

## Glyn Rhonwy Pumped Storage Development Consent Order

Deadline 10 – Applicant’s Responses to Written Submissions made at Deadline 9

---



<b>PINS Reference</b>	EN010072	
<b>Document Nos.</b>	SPH_GREX_WED10_01	
<b>Authors</b>	SPH/AECOM/GVA/BS	
<b>Revision</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>
0	8 <sup>th</sup> September 2016	Issued

Document Title	Glyn Rhonwy Pumper Storage Deadline 10: Applicant's Responses to Written Submissions made at Deadline 9
SPH Document Reference	
Issue Number	V1
Date	8 <sup>th</sup> September 2016

# CONTENTS

- 1 Natural Resources Wales
- 2 Gwynedd Council
- 3 Glyn Peris Guest House

---

# SUMMARY

## **1.1 Introduction**

- 1.1.1 A number of Written Representations were made by Interested Parties at Deadline 9 on 5<sup>th</sup> September 2016.
- 1.1.2 This document provides SPH's response and comments on these written submissions.
- 1.1.3 Where relevant cross-references are provided to other submission documents.

# 1 Natural Resources Wales

## Update on Dialogue between the Applicant and NRW

The Applicant has liaised with NRW regarding their request to amend Requirement 9, remove Requirement 10 and reinstate Requirement 16. NRW has confirmed that they will not be making any further comments on this matter (see e-mail included in Appendix 1-A to this document).

With regard to Requirement 9 and 10, the Applicant has amended this to be specifically for pre-construction and construction phase, with Requirement 10 being specifically for post-construction phase. It is the Applicant's position that the water monitoring post-construction is secured and there is nothing actively harmful to the separation of the monitoring within the Requirements for the purposes of the being undertaken in two distinct phases of the Development. The Applicant's position remains as was outlined at Deadline 7 and Deadline 9. With respect to the reinstatement of Requirement 16, the Applicant's position has not changed since the response provided at Deadline 7 to NRW Written Representation that the LDS is a certified document and does not require a separate Requirement.

Paragraph in Response	Applicants Response
<p><b>RESPONSES TO THE ExA's WRITTEN QUESTIONS WITHIN RULE 17 LETTER</b></p> <p>Please see annex A for NRW's answers to the relevant questions.</p> <p>Our comments are also provided without prejudice to any decision NRW may make on any application made to it by the applicant for an Environmental Permit under the Environmental Permit Regulations 2010 (EPR), or Abstraction Licence under the Water Resources Act 1991.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><b>1. DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER (DCO), POLICY AND OTHER CONSENTS</b></p> <p><b>Request N. 1.9</b></p> <p><u>ExA</u></p> <p>Article 36 – Certification of plans etc.</p> <p>a) The Applicant has stated [REP7-007] that it is unable to certify the Water Management Plan, Silt Management Plan, Biosecurity Plan or Excess Water Management Strategy as they may be amended as per the Environmental Permit application. However, these have all been included in the list of documents to be certified in the Applicant's latest version of the draft DCO [REP7-001]. The Applicant has later added [REP7-007] the CoCP and Pollution Prevention Plan to those as plans that "will be finalised as far as possible but require the further input listed". Please could the Applicant clarify its intentions?</p> <p>b) These plans all include mitigation that has been agreed with various parties during the</p>	<p>The Applicant confirms that the outline plans as submitted to the examination will be certified as the outline plans. The Applicant cannot finalise the detailed plans to follow on from those outlines until the Environmental Permitting process is suitably progressed to allow the measures required in those to be reflected in the plans. The final versions of the plans which must comply with the certified outlines will be submitted to Gwynedd Council for approval in consultation with NRW as set out in the DCO requirements at the appropriate time.</p>

Paragraph in Response	Applicants Response
<p>examination and therefore the ExA is minded to require the certification of the latest versions submitted during the examination and for those versions to be identified as such in the ExA's recommended draft DCO. The Applicant is encourage to ensure that the Environmental permit is secured before the ExA's Recommendation Report is submitted to the Secretary of State (this is likely to be around 8 December 2016), so that any amendments then proposed by the Applicant to the certified Code of Construction Practice, Water Management Plan, Silt Management Plan, Biosecurity Plan, Excess Water Management Strategy and Pollution Prevention Plan can then be considered by the Secretary of State and incorporated in the final DCO, as appropriate. Please could the Applicant, GC and NRW comment?</p> <p><u>NRW</u></p> <p>b) NRW advises that the finalised plans should be certified in the DCO and as suggested by the ExA, these should incorporate any amendments required by virtue of the Environmental Permit application. It is noted that the CoCP has been omitted from the list of plans to be certified in Article 36 of the applicant's latest revision of the DCO and we advise that this is included.</p>	
<p><b>Request N. 1.20</b></p> <p><u>ExA</u></p> <p>Requirement 11 – Drainage</p> <p>Is NRW content that its comments on drainage [REP5-049, question 1.16] have been addressed?</p> <p><u>NRW</u></p> <p>We are satisfied that our comments on drainage, which were within our letter dated 13th May 2016, have been addressed, except for the 12 months of post-construction watercourse monitoring, which we discussed further within our Deadline 8 response.</p>	Noted
<p><b>POLICY</b></p> <p><b>Request N. 1.27</b></p>	-

Paragraph in Response	Applicants Response
<p><u>ExA</u></p> <p>In its Statement of Common Ground with the Applicant [REP4-004] GC agreed with the Applicant's view at that time that NPSs EN-1, EN-3 and EN-5 were relevant to the application. The ExA's preliminary view [PD9-007, question 1.27] was "that policies in these NPSs, and particularly EN-1, are potentially important and relevant to this examination". Commenting on the ExA's preliminary view, NRW stated [REP2-047, response to question 1.27] that "EN-1, and possibly EN-5 appear to be relevant for the purposes of the Development".</p> <p>During the examination the Applicant later clarified [REP2-011, response to question 1.27] its view that "EN-1 is considered to be the NPS of principal relevance to the proposed development", that EN-3 is not relevant as energy is required to pump water from the lower reservoir to the upper reservoir and therefore the proposed development does not constitute renewable energy development; and that EN-5 is not relevant.</p> <p>Further to the clarifications provided during the examination the ExA is now minded to conclude that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• pumped storage does not fall within the scope of any NPS, for example although the contribution of pumped storage to a low carbon energy system is mentioned in paragraph 3.3.12, footnote 13 and paragraph 3.3.31 of EN-1, it is not covered by the scope set out in paragraph 1.4.2 of EN-1 and therefore does not fall within the scope of EN-1;</li> <li>• as pumped storage does not fall within the scope of any NPS, there is no designated NPS in effect for this kind of development and therefore the application should be decided against the criteria in s105 of PA2008;</li> <li>• with reference to s105 of PA2008, EN-1 should be considered important and relevant to the decision on this application because EN-1 specifically mentions the importance of pumped storage to a low carbon energy system and because the proposed development is a generating station with a capacity of over 50MW and the policies in EN-1 are devised specifically for generating stations and energy infrastructure of this scale;</li> <li>• EN-3 should not be considered important and relevant to the decision on the application because the proposed development is not renewable energy development and because</li> </ul>	

Paragraph in Response	Applicants Response
<p>pumped storage (or hydro power for that matter) is in the scope or EN-3 or mentioned in it; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EN-5 covers energy networks and is not a focus of the examination as the grid connection is not included in the application.</li> </ul> <p>Do the Applicant, GC and NRW agree with this approach and, if not, please could they set out their alternative views and reasoning?</p> <p><u>NRW</u></p> <p>NRW is not in a position to advise on the interpretation of the National Policy Statements.</p>	
<p><b>OTHER CONSENTS</b></p> <p><b>Request N. 1.29</b></p> <p><u>ExA</u></p> <p>Ref: Applicant's [REP7-004] and NRW's [REP7-042] responses to ExA's rule 17 request of 20th July 2016 [PD-025, request 1.6].</p> <p>a) Please could the Applicant and NRW provide an update on its discussions regarding the withdrawn Environmental Permits in respect of discharge activities?</p> <p>b) Please could the Applicant provide an update regarding the resubmission of the Environmental Permit applications?</p> <p>c) Please could NRW comment on whether the Applicant has made valid applications and advise when it anticipates that the applications will be determined?</p> <p>d) Please could the Applicant and NRW provide responses to (a), (b) and (c) by Deadline 9 and then again by Deadline 10?</p> <p><u>NRW</u></p> <p>NRW can confirm that we are yet (position as of 2nd September 2016) to receive a formal application for the environmental permits associated with the discharges at site. We would suggest that the applicant provided further comment on submission dates etc.</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that two Environmental Permit applications for the construction and operational discharges were submitted to NRW on the 7th September 2016. NRW confirmed receipt of the applications on the 8th September (copy of confirmation email included in Appendix 1-B). We therefore await formal notification of a duly made submission.</p> <p>The agreed minutes of the Environmental Permit meeting between the Applicant and NRW are included in Appendix 1-C for the ExA's reference.</p>



Paragraph in Response	Applicants Response
<p><b>2. ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT, MANAGEMENT PLANS AND STRATEGIES – GENERAL</b></p> <p><b>Request N. 2.1</b></p> <p><u>ExA</u></p> <p>a) Please could GC and NRW confirm their agreement (or otherwise) with the content of all of the most recent versions of the outline and draft management plans and strategies provided by the Applicant to date, and highlight any matters that are yet to be agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Code of Construction Practice [REP7-012]</li> <li>• Water Management Plan [REP7-014][[]]</li> <li>• Silt Management Plan [REP7-016]</li> <li>• Biosecurity Plan [REP7-018]</li> <li>• Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP7-020]</li> <li>• Outline Ordnance Management Strategy [REP7-022]</li> <li>• Baseline Air Quality Monitoring Plan [REP7-024]</li> <li>• Dust Control and Air Quality Management Plan [REP7-026]</li> <li>• Construction Noise Management Plan [REP7-028]</li> <li>• Operational Noise Management Plan [REP7-030]</li> <li>• Materials Management Plan [REP7-032]</li> <li>• Land Discovery Strategy [REP7-034]</li> <li>• Archaeological Compensation and Enhancement Strategy [REP7-036]</li> <li>• Excess Water Management Strategy [REP6- 009]</li> <li>• Health and Safety Plan [REP5-017]</li> </ul> <p>b) Please could the Applicant provide evidence to demonstrate GC's and NRW's agreements with any updates to these plans that the Applicant submits before the close of the examination?</p> <p><u>NRW</u></p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that the comments made by NRW in their correspondence dated 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2016 have been incorporated in to Rev 3 of the Excess Water Management Plan submitted at Deadline 9. Rev 3 also contained amendments required in comments received separately from the permitting function of NRW.</p>

Paragraph in Response	Applicants Response
<p>Our comments within our Deadline 8 response letter dated 17th August 2016, still apply with respect to the revised Land Discovery Strategy.</p> <p>Further versions of the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Code of Construction Practice [REP7-012]</li> <li>• Water Management Plan [REP7-014][[]]</li> <li>• Silt Management Plan [REP7-016]</li> <li>• Biosecurity Plan [REP7-018]</li> </ul> <p>have been submitted at Deadline 7. However, as noted by the applicant, these plans are not finalised and subject to amendments as a result of the Environmental Permit. NRW has reviewed the plans as far as it is able to do so in the context of its remit in the DCO and will continue to input in this regard. This also applies to the Excess Water Management Strategy [REP6-009], which was submitted as part of the previously withdrawn Environmental Permit applications, and will also be required for any future Permit applications. It appears that our comments under the DCO application, on the Excess Water Management Strategy, which we made on the 2nd June 2016 have not been incorporated within the latest version. We advise that the applicants amend the EWMP to incorporate NRW's advice.</p> <p>With regards to the Revised Ordnance Management Strategy (revision 2), and Revised Materials Management Plan (revision 1), we have previously confirmed that at this stage, we have no further comment on these plans, and that the applicant will develop these plans further with the Principal Contractor and submitted under requirement 7.</p>	
<p><b>4. HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p><b>Request N. 4.4</b></p> <p><u>ExA</u></p> <p>Ref: Applicant's [REP7-004] and GC's [REP7-044] responses to ExA's rule 17 request of 20th July 2016 [PD-025, request 4.7].</p> <p>Reflecting the Applicant's response, please could the Archaeological Compensation and Enhancement Strategy [REP7-036] be updated to confirm that all contractors will be expected to</p>	-

