





Document	Document status									
Version	Purpose of document	Authored by	Reviewed by	Approved by	Review date					
F01	Procedural Deadline	RPS	Morgan Offshore Wind Limited	Morgan Offshore Wind Limited	August 2024					
F02	Deadline 1	RPS	Morgan Offshore Wind Limited	Morgan Offshore Wind Limited	October 2024					
F03	Deadline 2	RPS	Morgan Offshore Wind Limited	Morgan Offshore Wind Limited	October 2024					
F04	Deadline 3	RPS	Morgan Offshore Wind Limited	Morgan Offshore Wind Limited	November 2024					
Prepared by:	:	Prepared	Prepared for:							
RPS Morgan Offshore Wind Limited										



Contents

1	ERRA	NTA SHEET	
	1.1	Overview	1
Tab	les		
Table	1.1:	Errata	2
Table	1.2:	Errata that have been corrected in submitted documents	0
Арр	end	ix	
APPE	NDIX	A1	3



1 Errata Sheet

1.1 Overview

- 1.1.1.1 On 17 May 2024, the application by Morgan Offshore Wind Limited for an order granting development consent for the Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets (hereafter referred to as the 'Morgan Generation Assets') was accepted for Examination by the Planning Inspectorate. The Planning Inspectorate provided its advice on the application under section 51 of the Planning Act 2008. Relevant Representations were received on 25 July 2024. The Examination commenced on 10 September 2024 with the preliminary meeting and first Issue Specific Hearing (ISH1) held at Aintree Racecourse in Liverpool.
- 1.1.1.2 In response to points highlighted in Relevant Representations, at ISH1, within the Examining Authority (ExA) written questions arising from ISH1, Written Representations and in response to the ExA's First Written Questions, the Applicant has reviewed the application documentation for any errors or inconsistencies. The table below (Table 1.1) provides correction or clarification on matters identified and provides an update to the errata sheet submitted for the Procedural Deadline (PD1-003). A very small number of updates have been added at Deadline 1 (REP1-019), Deadline 2 (REP2-009) and Deadline 3 (S_D3_6 Morgan Gen_Errata Sheet F04).
- 1.1.1.3 Going forwards, the Applicant will continue to update the errata document for matters material to the assessment conclusions only. The Applicant also proposes to take the following approach:
 - The Applicant will maintain an errata sheet to be appended to the relevant application document at the end of the Examination (Deadline 6) where there are less than 10 errors
 - Where there are more than 10 errors, the Applicant will incorporate errata amends within updated application documents at the end of the Examination (Deadline 6).
- 1.1.1.4 The Applicant proposes to take a proportionate approach to ensure post-consent certified documents are accurate and easy to read.
- 1.1.1.5 The Applicant has also provided updated versions (tracked and clean) of Volume 4, Annex 5.1 Offshore ornithology baseline characterisation (APP-053). This includes previously identified errata (PD1-003) as well as updates to Appendix A and Section 1.5: Species accounts to account for a duplication of raw data associated with the December 2022 survey. The duplication of these data is restricted to Volume 4, Annex 5.1 Offshore ornithology baseline characterisation (APP-053) and does not affect other aspects of the application (e.g. abundance metric estimation, collision risk modelling or displacement analyses). Errata which have been corrected in updated documents are presented in Table 1.2.



Table 1.1: Errata.

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document Number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph/ Table/Figure	Error	Correction
1	PD	APP-014	Volume 2, Chapter 10: Seascape, landscape and visual resources	10.8.6.6 10.8.6.8 10.8.6.10 10.8.7.6 10.8.8.7 10.8.10.6 10.8.13.65 10.8.13.125 10.8.13.149 10.8.13.149 10.8.13.173 10.8.13.173 10.8.13.173	The paragraphs listed included the text '(i.e. very good visibility 20 km to 40 km approximately 70% of the year)'.	This text should read '(i.e. very good visibility 20 km to 40 km approximately 40% of the year)'.
2	PD	APP-057	Volume 4, Annex 5.5: Offshore ornithology apportioning technical report	Table 1.16	In the table listed the apportioning values presented for lesser black-backed gull at the Skomer, Skokholm and seas off Pembrokeshire SPA in the non-breeding season are incorrect. It should be noted that this is a transcription error only; the erroneous values were not used within the calculations informing any of the analyses or assessments presented in HRA Stage 2 information to support an appropriate assessment Part Three: Special Protection Areas and Ramsar Site assessments (APP-098), HRA Stage 1 Screening Report (APP-099) or	The correct values for Table 1.16 are presented in Appendix A of this errata document.



Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document Number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph/ Table/Figure	Error	Correction
					any other document supporting the application.	
3	PD	APP-099	HRA Stage 1 Screening report	Paragraph A.1.2.1.1 (Table A.1) of Appendix A	The collision risk estimates presented in paragraph A.1.2.1.1 (Table A.1) are incorrect.	The correct values for Table A.1 are presented in Appendix A of this errata document.
					This is a transcription error only and these values have not been used to inform the screening process undertaken in HRA Stage 1 Screening Report (APP-099) or any other document supporting the application. This process has used the collision risk estimates calculated incorporating the parameters recommended by the EWG.	
4	PD	APP-098	HRA Stage 2 information to support an appropriate assessment Part Three: Special Protection Areas and Ramsar Site	Table 1.26	The population provided in Table 1.26 of HRA Stage 2 information to support an appropriate assessment Part Three: Special Protection Areas and Ramsar Site assessments (APP-098) is incorrect. This is a transcription error only; the 2023 population has been used within	The breeding population used was 32,964 breeding adults representing the colony count undertaken in 2023 sourced from the online Seabird Monitoring Programme database (BTO et al., 2024). BTO, JNCC and RSPB (2024) Seabird Monitoring Programme. [Online]. Available at:
			assessments		the analyses presented in Table 1.26.	(Accessed August 2024).
5	PD	APP-022	Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals	Paragraph 4.9.6.16	The Applicant notes that the wording presented in paragraph 4.9.6.16 of Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine Mammals (APP-022) 'However, all geotechnical and geophysical surveys will be very short duration (up to several months), activities are likely to be intermittent, and animals are expected to recover quickly after cessation of the survey activities' was in error.	The correct wording should read: "However, all geotechnical and geophysical surveys will be of medium term duration (up to several months), activities are likely to be intermittent, and animals are expected to recover quickly after cessation of the survey activities." The Applicant considers surveys over a period of 'up to several months' to be of



Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document Number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph/ Table/Figure	Error	Correction
						paragraph 4.9.6.17 of Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals (APP-022).
6	PD	APP-072	Outline marine mammal mitigation protocol	Paragraph 1.7.2.3	The Applicant notes Natural England's comment relating to paragraph 1.7.2.3 of the Outline MMMP (APP-072) and agrees that the wording here is incorrect: 'The PTS onset ranges will be further reduced by application of ADDs, described in more detail in paragraph 1.7.5.1'.	The Applicant acknowledges that the PTS ranges will not be reduced by the application of ADDs, but instead the risk of injury within the modelled ranges will reduce. The correct wording should read: 'The risk of injury within the modelled ranges will reduce by the application of ADDs, described in more detail in paragraph 1.7.5.1'.
7	PD	APP-055	Volume 4, Annex 5.3: Offshore ornithology collision risk modelling technical report	Paragraph 1.3.4.5	Worked example should refer to 2,000 birds in the Morgan Survey Area rather than the Morgan Array Area.	The worked example should read as follows: ' if MRSea generated a density of 10 black-legged kittiwake per km² in the Morgan Array Area for all behaviours, and there were a total of 2,000 black-legged kittiwake in the raw data for the Morgan Survey Area, 600 of which were in flight. The density of flying birds in the Morgan Array Area would then be calculated as 600/2000 * 10 = 3 kittiwake per km².'
8	PD	APP-022	Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals	Table 4.10	The Isle of Man Territorial Seas Committee (TSC) provided a comment on the PEIR stating that "The TSC would request that appropriate consideration is given to the species which are protected under the Wildlife Act'. This was raised again within the TSC relevant representations (RR-015) where the TSC sought confirmation that treatment of species and sites protected under Manx legislation has been accounted for within the EIA process.	Wildlife Act 1990 (Isle of Man) should be included in the Conservation Importance column of Table 4.10 within Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals.



Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document Number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph/ Table/Figure	Error	Correction
9		APP-021	Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish	Paragraph 3.9.3.16	The inclusion of references to 135 dB re $1\mu Pa^2.s$ SELss and 160 dB re $1\mu Pa$ SPL _{pk} being roughly equivalent are included in error and should be disregarded; this statement is not reflected in the assessment outcomes and specific assessment content, and does not change the conclusions of the assessment. The assessment outcomes are based upon the maximum extent of behavioural contours presented, which are derived from the highly precautionary 135 dB re $1\mu Pa^2.s$ SELss contours, shown in Figure 3.6 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology (APP-021).	The correct wording should read: 'Discrete high and low intensity mapped herring spawning grounds are located off the east coast of the IoM at Douglas Bank. Underwater sound at levels with potential to cause behavioural effects to herring (135 dB re 1µPa².s SELss in line with the precautionary approach requested by stakeholders) from pile driving using a maximum hammer energy of 4,400 kJ overlap with these mapped grounds; the former encompasses both high and low intensity mapped spawning ground (54.9% of combined high and low intensity spawning grounds)'.
10	PD	APP-027	Volume 2, Chapter 9: Other sea users	Paragraph 9.5.2.22	Reference to Figure 9.6 is an error. It should refer to Figure 9.4.	Delete the words '(see Figure 9.6)' where they appear in paragraph 9.5.2.22 and replace with the words '(see Figure 9.4)'.
11	PD	APP-076	Mitigation and Monitoring Schedule	Tables 1.1 to 1.12	The table headings for the third column of each table currently state 'Description of mitigation, monitoring or enhancement measure' but should state 'Description of mitigation or monitoring measure'.	The table headings for the third column of each table should state 'Description of mitigation or monitoring measure'. This has been updated in the updated Mitigation and Monitoring Schedule submitted at Deadline 2.
12	PD	APP-053	Volume 4, Annex 5.1: Offshore ornithology baseline characterisation	See Table 1.2	See Table 1.2	See Table 1.2
13	PD	APP-053	Volume 4, Annex 5.1: Offshore ornithology baseline characterisation	See Table 1.2	See Table 1.2	See Table 1.2



Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document Number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph/ Table/Figure	Error	Correction
14	PD	APP-098	HRA Stage 2 information to support an appropriate assessment Part Three: Special Protection Areas and Ramsar Site assessments	Figure 1.1	The boxes presented in the diagram should be the other way round. The boxes should read: "Yes – Not taken to Stage 2. LSE can be ruled out" and "No – Taken to Stage 2. LSE can not be ruled out".	The boxes should read: "Yes – Not taken to Stage 2. LSE can be ruled out" and "No – Taken to Stage 2. LSE can not be ruled out".
15	PD	APP-059	Volume 4, Annex 6.1: Commercial fisheries technical report	Figure 1.1, Figure 1.44, Figure 1.50, Figure 1.51, Figure 1.52, Figure 1.53, Figure 1.54, Figure 1.56, Figure 1.61, Figure 1.62, Figure 1.66.		The 'Data Sources' box for each figure should read 'Marine Space, ICES, Contains public sector information licenced under the Open Government Licence v3.0'.
16	D1	APP-025	Volume 2, Chapter 7: Shipping and navigation	Paragraph 7.9.4.23	The text should read: 'three hour 45 minute' instead of 'two hour 45 minute'.	The paragraph should read as follows: 'The IoMSPC Heysham to Douglas adverse weather routeing accounts for an additional 10 to 23 minutes of additional journey time per crossing on a three hour 45 minute journey, as identified within the 2022 AIS data. These transits tend to trend to the southwest and therefore it has been assumed that vessels would pass to the south and west of the Morgan Array Area. A revised passage plan was developed for the Heysham to Douglas route which passes south of the Morgan Array Area, continuing to the west before turning north up to Douglas on a more stable course. This would necessitate an additional 5.7 nm of steaming and a further 21.5 minutes of transit time. This would be in addition to



