

Examining Authority's Second Round of Questions

This is the Examining Authority's second round of written questions (EAQs) and requests for information. Responses should be received by the Examining Authority (ExA) (also referred to as the Panel) on or before **Wednesday 18 November 2015 at noon**. The Panel has noted that some of the responses to requests for information arising from the hearings will be submitted at deadline 4 and has tried to ensure that those requests for information are not repeated in these questions.

Questions are asked of interested and/or other parties, where applicable, these have been identified against each question. In addition to any identified party, all interested parties are welcome to respond to any question wherever they have relevant information to offer.

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
0.0		Option B
0.1	Interested Parties	The Panel proposes to undertake a further set of unaccompanied site inspections in December 2015 in order to observe the Rhyl Flats double wood pole line and the alternative viewpoints suggested by Denbighshire County Council in relation to Option A (the original application). Do any Interested Parties wish to suggest locations for site inspections that they would wish the Panel to visit in relation to Option B proposals? These suggestions could be for either unaccompanied inspections at locations which are accessible from public roads or footpaths, or accompanied site inspections on privately owned land, (so long as the land owner consents to the inspection taking place).
0.2	The Applicant, Interested Parties, Affected Persons and their Land-agents	Please could the Applicant, Interested Parties and Affected Persons provide details of requests that were made to the applicant for the pole locations that were proposed in the original application (Option A) to be moved, where these requests could not be accommodated within Option B, and provide the reasons why these requests were made and why they could not be included in Option B.
0.3	Interested Parties, Affected Persons and their Land-agents	Please could Interested Parties/Affected Persons who have had their concerns addressed through changes to the pole locations in Option B, confirm whether the changes made to the pole locations in Option B affect their original written representations and/or any

		objections that have been made to the Compulsory Acquisition of Rights, and explain how their original representation is modified in respect of Option B. Please could Interested Parties/Affected Persons and/or their agents provide details of the relevant land plots and pole numbers in their responses.
0.4	The Applicant	The Environmental Report in Support of Option B (ERISOB) identifies in paragraph 3.5.1 that Option B would result in a net increase in the Order Limit land area of 1425.4m ² and an increase to the limit of deviation of 740.4m ² . However the Option B Compulsory acquisition (CA) Document, in the table following paragraph 4.3 states that "SP Manweb considers that the Funding Statement submitted in March 2015 applies equally to the proposed provision and therefore this document should be read to apply to the proposed provision." Please could the Applicant explain why the funding liability would not be changed for Option B and provide evidence that their independent advisor who advises on CA matters agrees with this statement.
0.5	DCC, CCBC and other Interested Parties	Do the LPAs and other Interested Parties agree with the Applicant's ERISOB, particularly in respect of the conclusions on landscape effects, visual effects and residential visual amenity effects. If not, why not?
0.6	The Applicant	The ERISOB notes that although there would be some changes in the magnitude of effects at some locations due to the relocation of poles, this would not result in any changes to the conclusions on significance contained in the Environmental Statement (ES). The receptors that could be affected are identified, however it is not stated if any of the changes in magnitude would be so great as to result in the magnitude category changing (as set out in the ES Chapter 7, paragraph 7.4.100). In addition, although it is stated that for each changed pole location there will be no change to the significance of potential visual effects, it is not always identified whether or not there would be any changes in magnitude, for example at changes 4, 11 and 13. Please could the Applicant consider the changes in magnitude that would result from the relocation of poles in Option B and clarify these points.
0.7	The Applicant	Paragraphs 3.6.5-3.6.7 of the ERISOB state that the effects of Option B Change 1 on residential visual amenity at Hafod Olygfa would remain the same as identified in the ES. However the Panel notes that the ES concludes that the effects would be minor, but notes