Paragraph in Response	Applicants Response
<p>follow standards and guidance provided by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists?</p> <p><u>NRW</u></p> <p>We have no comment regarding the historic environment.</p>	
<p><b>6. NOISE, VIBRATION AND AIR OVERPRESSURE</b></p> <p><b>Request N. 6.1</b></p> <p><u>ExA</u></p> <p>Ref: NRW's [REP7-042] response to ExA's rule 17 request of 20th July 2016 [PD-025, request 6.1].</p> <p>Further to its responses to the SWQs [REP5-049, question 7.1], please could NRW and GC comment on the Applicant's response [REP5-005, question 7.1] regarding potential noise and vibration impacts on biodiversity from piling works in Llyn Padarn?</p> <p><u>NRW</u></p> <p>We are satisfied that piling works within Llyn Padarn will not have any significant noise and vibration impacts on biodiversity.</p>	-
<p><b>7. WATER RESOURCES, CONTAMINATED LAND, FLOOD RISK AND CLIMATE CHANGE</b></p> <p><b>Request N. 7.7</b></p> <p><u>ExA</u></p> <p>Ref: Applicant's [REP7-004] response to ExA's rule 17 request of 20th July 2016 [PD-025, request 7.12].</p> <p>a) Is NRW satisfied with the updated Materials Management Plan submitted at Deadline 7 [REP7-032]?</p> <p>b) Is NRW satisfied that slate runoff is adequately covered in the Silt Management Plan [REP7-016]?</p>	-

Paragraph in Response	Applicants Response
<p><u>NRW</u></p> <p>a) At this stage, we have no further comment. Within the plan, 2.1.1, it confirms that a detailed Material Management Plan (MMP) is to be finalised and approved prior to construction commencing as per DCO requirement.</p> <p>b) Slate run off has been identified as a source of fine sediment within the Silt Management Plan. NRW as previously confirmed has reviewed the Silt Management Plan as far as it is able to do so in the context of its remit in the DCO. However, as confirmed by the applicant, the Silt Management Plan will be subject to ongoing discussions with NRW through the separate Environmental Permitting regime.</p>	
<p><b>Request N. 7.8</b></p> <p><u>ExA</u></p> <p>Ref: Applicant's [REP7-004] response to ExA's rule 17 request of 20th July 2016 [PD-025, request 7.13].</p> <p>a) 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 (FCA) [APP-131]? The Applicant has not provided confirmation that this specific advice has been followed.</p> <p>b) Does NRW agree with the conclusions reached in the FCA [APP-131]?</p> <p><u>NRW</u></p> <p>b) NRW confirm that we agree with the conclusions within the FCA.</p>	-
<p><b>8. ORDNANCE</b></p> <p><b>Request N. 8.2</b></p> <p><u>ExA</u></p> <p>Ref: GC's [REP7-044] response to ExA's rule 17 request of 20th July 2016 [PD-025, request 8.2]. Further to GC's recent [REP7-044, response to request 8.2] and earlier comments [REP5-044, response to 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 NRW have any concerns</p>	<p>The Applicant confirms that all water sampling data (which has also been submitted as part of the DCO) is part of the supporting H1 assessment documentation submitted as part of the Environmental Permit applications.</p>

Paragraph in Response	Applicants Response
<p>regarding the extent of sampling and testing undertaken to date in quarry Q6, noting GC's comment [REP7-044, response to request 8.2] that the principal concern is the dewatering of quarry Q6 into the SSSI of Llyn Padarn?</p> <p><u>NRW</u></p> <p>As we are not currently in receipt of a valid application, we have not formally received sampling data from the applicant. As a result we cannot offer any comment regarding the data or its effect on any designations. This will be assessed during determination of any formal application that is received.</p> <p>(Please note: Any previous sampling/testing data – as with all information/supporting documentation – that we received during the withdrawn applications is not being used. The applicant has been advised that they will need to re-submit all documentation/sampling again if they re-submit their Environmental Permit applications).</p>	

## 2 Gwynedd Council

Paragraph in Response	Applicants Response
<p><b>1. DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER (DCO), POLICY AND OTHER CONSENTS</b></p> <p><b>Request N. 1.3</b></p> <p><u>ExA</u></p> <p>Article 3 – Development consent etc. granted by the Order</p> <p>The Applicant has objected [REP7-007] to the proposed [PD-023] addition of paragraph (3), stating that the Order does not authorise associated development. This provision was included because of the flexibility requested by the Applicant in the definition of some of the authorised development, in particular the “works as may be necessary or expedient for the purposes of the authorised development” [REP7-001, Schedule 1, Part 1]. The ExA suggests that paragraph (3) [PD-023] is not added and that, instead, Schedule 1 Part 1 [REP7-001] is updated to “works as may be necessary or expedient for the purposes of the authorised development, subject to it being demonstrated to the satisfaction of the relevant planning authority that such works would not be associated development within the meaning of section 115 of the 2008 Act if the authorised development were to be carried out in England.” Please could the Applicant and Gwynedd Council (GC) comment?</p> <p><u>Gwynedd Council</u></p> <p>The Council agrees to the suggested update.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p><b>Request N. 1.5</b></p> <p><u>ExA</u></p> <p>Article 15(5)(a) – Construction and maintenance of new or altered streets</p> <p>Is GC content that the undertaker will not take on the responsibilities of street authority?</p> <p><u>Gwynedd Council</u></p>	<p>-</p>

Paragraph in Response	Applicants Response
Yes	
<p><b>Request N. 1.6</b></p> <p><u>ExA</u></p> <p>Part 3 – Powers of acquisition</p> <p>Are GC and Interested Parties content that the following articles that were included in draft DCO version 6A [REP5-002] have now been deleted (article numbers quoted as in version 6A):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Article 19(3) and 19(4) (compulsory acquisition of land);</li> <li>• Article 22 (private rights);</li> <li>• Article 23 (2) and 23(4) (acquisition of subsoil only); and</li> <li>• Article 24 (acquisition of part of certain properties).</li> </ul> <p><u>Gwynedd Council</u></p> <p>Yes</p>	-
<p><b>Request N. 1.9</b></p> <p><u>ExA</u></p> <p>Article 36 – Certification of plans etc</p> <p>a) The Applicant has stated [REP7-007] that it is unable to certify the Water Management Plan, Silt Management Plan, Biosecurity Plan or Excess Water Management Strategy as they may be amended as per the Environmental Permit application. However, these have all been included in the list of documents to be certified in the Applicant’s latest version of the draft DCO [REP7- 001]. The Applicant has later added [REP7-007] the CoCP and Pollution Prevention Plan to those as plans that “will be finalised as far as possible but require the further input listed”. Please could the Applicant clarify its intentions?</p> <p>b) These plans all include mitigation that has been agreed with various parties during the examination and therefore the ExA is minded to require the certification of the latest versions submitted during the examination and for those versions to be identified as such in the ExA’s</p>	-

Paragraph in Response	Applicants Response
<p>recommended draft DCO. The Applicant is encourage to ensure that the Environmental permit is secured before the ExA's Recommendation Report is submitted to the Secretary of State (this is likely to be around 8 December 2016), so that any amendments then proposed by the Applicant to the certified Code of Construction Practice, Water Management Plan, Silt Management Plan, Biosecurity Plan, Excess Water Management Strategy and Pollution Prevention Plan can then be considered by the Secretary of State and incorporated in the final DCO, as appropriate. Please could the Applicant, GC and NRW comment?</p> <p><u>Gwynedd Council</u></p> <p>No comment</p>	
<p><b>Request N. 1.19</b></p> <p><u>ExA</u></p> <p>Is GC content that the following requirements that were included in draft DCO version 5 [REP4-009] but have been deleted (requirement numbers as in version 5), are not necessary and that the relevant provisions in these deleted requirements have now been adequately secured through the documents to be certified under article 36(1):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Silt management plan (requirement 10);</li> <li>• Construction traffic management plan (requirement 12);</li> <li>• Dust management plan (requirement 13);</li> <li>• Noise management plans (requirement 14);</li> <li>• Habitat management plan (requirement 15);</li> <li>• Land discovery strategy (requirement 16);</li> <li>• Air quality baseline monitoring plan (requirement 17); and</li> <li>• Archaeological compensation and enhancement strategy (requirement 18).</li> </ul> <p><u>Gwynedd Council</u></p>	<p>-</p>



Paragraph in Response	Applicants Response
Yes	
<p><b>Request N. 1.21</b></p> <p><u>ExA</u></p> <p>Requirement 13 – Construction hours</p> <p>a) The Applicant [REP7-007] has objected to a suggestion [PD-023] to restrict the hours permitted for tunnelling works at weekends and public holidays. Please could GC comment, with reference to its earlier comments [REP5-044, response to question 7.9(a)]?</p> <p>b) Please could the Applicant clarify how it considers that the suggestion conflicts with Requirement 1?</p> <p><u>Gwynedd Council</u></p> <p>a) Please note the earlier comment in REP5-044, No tunnelling work is permitted on public holidays or between 13.00 on any Saturday to 07:00 the following Monday morning, without the prior written approval of the relevant planning authority which is not to be given unless the undertaker is able to satisfy the relevant planning authority that noise generated by tunnelling during these times will not unduly affect local residents</p> <p>Gwynedd Council is of the opinion that the condition gives the applicant the opportunity to provide evidential support that the additional tunnelling working hours will not unduly affect local residents. Therefore we do not concur with the applicants objection and request that they validate their objection to this condition with supporting evidence. Please note that the revised Noise Management Plan suggest a night time level in contradiction to the planned restricted daytime working hours. Could the applicant please clarify</p>	<p>Paragraph 3.3.1 of the CNMP states:</p> <p>‘Normal construction hours will be 07:00-19:00 Monday to Friday and 07:00-13:00 Saturday although this may be extended to 19.00 at critical path construction phases and no working on Sundays and Bank Holidays, except for underground excavation works as per Requirement 13.’</p> <p>As there will be 24 hour working for underground excavation works, maximum night time limits have been set out in Appendix A of the outline CNMP. These limits have been agreed with GC and are based on the guidance in MPG 11 (see Appendix 2-A for confirmation email from GC).</p> <p>As stated at the introduction paragraph of Appendix A of the outline CNMP maximum limits are set out which the development will have to comply with. These limits will be reviewed and finalised as part of the approved CNMP but will be no higher than those stated in Appendix A.</p>
<p><b>POLICY</b></p> <p><b>Request N. 1.27</b></p> <p><u>ExA</u></p> <p>In its Statement of Common Ground with the Applicant [REP4-004] GC agreed with the Applicant’s view at that time that NPSs EN-1, EN-3 and EN-5 were relevant to the application.</p>	-

Paragraph in Response	Applicants Response
<p>The ExA’s preliminary view [PD9-007, question 1.27] was “that policies in these NPSs, and particularly EN-1, are potentially important and relevant to this examination”. Commenting on the ExA’s preliminary view, NRW stated [REP2-047, response to question 1.27] that "EN-1, and possibly EN-5 appear to be relevant for the purposes of the Development".</p> <p>During the examination the Applicant later clarified [REP2-011, response to question 1.27] its view that “EN-1 is considered to be the NPS of principal relevance to the proposed development”, that EN-3 is not relevant as energy is required to pump water from the lower reservoir to the upper reservoir and therefore the proposed development does not constitute renewable energy development; and that EN-5 is not relevant.</p> <p>Further to the clarifications provided during the examination the ExA is now minded to conclude that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• pumped storage does not fall within the scope of any NPS, for example although the contribution of pumped storage to a low carbon energy system is mentioned in paragraph 3.3.12, footnote 13 and paragraph 3.3.31 of EN-1, it is not covered by the scope set out in paragraph 1.4.2 of EN-1 and therefore does not fall within the scope of EN-1;</li> <li>• as pumped storage does not fall within the scope of any NPS, there is no designated NPS in effect for this kind of development and therefore the application should be decided against the criteria in s105 of PA2008;</li> <li>• with reference to s105 of PA2008, EN-1 should be considered important and relevant to the decision on this application because EN-1 specifically mentions the importance of pumped storage to a low carbon energy system and because the proposed development is a generating station with a capacity of over 50MW and the policies in EN-1 are devised specifically for generating stations and energy infrastructure of this scale;</li> <li>• EN-3 should not be considered important and relevant to the decision on the application because the proposed development is not renewable energy development and because pumped storage (or hydro power for that matter) is in the scope of EN-3 or mentioned in it; and</li> <li>• EN-5 covers energy networks and is not a focus of the examination as the grid connection</li> </ul>	

