

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Errata Sheet

Deadline: Procedural Deadline

Application Reference: EN01037

Document number: MOCNS-J3303-RPS-10207

Document Reference: S_PD_1

25 June 2024

F01



Image of an offshore wind farm

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Document status

Version	Purpose of document	Authored by	Reviewed by	Approved by	Review date
F01	Procedural Deadline	Mona Offshore Wind Ltd	Mona Offshore Wind Ltd	Mona Offshore Wind Ltd	June 2024

Prepared by:

Mona Offshore Wind Ltd.

Prepared for:

Mona Offshore Wind Ltd.

Contents

1 ERRATA SHEET 2

Tables

Table 1.1: Errata. 3

1 Errata Sheet

- 1.1.1.1 On 21 March 2024, the application by Mona Offshore Wind Limited for an order granting Development Consent for the Mona Offshore Wind Project was accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate.
- 1.1.1.2 In response to the section 51 advice issued following acceptance of the Application, and in response to points highlighted in Relevant Representations, the Applicant has reviewed the application documentation for any errors or inconsistencies. The table below provides correction or clarification on matters identified (with the exception of ornithology errata, as set out in 1.1.1.3).
- 1.1.1.3 An update to this document will be provided at Deadline 1, and will address errata identified by Interested Parties, and by the Applicant, with respect to ornithology documents (Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology (APP-057), Volume 6, Annex 5.1: Offshore Ornithology Baseline Characterisation Technical Report (APP-091), Volume 6, Annex 5.2: Offshore Ornithology Displacement Technical Report (APP-092), Volume 6, Annex 5.3: Offshore ornithology collision risk modelling technical report (APP-093), Volume 6, Annex 5.4: Offshore ornithology migratory bird Collision Risk Modelling technical report (APP-094), Volume 6, Annex 5.5: Offshore ornithology apportioning technical report (APP-094), Volume 6, Annex 5.6: Offshore ornithology population viability analysis technical report (APP-096), HRA Stage 1 Screening Report (APP-034), Part Three: Special Protection Areas and Ramsar sites Assessments (APP-033)). For errata raised through Relevant Representations the Applicant's response to the Relevant Representation notes that the errata will be included in the errata document at Deadline 1.

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Table 1.1: Errata.

Doc Number	Volume & Chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
APP-092, APP-093, APP-095, APP-096, APP-099	Volume 6 – Offshore ES Annexes	na	<p>Environmental Statement (Doc F6)</p> <p>Referencing inconsistencies on page 1 of the following documents: F6.5.2, F6.5.3, F6.5.5, F6.5.6, F6.8.1.</p> <p>F6.5.2, for example, is referenced as 'F.6.5.2'. A full consistency check of document references is suggested.</p>	<p>The Applicant has undertaken a full consistency check of document references and identified the following minor inconsistencies below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cover page of Volume 6, Annex 5.2: Offshore Ornithology Displacement Technical Report (APP-092) referenced 'Volume 6, Annex 5.2: Offshore Ornithology Displacement Technical Report (Document Reference: F.6.5.2)' which should have been 'Volume 6, Annex 5.2: Offshore Ornithology Displacement Technical Report (Document Reference: F6.5.2)' • The document footer of Volume 6, Annex 5.2: Offshore Ornithology Displacement Technical Report (APP-092) referenced 'Document Reference: F.6.5.2' which should have been 'Document Reference: F6.5.2'. • The cover page of Volume 6, Annex 5.3: Offshore Ornithology Collision Risk Modelling Technical Report (APP-093) referenced 'Volume 6, Annex 5.3: Offshore Ornithology Collision Risk Modelling Technical Report (Document Reference F.6.5.3)' which should have been 'Volume 6, Annex 5.3: Offshore Ornithology Collision Risk Modelling Technical Report (Document Reference F6.5.3)' • The document footer of Volume 6, Annex 5.3: Offshore Ornithology Collision Risk Modelling Technical Report (APP-093) referenced 'Document Reference: F.6.5.3' which should have been 'Document Reference: F6.5.3'. • The cover page of Volume 6, Annex 5.5: Offshore Ornithology Apportioning Technical Report (APP-095) referenced 'Volume 6, Annex 5.5: Offshore Ornithology Apportioning Technical Report (Document Reference F.6.5.5)' which should have been 'Volume 6, Annex 5.5: Offshore Ornithology

