response to the SWQs [REP5-005, question 9.11] that " <i>the timing of the ordnance related works will depend on the detailed construction design and program, but the anticipation is for all risk mitigation works to be completed prior to construction to ensure site safety</i> " be included in the outline Ordnance Management Strategy [REP5-024]?
8.11.	Applicant	Please include the Applicant's undertakings regarding security in relation to ordnance [REP5-005, question 9.14] in the outline Ordnance Management Strategy [REP5-024].
9.	Air quality	
9.1.	Gwynedd Council	Further the Applicant response [REP6-002, page 4-17] to GC's earlier comment [REP5-044,

		<p>question 10.1], is GC content that air quality monitoring and assessment associated with blasting are appropriately covered by the outline CoCP [REP6-007] and the outline Dust Control and Air Quality Management Plan [REP5-010]?</p> <p>Chapter 1.5.7 of the Dust Control and Air Quality Management Plan stipulates that automatic particulate monitoring equipment will be used to measure the concentration of particulate matter. This measure will ensure that air quality issues associated with blasting will be appropriately covered. Table 5.1 of the CoCP addresses this topic adequately.</p>
9.2.	Gwynedd Council	<p>Further to the Applicant response [REP6-002, page 4-18] to GC's earlier comment [REP5-044, question 10.3], is GC content that the Baseline Air Quality Management Plan is appropriately covered by the outline CoCP [REP6-007] and the outline Baseline Air Quality Monitoring Plan [REP5-009]?</p> <p>GC is satisfied that the Baseline Air Quality Management Plan is appropriately covered by the outline CoCP.</p>
9.3.	Applicant	<p>Please update the outline Baseline Air Quality Monitoring Plan [REP5-009] to clarify to whom the summary report is to be issued for approval at the end of the baseline monitoring period – e.g. the relevant planning authority in consultation with NRW?</p>
9.4.	Applicant	<p>The outline Dust Control and Air Quality Management Plan [REP5-010, paragraph 1.1.5] refers to a location plan for sensitive receptors that has not been included. Could a location plan be included?</p>
9.5.	Applicant	<p>Please provide more detail on how action trigger levels will relate to baseline dust deposition rates and baseline air pollutant concentrations [REP5-010, paragraph 1.1.3] and how it will be ensured that the levels are consistent with the ES [APP-081].</p>
9.6.	Applicant	<p>a) The outline Dust Control and Air Quality Management Plan [REP5-010, table 1] suggests that the closest (dust generating) construction activities to Glyn Peris Guest House, Glyn Peris Cottage and Lake View Hotel are at Q6. Please clarify this and address any implications of activities closer than Q6.</p> <p>b) Is similar clarification required for other sensitive locations?</p> <p>c) Should location ID 24 [REP5-010, table 1] refer to the distance from Q6, rather than Q1?</p>
9.7.	Applicant	<p>a) Please could the dust control mitigation measures [REP5-010, table 4] address the Applicant's previous statement [REP2-013, page 38] that (to reduce dust impacts) '<i>blasting should be avoided where possible</i>'?</p> <p>b) Could a process be described for considering alternatives to blasting?</p>

		c) Is the process of agreeing the final methods with GC secured in the relevant mitigation plan?
9.8.	Applicant	Please update the outline Dust Control and Air Quality Management Plan [REP5-010, table 14] to set out examples of responses in relation to other potential dust generating construction activities including blasting and the use of conveyors.
9.9.	Applicant	Is it intended that summary reports of monitoring will be prepared and issued to the relevant planning authority, liaison group and other stakeholders after the baseline monitoring period [REP5-010, paragraph 1.5.1] and, if so, please could this be clarified in the outline Dust Control and Air Quality Management Plan [REP5-010]?
9.10.	Applicant	Further to its response to the SWOs [REP5-005, question 10.4(a)] please update the outline Dust Control and Air Quality Management Plan [REP5-010] to clarify that the air quality monitoring data will be automatically provided to the relevant planning authority directly from the monitoring equipment in 'real time'?
9.11.	Applicant	Should the objective adopted for PM _{2.5} in England and Wales [APP-081, paragraph 14.3.10] be included in appendix A of the outline Dust Control and Air Quality Management Plan [REP5-010]?
9.12.	Applicant	Would it be clearer and help to avoid any inconsistencies if there was less overlap between the outline Baseline Air Quality Monitoring Plan [REP5-009] and the outline Dust Control and Air Quality Management Plan [REP5-010]?
10.	Other health impacts, safety and security	
10.1.	Gwynedd Council	<p>a) Is GC content with the Applicant's proposed mitigation for non-ionizing radiation [REP5-005, question 11.1]?</p> <p>b) Would GC like to see a submission from the Applicant at the post consent stage which sets out how ICNIRP guidance has been met through the detailed design?</p> <p>a)&b): Non-ionizing radiation does not fall within the remit of GC. Please refer to HSE for further guidance and advice.</p>
11.	Socio-economics, land use, accessibility, tourism and recreation	
11.1.	Gwynedd Council	Further to the Applicant's response [REP6-002, page 4-19] to its earlier comments [REP4-044, question 12.4] is GC content that its suggestions regarding suitable standard for the construction

		<p>of public rights of way have been addressed by the outline CoCP [REP6-007]?</p> <p>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.</p>
11.2.	Applicant	<p>a) Will access be maintained from the Llyn Padarn car parks to the lakeside footpath to the north east during the construction of the pumping station and spillway structure and, if so, please add this to the outline CoCP [REP6-007, paragraph 2.11.1]?</p> <p>b) Similarly please include notification of piling as well as of access restrictions.</p>
11.3.	Applicant	<p>Following the Applicant's response to the SWQs [REP5-005, question 12.8] wording was included in the outline CoCP [REP6-007, paragraph 2.9.2] stating that British Horse Society recommendations "<i>will be duly noted</i>". Can this wording be amended to make the commitment more secure?</p>
11.4.	Applicant Gwynedd Council	<p>Further to NRW's response [REP5-049, question 12.9] that the abstraction and discharge permits do not take into consideration the safety of water users, please could the Applicant and GC suggest a mechanism by which the possibility of entrapment or snagging on the infrastructure in Llyn Padarn can be mitigated?</p> <p>It is considered that appropriate measures such as warning signs and/or a clear 'buffer zone' would be sufficient, details of which can be agreed upon in writing through a DCO requirement.</p>
11.5.	Applicant	<p>Following the Applicant's response to the SWQs [REP5-005, question 12.13], please could the Applicant clarify why Lake View Hotel and Glyn Peris Cottage differ from Glyn Peris Guest House in respect of the need for a Property-Specific Mitigation Plan [REP4-014, Appendix 12.1]?</p>

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