Paragraph in Response	Applicants Response
<p>is not included in the application.</p> <p>Do the Applicant, GC and NRW agree with this approach and, if not, please could they set out their alternative views and reasoning?</p> <p><u>Gwynedd Council</u></p> <p>Gwynedd Council agree with this approach</p>	
<p><b>OTHER CONSENTS</b></p> <p><b>Request N. 1.28</b></p> <p><u>ExA</u></p> <p>Ref: Applicant's [REP7-004] and GC's [REP7-044] responses to ExA's rule 17 request of 20th July 2016 [PD-025, requests 1.1 and 1.2].</p> <p>a) Please could the Applicant provide a copy of the final signed s278 agreement and design drawings for the proposed highway improvements to Ffordd Cefn Du?</p> <p>b) Please could the Applicant set out the changes to the s278 agreement and drawings that have been made in response to feedback received from local residents at the open event and does GC consider it reasonable for any further changes to be made?</p> <p>c) Please could the Applicant provide a copy of the road safety audit requested by GC, provide evidence that this has been accepted by GC and demonstrate how relevant road safety measures are secured either through the s278 agreement or through the draft DCO [REP7-001]? inclusion in the S278 agreement.</p> <p><u>Gwynedd Council</u></p> <p>a) Applicant to respond</p> <p>b) Gwynedd Council recently requested revisions to the drainage design and are awaiting revised drawings for inclusion in the S278 agreement.</p> <p>c) The level of Road Safety audits required have been agreed with the Applicant. It is understood the audits will be carried out soon.</p>	<p>The Applicant concurs with this response and continues to liaise with Gwynedd Council Highways on the s278</p>

Paragraph in Response	Applicants Response
<p><b>2. ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT, MANAGEMENT PLANS AND STRATEGIES – GENERAL</b></p> <p><b>Request N. 2.1</b></p> <p><u>ExA</u></p> <p>a) Please could GC and NRW confirm their agreement (or otherwise) with the content of all of the most recent versions of the outline and draft management plans and strategies provided by the Applicant to date, and highlight any matters that are yet to be agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Code of Construction Practice [REP7-012]</li> <li>• Water Management Plan [REP7-014][[]]</li> <li>• Silt Management Plan [REP7-016]</li> <li>• Biosecurity Plan [REP7-018]</li> <li>• Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP7-020]</li> <li>• Outline Ordnance Management Strategy [REP7-022]</li> <li>• Baseline Air Quality Monitoring Plan [REP7-024]</li> <li>• Dust Control and Air Quality Management Plan [REP7-026]</li> <li>• Construction Noise Management Plan [REP7-028]</li> <li>• Operational Noise Management Plan [REP7-030]</li> <li>• Materials Management Plan [REP7-032]</li> <li>• Land Discovery Strategy [REP7-034]</li> <li>• Archaeological Compensation and Enhancement Strategy [REP7-036]</li> <li>• Excess Water Management Strategy [REP6-009]</li> <li>• Health and Safety Plan [REP5-017]</li> </ul> <p>b) Please could the Applicant provide evidence to demonstrate GC's and NRW's agreements with any updates to these plans that the Applicant submits before the close of the examination?</p> <p><u>Gwynedd Council</u></p>	<p>The Applicant notes the agreement of the management plans. Comments in response to the night-time working as per the response to Question 1.2</p>

Paragraph in Response	Applicants Response
<p>a) Gwynedd Council have agreed with the contents of The Construction Noise Management Plan with the applicant; but seek clarification as to why noise time noise limits are referred to in the appendices of the document. There should be no need for night time noise levels given that the Noise Management Plan Revision 2 Sept 2016 refers to working hours as 07:00 – 19:00 hrs daytime hours and weekdays (Mon –Fri), and 07:00 – 13:00 Sat, no working Sundays and Bank Holidays.</p> <p>Gwynedd Council are happy with the Baseline Air quality Management Plan, The Outline Ordnance Management Strategy and the Dust Control and Air Quality Management Plan, Code of Construction Practice, Water Management Plan, Silt Management Plan, Biosecurity Plan, and Construction Traffic Management Plan.</p> <p>No response has been received from consultees with regard to the other documents.</p>	
<p><b>Request N. 2.2</b></p> <p><u>ExA</u></p> <p>Ref: Applicant's [REP7-004] and GC's [REP7-044] responses to ExA's rule 17 request of 20th July 2016 [PD-025, request 2.1].</p> <p>a) Is GC satisfied with the Applicant's response regarding the reprofiling of existing slate mounds in Work 1G and Work 4C and does it consider that the landscaping proposals secured in the draft DCO [REP7-001] via the Landscape and Reinstatement Strategy as set out in the CoCP [REP7-012] are appropriate in this regard?</p> <p>b) The Applicant has referred to related potential impacts on Landscape. Please could it demonstrate how other relevant potential impacts, for example on local biodiversity as mentioned by GC [REP7-044], have been considered?</p> <p><u>Gwynedd Council</u></p> <p>a) Yes</p>	-
<p><b>Request N. 2.4</b></p> <p><u>ExA</u></p>	-

Paragraph in Response	Applicants Response
<p>Ref: Applicant's [REP7-004] and GC's [REP7-044] responses to ExA's rule 17 request of 20th July 2016 [PD-025, request 2.11].</p> <p>a) Please could the Applicant demonstrate how the CoCP [REP7-012] addresses the matters raised by GC regarding trafficking on unstripped ground?</p> <p>b) The Applicant's updates to the CoCP [REP7-012] regarding the storage of vegetation, topsoil and subsoil and trafficking on unstripped ground do not adopt the same working as the 2012 T&amp;CPA approval [APP-086, conditions 10 and 56]. Is GC content with the Applicant's suggested wording?</p> <p><u>Gwynedd Council</u></p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Request N. 2.5</b></p> <p><u>ExA</u></p> <p>Ref: Applicant's [REP7-004] and GC's [REP7-044] responses to ExA's rule 17 request of 20th July 2016 [PD-025, request 2.12].</p> <p>a) Please could the CoCP [REP7-012] specifically refer to the need to include measures to promote natural growth throughout the site, using the same wording as the T&amp;CPA approval [APP-086, condition 7]?</p> <p>b) Is GC content with the Applicant's suggesting wording regarding the restrictions on materials used to form the new slate tips [REP7-012, Section 4.3]?</p> <p><u>Gwynedd Council</u></p> <p>Yes</p>	-
<p><b>4. HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p><b>Request N. 4.2</b></p> <p><u>ExA</u></p>	-

Paragraph in Response	Applicants Response
<p>Ref: Applicant's [REP7-004] and GC's [REP7-044] responses to ExA's rule 17 request of 20th July 2016 [PD-025, request 4.5].</p> <p>a) Is GC satisfied that the Archaeological Compensation and Enhancement Strategy [REP7-036, paragraph 1.1.4] now addresses their concerns regarding approval, monitoring and sign off?</p> <p>b) Please could the Applicant provide the additional comments that it referred to [REP5-006, page 6-1] from Cadw and any responses to those?</p> <p><u>Gwynedd Council</u></p> <p>a) It is confirmed that the August 2016 changes to the Archaeological Compensation and Enhancement Strategy 1.1.4 addresses concerns regarding approval. This will allow us to ensure that monitoring and sign off is agreed in advance.</p>	
<p><b>Request N. 4.4</b></p> <p><u>ExA</u></p> <p>Ref: Applicant's [REP7-004] and GC's [REP7-044] responses to ExA's rule 17 request of 20th July 2016 [PD-025, request 4.7].</p> <p>Reflecting the Applicant's response, please could the Archaeological Compensation and Enhancement Strategy [REP7-036] be updated to confirm that all contractors will be expected to follow standards and guidance provided by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists?</p> <p><u>Gwynedd Council</u></p> <p>The Archaeological Compensation and Enhancement Strategy does not make reference to the ClfA standards and guidance but as with 4.2a the standards will be agreed in advance and compliance can be built in to the monitoring procedure.</p>	-
<p><b>Request N. 4.5</b></p> <p><u>ExA</u></p> <p>Ref: Applicant's [REP7-004] and GC's [REP7-044] responses to ExA's rule 17 request of 20th July 2016 [PD-025, request 4.8].</p>	-



Paragraph in Response	Applicants Response
<p>a) Please could the Archaeological Compensation and Enhancement Strategy [REP7-036] be updated to set out that following a pre-construction assessment of the stability of the tailpond dam by the Panel Engineer acting under the Reservoir Act 1975, it will be necessary to satisfy the relevant planning authority that there will be no impacts on the bomb store and it will be necessary to agree requirements for a watching brief and any structural surveys of the bomb store with the relevant planning authority?</p> <p>b) Please could the applicant provide evidence that GC are content with the updates to the Archaeological Compensation and Enhancement Strategy [REP7-036], with respect to the bomb store?</p> <p>c) Please could GC comment?</p> <p><u>Gwynedd Council</u></p> <p>a) The Archaeological Compensation and Enhancement Strategy has not been updated to make specific reference to the bomb store. Specific reference would be preferable in this respect. However, as with 4.2a &amp; 4.4 (above) this will be a requirement in order to gain approval from Gwynedd Council and Gwynedd Archaeological Planning Service. There should therefore be a mechanism to ensure that this element is properly considered.</p>	
<p><b>5. TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT</b></p> <p><b>Request N. 5.3</b></p> <p><u>ExA</u></p> <p>Ref: Applicant's [REP7-004] and GC's [REP7-044] responses to ExA's rule 17 request of 20th July 2016 [PD-025, requests 5.4 and 5.5].</p> <p>a) Further to the submission from Jane and Mads Huuse, [REP8-004, slides 14 and 15] please could the Applicant and GC review and agree an update to the process and periods proposed in the CTMP [REP7-020, section 2.12] in order to minimise the period during which any potential exceedances of predicted construction traffic movements could occur?</p> <p>b) The CTMP [REP7-020, paragraph 2.12.3] states that the strategy will set out reductions</p>	-



Paragraph in Response	Applicants Response
<p>“where possible”, which is not a firm commitment. The ES considered that the Applicant had assessed vehicle movements conservatively by adding on an extra 25% to the numbers predicted. In there a reason why a cap cannot be based on these calculations, and thereby ensure that the movements permitted in the DCO are not more than those assessed in the ES?</p> <p>c) Please could the Applicant and GC comment on the whether it is possible for measures to be proposed at the offset to reduce and control overall movements in a proactive manner (and thereby ensure that they are within the limits assessed in the ES) rather than a reactive manner (which deals with any movements in excess of those considered in the ES after the event)?</p> <p><u>Gwynedd Council</u></p> <p>a) The revised CTMP has already been approved by Gwynedd Council on the 5th August 2016</p> <p>b) Applicant to reply</p> <p>c) Applicant to reply</p>	
<p><b>6. NOISE, VIBRATION AND AIR OVERPRESSURE</b></p> <p><b>Request N. 6.1</b></p> <p><u>ExA</u></p> <p>Ref: NRW’s [REP7-042] response to ExA’s rule 17 request of 20th July 2016 [PD-025, request 6.1].</p> <p>Further to its responses to the SWQs [REP5-049, question 7.1], please could NRW and GC comment on the Applicant’s response [REP5-005, question 7.1] regarding potential noise and vibration impacts on biodiversity from piling works in Llyn Padarn?</p> <p><u>Gwynedd Council</u></p> <p>The Applicant’s response does not refer to the effects of piling works on biodiversity, and states that the recreational users of Llyn Padarn will be the closest receptors. Gwynedd Council agree that the effect will be localised and temporary in nature, and we are content to receive further details within the Detailed construction noise and vibration assessment. This document should</p>	<p>The effects of piling works on biodiversity was assessed in the Ecology chapter of the ES. NRW have also confirmed that they are happy that the piling in Llyn Padarn will not have any adverse effects on biodiversity. The piling method statement will provide details of any restrictions on the timing and length of the piling if necessary.</p>