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Doc Number	Volume & Chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
				<p>Apportioning Technical Report (Document Reference F6.5.5)'. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The document footer of Volume 6, Annex 5.5: Offshore Ornithology Apportioning Technical Report (APP-095) referenced 'Document Reference: F.6.5.5' which should have been 'Document Reference: F6.5.5'. The cover page of Volume 6, Annex 5.6: Offshore Ornithology Population Viability Analysis (APP-096) referenced 'Volume 6, Annex 5.6: Offshore Ornithology Population Viability Analysis Technical Report (Document Reference: F.6.5.6)' which should have been 'Volume 6, Annex 5.6: Offshore Ornithology Population Viability Analysis Technical Report (Document Reference: F6.5.6)'. The document footer of Volume 6, Annex 5.6: Offshore Ornithology Population Viability Analysis (APP-096) referenced 'Document Reference: F.6.5.6' which should have been 'Document Reference: F6.5.6'. The cover page of Volume 6, Annex 8.1: Seascape and visual resources legislation and planning policy context (APP-099) referenced 'Volume 6, Annex 8.1: Seascape and visual resources legislation and planning policy context (Document Reference: F6 8.1)' which should have been 'Volume 6, Annex 8.1: Seascape and visual resources legislation and planning policy context (Document Reference: F6.8.1)'. The document footer of Volume 6, Annex 8.1: Seascape and visual resources legislation and planning policy context (APP-099) referenced 'Document Reference: F6 8.1' which should have been 'Document Reference: F6.8.1'. </p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Doc Number	Volume & Chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
APP-117 and APP-050	Volume 7, Annex 2.1: Flood Consequences Assessment (APP-117) and Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description (APP-050)	3.13.3.3	ES Volume 7, Annex 2.1: Flood Consequences Assessment (FCA) (APP-117) ES Volume 1, Chapter 3, paragraph 3.13.3.3 (APP-050) states that the operational life of the onshore substation is expected to be 50 years, whereas FCA paragraph 3.1.4.1 states that the expected operational life for the onshore substation is 35 years.	The information within Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description (APP-050) is correct that the operational life of the onshore substation is expected to be 50 years. Volume 7, Annex 2.1: Flood Consequences Assessment (SPP) (APP-117) should have referenced a 50 year operational lifespan.
APP-120	Volume 7, Annex 2.4: Water Framework Directive Surface and Groundwater Assessment (APP-120)	Table 1.15	Incorrect category was used to describe the status of the North Wales coastal body in Table 1.15	The mitigation measures assessment element for North Wales coastal water body (Table 1.15 (APP-120)) should be moderate status, rather than the good status reported in 2021 classification. This is because the mitigation measures should be "not in place - not yet identified" instead of "Not applicable - not required in this water body"
APP-034	HRA Stage 1 Screening Report	Table 1.40	LSE matrix for Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC contains grey seal.	According to NPWS (2013), Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC is designated for the Annex II species harbour porpoise only (as detailed correctly in Table 1.6: European sites designated for Annex II marine mammal species taken forward for determination of LSE). The Applicant acknowledges that grey seal has been included in Table 1.40 in error. The explanatory notes below the table which cover harbour porpoise only are correct and the outcome of the LSE screening for this SAC is unchanged.
APP-034	HRA Stage 1 Screening Report	Table 1.51	LSE matrix for the Chaussée de Sein SCI, for grey seal: Underwater sound from Piling, Underwater sound from Clearance of UXO, Underwater sound during site investigation surveys, Underwater sound due to vessel use and other activities, and In-combination Effects cells have a conclusion of no LSE (Likely Significant Effect) but are highlighted in blue rather than green.	Table 1.51 for Chaussée de Sein SCI, as detailed in Section 1.4.2 of APP-032, those cells marked with X's mean there is no potential for an LSE and therefore the screening assessment itself is correct and valid. However, the Applicant confirms those cells with X's (no LSE) should be green, and therefore for grey seal: Underwater sound from Piling, Underwater sound from Clearance of UXO, Underwater sound during site investigation surveys, Underwater sound due to vessel use and other activities, and In-combination Effects should be green.