		that if the poles were located on the edge of the Limits of Deviation (LoD) (ES Appendix 7.1, Table 3.1, Ref 19), the effects could become moderate, and therefore significant. Option B would result in this scenario, so does this represent a change to the conclusion on visual amenity effects in relation to this receptor?
0.8	The Applicant	It is unclear whether in relation to Change 13 (ERISOB paragraphs 3.6.24 -3.6.27) one or two pole positions are being realigned ie poles 176 and/or 177. It is also unclear on the Comparison Plan sheet 11. Please could the Applicant confirm what the proposed changes are in these pole locations?
0.9	The Applicant	The ERISOB does not make any reference to any potential changes to cumulative effects identified in the ES in relation to any topic. Please could the applicant confirm whether any changes in cumulative effects would arise from Option B, particularly in relation to landscape and visual impact matters.
0.10	The Applicant	Please can the Applicant provide a copy of the Option B draft Development Consent Order (DCO) as a track change document (based on the Option A draft DCO v3 (October 2015) edition).
1.0		Principles of Development: Assessment Approach and Policy
1.1	The Applicant	<p>(a) The Panel requests that the Applicant provides justification for interpreting the term 'serious concerns' from paragraph 2.8.8 of NPS EN-5 as "adverse significant landscape and visual effects that are over and above that expected for this type of project."</p> <p>(b) The Panel considers that the term 'serious concerns' in paragraph 2.8.8 of NPS EN-5 does not relate directly to a particular minimum level of impact applicable to all such NSIPs, but rather simply to the level of <u>concern</u> about whatever level of potential adverse landscape and visual effects there may be. The definition used by the applicant for 'serious concerns' suggests that it considers that there is only a single standard level of impact one would expect from an overhead line as a general concept applicable to all overhead lines across the country, as opposed to each proposed line requiring its own assessment. Please could the Applicant confirm whether this is the case?</p> <p>(c) Please could the Applicant provide its view on whether, even if there was only a</p>

		<p>single method of construction, a single pole or pylon height and a single set of materials available to all power line developers, that uniform construction could have very different landscape and visual effects at different locations, giving cause for serious concerns at some, but not at others?</p> <p>(d) Paragraph 2.8.9 of NPS EN-5 goes on to say that, "Therefore, each project should be assessed individually on the basis of its specific circumstances and taking account of the fact that Government has not laid down any general rule about when an overhead line should be considered unacceptable". Please could the Applicant explain how its proposed definition of the term 'serious concerns' fits with this statement from Government in the NPS?</p>
1.2	The Applicant	<p>The Panel understands that the northern section of the proposed development beyond the terminal poles would be undergrounded, and as the Applicant regards this to be 'associated development' in Wales, this is not included in the 'Works' in the Order Limit. However, as the compulsory acquisition of rights over this land has been requested, the Panel requires clarification on two matters: -</p> <p>(a) Where the cable would go underground, what would be the construction process for installing the cable, for example the depth and width of trench that would be dug, location and number of any inspection hatches necessary and timescale for these construction works; and</p> <p>(b) Why was this section of the route chosen for undergrounding the cable over other sections of the route, for example: -</p> <p>(i) those locations suggested by CCBC where it considers that the route should be undergrounded; or</p> <p>(ii) in locations where it was identified in the ES that there would be likely to be a significant effect upon residential receptors?</p>
2.0		Nature of the Proposed Development and Relationship with the Wind Farms at Clocaenog, Brenig, Derwydd Bach and Nant Bach as well as the Electricity Sub-station at St Asaph and the new Collector Station at Clocaenog Forest
		No further questions at present.
3.0		Construction Impacts including Noise and Vibration, Traffic and Aerial Emissions

		No further questions at present.
4.0		Operational Impacts Including Land-use, Land-take and Land-management, Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMFs), Noise and Community Benefits
		Land-use, Land-take and Land-management
4.1	The Applicant	<p>The Applicant has stated in its written summary of oral evidence in relation to Issue Specific Hearing (ISH) Day 3 (1 Oct 2015) "There is no extant ALC survey that differentiates between Grade 3a or 3b. Therefore, the Applicant has assumed a worst case scenario and carried out its assessment on the basis that all land affected by the Proposed Development is Grade 3a and therefore BMV land."</p> <p>(a) Is this correct?</p> <p>(b) Please could the Applicant provide an update/addendum to the Land Use and Agriculture Chapter of the ES that identifies the land take areas for both Options A and Options B in relation to whether they are ALC Grade 3 (BMV Land) or ALC Grade 4 as well as the percentages of the two ALC land grades along the route of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>(c) In addition, ES chapter 10, paragraph 10.7.1 and Table 10.1 (compliance with NPS EN-1 requirements, page 1) also need to be amended to reflect the fact that there is a considerable amount of BMV land along the route of the development.</p>
4.2	The Applicant	Please could the Applicant explain why the Land Use and Agriculture Chapter of the ES does not provide assessments of significance of impacts upon farm operations for individual farm units and does not consider that this information is necessary.
4.3	The Applicant	<p>The Panel notes that the Applicant will provide information for DL4 as to how they will assist landowners/farmers with both managing potential breaches of agri-environment schemes and cross compliance and also assist landowners/farmers in informing the relevant body of a potential and actual breach.</p> <p>(a) Please could the Applicant explain how this assistance would be secured.</p> <p>(b) Please could the Applicant explain the different mechanisms that would be required for a foreseen breach due to a known operation and an unforeseen breach due, for example, to adverse weather conditions during construction.</p>
		Other Operational Matters – Electro and Magnetic Fields (EMFs)
4.4	Interested Parties	The Applicant has submitted a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) with the Local Health