Paragraph in Response	Applicants Response
<p>include mitigation measures for biodiversity e.g ‘soft starts’ in order give animals the opportunity to escape the area; and restrictions on the timing and length of the piling.</p>	
<p><b>Request N. 6.5</b></p> <p><u>ExA</u></p> <p>The Applicant appears to have suggested [REP7-029, Appendix A] a higher daytime vibration dose value than suggested by GC [REP7-044, response to request 6.13]. Please could GC comment?</p> <p><u>Gwynedd Council</u></p> <p>British Standard 6472– 2008, Guide to evaluation of human exposure to vibration in buildings Part 1: Vibration sources other than blasting (BS 6472-1:2008), is recognised as the preferred Standard for assessing the human comfort criteria for residential building types.</p> <p>The range values within Section 6 Table 1 give the vibration dose values above which various degrees of adverse comment may be expected in residential houses, as taken from this Standard. 0.2 to 0.4 (1m/s1.75)is given for 16hr day in residential buildings would result in low probability of adverse comment 1m/s1.75, however as Adverse comment is possible between values 0.4 and 0.8 (m/s1.7), the lowest value was chosen.</p> <p>BS 6472-1:2008 recognises that if the work is undertaken in accordance with a well developed management plan some minor discomfort may be acceptable by receivers provided close controls are implemented. Gwynedd Council, given the duration of scheme and rural setting opted for the lesser of the permitted range within the aforesaid British Standard.</p> <p>The same table gives Nighttime 8 hour values 0.1 -0.2(1m/s1.75) for low probability of adverse comments and as such, in line with the above reasoning a nighttime condition of 0.1 (1m/s1.75) may be applied.</p> <p>In addition, The contractor shall employ the “best practicable means” as defined in are defined in Section 72 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 and Section 79 ofthe Environmental Protection Act 1990 to minimise noise and vibration resulting from his operations and shall have regard to British Standard BS 5228: 2009 Code of Practice for Noise and Vibration Control on Construction</p>	<p>Euron Thomas (EHO) GC, confirmed via email on 8<sup>th</sup> August 2016 he was in agreement with the vibration limits which had been changed to VDV limits based on BS 6472-1:2008.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that BS 6472-1:2008 in Section 6 Table 1 provides a range of values and the upper value for Low probability for adverse comment has been used for proposed the day and night vibration limits. However as stated at the introduction paragraph of Appendix A of the outline CNMP maximum limits are set out which the development will have to comply with. These vibration limits will be reviewed and finalised as part of the approved CNMP but will be no higher than those stated in Appendix A.</p>

Paragraph in Response	Applicants Response
<p>and Open Sites, British Standard BS 6472-1: 2008 Guide to evaluation of human exposure to vibration in buildings – Part 1: Vibration sources other than blasting</p>	
<p><b>Request N. 6.6</b></p> <p><u>ExA</u></p> <p>Ref: Applicant's [REP7-004], GC's [REP7-044] and NRW's [REP7-042] responses to ExA's rule 17 request of 20th July 2016 [PD-025, request 6.18].</p> <p>a) Is GC content with the applicant's response [REP7-004, response to request 6.18] regarding clarification of the daytime and night time limits on Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays in the CNMP [REP7-028, appendix A]?</p> <p>b) Separate to any potential Section 61 COPA applications, is it necessary to set limits at all times, including outside construction hours?</p> <p><u>Gwynedd Council</u></p> <p>There is a lack of clarity in the Construction Noise Management Plan and associated appendices in respect of night time construction noise. The applicant has suggested daytime and night time noise limits that would be in line with guidance under MTAN 1, however the Construction Noise Management has been based on restricting working hours as defined in the Control of Pollution Act 1974 s60/61, and as stated in point 3.3.1 of the Noise Management Plan Revision 2 Sept 2016.</p> <p>07:00 – 19:00 hrs daytime hours and weekdays (Mon –Fri), and 07:00 – 13:00 Sat, no working Sundays and Bank Holidays.</p> <p>Any works outside these hours would be subject to Prior Consent, and therefore Gwynedd Council seek to clarify why night time noise levels in Appendix A point 3. of the Noise Management Plan Revision 2 Sept 2016 are required.</p> <p>Please note our previous comment regarding tunnelling in point 1.21</p>	<p>As per the response to Question 1.21</p>
<p><b>7. WATER RESOURCES, CONTAMINATED LAND, FLOOD RISK AND CLIMATE CHANGE</b></p> <p><b>Request N. 7.5</b></p>	<p>-</p>

Paragraph in Response	Applicants Response
<p><u>ExA</u></p> <p>Ref: Applicant's [REP7-004] responses to ExA's rule 17 request of 20th July 2016 [PD-025, request 7.9].</p> <p>a) Please could the intention to secure culverts under the land drainage consent process be reflected in Other Consents and License Status Document [REP7-003]?</p> <p>b) Does GC agree that a separate draft DCO [REP7-001] Requirement is not necessary and the culverts can be secured via the land drainage consent process?</p> <p><u>Gwynedd Council</u></p> <p>Gwynedd Council are content that the two permanent crossings of Nant-y-Betws can be secured through the Land Drainage Consent process.</p>	
<p><b>9. AIR QUALITY</b></p> <p><b>Request N. 9.5</b></p> <p><u>ExA</u></p> <p>Ref: Applicant's [REP7-004] response to ExA's rule 17 request of 20th July 2016 [PD-025, request 9.11].</p> <p>a) Please comment on the Applicant's statement that particulate matter size fraction PM2.5 is not suitable for use as a trigger criterion as it is an annual mean value.</p> <p>b) Should this metric be monitored?</p> <p><u>Gwynedd Council</u></p> <p>As the Air Quality Objective for PM2.5 does not come into legislation until 2020 Gwynedd Council are content with the monitoring of PM10.</p>	-

### 3 Glyn Peris

Paragraph in Response	Applicants Response
<p>We would like to reiterate our support for the arguments made by Jane Huuse and others re the access road via Waunfawr and the devastating effect it will have on the residents of that lane. Their lives and their properties will surely be ruined by this scheme and if it really has to go ahead, the Applicant must be made to look at alternative routes to that part of the site despite the extra costs that may be incurred by them.</p> <p>We are again unnerved by the feeling that the Applicant is trying to do as little as possible in preparation for the scheme before gaining the decision to go ahead but relieved that you are picking up on important details of strategies, plans and designs that are still missing.</p>	<p>The Applicant does not agree with this statement. A significant amount of information has been prepared and submitted as part of this Development Consent Order application, especially through the examination period. This includes the engineering review which informed the Rochdale Envelope, site investigation information and information about the design of the Development. Information and representations submitted by the Applicant in the Environmental Statement and through the examination process has sought to address the concerns and mitigation any potential adverse effects to the Glyn Peris Guest House. Some of these are property specific including the property management plan and noise monitoring of the front and back of the property.</p>
<p>Question 5.3</p> <p>Placing a cap on the maximum traffic movement would be an excellent move to stop the situation getting out of control.</p>	<p>We refer the Respondent to the Applicant's response to question 5.3 in response to the ExA's Rule 17 request submitted at Deadline 9 (SPH_GREX_WED9_01).</p>
<p>Question 5.4</p> <p>CCTV cameras must be installed along Ffordd Cefn Ddu as suggested by Jane Huuse to prevent any possible dispute of responsibility should any incidents occur.</p>	<p>We refer the Respondent to the Applicant's response to question 5.6 in response to the ExA's Rule 17 request (dated 20<sup>th</sup> July 2016) submitted at Deadline 7 (SPH_GREX_WED7_01)</p>
<p>Question 6.4</p> <p>We as the owners of Glyn Peris Guest House expect it to be clarified in the CNMP that there will be noise monitoring stations at both the front and back of our property as part of the noise mitigation package offered by the Applicant.</p>	<p>We refer the Respondent to Section 2.2.3 of the updated CNMP submitted at Deadline 9 (SPH_GREX_DC0D5_04 (Rev2))</p>
<p>Question 6.5</p> <p>We are concerned that the Applicant has suggested a higher daytime vibration dose value than that suggested by Gwynedd Council. Strict control of vibration limits is essential for the sake of all those living and working around the sites.</p>	<p>Maximum noise limits have been agreed with Gwynedd Council via the Construction Noise Management Plan and are in line with maximum limits in the relevant guidance and also in line with the limits in the approved scheme decision notice.</p>

Paragraph in Response	Applicants Response
<p>Question 6.6</p> <p>There should not be any work allowed on Saturday afternoons, Sundays or Bank Holidays - it is bad enough for us all to have to cope with the hours already set.</p>	<p>Working hours are restricted as per Requirement 13 of the DCO (Rev9).</p>
<p>Question 7.3(c)</p> <p>Thank you for showing the Applicant where Glyn Peris Cottage actually is!</p> <p>Selwyn Hughes the resident of Glyn Peris Cottage tells us he is extremely concerned about the disruption to the well in his garden. Residents from cottages opposite (long since demolished) used to come across with enamel buckets to collect water from this well and it has supplied them and him and his family with an excellent supply of water for over 70 years. He is not only concerned that disturbance of the ground at Q6 during construction will disrupt the supply to that well by perhaps diverting the channels that feed it but also has the tremendous fear that flooding will become a major factor in the future. As slate waste is porous and there is little or no topsoil above us at Q6 there is no doubt that the water table will be affected when there is all the extra water stored in the newly enlarged quarry/reservoir. As water seeps out the water table will rise (and it is already pretty close to the surface as it is). The risk of flooding and excess dampness in the property is therefore inevitable and Mr Hughes, (aged 76 and with a heart condition) does not need this sort of worry hanging over him.</p>	<p>The Applicant is aware of the private water supply at Glyn Peris Cottage. We refer the Respondent to the Applicant's response to Question 7.3 in response to the ExA's Rule 17 request submitted at Deadline 9 (SPH_GREX_WED9_01).</p> <p>This has also been incorporated into the revised Water Management Plan (Rev4) which was submitted at Deadline 9.</p>
<p>In reference to 7.3(d), Mr Hughes tells us that apart from the initial survey we all received some years back asking who has a private water supply and a brief discussion with the Applicant at a meeting at the Victoria Hotel, he has had no contact from the Applicant at all. He has not been kept up to date with any decisions made about the monitoring or lack of it at his property.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>Question 7.8</p> <p>We, like Mr Hughes, are hugely concerned about the risk of flooding to our property, not just from the extreme case of breaching of the damn at Q6 but of a possible more regular risk of flooding as a result of the raising of the water table and the effects of the construction process on surface run-off and ground seepage. As mentioned before, we have both already suffered from the tarmacking of the area at Q6 and would like reassurance that a careful survey will be carried out</p>	<p>We refer the Respondent to the previous comments made by the Applicant on this subject in the following responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applicant's response to written representation made by Glyn Peris – Section 5 (SPH_GREX_WED5_01)</li> <li>• Applicant's response to written representation made by Glyn Peris – Section 3, page 3-15 (SPH_GREX_WED6_02)</li> </ul>



Paragraph in Response	Applicants Response
<p>and the necessary drainage system installed to prevent this happening again.</p>	
<p>Question 8 The response from the MOD finally admitting that there were chemical weapons stored at Glyn Rhonwy is a serious development and reiterates the concerns raised by Jeff Taylor and others during this process - it is not a safe site to develop!</p>	<p>The Applicant again wishes to clarify that by removing any UXO within the Q6, this is actually remediating and protecting the environment and local community. We refer the Respondent to the Applicant's response on this matter made at Deadline 8 and 9 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applicant's response to Jeff Taylor representation contained within Applicants responses to written representations (SPH_GREX_WED8_01)</li> <li>• Applicant's response to Jeff Taylor representation contained within Applicants responses to written representations (SPH_GREX_WED9_02)</li> <li>• Applicant's response to Section 8 Ordnance at Deadline 9 (SPH_GREX_WED9_01)</li> </ul>
<p>Once again we have to state that we cannot stress enough the devastating effect this scheme will have on us, our fellow businesses and neighbours, the community, the landscape and the tourist economy and we implore you not to let this plan go ahead.</p>	<p>The Applicant does not agree with this conclusion.</p>

## **APPENDIX 1-A**

**COPY EMAIL (DATED 7<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2016) FROM NRW RE:  
REQUIREMENTS 9, 10 AND 16**



**From:** [Glyn Rhonwy](#)  
**To:** [Anderson, Catherine](#)  
**Cc:** [Glyn Rhonwy Pumped Storage Scheme](#); [Ninnes, Richard](#); [Wilby, David](#); [Gwyn, Emyr](#); [Paula McGeady](#)  
**Subject:** DCO Requirements 9, 10 regarding water quality monitoring, and previous requirement 16 in relation to the LDS  
**Date:** 07 September 2016 16:48:51  
**Attachments:** [image001.gif](#)

---

Catherine,

We refer to your email below.