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Doc Number	Volume & Chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
APP-032	ISAA Stage 2 Special Areas of Conservation	Table 1.85	For grey seal, the initiation (first strike) impact range at 4,400 kJ is listed as 25 m.	The initiation (first strike) impact range at 4,400 kJ should be 28 m, however this does not change the conclusions of the assessment.
APP-186	Planning Statement	1.5.2.28	states that ‘...no cable protection is anticipated [emphasis added] on Constable Bank’.	Should state ‘no cable protection will be placed on Constable Bank’.
APP-088	Water Framework Directive Coastal Waters Assessment	1.4.1.1	Refers to a 12 km buffer for features under consideration for the WFD assessment.	This should refer to a buffer of 2 km. The assessment used a distance of 2 km; therefore, the conclusions are unaffected by this discrepancy in the text.
APP-034	HRA Stage 1 Screening Report	Table 1.6	States that the distance to the North Anglesey Marine SAC from the Mona Array Area is 22.58 km	Should state that the distance to the North Anglesey Marine SAC from the Mona Array Area is 23.67 km, however this does not change the assessment and the conclusions of the screening report still stand.
APP-032	ISAA Stage 2 Special Areas of Conservation	Table 1.78	The West Wales Marine SAC was not included in table 1.78.	The West Wales Marine SAC should have been included in table 1.78 however it was included in the assessment.
APP-196	Mitigation and monitoring schedule	Reference number	The Underwater Sound Management Strategy (UWSMS) is incorrectly referenced as J19.	The UWSMS is J16 of the Mona application.
APP-043	Technical Engagement Plan Appendices - Part 2 (F to M)	L.4	The meeting minutes for a Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets consultation meeting were included.	The correct Mona Offshore Wind Project consultation meeting minutes are included in Appendix A:
APP-060	Volume 2, Chapter 8: Seascape and visual resources	8.8.3.8 8.8.3.23 8.8.3.39 8.8.3.45 8.8.3.59 8.8.3.75 8.8.3.105 8.8.3.120 8.8.3.134	These paragraphs 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)’

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Doc Number	Volume & Chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
		8.8.3.200		
		8.8.4.19		
		8.8.4.32		
		8.8.4.45		
		8.8.4.71		
		8.8.4.97		
		8.8.4.236		
		8.8.4.249		
		8.8.4.262		
		8.8.4.275		
		8.8.4.288		
		8.8.4.340		
		8.8.4.353		
		8.8.4.366		
		8.8.4.379		
		8.8.4.392		
		8.8.4.405		
		8.8.4.457		
		8.8.4.470		
		8.8.4.548		
		8.8.4.574		

Appendix A: Seascape, landscape and visual resources meeting minutes

MINUTES OF MEETING



Security Classification: Project Internal

MOM Number : 20220928_ Mona Offshore Wind Project **REV. No.** : F01
MOM Subject : Mona – Seascape, Landscape and Visual Impact Workshop 1.

MINUTES OF MEETING

MEETING DATE : 28/09/2022
MEETING LOCATION : Microsoft Teams
RECORDED BY : ██████████ (RPS)
ISSUED BY : ██████████ (RPS)

PERSONS PRESENT:

- █ ██████████ BM Denbighshire County Council
- █ ██████████ CR RPS
- █ ██████████ CD RPS
- █ ██████████ MK RPS
- █ ██████████ EH Isle of Anglesey CC
- █ ██████████ ER Isle of Man
- █ ██████████ GV bp
- █ ██████████ GD RPS
- █ ██████████ HC Welsh Government
- █ ██████████ IJ Isle of Anglesey CC
- █ ██████████ JH Conwy County Borough Council
- █ ██████████ KS Gwyneth County Council
- █ ██████████ KM Isle of Man
- █ ██████████ LR Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru (Natural Resources Wales)
- █ ██████████ LH bp
- █ ██████████ ME Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru (Natural Resources Wales)
- █ ██████████ PRW bp
- █ ██████████ SR Snowdonia National Park Authority
- █ ██████████ SF Isle of Man

APOLOGIES:

- █ ██████████ (bp)
- █ ██████████ (CADW)

ITEM NO:	DISCUSSION ITEM:	Responsible party	HCDate
1.	<p>Introductions (Presented by CR)</p> <p>Introductions were made for everyone on the call.</p> <p>The meeting provides an update on the information set out in the Scoping Report for the Mona Offshore Wind Project in terms of the site selection and design process.</p> <p>The purpose of the meeting is to present the wind turbine option layouts in the context of the baseline seascape character and ask</p>		

	<p>the stakeholders to confirm which option presented the worst case. The agreed worst case option would form the basis of the assessment.</p> <p>The agenda of the meeting is presented below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductions • About the Project • Project timeline (indicative) • Bodelwyddan – scoping • Offshore cable corridor to landfall • Baseline character • Representative viewpoint locations • Design • Summary 		
2.	<p>About the Project (Presented by GV)</p> <p>GV presented a general introduction to the Mona and Morgan Offshore Wind Projects confirming that the meeting would focus on Mona.</p> <p>Bp/EnBW is expecting to sign the Agreement for Lease (AfL) for Mona in Q4 2022. Bp/EnBW is looking to submit the PEIR in Q1 2023 with the Application in Q1 2024.</p> <p>GV explained the timeline for stakeholder engagement and flagged that engagement with the statutory consultees was key to ensuring a robust PEIR and Application.</p>		
3.	<p>Offshore cable corridor to landfall (Presented by GV)</p> <p>GV explained the phased approach used to identify the cable route opportunities including the early identification of key constraints and stress-testing the constraints through RAG analysis.</p> <p>Mona Offshore Wind Project requires an Offshore Cable Corridor width of 1.5km to accommodate up to four export cables. This width is required to allow for installation of each export cable and operation and maintenance activities. Additionally, this width provides adequate separation distances between neighbouring cables; and allows for micro-siting and mitigation of ‘unknowns’ identified pre-construction such as ephemeral reefs, archaeology and unexploded ordnance. The Project proposes the minimum use of cable protection measures by using standard installation techniques.</p> <p>ME – NRW provided regulatory advice for the Burbo Bank projects and suggested that mitigation measures from other OWF should be incorporated into the design of Mona where appropriate. GV noted this point and responded that where possible, best practice mitigation would be incorporated into the design, which is set out in the PEIR.</p> <p>GV explained the key offshore environmental constraints on Offshore Cable Corridor routing that were identified through the site selection process. Four routes were initially considered for the Offshore Cable Corridor between the Mona Array Area and grid</p>		