		Board for North Wales (Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board), dated 10 September 2015. It states that the Local Health Board for North Wales is satisfied with the conclusion of the ES that the Proposed Development will not give rise to exposure to EMFs above the maximum levels set out in DECC's Code of Practice 'Power Lines: Demonstrating Compliance with Public Exposure Guidelines'. Are other Interested Parties (who originally commented upon potential risks arising from EMFs) satisfied with this conclusion in the SoCG, which is quoted above? If not, why not?
		Other Operational Matters – Health and Safety
4.5	Cllr Alice Jones of Denbighshire County Council	In her Written Representation to the Panel, submitted prior to the Issue Specific Hearing (ISH) on Thursday 1 October, Councillor Alice Jones stated, "Last year there were 89 incidents on farmland in North Wales and Merseyside. This is an extremely high number as the harvest and field work involved lasts just over six months of the year..". Please could Cllr. Jones provide the Panel with details identifying where the information stating the number of incidents on farms came from and provide a web-link or PDF version of the original report or document to the Examination?
4.6	The Applicant	In his oral evidence to the Panel on ISH Day 3, Mr Huw Thomas gave brief details of two fatalities that had happened this year in relation to vehicles and/or mobile plant coming into contact with SP Manweb's overhead wires. Please could the applicant provide brief summaries of what happened in those two incidences and what steps have been taken to minimise the risk of those types of fatalities happening again?
4.7	The Applicant	The Panel notes that the Health and Safety Executive's (HSE) document 'Shock Horror' has recently been withdrawn from the HSE website and has been replaced by 'Working Safely near overhead electricity power lines'. However, the Applicant has submitted a copy of 'Shock Horror' into the examination as part of Appendix 8 to the written summary of oral evidence for ISH Day 3. Paragraph 5.4.2(a) of the Applicant's ISH Day 3 written summary of oral evidence states that Appendix 8 contains both 'Shock Horror' and 'Working safely near overhead electricity power lines – Agricultural Information Sheet No. 8', but in fact it only contains 'Shock Horror'. Please could the Applicant provide a copy of the other document for Deadline 4?
4.8	The Applicant and	'Shock Horror' states that if you wish to work near overhead power lines (OHPLs) you

	Affected Persons	<p>should use barriers or goalposts to limit access. It then goes on to describe how these features should be painted red and white so that they are highly visible.</p> <p>(a) Has the Applicant considered how many barriers and goalpost structures would be required along the length of the route? If not, why not?</p> <p>(b) Has the Applicant considered the visual impact arising from red and white goalposts along the length of the cable? If so, please could the paragraph number/document number details be provided? If not, why not?</p> <p>(c) Please could Affected Persons provide evidence to the Examination identifying where, in their view, if the development was consented, they would need to construct barriers and/or goalposts to mark the locations of the overhead wires to minimise the risk of tractors/sprayers/mobile plant and tipper lorries etc. coming into contact with the wires?</p>
4.9	The Applicant	<p>'Shock Horror' also states under 'controls' that if high machines frequently work near OHPLs eg in the farmyard, "consult your local electricity company about burying or diverting the line". Was this advice to farmers taken into consideration in designing the proposed development or in the ES? If so, please could the applicant provide the document reference and paragraph number(s) where this matter is discussed. If not, why not?</p>
4.10	The Applicant	<p>In the Applicant's written evidence following the ISH Hearing (Day 3) of 1 October, it states in response to agenda item 4.2.7 whether this been resolved: -</p> <p>"(a) The Applicant has not received any response from the Ministry of Defence.</p> <p>(b) It is considered, in the context of the experience that the Applicant has gained from constructing similar projects, that it is unlikely that a maximum structure height of 18.4m (which includes the permitted 2m vertical limits of deviation) is not likely to pose any concern to the Ministry of Defence."</p> <p>(a) Part b of this note contains two negatives, is this worded correctly?</p> <p>(b) The Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) responded at Deadline 3 stating, amongst other things, "Although not close to an aerodrome the developer/ planning authority should contact the Ministry of Defence (MOD) and National Air Traffic Service (NATS) who may wish to comment on this proposal. To address the</p>