NRW have made their comments with regards to the points below (requirements 9, 10 regarding post construction water quality monitoring, and previous requirement 16 in relation to the LDS) to the Examination, and maintain our position. The final decision with regard to the wording of the DCO requirements rests with the ExA.

Kind regards,

**Gareth Thomas**  
Ymgynghorydd Cynllunio Datblygiad / Development Planning Advisor  
Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resources Wales

**Ffôn/Tel:** **Siaradwr Cymraeg / Welsh Speaker**



**E-bost/E-mail:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Gwefan / Website:** [www.cyfoethnaturiolcymru.gov.uk](http://www.cyfoethnaturiolcymru.gov.uk) / [www.naturalresourceswales.gov.uk](http://www.naturalresourceswales.gov.uk)

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

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

---

**From:** Anderson, Catherine [mailto:Catherine.Anderson@aecom.com]

**Sent:** 07 September 2016 16:00

**To:** Glyn Rhonwy <>

**Cc:** Glyn Rhonwy Pumped Storage Scheme <; Ninnes, Richard

<>; Wilby, David

<>; Gwyn, Emyr

<; Paula McGeady ( Julie Drew-Murphy

(>

**Subject:** RE: Glyn Rhonwy - Rule 17 and Deadline 9 responses

Gareth

Just tried your phone but no response.

With regards to Condition 9, this should have read as follows:

- (5) Water quality monitoring must be undertaken by the undertaker at locations approved in advance in writing by the relevant planning authority in consultation with Natural Resources Wales for the following periods as a minimum:
- (i) for private water supplies; once a month for a minimum of 6 months prior to the start of any construction works of the authorised development where access to such supplies is granted;
  - (ii) for surface water, once a month for a minimum of 12 months prior to the start of any construction works of the authorised development; and
  - (iii) throughout the construction programme ~~and for a minimum of 6 months post completion.~~

Therefore there is monitoring throughout the construction phase, as we have clarified previously. However we still propose Requirement 10 as outlined in my email dated 6<sup>th</sup> September to provide the 12 months post-construction monitoring. Requirement 10 is necessary as it secures the post-construction phase monitoring and the monitoring plan to be agreed with GC and NRW prior to this phase of monitoring to be undertaken. Please can NRW confirm if there is anything contained within Requirement 10 which is actively harmful or that you actively oppose for its inclusion?

In relation to Requirement 16, this is not to be reinstated. The LDS is a certified document and therefore requires not Requirement to duplicate its contents.

Your prompt response in this regard would be very much appreciated.

Kind Regards  
Catherine

Catherine Anderson  
EIA Associate Director  
Environment & Planning  
**AECOM**  
1 Tanfield, Edinburgh, EH3 5DA

*AECOM and URS have joined together as one company. [Learn more](#)*

---

**From:** Glyn Rhonwy [<mailto:g>]  
**Sent:** 07 September 2016 14:20  
**To:** Anderson, Catherine  
**Cc:** Glyn Rhonwy Pumped Storage Scheme; Nannes, Richard; Wilby, David; Gwyn, Emyr; Paula McGeady  
**Subject:** RE: Glyn Rhonwy - Rule 17 and Deadline 9 responses  
**Importance:** [High](#)

Dear Catherine,

Although we highlighted a typographical error within the revised, updated LDS version 2, our

main recommendation was that the previous requirement 16 within draft DCO version 5 was reinstated. Could you please confirm that this will be the change that you refer to?

We cannot see how the amendments to requirements 9 and 10 are beneficial compared to the change that we suggested to requirement 9 5 (iii), and removal of requirement 10 altogether. Requirement 10 now refers to post-construction monitoring rather than operational monitoring. Your amendments would not include any monitoring during the construction works whatsoever. We therefore refer to our previous advice that requirement 9 5 (iii) is amended to 12 months post construction monitoring, and that Requirement 10 is unnecessary and should not be included. Also amending requirement 9 5 (iii) to 12 months post construction would maintain the consistent suite of determinands and locations of water monitoring as with the pre-construction and during construction monitoring.

Regards,

Gareth

**Gareth Thomas**  
Ymgynghorydd Cynllunio Datblygiad / Development Planning Advisor  
Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resources Wales

**Ffôn/ Siaradwr Cymraeg / Welsh Speaker**



E-bost/E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_  
k \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

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

---

**From:** Anderson, Catherine [ ] \_\_\_\_\_

**Sent:** 06 September 2016 14:21

**To:** Glyn Rhonwy <[glyn.rhonwy@cyfoethnaturiolcymru.gov.uk](mailto:glyn.rhonwy@cyfoethnaturiolcymru.gov.uk)>

**Cc:** Glyn Rhonwy Pumped Storage Scheme <[GlynRhonwy@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:GlynRhonwy@pins.gsi.gov.uk)>; Gwyn, Emyr

< \_\_\_\_\_ >

> \_\_\_\_\_

**Subject:** RE: [Glyn Rhonwy - Rule 17 and Deadline](#) 9 responses

**Importance:** High \_\_\_\_\_

Gareth

Further to your email below, unfortunately this was received too close to the Deadline 9 submission to make the changes to the LDS plus the LDS had already been submitted. Therefore I can confirm that the LDS will be submitted at D10 with the change as requested below. Trust this is satisfactory.

Regarding the water monitoring, securing the requirement for the water monitoring prior to, during and post-construction phases of the Development does not seem to be in question, albeit within two Requirements. From your email, it does seem to be more of an issue of the terminology used. Therefore please can we suggest the following amends to Rev9 of the DCO in order to resolve this issue prior to the end of examination:

The following strikethrough would be removed from Requirement 9:

(5) Water quality monitoring must be undertaken by the undertaker at locations approved in advance in writing by the relevant planning authority in consultation with Natural Resources Wales for the following periods as a minimum:

- (i) for private water supplies; once a month for a minimum of 6 months prior to the start of any construction works of the authorised development where access to such supplies is granted;
- (ii) for surface water, once a month for a minimum of 12 months prior to the start of any construction works of the authorised development; and
- ~~(iii) throughout the construction programme and for a minimum of 6 months post completion.~~

And the following red text would replace the strikethrough text in Requirement 10:

#### **Operational Post Construction Water Quality Monitoring**

**10.**—(1) The undertaker shall carry out the following water quality monitoring during the ~~operational~~ **post construction** phase of the authorised development;

(a) monitoring of the water quality of private water supplies for a period of six months from the date of commencement of operation where access to such supplies is granted; and

(b) monitoring of the water quality of surface water (including Llyn Padarn, Nant-Y-Betws and the Afon Gwyrfai) for a period of twelve months from the date of ~~commencement of operation~~ **demobilisation from site or complete cessation of construction phase, whichever is sooner**.

(2) The water quality monitoring to be carried out under sub-paragraph (1) shall be carried out at the locations and times approved in writing in advance by the relevant planning authority having consulted National Resources Wales.

(3) The water quality monitoring to be carried out under sub-paragraph (1) must include a sampling suite including total and dissolved metals, electrical conductivity, pH, suspended solids, chemical oxygen demand (COD), biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) and turbidity as a minimum.

A response at your earliest convenience prior to Deadline 10 (Thursday lunchtime) would be much appreciated so that we are able to make the amends and the final submission within a timely manner. If it is easier to discuss this over the phone given the pressing deadlines, please do let me know.

Regards  
Catherine

---

**From:** Glyn Rhonwy [<mailto:glyn.rhonwy@cyfoethnaturiolcymru.gov.uk>]

**Sent:** 05 September 2016 11:36

**To:** Anderson, Catherine

**Cc:** Glyn Rhonwy Pumped Storage Scheme; Gwyn, Emyr; Ninnes, Richard; Wilby, David; Julie Drew-Murphy ()

**Subject:** RE: Glyn Rhonwy - Rule 17 and Deadline 9 responses

Dear Catherine,

Thank you for your email below.

We confirm that the post construction monitoring is covered under requirement 9 (5)(iii). 9 (5) (iii) should be changed to 12 months post completion monitoring. The latest DCO version we can see that has been submitted to the DCO process is revision 8, dated 10<sup>th</sup> August (copy attached). Requirement 10 within that version (pg33), again refers to operational water quality monitoring rather than construction water quality monitoring, which is undertaken under requirement 9. Again, we see no benefit in including requirement 10 of version 8 of the DCO.

Whilst we welcome the amendment to the Land Discovery Strategy (we would assume that the change in wording should be to “complying” rather than “compiling” in the first paragraph of Appendix A revision 2) , we would request that the previous Land Discovery Strategy requirement is reinstated. Again, we see no benefit in removing the wording of the previous requirement 16 within draft DCO version 5 from the DCO.

Note that the above is intended to address questions 1.18 and 7.6 by the ExA to the applicant dated 26<sup>th</sup> August only and not intended to be submitted as a NRW representation for Deadline 9. NRW’s Deadline 9 representation will be sent separately directly to the ExA.

Kind regards,

Gareth Thomas  
Ymgynghorydd Cynllunio Datblygiad / Development Planning Advisor  
Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resources Wales

Ffôn/Tel: ( **Siaradwr Cymraeg / Welsh Speaker** 

E-bost/E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

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

Ein diben yw sicrhau bod adnoddau naturiol Cymru yn cael eu cynnal, eu gwella a’u defnyddio yn gynaliadwy, yn awr ac yn y dyfodol.

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

---

**From:** Anderson, Catherine [ ] \_\_\_\_\_

**Sent:** 02 September 2016 15:48

**To:** Glyn Rhonwy <[glyn.rhonwy@cyfoethnaturiolcymru.gov.uk](mailto:glyn.rhonwy@cyfoethnaturiolcymru.gov.uk)>

**Cc:** Gwyn, Emyr <[E](mailto:E)>; Ninnes, Richard \_\_\_\_\_

<>; Julie Drew-Murphy \_\_\_\_\_

() >; Glyn Rhonwy \_\_\_\_\_

Pumped Storage Scheme <[GlynRhonwy@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:GlynRhonwy@pins.gsi.gov.uk)>; Hatcher, David  
<k>

**Subject:** RE: Glyn Rhonwy - Rule 17 and Deadline 9 responses

Hi Gareth

Thanks for your email.

For absolute clarity, the intention is to carry out water monitoring of surface waters 12 months prior to construction and then throughout the construction phase as per the methods outlined in the WTMP. This is not just aligned specifically with activities such as the dewatering of the quarries or works in Llyn Padarn. Once the construction phase is over and demobilised, the 12 months post-construction will commence.

Please can I also check that you are reviewing Rev9 of the DCO where Requirement 10 states 12 months for surface waters and 6 months for private water supplies.

Please find attached track change version of the LDS. I trust this meets your satisfaction.

Regarding the implementation, this would be covered under the Requirement for Phasing and so we intend to add this into this Requirement and also cross reference with the HMP. This is to avoid any duplication or confusion. Again I trust this is satisfactory.

Please can you review and provide feedback if possible prior to Deadline 9 so that the Applicant can update our responses.

Kind Regards  
Catherine

---

**From:** Glyn Rhonwy [<mailto:glyn.rhonwy@cyfoethnaturiolcymru.gov.uk>]  
**Sent:** 01 September 2016 16:30  
**To:** Anderson, Catherine  
**Cc:** Gwyn, Emyr; Ninnes, Richard; Julie Drew-Murphy); [Glyn Rhonwy Pumped Storage Scheme; Hatcher, David](mailto:GlynRhonwy@pins.gsi.gov.uk)  
**Subject:** RE: Glyn Rhonwy - Rule 17 and Deadline 9 responses

Dear Catherine,

Thank you for your email.