Errata reference number	Deadline included		Volume and chapter	Paragraph/ Table/Figure	Error	Correction
						existing delays of approximately between 10 and 23 minutes to total delay of at least 31.5 minutes per crossing on an advertised journey of three hours and 45 minutes.'
17	D1	APP-071	Outline Vessel Traffic Management Plan (VTMP)	Paragraph 1.4.1.2	The paragraph was missing wording. 'In the absence of formal guidance, this plan is based which provides the legislative guidance for Passage Planning in the shipping sector and focuses on measures which improve safety of navigation International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS) chapter V (Annex 24 and Annex 25) n, and to reduce the risk of accidents occurring at sea, and Marine Guidance Note (MGN) 610 (M+F) which clarifies the application of SOLAS Chapter V in UK law.'	The paragraph should read as follows: 'In the absence of formal guidance, this plan is based on International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS) chapter V (Annex 24 and Annex 25) which provides the legislative guidance for Passage Planning in the shipping sector and focuses on measures which improve safety of navigation, and to reduce the risk of accidents occurring at sea, and Marine Guidance Note (MGN) 610 (M+F) which clarifies the application of SOLAS Chapter V in UK law.'
18	D1	APP-023	Volume 2, Chapter 5 Offshore ornithology	Table 5.173: Summary of potential cumulative environmental effects, mitigation and monitoring	Scenario 1, Disturbance and displacement from airborne noise, underwater sound, and presence of vessels and infrastructure: 'Residual effect' for Guillemot during operation is incorrectly presented as 'Minor adverse'.	Scenario 1, Disturbance and displacement from airborne noise, underwater sound, and presence of vessels and infrastructure: 'Residual effect' for Guillemot during operation should be 'Negligible'.
19	D1	APP-053	Volume 4, Annex 5.1: Offshore ornithology baseline characterisation	See Table 1.2	Please see the detail provided within Table 1.2.	Please see the detail provided within Table 1.2.
20	D1	APP-053	Volume 4, Annex 5.1: Offshore ornithology baseline characterisation	See Table 1.2	Please see the detail provided within Table 1.2.	Please see the detail provided within Table 1.2.



Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document Number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph/ Table/Figure	Error	Correction
21	D1	APP-053	Volume 4, Annex 5.1: Offshore ornithology baseline characterisation	Appendix D, Table D.3	Please see the detail provided within Table 1.2	Please see the detail provided within Table 1.2
22	D2	APP-060	Volume 4, Annex 7.1 Navigational risk assessment	Paragraph 1.9.3.6	Paragraph states that 'Hazards are then defined as either Broadly Acceptable, with existing mitigation, or Unacceptable'. This is a typographic error and as per Table 1.33 of Volume 4, Annex 7.1: Navigational Risk Assessment (APP-060), hazards were scored against three levels (Broadly Acceptable, Tolerable (if ALARP), and Unacceptable/Intolerable).	The paragraph should read as follows: 'Hazards are then defined as either Broadly Acceptable, Tolerable (if ALARP), and Unacceptable/Intolerable. MGN654 Annex 1 (MCA, 2021b) states that where risks are scored as Medium Risk, 'Further risk control options must be considered to the point where further risk control is grossly disproportionate (i.e. the ALARP principle) and an ALARP justification and declaration made.' Therefore, hazards scored as Medium Risk can only be Tolerable if ALARP is met'.
23	D3	APP-098	HRA Stage 2 information to support an appropriate assessment Part Three: Special Protection Areas and Ramsar Site assessments	Table 1.46	Table 1.46 (Summary of integrity test: Step 1) states that the breeding seabird assemblage feature of Rathlin Island SPA has been carried forward to Integrity Test: Step 2. The breeding assemblage of the Rathlin Island SPA does not require consideration in the Step 2 integrity test as the impact from the Morgan Generation Assets alone on all features that constitute the assemblage represents less than a 0.05% increase in the baseline mortality of the SPA population.	Table 1.46 should therefore state 'No' in the column 'Inclusion in Integrity test: Step 2 (Yes/No)' for the 'Breeding seabird assemblage' qualifying feature.
24	D3	AS-010	Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals	Paragraph A.1.1.1.63	Paragraph A.1.1.1.63 states "maximum number of animals predicted to be disturbed is up to 2,112 (Table A.8)". The table that should be referenced is Table A.2 and not Table A.8.	The cross reference in Paragraph A.1.1.1.63 should be to Table A.2, rather than Table A.8.



Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document Number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph/ Table/Figure	Error	Correction
25	D3	AS-010	Volume 2, Chapter 4 Marine mammals	Paragraph A.1.1.2.32	Paragraph A.1.1.2.32 states that the maximum cumulative number of harbour porpoises potentially affected by PTS from Morgan Generation Assets, Morgan and Morecambe Transmission Assets and Tier 1 projects is 650 animals, yet the figures supplied in Table A.7 for harbour porpoise whether summed or not, do not reflect the 650 number.	The sum of the relevant values presented in Table A.7 of Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine Mammals (AS-010) is 1,194 animals (in line with the individual numbers presented in Table A.7). The Applicant highlights the values in Table A.7 are correct and the error occurred in summing these values.
26	D3	APP-021	Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology	Paragraph 3.8.1.2	References to 'section 3.7.1.2' for mitigation measures are incorrect.	The Applicant confirms the mitigation measures are in section (paragraph) 3.8.1.2.
27	D3	APP-021	Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology	Paragraph 3.9.2.11	Paragraph 3.9.2.11 refers to the magnitude of impact on 'most subtidal IEFs', however this should state 'most fish and shellfish ecology IEFs'.	Paragraph 3.9.2.11 should refer to 'most fish and shellfish ecology IEFs'.
28	D3	APP-017	Volume 2, Chapter 13: Socio-economics	Table 13.89	Reference to 'medium (adverse) significance' in Table 13.89 is incorrect.	The use of the term 'medium (adverse) is a typographical error, which should read 'minor (adverse) significance'. This typographical error does not affect the conclusions of the assessment.
29	D3	APP-020	Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal ecology	Table 2.28 and Table 2.30	In Table 2.28, a minor adverse significance of effect is reported as 'significant in EIA terms'. In Table 2.30, minor adverse effects are reported as significant in EIA terms in all three scenarios.	The Applicant confirms that, as stated in section 5.3.6 of Volume 1, Chapter 5: Environmental impact assessment methodology (APP-012), significance levels of minor or less have been concluded to be not significant in terms of the EIA Regulations. Table 2.28 and Table 2.30 should therefore conclude that minor effects are 'not significant'.



Table 1.2: Errata that have been corrected in submitted documents.

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph /Table/ Figure	Error	Correction	Updated document reference
11	D2	APP-076	Mitigation and Monitoring Schedule	Tables 1.1 to 1.12	The table headings for the third column of each table currently state 'Description of mitigation, monitoring or enhancement measure' but should state 'Description of mitigation or monitoring measure'.	The table headings for the third column of each table should state 'Description of mitigation or monitoring measure'. This has been updated in the updated Mitigation and Monitoring Schedule submitted at Deadline 2.	S_D2_10 F02
12	PD	APP-053	Volume 4, Annex 5.1: Offshore ornithology baseline characterisati on	Table A.2	Copy and paste error. Table A.2 is titled the same as previously presented table.	Table title should be "Raw count data for the Morgan Offshore Ornithology survey area between April 2022 and March 2023". This correction has been made in version F02 of Volume 4, Annex 5.1: Offshore ornithology baseline characterisation submitted at Deadline 1.	F4.5.1 F02
13	PD	APP-053	Volume 4, Annex 5.1: Offshore ornithology baseline characterisati on	Table 1.15 Table 1.16 Table 1.17 Table 1.19 Table 1.24 Table 1.28	The table captions are incorrect and should not include reference to model-based abundance estimates. Only design-based abundance estimates were calculated for common gull, great black-backed gull, herring gull, lesser black-backed gull, puffin and fulmar as the abundance of these species was too low for MRSea modelling to be carried out.	The table captions should read: Table 1.15: Design-based (all behaviour) population estimates with lower and upper (95%) confidence limits for each month surveyed from April 2021 to March 2023 for the Morgan Generation Assets study area for common gull. Table 1.16: Design-based (all behaviour) population estimates with lower and upper (95%) confidence limits for each month surveyed from April 2021 to March 2023 for the Morgan Generation Assets study area for great black-backed gull. Table 1.17: Design-based (all behaviour) population estimates with lower and upper (95%) confidence	F4.5.1 F02



Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph /Table/ Figure	Error	Correction	Updated document reference
						limits for each month surveyed from April 2021 to March 2023 for the Morgan Generation Assets study area for herring gull.	
						Table 1.19: Design-based (all behaviour) population estimates with lower and upper (95%) confidence limits for each month surveyed from April 2021 to March 2023 for the Morgan Generation Assets study area for lesser black-backed gull.	
						Table 1.24: Design-based (all behaviour) population estimates with lower and upper (95%) confidence limits for each month surveyed from April 2021 to March 2023 for the Morgan Generation Assets study area for puffin.	
						Table 1.28: Design-based (all behaviour) population estimates with lower and upper (95%) confidence limits for each month surveyed from April 2021 to March 2023 for the Morgan Generation Assets study area for fulmar.	
						This correction has been made in version F02 of Volume 4, Annex 5.1: Offshore ornithology baseline characterisation submitted at Deadline 1.	
19	D1	APP-053	Volume 4, Annex 5.1: Offshore ornithology baseline	Appendix A. Section 1.5	Raw data presented in Appendix A and behavioural data in Section 1.5: Species accounts included a duplication of raw data associated with the December 2022 survey.	Raw data presented in Appendix A and behavioural data in Section 1.5: Species accounts have been updated to account for a duplication of raw data	F4.5.1 F02



Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph /Table/ Figure	Error	Correction	Updated document reference
			characterisati on			associated with the December 2022 survey.	
						The duplication of these data is restricted to Volume 4, Annex 5.1: Offshore ornithology baseline characterisation (APP-053) and does not affect other aspects of the application (e.g. abundance metric estimation, collision risk modelling or displacement analyses).	
20	D1		Volume 4, Annex 5.1: Offshore ornithology baseline characterisati on	Table A.2	The data presented in the March 2023 column of Table A.2 in APP-053 represented the total number of raw observations in all months of the survey programme, rather than the raw data for the March 2023 survey only.	The data presented in the March 2023 column of Table A.2 in APP-053 has been corrected to include only the raw data for the March 2023 survey.	F4.5.1 F02
						This does not affect any other aspect of the application.	
21	D1	APP-053	Volume 4, Annex 5.1:	Appendix D, Table D.3	Table D.3 contained missing data.	Table D.3 has been populated with the relevant data.	F4.5.1 F02
			Offshore ornithology baseline characterisati on			This does not affect any other aspect of the application.	



Appendix A.

APP-057

The calculation of apportioning values for use in the non-breeding season for lesser black-backed gull at the Skomer, Skokholm and Seas off Pembrokeshire SPA.

Table 1.16: Calculation of non-breeding season apportioning values for lesser black-backed gull.

	Apportioning value									
	Autumn migration (August to October)		Winter (November to February)			Spring migration (March to April)				
SPA	BDMPS population (no. of individuals)	Number of breeding adults in BDMPS population from SPA	Apportioning value (%)	BDMPS population (no. of individuals)	Number of breeding adults in BDMPS population from SPA	Apportioning value (%)	BDMPS population (no. of individuals)	Number of breeding adults in BDMPS population from SPA	Apportioning value (%)	
Skomer, Skokholm and Seas off Pembrokeshire	UK western waters = 163,304	13,496	8.26	UK western waters = 41,159	3,856	9.37	UK western waters = 163,305	13,496	8.26	

Document Reference: S_D3_5 Page 13



APP-099

Impact estimates (all birds) used as part of the screening exercise presented in Appendix A: Apportioning assessment for designated sites of HRA Stage 1 Screening Report (APP-099). These values are calculated using Natural England's recommended parameters (Natural England, pers. comm., 7 July 2022) for use in collision risk modelling and the upper range associated with displacement and mortality rates as applied in displacement analyses for each species.

Table A.1: Annual predicted mortality estimates across species and seasons from collision risk and displacement.

Species	Mortality collisions	Mortality displacement	Mortality combined
Kittiwake	40.0	171.3	211.3
Great black-backed gull	4.6	N/A	N/A
Herring gull	10.1	N/A	N/A
Lesser black-backed gull	1.2	N/A	N/A
Guillemot	N/A	267.7 (non-breeding season only)	N/A
Razorbill	N/A	122.6 (non-breeding seasons only)	N/A
Fulmar	N/A	1.4	N/A
Manx shearwater	<0.1	21.7	N/A
Gannet	1.5	20.3	21.8

Document Reference: S D3 5 Page 14