		<p>question of military aircraft safety you should contact the Head of Safeguarding, Defence Infrastructure Organisation, Kingston Road, Sutton Coldfield B75 7RL (DIOSEE-EPSSG1a@mod.uk). NATS can be contacted at natssafeguarding@nats.co.uk."</p> <p>Has the applicant contacted NATS in relation to this proposal, and if so, please could their response be submitted to the Examination?</p>
5.0		Decommissioning Phase
		No further questions at present.
6.0		Species and Habitats – European Sites and Other Designated Sites and Protected Species
		European Sites – No Significant Effect Report (NSER)
6.1	Welsh Government and NRW	<p>(a) Please could the Welsh Government explain what they meant in their Deadline 1 comment regarding Greenland White Fronted Geese, ".....general precautions in respect of large birds would probably minimise any risk to this endangered and iconic species." What are those "general precautions"?</p> <p>(b) For the avoidance of doubt, please could NRW provide their views on this matter?</p>
7.0		Flood Risk, Water Resources and Climate Change Adaptation
		No further questions at present.
8.0		Landscape and Visual Impact
8.1	The Applicant and Interested Parties	<p>In the Appendices to SP Manweb's Responses to First Written Questions, (PINS Document Library reference [REP1-082]), the Updated Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan v2 (September 2015), paragraph 3.3.2 (second bullet point), states, "Replanting of trees would be partially undertaken as secondary mitigation and partially by agreement with landowners".</p> <p>(a) Please could the Applicant expand on this statement especially explaining how a reluctant landowner would be accommodated.</p> <p>(b) Please could Interested Parties provide their interpretation of the above sentence.</p>
9.0		Heritage Impacts
9.1		<p>(a) In the Appendices to SP Manweb's Responses to First Written Questions, (PINS Document Library reference [REP1-082]), the Updated Outline Construction</p>

		<p>Environmental Management Plan v2 (September 2015), paragraph 3.4.5 states, "Those remains identified outside of the Order Limits will be identified clearly on plans..." What is the maximum distance outside the Order Limits for this process?</p> <p>(b) Paragraph 3.4.6 of this document refers to "sufficient time", please could the applicant be more precise and explain what is meant by "sufficient time"?</p> <p>(c) Similarly, the following phase needs to be clarified, "their continuing preservation will be considered by the appointed monitor in conjunction with SP Manweb". What is the criteria for this process?</p>
10.0		Socio-Economic Impacts
10.1	The Applicant	<p>Pylon the Pressure Group's representation for Deadline 3 provides the details of 46 self-catering, holiday cottages, B&B providers, hotels and guest houses that are in close proximity to the route of the proposed development.</p> <p>(a) How many of these providers of holiday accommodation were asked to participate in the Applicant's survey of tourism related businesses?</p> <p>(b) How many of these providers of holiday accommodation responded to the survey?</p> <p>(c) If they were not selected to participate in the survey, why not?</p>
11.0		Compulsory Acquisition of Rights over Land etc
11.1	The Applicant and Affected Persons and their Land-agents	<p>The Panel has prepared a schedule of Interested Parties and Affected Persons that have objected to the compulsory acquisition (CA) of rights over land in their representations. The Panel proposes to keep this schedule updated during the remainder of the Examination. It is attached as Table 1.</p> <p>(a) Please could the Applicant, Interested Parties, Affected Persons and their agents check it for accuracy and provide any changes or additions that they consider should be made to it (by track changes or provision of a note submitted by the 18 November); and</p> <p>(b) Please could the Applicant assist with populating the column identifying land plots and pole numbers.</p>
11.2	The Applicant and BT	<p>Appendix 3 to the Applicant's written summary of oral evidence for the ISH on CA matters on the 24 and 25 September provides a long email chain between BT and the Applicant. The final email from a BT representative states, "These provisions are fine. To note; any</p>