Regarding question 1.18, we reiterate our comments regarding the proposed requirement 10 within our Deadline 8 response dated 17<sup>th</sup> August 2016. We disagree with your explanation. The applicant should be clear that although construction could have been completed in the future, this does not necessarily mean that the development is “operational”. **Post-construction monitoring is already a requirement within 9 (5)(iii)**, although this should be amended to 12 months, rather than the 6 months, as we have previously requested. Requirement 10 would then not be necessary, with operational water quality of the discharges being covered by any separate Environmental Permit.

Regarding question 7.6, the current Land Discovery Strategy states that it “will have due regard”

of the previous planning conditions placed on the approved scheme under the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (ref C12/1451/LL). NRW would seek to have greater security that the necessary requirements within the previous planning permission are also included within the DCO. We see no benefit in removing the wording of the previous requirement 16 within draft DCO version 5 from the DCO.

The Implementation Timetable was stipulated within requirement 15 (2) of DCO version 5, and the wording was proposed by the Applicant. NRW consider the meaning of the "Implementation timetable" to be a timetable showing the construction works aspects and how the relevant mitigation e.g. avoiding works that would possibly impact the breeding bird nesting season, or fish spawning would fit in to this.

Regards,

Gareth

**Gareth Thomas**

Ymgynghorydd Cynllunio Datblygiad / Development Planning Advisor  
Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resources Wales

Ffôn/Tel: ( **Siaradwr Cymraeg / Welsh Speaker** 

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

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

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

---

**From:** Anderson, Catherine [<mailto:>]

**Sent:** 31 August 2016 10:49

**To:** Thomas, Gareth <>

**Cc:** Hatcher, David <k>; Julie Drew-Murphy

<>

**Subject:** Glyn Rhonwy - Rule 17 and Deadline 9 responses

**Importance:** High

Morning Gareth

As you are probably aware the ExA has released another Rule 17 and has asked for resolution of matters within the questions, namely 1.18 and 7.6. Therefore, please find attached the Applicant's draft response to NRW's Deadline 8 response which we trust will assist in this regard. Your assistance and feedback in these matters is much appreciated as would a response to me email dated 26<sup>th</sup> August 2016 regarding the meaning of the "implementation timetable".

Given the timescales for Deadline 9 if a teleconference would assist please let me know, otherwise your response by end of play tomorrow would be very much appreciated so that we

can make amends or converse further in advance of the Deadline 9 submission.

Any queries please do not hesitate to contact me

Kind Regards

Catherine

Catherine Anderson

EIA Associate Director

Environment & Planning

**AECOM**

1 Tanfield, Edinburgh, EH3 5DA

*AECOM and URS have joined together as one company. [Learn more](#)*

---



## **APPENDIX 1-B**

**COPY OF E-MAIL (DATED 8<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2016) FROM NRW  
CONFIRMING RECEIPT OF PERMIT APPLICATIONS**

**Lewis, Ben (Bilfinger GVA)**

---

**Subject:** FW: Glyn Rhonwy - Revised EP application

**Ben Lewis**, Director, Planning, Development & Regeneration, Bilfinger GVA  
Direct Dial: \_\_\_\_\_  
Web: [www.gva.co.uk](http://www.gva.co.uk) - National Number: 08449 02 03 04 - Fax: 029 2024 8900

We have been appointed to the NPS framework on behalf of the Welsh Government, for more information, click [here](#)

Follow us on Twitter: [@GVAWales](#)

**From:** "Jenkins, Stephanie" <>  
**Date:** 8 September 2016 at 08:02:50 BST  
**To:** Chris <c>  
**Cc:** "Thomas, Gareth" <G>, "Roe, Emily"  
<>  
**Subject:** RE: Glyn Rhonwy - Revised EP application

Hi Chris,

I can confirm that we have received the documents via the Sharefile system, many thanks.  
I will pass this information to our Permit Receipt Centre so that the documents can be appropriately logged.

Kind Regards,

Steph

---

**From:** Chris [<mailto:c>]  
**Sent:** 07 September 2016 17:43  
**To:** Jenkins, Stephanie <S>  
**Cc:** Dave Holmes <>; Anderson, Catherine  
<\_\_\_\_\_  
**Subject:** Glyn Rhonwy - Revised EP application

Dear Steph,

I have just finished uploading all of the revised environmental permit documentation to the NRW Sharefile system. Could you please confirm that you have received the application by 10am tomorrow (the 8th) so we can include in our final DCO submission.

I also attach confirmation that payment to NRW for the applications has been made successfully.

Best,

Chris

## **APPENDIX 1-C**

### **AGREED MINUTES – MEETING WITH NRW ON ENVIRONMENTAL PERMIT 21ST JULY 2016**

Project Name: **Glyn Rhonwy Pumped Storage**

Meeting Title: **Environmental Permit**

Venue: **NRW Office, Ty Cambria, Cardiff**

Date: **21<sup>st</sup> July 2016, 2pm**

Attendance: **Catherine Anderson (CA), EIA Associate Director – AECOM**  
**Dylan Huws (DyH), Water & Flood Risk Associate Director – AECOM**  
**Owen Tucker (OT), Principal Water Quality Consultant – AECOM**  
**Richard Wood (RW), Permitting Specialist - AECOM**  
**Chris Williamson (CW), Development Manager - Snowdonia Pumped Hydro**  
**Dave Holmes (DaH), Managing Director – Snowdonia Pumped Hydro (via skype)**  
**Emily Roe (ER) – Permitting Team Leader (WQ) NRW**  
**Stephanie Jenkins (SJ), Permitting Officer – NRW**  
**David Wilby (DW), Environmental Protection – NRW (Via skype)**

Apologies: **Huw Jones (HW) – NRW**

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Discussion Point</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Introductions and Aim of the Meeting</b>	
1.1	CA outlined that the aim of the meeting was to understand what further information is required for the discharge consent applications and how the applications could be progressed.	
1.2	CA provided a brief history to the Glyn Rhonwy Pumped Storage scheme (the Development) including the approved planning Town & Country Planning Act (T&CPA) consent, reasons for increasing to 99MW capacity, difference in boundary and Order Limits from T&CPA application and progress to date.	
1.3	DyH gave a presentation to SJ and ER which explained how the Development would operate. This had previously been given to DW and HJ in the previous permit meeting held on the 9 <sup>th</sup> November 2015. This presentation is appended to these minutes but please note that this does not provide the animation. The hierarchy of discharges has already been established in the meeting held on the 9 <sup>th</sup> November 2015. However the key points were repeated for completeness: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The discharge of excess water disconnected from rainfall events as the freeboard in the system provides a storage volume. Water can be released in a controlled way which would help to provide a benefit in terms of local flood risk.</li> <li>• Water level in the Development would be controlled preferentially by using the Q6 relief valve to Llyn Padarn.</li> <li>• The relief valve is positioned at the base of the impounded volume and</li> </ul>	

Agenda Item	Discussion Point	Action
	<p>not the bottom of the quarry therefore ingress of sediment not expected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The spillways will only be used in exceptional circumstances (e.g. in the unlikely event to avoid a dam breach).</li> </ul>	
1.4	<p>CW then provided a brief summary that there has been an extensive amount of information produced for the DCO, some of which has been provided for the permit application. However the DCO examination has meant that the Management Plans are now more comprehensive than previously submitted for the purposes of the DCO.</p> <p>CW continued that there has been some assumption and confusion by the applicant regarding the link between the DCO and the water quality permitting team within NRW as there is some overlap between the two processes. There has been a significant volume of information prepared for the DCO, some of which has been used for the permit applications. However the key point of the meeting is to agree a way forward. It was acknowledged by AECOM and SPH that the most recent documentation had not been submitted to the permitting team as the DCO has moved on since the Schedule 5 request.</p> <p>CW confirmed that Snowdonia Pumped Hydro would be resubmitting the applications for the construction (dewatering) and operational discharge consents, and SPH would be the applicant and take responsibility for these permits although it must be acknowledged that elements or specific activities may be transferred to contractors at the appropriate time. The reason why some previous documentation outlined the completion of certain documents by the Principal Contractor or Operator was to provide flexibility. However as the documentation and information about the Development has evolved significantly since the initial submission, SPH can clarify that they will be the responsible applicant.</p>	
1.5	<p>ER accepted this and confirmed that when these permits are granted, they are done so “ready to go” and could be applied to be transferred the next day to the contractor. Therefore there is the expectation that these are likely to be transferred. All information to be taken into account must be submitted to NRW’s permitting team with the application, as the permits are granted on the values used for the assessments carried out.</p>	
1.6	<p>RW enquired whether there are scenarios where pre-operation conditions are included on these permits, for example, where certain information or elements of the Environmental Management System (EMS) are to be finalised?</p>	
1.7	<p>ER confirmed that there is scope to place pre-operational conditions but not for things like flows which are needed to make an assessment of the environmental effects</p>	
1.8	<p>CW and OT enquired about the maximum dewatering flows as these had been included within the dewatering application forms</p>	
1.9	<p>SJ stated that there had been an apparent contradiction as the application forms for the dewatering stated flows but the Excess Water Management Strategy stated that flows could not be provided</p>	
1.10	<p>DyH and CA clarified that the Excess Water Management Strategy was not relevant for the dewatering as it is only applicable in operational phase</p>	
1.11	<p>ER and SJ clarified that when the applications are resubmitted, it should be made clear which information is supporting which application to avoid any confusion.</p>	
1.12	<p>CW agreed and CA offered to provide a technical note with the minutes of the meeting to NRW to confirm what information will be provided to ensure that there is no further confusion on the resubmission. SPH would welcome comments from</p>	<p>CA / CW</p>

Agenda Item	Discussion Point	Action
	NRW.	
1.13	SJ and ER confirmed that they are happy to review draft documents to ensure that they contain all of the information required to make an assessment. However on the point about pre-operational conditions, ER confirmed that the permit determination and conditions will be determined on the basis and structure of the information submitted. Any significant change from draft documents which are submitted to inform the permit application could require a variation to the permits, or otherwise may lead to a non-compliance. The basic information on process / activity and associated control measure must not change. It's the finer detail on the control measures that is needed. ER & SJ reiterated that agreeing to review draft documentation does not mean that no further requests for information will be issued once a formal application is submitted.	
1.14	CW acknowledged this. CA confirmed that as the Management Plans are well advanced although as part of the technical note, this would be outlined for clarity.	CA / CW
1.15	ER and SJ acknowledged this	
1.16	ER outlined the permitting consultation process, where the information received is then distributed for comments within the wider NRW team. The permitting team may have queries but will also rely on the wider NRW teams for further technical comments. Whilst the permitting team are happy to review documents prior to the resubmission, this would not preclude any further queries which may come from the wider NRW teams.	
1.17	CW and CA acknowledged this and welcomed the opportunity to provide information prior to the resubmission.	
<b>2</b>	<b>H1 Assessment &amp; Environmental Management Systems</b>	
2.1	CA queried why the requirement for a H1 assessment was not identified at duly made stage given that these are not applicable for discharges to lakes or as the discharge is freshwater (therefore not effluent or process water).	
2.2	SJ clarified that NRW require an Environmental Risk Assessment, however NRW had not specified that an ERA would mean a H1 assessment as SJ confirmed that a H1 Risk Assessment are not applicable to discharges to lakes. Whilst the information contained within the H1 assessment was useful and helpful, a report format would be acceptable should the permits be resubmitted.	
2.3	CW and CA acknowledged this	
2.4	RW enquired whether the permits would be resubmitted in the same way or a different way	
2.5	SJ confirmed that NRW has split the permits up in to dewatering and operational activities, but that the same discharge points were applied to both permits.	
2.6	RW stated that the EMS for each activity should include confirmation over the management of flows and monitoring of the discharges taking place – maximum expected flows should be identified for assessment purposes.	
2.7	DyH enquired about the maximum flows required for the operational use of the spillways. These can be influenced by many variables. The relief valves have been sized based on calculations with regard to reservoir drawdown in line with current methods adopted in the UK.	
2.8	ER confirmed that a reasonable worst case scenario and an average flow scenario should be provided	
2.9	DyH queried this as this would be no different to the rainfall and runoff received within the catchment in line with all other spillway arrangement on reservoirs. The reservoir will provide a degree of attenuation based on the provision of flood	

Agenda Item	Discussion Point	Action
	lift and the then the flood water would spill over spill arrangement and into the receiving water bodies through the discharge arrangements	
2.10	A technical note would be provided stating the variables involved and how these reduce the risk of spill occurring together with the impact of reservoir discharge compared to the natural runoff from the contributing area. The spill arrangement is a mechanism for controlling the passage of flood water from the reservoir in a safe manner. Therefore designing with a limit of capacity to a certain event would not be appropriate. The spill capacity should not be throttled. During flood events what is being discharged is a consequence of the rainfall on the reservoir and its contributing area and not as a result of any releasing of water based on an operational requirement.	
2.11	CA confirmed that a technical note would be provided after the meeting. The principal of the number of permits had been established at the meeting held on the 9 <sup>th</sup> November 2015.	
2.12	ER confirmed that should the monitoring of the permits demonstrate that the operation of the Development is not posing a risk to the environment, there is the possibility of the permits being surrendered after a time period.	
2.13	OT queried what was NRW's specific concerns regarding water quality of operational runoff, given that this water would be sourced from Llyn Padarn (plus rainfall, increasing with time), the quarries would be lined but not with extensive concrete works (e.g. combination of grouting, pinning, netting etc), and that there was no 'process' operation or discharge that would significantly alter the quality of the water.	
2.14	SJ explained that NRW's concerns included, but were not limited to pH, buoyancy, turbidity, nutrient enrichment, and water temperature.	
2.15	CA explained that we have provided an assessment of the risk from temperature changes, but acknowledged that more information and assessment was available as part of the DCO application documents. This assessment would be clarified in the ERA provided with the revised applications.	
<b>3</b>	<b>Management Plans</b>	
3.1	CA thanked NRW for the initial feedback they had received on the 7 <sup>th</sup> July 2016, but enquired whether the comments related to the language used within the Management Plans or the technical detail	
3.2	ER confirmed that it was primarily the language, as opposed to the technical information, although technical gaps have been identified.	
3.3	SJ confirmed that some of the information submitted was actually very useful and helpful and that they do have more comprehensive feedback with regards to the technical aspects of the supporting documents which NRW will provide following the meeting	
3.4	CA confirmed that the Management Plans, specifically the Water Management Plan and Biosecurity Plan are more comprehensive now than those sent to NRW previously. These have now been approved by NRW planning team as part of the DCO.  New point: SJ and ER reinforced that the Permitting application and the Planning application are separate processes and SPH cannot make the assumption that information is shared. All documentation that is to be considered must be submitted via the individual process.	
3.5	CA stated that even though the Rule 17 request from the Examining Authority (ExA) has been received on the 20 <sup>th</sup> July, no significant amends were expected to the relevant Management Plans and so would NRW consider the opportunity to	

Agenda Item	Discussion Point	Action
	review these in advance of any further documentation prior to resubmission. CA asked whether it would be better to have documents for review in batches as opposed to all in one go	
3.6	ER confirmed that this would be preferable but would advise on a timescale for this review	
3.7	ER enquired about the water monitoring and had this been undertaken at depth	
3.8	<p>CA confirmed that as part of the DCO, SPH will be undertaking 12 months of pre-construction monitoring prior to construction starting. It is recognised that there are access issues into Q1 which have been recognised by NRW previously and less samples have been obtained to date. Due to these access difficulties, 12 months of pre-construction monitoring from Q1 is not proposed but sample points in the wider catchment have been proposed and agreed with NRW through the DCO. This has been approved by NRW. In addition there will be the opportunity for additional sampling to be undertaken in Q1 as part of the secondary ground investigation which is needed to inform detailed design. This will be undertaken prior to works formally commencing.</p> <p>CA clarified that access to Q6 is possible via formal permission to SPH.</p>	
3.9	<p>Ensis, who are the consultant arm of University College of London, were commissioned to undertake the fish and aquatic invertebrate surveys in the quarries, which also included water quality depth profiling (e.g. temp, DO, electrical conductivity), water quality sampling and attempts to collect fine sediment samples (that were not successful). The water quality depth profiling was undertaken at the end of April/early May and did not detect any stratification. It is possible that later in the summer Q6 does stratify, however the profiling suggests that this is not permanent and overturned frequently mixing any pollutants (for example if they were continuing to leach from UXO if present) back into the water column. Water quality monitoring included sampling during periods when the water column was well mixed and there is no obvious change in water quality.</p> <p>OT confirmed that the Water Management Plan now outlined that when Q6 is dewatered, the dewatering will be undertaken in two stages. At an intermittent stage dewatering will cease and additional water samples collected for laboratory analysis. This may also allow for the bed and sides of the quarry to be exposed and any unexploded ordnance, if present, to be identified and investigated (including chemical analysis of fine sediment if possible to sample). The dewatering of Q6 will be regularly observed by the Environmental Clerk of Works / Environmental Manager who will be looking for signs of change. Water quality will also be monitored constantly using an in line sonde recording indicator parameters like pH, temperature, conductivity and turbidity. At any time in the dewatering process pumping can be stopped if it is suspected that water quality has changed and there is a risk of polluting Llyn Padarn.</p>	
<b>4</b>	<b>Q5 Drainage</b>	
4.1	<p>CA provided background to Q5 explaining that its inclusion in the DCO Order Limits was a precautionary measure as at the time, additional LiDAR and topographical information was not available. In addition, there is an unstable dolerite dyke which has seen some rockfall and access to Q5 is currently unsafe.</p> <p>CA explained that if the bottom level of Q5 was below the level of the operational water level of Q6, there may be the potential for any surface water drainage or flow through the existing catchment, to then backup and pool in Q5. This would also depend on how high the lining of the reservoir would be.</p> <p>This is subject to further investigation and also detailed design. Should the level</p>	



Agenda Item	Discussion Point	Action
	of Q5 be below the operational water level of Q6, then an engineering solution would be required and this would involve a drain being installed from Q6 into Q5. This would allow any surface water to drain in to Q6 and in effect would formalise the existing natural drainage.	
4.2	ER asked if there was water in Q5	
4.3	CA confirmed that there is no water in Q5 currently and that any water that might pool would be derived from rainfall.  However subsequent receipt of the topo data has confirmed that likely level of Q5 is above the operational water level within Q6, and so therefore this is an unlikely event. This has been the subject of some dialogue within the DCO responses and therefore SPH thought it prudent to involve this in today's meeting for openness and clarity. CA confirmed that only if this engineering solution was to be required, this would be formalising the natural drainage already occurring in the catchment, which is a considerable size leading into Llyn Padarn. Therefore a permit would not be required as it is the transfer of freshwater to freshwater within the Development.	
4.4	ER confirmed that this was something that has only recently been brought to their attention and welcomed the inclusion into the agenda. This may require further consultation internally	
4.5	SJ highlighted that a permit application may be required if the above uses of Q5 may transfer contamination in to Q6	
4.6	CW stated that this was unlikely as Q5 had been subject to an extensive UXO remediation. OT and DyH also added that as it is likely that Q5 already drains into Q6, any potential mobile contaminants would have likely already been picked up by the water sampling in Q6.	
4.7	ER and SJ acknowledged this point but agreed to seek further consultation internally. If there is drainage of rainfall from Q5 to Q6 through the ground and that this provides a level of treatment that might not occur if a drain is provided, then further assessment would be required to determine how this might alter the risk from operational discharges of excess water.	
4.8	CA confirmed that as this is subject to confirmation at detailed design stage, and only if NRW could provide justification for requiring a permit for this activity, SPH would not include this in the applications at this stage.	
4.9	ER acknowledged this and said that it could be applied for in the future as a variation to any potential permit that may be issued.	
<b>5</b>	<b>Next Steps</b>	
5.1	CA queried whether there would be the same fees applicable for the resubmission	
5.2	ER confirmed that as this would be considered a new application, the fees would still apply. However in recognition of the withdrawal and the fees already paid, NRW were willing to review information prior to the resubmission of the permit applications to ensure that all information required to make the assessment "duly made" was present. NRW were clear that this preliminary review would have no bearing on the assessment and determination made by the permitting team, but would only serve to ensure that all relevant data required is present upon submission.	
5.3	This was welcomed by SPH	
5.4	CW queried what consultation would be required	
5.5	ER confirmed that consultation would be undertaken with Gwynedd Council. All	

Agenda Item	Discussion Point	Action
	<p>those who made representations the first time would be contacted and asked to provide any new or additional comments. As before, all interested parties would be given 28 days to provide comments.</p>	
	<p>ER confirmed that – unless the application provided new (“never seen/considered before”) information, no further drop-in events would be undertaken.</p>	
5.6	<p>CA asked if NRW could provide an indication of what comments were provided previously so these could also be incorporated into the resubmission documentation to ensure all potential queries are covered.</p>	
5.7	<p>SJ agreed and will provide details of any common themes from the representations previously received.</p>	SJ
5.8	<p>CA summarised that SPH would provide the following to NRW:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minutes of the meeting for NRW comment and approval;</li> <li>• Updated Management Plans;</li> <li>• A technical note outlining what information will be submitted to support the dewatering and operational permit applications including specific documentation and reports; and</li> <li>• A technical note on the flow rates</li> </ul>	CA
5.9	<p>SJ and ER agreed and also agreed that NRW would provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments on the technical note on the contents of the previous permit applications;</li> <li>• Further detail on the technical information required from their own internal notes including common themes from the representations previously received; and</li> <li>• Comments on the flow rate technical note; and</li> <li>• Any other further information they feel relevant to the resubmission.</li> </ul>	ER / SJ
5.10	<p>RW enquired about if there were any delays or backlogs</p>	
5.11	<p>ER confirmed that there were no delays or queue at present, but they were expecting additional workload in August.</p>	
5.12	<p>SJ confirmed that they would meet their statutory timescales and deadlines for the determination of the applications once received and duly made within 21 days.</p>	
	<p>Meeting ends</p>	

## **APPENDIX 2-A**

**COPY EMAIL FROM GC RE: CONSTRUCTION NOISE MANAGEMENT**

**PLAN REV. 3 (SPH\_GREX\_DCOD5\_04)**

**From:** [Roberts Gwenan Mai \(Rh-CTGC\)](#)  
**To:** [Lewis, Ben \(Bilfinger GVA\)](#)  
**Cc:** ["Anderson, Catherine"; Thomas Euron \(Rh-CTGC\)](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Glyn Rhonwy - Construction Noise Management Plan  
**Date:** 08 September 2016 10:30:16

---

Hi Ben,

I have reviewed the tracked changes to condition 3 Appendix A and I am satisfied with the changes as it clarifies the position in respect of night time noise limits, so as to avoid any misunderstanding.

Regards,

Gwenan

**Gwenan Mai Roberts**

Rheolwr Gwarchod y Cyhoedd | Public Protection Manager  
Amgylchedd | Environment

-----  
-----

[Cyngor Gwynedd Council](#) | [Swyddfa Ardal Dwyfor](#) | [Pwllheli](#) | [Gwynedd](#) | LL53 5AA

-----  
-----

---

**From:** Lewis, Ben (Bilfinger GVA) [mailto:]  
**Sent:** 08 September 2016 10:21  
**To:** Roberts Gwenan Mai (Rh-CTGC); 'Anderson, Catherine'  
**Cc:** Duell Parri Moira Ann (Rh-CTGC); Muscroft Ffion (Rh-CTGC); Williams David Anthony (Rh-CTGC); Gruffudd Glyn Llewelyn (Rh-CTGC); Preston, Deborah J.; Paula McGeady ; Thomas Euron (Rh-CTGC)  
**Subject:** RE: Glyn Rhonwy - Construction Noise Management Plan  
**Importance:** High

Gwenan

Further to Catherine's email, please find attached a final CNMP with the changes to condition 3 of Appendix A shown as tracked changes.

If you could come back to me ASAP to confirm your agreement, it would be appreciated so we can advise PINS before today's final deadline at noon.