		<p>alterations will be under Para 23 of the Code. No cost share.”</p> <p>The Panel considers that this does not provide sufficient evidence that BT is in agreement with the Protective Provision wording that is provided in Schedule 9, Part 1 (For the Protection of Operators of Electronic Communications Code Networks) in draft DCO v3 (dated October 2015). For the avoidance of doubt, please could the Applicant ask BT to provide a signed, dated letter from BT stating that they are in agreement with the wording contained in the relevant Protective Provision in the most recent edition of the draft DCO, with the original (signed version of the paper document) submitted to the Examination.</p>
11.3	The Applicant	Please could the Applicant submit a signed, dated, paper copy of Appendix 6 to the Examination (the Statement from Mr Gareth Roberts regarding his independent auditing of the CA liability calculations).
11.4	The Applicant	<p>The Applicant’s response to the first written questions, in relation to question number 11.10(d), regarding the request for the CA of rights for the northern section of the Order stated that it considers that “there is a precedent for this approach in the Hirwaun Generating Station Order 2015, where the Secretary of State granted compulsory acquisition powers for the gas connection and the electrical connection which were necessary for the generating station but which did not receive development consent in the order”.</p> <p>Please could the Applicant provide an explanation why it considers that the Hirwaun Generating Station Order 2015 provides justification for the approach being requested for the CA of rights for works which are not included in the DCO at NWWFC.</p>
11.5	Mr Meilir Jones and the Applicant	<p>(a) Please could Mr Meilir Jones provide a copy of the planning permission that has been granted for his proposed bungalow, which is referred to in representation 10031312 and again in the Deadline 3 representation of the 14 October, either as a PDF or as a web-link to the relevant permission on the planning authority’s website.</p> <p>(b) Please could the Applicant confirm whether this proposed residential property was considered in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), and if so please provide the paragraph numbers. If not, why not?</p>
12.0		Other Draft Development Consent Matters

12.1	The Applicant	<p>Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) v2 (September 2015) contained the definition of “distribution” which included the words, “...is used for conveying electricity from a generating station to a substation”, and the definition of “operate” which “means one or any of the following: to put or keep working in operation, the distribution and export of electricity together with the running, activating, managing, controlling and utilising that distribution...” whereas the definition of “operate” has been deleted in v3 of the draft DCO and the definition of “distribution” has been changed in the draft DCO v3 (October 2015) to “distribution system” which is “...used for the distribution of electricity from grid supply points or generation sets or other entry points to the points of delivery to customers or authorised electricity operators”.</p> <p>(a) Does this mean that if the DCO is made using the terminology in v3 of the draft DCO, the cables could be used for the import or export of electricity?</p> <p>(b) Why has this change been made? and</p> <p>(c) How can the Applicant justify this change as the ES and application documents are predicated upon the cable connection being the “North Wales Wind Farms Connection” serving four (now three) wind farms?</p>
12.2	Interested Parties	Do Interested Parties have comments to make upon these changes to definitions?
12.3	The Applicant and DCC	At Deadline 3, DCC supplied comments from Development Services (Highways and Transportation Department) in relation to draft Articles 13-16 stating that they do not agree with the powers that are being sought in relation to draft DCO Part 3 Section 10 (power to alter the streets) and also they do not agree with the transfer of highway powers to the undertaker. Please could the Applicant and the Highways Authority resolve these matters outside the Examination hearings and provide an agreed form of wording for the relevant articles and schedules by 18 November?
12.4	The Applicant and Interested Parties	Draft DCO v3 Article 19 would authorise the Applicant to create and acquire compulsorily various classes of rights and impose restrictions. As Class 2(b)(g)(h)(i) and (j) and Class 4 are for temporary rights only should Article 19(1) be changed to remove rights that are defined as temporary in the Book of Reference from this article? If not, why not?
12.5	The Applicant	<p>Draft DCO v3 Article 23 (Private Rights).</p> <p>(a) Why does the Applicant need to extinguish private rights under this article</p>