Many thanks and kind regards

Ben

**Ben Lewis**, Director, Planning, Development & Regeneration, Bilfinger GVA  
Web: [www.gva.co.uk](http://www.gva.co.uk) - National [Number: 08449 02 03 04](tel:08449020304) - Fax: 029 2024 8900

---

We have been appointed to the NPS framework on behalf of the Welsh Government, for more information, click [here](#)

Follow us on Twitter: [@GVAWales](#)

---

**From:** Roberts Gwenan Mai (Rh-CTGC) [<mailto:> \_\_\_\_\_]  
**Sent:** 08 September 2016 09:48  
**To:** 'Anderson, Catherine'  
**Cc:** Duell Parri Moira Ann (Rh-CTGC); Muscroft Ffion (Rh-CTGC); Williams David Anthony (Rh-CTGC); Gruffudd Glyn Llewelyn (Rh-CTGC); Lewis, Ben (Bilfinger GVA); Preston, Deborah J.; Paula McGeady ; [Thomas Euron \(Rh-CTGC\)](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Glyn Rhonwy - Construction Noise Management Plan  
**Importance:** High

Hi Catherine,

Your e mail below provides the clarification required on the issue of night time noise limits; and details the context in which these noise limits were included. I would be grateful if you could confirm the changes to condition 3 of Appendix A.

Regards,

Gwenan

**Gwenan Mai Roberts**

Rheolwr Gwarchod y Cyhoedd | Public Protection Manager  
Amgylchedd | Environment

-----  
-----  
-----  
[Cyngor Gwynedd Council](#) | Swyddfa Ardal Dwyfor | Pwllheli | Gwynedd | LL53 5AA  
-----  
-----

**Lewis, Ben (Bilfinger GVA)**

---

**From:** Roberts Gwenan Mai (Rh-CTGC) <  
**Sent:** 08 September 2016 09:48  
**To:** 'Anderson, Catherine'  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** RE: Glyn Rhonwy - Construction Noise Management Plan  
**Importance:** High

Hi Catherine,

Your e mail below provides the clarification required on the issue of night time noise limits; and details the context in which these noise limits were included. I would be grateful if you could confirm the changes to condition 3 of Appendix A.

Regards,

Gwenan

**Gwenan Mai Roberts**  
Rheolwr Gwarchod y Cyhoedd | Public Protection Manager  
Amgylchedd | Environment

---

**From:** Anderson, Catherine [mailto:Catherine.Anderson@aecom.com]  
**Sent:** 07 September 2016 17:35  
**To:** Roberts Gwenan Mai (Rh-CTGC)  
**Cc:** Duell Parri Moira Ann (Rh-CTGC); Muscroft Ffion (Rh-CTGC); Williams David Anthony (Rh-CTGC); Gruffudd Glyn Llewelyn (Rh-CTGC); Lewis, Ben (Bilfinger GVA); Preston, Deborah J.; Paula McGeady  
)  
**Subject:** RE: Glyn Rhonwy - Construction Noise Management Plan  
**Importance:** High

Hi Gwenan

Apologies for any confusion caused but I think there is some misunderstanding over night time construction works and tunnelling (underground excavation works as defined in the DCO).

Night time limits were briefly discussed with Euron at our meeting after the issue specific hearing on 17<sup>th</sup> May 2016 and therefore limits were included in all CNMP plus its revisions since then, all of which have been approved by Gwynedd Council.

In relation to the previously conditions, condition 41 relates to tunnelling works and permitted hours, and condition 44 relates to the night time noise limit (42 dB LAeq,t) (apologies I only gave condition 41 in my earlier responses).

The night time construction limits in Appendix A of the CNMP (condition 3) apply to the underground excavation works, and would also be the maximum noise limit for any other construction works which may be permitted under section 61 of COPA, with prior consent from Gwynedd Council.

I trust this clarifies and if you are agreeable, we will make this change to Condition 3 of Appendix A to secure this. Please can you let me know by 10am tomorrow.

Kind Regards  
Catherine

---

**From:** Roberts Gwenan Mai (Rh-CTGC) [\_\_\_\_\_  
**Sent:** 07 September 2016 16:44  
**To:** Anderson, Catherine  
**Cc:** Duell Parri Moira Ann (Rh-CTGC); Muscroft Ffion (Rh-CTGC); Williams David Anthony (Rh-CTGC); Gruffudd Glyn Llewelyn (Rh-CTGC); Lewis, Ben (Bilfinger GVA)  
**Subject:** RE: Glyn Rhonwy - Construction Noise Management Plan

Hi Catherine,

I have spoken to Euron and he has confirmed that there have not been any discussions regarding night time noise limits – as there is no intention to carry out night time construction( with the exception of tunnelling.)

I have viewed the previous related planning condition as you suggest, and I cannot find reference to night time construction noise levels.

We are seeking clarification as to why night time construction noise limits are refers to in the appendices to the CNMP

Is it the intention that setting night time noise limits in accordance with MTAN1 is done -in the event of prior consent being sought for works outside permitted hours?

**Gwenan Mai Roberts**  
Rheolwr Gwarchod y Cyhoedd | Public Protection Manager  
Amgylchedd | Environment

----- k

-----  
Cyngor Gwynedd Council | Swyddfa Ardal Dwyfor | Pwllheli | Gwynedd | LL53 5AA  
-----

---

**From:** Anderson, Catherine [\_\_\_\_\_  
**Sent:** 07 September 2016 16:15  
**To:** Roberts Gwenan Mai (Rh-CTGC)  
**Cc:** Duell Parri Moira Ann (Rh-CTGC); Muscroft Ffion (Rh-CTGC); Williams David Anthony (Rh-CTGC); Gruffudd Glyn Llewelyn (Rh-CTGC); Lewis, Ben (Bilfinger GVA)  
**Subject:** RE: Glyn Rhonwy - Construction Noise Management Plan

Hi Gwenan

Further to the Deadline 9 response and confirmation provided in my email below that the limits have already been agreed with Euron, please see our draft responses which will be going in tomorrow for Deadline 10. Please do let me know if you have any comments before 10am which is prior to tomorrow's 12 noon deadline, which is the end of examination.

Kind Regards  
Catherine

---

**From:** Anderson, Catherine  
**Sent:** 02 September 2016 11:55  
**To:** Roberts Gwenan Mai (Rh-CTGC)

**Cc:** Duell Parri Moira Ann (Rh-CTGC); Muscroft Ffion (Rh-CTGC); Williams David Anthony (Rh-CTGC)  
**Subject:** Re: Glyn Rhonwy - Construction Noise Management Plan

Hi gwenan

Thanks for the email. Thanks for the approval of the CNMP.

In response to your concerns, night time limits have been provided as the ExA wanted reassurance of the maximum noise or vibration limits which will be for the development. The night time limit is based on guidance in MPG11 and was in the previous planning conditions (No.41). Does this assist?

Kind regards

Catherine

Catherine Anderson  
Associate Director

On 2 Sep 2016, at 11:09, Roberts Gwenan Mai (Rh-CTGC) <> wrote:

Dear Catherine,

I can confirm that we are happy with the tracked amendments to the CNMP.

However, the points raised in the e mail below require addressing. In response to the latest ExA questions we will be noting that we are seeking clarification on the references which have been made in to night time noise limits. It is our understanding that the only night time work to be undertaken are tunnelling operations.

Any works outside the specified hours would be subject to Prior Consent, and therefore we question the inclusion of a fixed night time level referred to in Appendix A point 3. of the Noise Management Plan Revision 2 Sept 2016.

Regards,

Gwenan

**Gwenan Mai Roberts**  
Rheolwr Gwarchod y Cyhoedd | Public Protection Manager  
Amgylchedd | Environment

-----  
-----  
-----  
Cyngor Gwynedd Council | Swyddfa Ardal Dwyfor | Pwllheli | Gwynedd | LL53 5AA  
-----  
-----

**From:** Anderson, Catherine []  
**Sent:** 01 September 2016 12:49  
**To:** Roberts Gwenan Mai (Rh-CTGC)



**Cc:** Duell Parri Moira Ann (Rh-CTGC); Muscroft Ffion (Rh-CTGC); Williams David Anthony (Rh-CTGC)  
**Subject:** RE: Glyn Rhonwy - Construction Noise Management Plan

Hi Gwenan and Moira

Please note that we are only asking your approval on the track changes. The points raised below have already been agreed at Deadline 7 by Euron and are also in line with Condition 41 of the T&CPA decision notice, therefore these have not changed. I attached the approval email for your information.

Please can you review and respond the track changes only which are in response to the ExA's requests.

Kind Regards  
Catherine

---

**From:** Roberts Gwenan Mai (Rh-CTGC) [ ]  
**Sent:** 01 September 2016 12:01  
**To:** Anderson, Catherine  
**Cc:** Duell Parri Moira Ann (Rh-CTGC); Muscroft Ffion (Rh-CTGC); Williams David Anthony (Rh-CTGC)  
**Subject:** FW: Glyn Rhonwy - Construction Noise Management Plan  
**Importance:** High

Good afternoon Catherine,

Please find below our comments on the revised Construction Noise Management Plan.

Comments on the minor amendments to the Baseline Air Quality Monitoring Plan and Dust Control & Air Quality Management Plan will be sent to you tomorrow morning.

Regards,

Gwenan

**Gwenan Mai Roberts**  
Rheolwr Gwarchod y Cyhoedd | Public Protection Manager  
Amgylchedd | Environment

-----  
Cyngor Gwynedd Council | Swyddfa Ardal Dwyfor | Pwllheli | Gwynedd | LL53 5AA  
-----  
---

**From:** Duell Parri Moira Ann (Rh-CTGC)  
**Sent:** 01 September 2016 11:50  
**To:** Roberts Gwenan Mai (Rh-CTGC)  
**Subject:** FW: Glyn Rhonwy - Construction Noise Management Plan  
**Importance:** High

We do not agree with part of the Construction Management Plan. The applicant has suggested daytime and night time noise limits that would be in line with guidance under MTAN 1, however the Construction Noise Management has been based on restricting working hours as

defined in the Control of Pollution Act 1974 s60/61, and as stated in point 3.3.1 of the Noise Management Plan Revision 2 Sept 2016.

07:00 – 19:00 hrs daytime hours and weekdays (Mon –Fri), and 07:00 – 13:00 Sat, no working Sundays and Bank Holidays.

Any works outside these hours would be subject to Prior Consent, and therefore Gwynedd Council do not agree with the need for a fixed night time level in Appendix A point 3. of the Noise Management Plan Revision 2 Sept 2016.

---

**From:** Anderson, Catherine

**Sent:** 01 September 2016 11:35

**To:** Roberts Gwenan Mai (Rh-CTGC)

**Cc:** Hughes Gwawr Teleri (Rh-CTGC); Julie Drew-Murphy; Lewis, Ben (Bilfinger GVA)

**Subject:** RE: Glyn Rhonwy - Construction Noise Management Plan

Morning Gwenan

Please find attached the revised Construction Noise Management Plan for your approval. The amends have been made in track changes for ease of reference. If you are able to provide your approval tomorrow this would be very much appreciated.

---

Kind Regards

Catherine

---

**From:** Anderson, Catherine

**Sent:** 31 August 2016 14:58

**To:** 'gwenanmaiwilliams'

**Cc:** Hughes Gwawr Teleri (Rh-CTGC); 'Julie Drew-Murphy'; 'Lewis, Ben (Bilfinger GVA)'

**Subject:** Glyn Rhonwy - Air / Dust Management Plans

Afternoon Gwenan

As part of the latest Rule 17 request from the ExA, there have been some very minor amends to the Baseline Air Quality Monitoring Plan and Dust Control & Air Quality Management Plan for the Glyn Rhonwy project. These have been made in track changes for ease of reference.

Please can you review and provide your approval of the changes so that we can finalise and certify for Deadline 9.

Please note that some minor amends are required in the Construction Noise Management Plan and this will follow tomorrow. The Operational Noise Management Plan remains unchanged.

Any queries please do not hesitate to contact me but it would greatly assist the submission if you are able to provide your approval by lunchtime on Friday or earlier if possible.

<< File: Dust\_AQ Plan\_D9\_Rev2\_final\_20160830\_track.docx >> << File: Baseline AQ Monitoring Plan\_D9 Rev2\_draft\_20160830\_track.docx >>

Kind Regards  
Catherine

Catherine Anderson  
EIA Associate Director  
Environment & Planning  
**AECOM**

*AECOM and URS have joined together as one company. [Learn more](#)*

---

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 ddosbarthu 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.