		<p>(A23(1)), when the aim of the compulsory acquisition being requested is to obtain rights over land, not the land itself?</p> <p>(b) Please could the Applicant give examples clarifying why the extinguishment of rights is necessary here?</p>
12.6	The Applicant	<p>Draft DCO v3 Article 27 (Temporary Use of Land for Carrying Out the Authorised Development).</p> <p>A27(4) does not include the need for the Applicant to remove all permanent works, it only requires them to remove all temporary works before giving up land that was the subject of temporary possession.</p> <p>(a) Would this enable the Applicant to retain permanent structures on land that had been the subject of temporary possession, even if CA rights are not exercised over those plots of land?</p> <p>(b) If so, is this justifiable and/or correct?</p>
12.7	The Applicant	<p>At Deadline 3, the Applicant's written note of its oral evidence in relation to the ISH on the DCO (2 October 2015), at paragraph 6.8.4 regarding Conwy County Borough Council's (CCBC) suggestions (to amend Schedule 1 of the Draft DCO to request that two areas of the cable route be undergrounded, namely at the crossing under the A543 and at the area around Berain Farm) was that, "It was noted by Mr Griffiths that there would need to be an Option C put forward by the Applicant to cater for any undergrounding of the overhead electric line in the locations proposed by Conwy County Borough Council."</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt, the Panel wishes the Applicant to clarify whether it is proposing to submit an application for a change to its application to cater for such an 'Option C'.</p>
12.8	The Applicant, DCC, CCBC and other Interested Parties	<p>Draft DCO v3 R16 has been modified slightly to include a need for consultation with NRW during the approval process and the deletion of "the parameters specified in requirement 3(2)" in R16(1). Do draft DCO R3(2) and R16 now give the applicant the ability to change the design parameters in such a way that the development could be modified in such a way that it no longer would be in line with the scheme as assessed in the Environmental Statement (ES)?</p>
12.9	The Applicant, DCC and CCBC	<p>The draft DCO v3, R18 now states, "In the event that, at some future date, numbered works 1A and 1B are no longer in use and there is no likelihood of numbered works 1A and</p>

		<p>1B being in use, the undertaker is to.....” and then provides the actions that have to be taken to commence the decommissioning and restoration plan.</p> <p>(a) Please could the Applicant now provide a definition of “in use” for example, “when there are wind turbines within the TAN 8 area that are both connected to the development and operational”; and</p> <p>(b) Whilst the Panel acknowledges that the LPAs have provided their own suggestion for a decommissioning requirement, please could DCC and CCBC provide their views on the Applicant’s revised wording in this requirement, on a ‘without prejudice’ basis, for example would it meet the requirements of Welsh Circular 11/95 in terms of being enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other aspects?</p> <p>(c) The Applicant’s written statement of its oral evidence in relation to the ISH on the draft DCO (2 October 2015), paragraph 9.57.1 states that, “Under Requirement 18(1), where electricity is no longer being generated by and transmitted from the Wind Farms, a requirement is triggered for the undertaker to produce a report setting out whether the authorised development will continue to be in operation (e.g. because another generating station has been connected to it which requires it to remain in operation), and if so, the identity of the generating station(s) from which it is distributing and exporting electricity;” This refers to the ‘distribution and export’ of electricity, but not the ‘import’ of energy. Has the Applicant’s stance on this matter changed since the ISH was held, and if so why?</p>
12.10	DCC and CBCC	Please could the two LPAs confirm whether they are satisfied that the wording of the draft DCO v3 (October 2015) Schedule 10 (in relation to the procedure for discharge of requirements) takes into account their concerns and is now acceptable (or not).
13.0		Construction Environmental Management Plan; Ecological Management Plan, Landscaping Plan, Traffic Management Plan etc
		No further questions at present.

27 October 2015

Glossary:

A	Article (from the Planning Act 2008)	LA	Local Authority
ALC	Agricultural Land Classification	LVIA	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
AP	Affected Person	LoD	Limits of Deviation
		LWS	Local Wildlife Site
BoR	Book of Reference		
BMV	Best and Most Versatile (Land)	MOD	Ministry of Defence
CA	Compulsory Acquisition	NATS	National Air Traffic Service
CAA	Civil Aviation Authority	NPS	National Policy Statements
CCBC	Conwy County Borough Council	NRW	Natural Resources Wales
CEMP	Construction Environment Management Plan	NSER	No Significant Effect Report
COSHH	Control of Substances Hazardous to Health	NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
		NWWFCP	North Wales Wind Farms Connection Project
DCC	Denbighshire County Council	OHPLS	Overhead Power Lines
DCO	Development Consent Order	OLMP	Outline Landscape Management Plan
DCWW	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water		
DECC	Department of Energy and Climate Change		
DL	Deadline	PA2008	Planning Act 2008
		PPW	Planning Policy Wales
EMF	Electric and magnetic fields	PSTA	Planning Statement Technical Appendices
ERISOB	Environmental Report in Support of Option B		
ES	Environmental Statement	R	Requirement
ESNTS	Environmental Statement Non-Technical	RR	Relevant Representation
Summary			
FCA	Flood Consequences Assessment	SAC	Special Area for Conservation
		SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
		SoR	Statement of Reason
HRA	Habitats Regulation Assessment	SPA	Special Protection Area
HSE	Health and Safety Executive	SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
		SU	Statutory Undertaker
ISH	Issue Specific Hearing		
IP	Interested Parties	TAN	Technical Advice Note