	<p>connection at Bodelwyddan. Three routes to the east passed between the east and west components of Gwynt-y-Mor were rejected because of significant technical constraints offshore and lack of available space at the only potential landfall area at Rhyl: there was insufficient remaining width at the landfall because of Awel y Mor cables, and the Belgrano/Kimnel Bay landfall would have required crossing the Rhyl flats in shallow waters which was considered to be technically unfeasible.</p> <p>The remaining option routing option routes to the west of the proposed Awel y Mor project and makes landfall on the Llanndulas and Pensarn beaches. It avoids a number of key constraints including the Lavan Sands/Conwy Bay SPA and the North Anglesey Marine SAC, but passes through the periphery of the Menai Straights and Colwyn Bay SAC and Constable Bank seabed feature and through the Liverpool Bay SPA, which is unavoidable.</p> <p>The eastern part of the landfall at Llanndulas crosses the Traeth Pensarn SSSI. GV acknowledged the sensitivity of the SSSI, but explained that this overlap with the SSSI has to be retained at this stage to retain some optionality for the Project.</p>		
4.	<p>Baseline character (presented by CD)</p> <p><u>Guidance documents</u></p> <p>CD explained that the principal guidance used to identify the baseline character of the seascape was the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, 3rd Edition (GLVIA3) and technical guidance notes from the Landscape Institute. The Awel y Mor SLVIA methodology was also taken into account. All relevant documentation from the 2003 BMT Cordah report, to date has been reviewed, including the detailed DTI <i>Guidance on the Assessment of the Impact of Offshore Wind Farms: Seascape and Visual Impact Report</i> (2005).</p> <p><u>Study areas</u></p> <p>The following study areas have been used to establish the baseline character:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50km for the array • 10km for the onshore substation • 1km for the onshore cable corridor <p><u>Character areas</u></p> <p>Within these study areas there are various national and regional character areas. The Seascape Character slide shows multiple constraints from other existing activities such as shipping, oil and gas platforms, recreational activities.</p> <p><u>Sensitivity</u></p> <p>Nationally Designated Landscapes i.e., National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, are landscapes of the highest</p>		

	<p>sensitivity. NRW has produced a series of strategic assessment and guidance documents regarding Seascape and visual sensitivity to offshore wind farms in Wales. Report No. 331 presented a number of figures illustrating suggested distances, for differing heights of turbines, to achieve a “low magnitude of visual effect” around nationally designated landscapes. It does not consider the occupation of the viewer, or the context of the view.</p> <p>CD also presented a figure showing the designated landscapes, their seascape settings and their sensitivity to offshore wind farms. CD explained that the Mona Array Area mainly overlaps Zone nos. 2 and 5 which both have an overall sensitivity of medium/low. The definition of the medium/low sensitivity is as follows: ‘<i>Seascape and/or visual characteristics of the zone are resilient to change and/or its values are medium/low or low and it can accommodate the relevant type of development in many situations without significant character change or adverse effects. Thresholds for significant change are high.</i>’</p> <p>Report no. 331 notes that for Zone 2 “<i>The area has ability for further development to be accommodated to the north of Gwynt y Mor (but away from the Douglas Oil field). The size of turbine should be similar to the existing development closer to shore, but can increase in height further offshore (the location of Mona) ...</i>”. For Zone 5 “<i>The least susceptible area lies to the north east (the location of Mona) as this is located in [sic] further out to sea than existing wind, oil and gas development to the to the south and east.</i>”</p>		
5.	<p>Visual baseline (Presented by CD)</p> <p><u>Visibility</u></p> <p>The methodology used for the photography survey is in line with the Landscape Institute <i>Technical Guidance Note 06/19: Visual representation of development proposals</i>. The surveys were undertaken on days when good visibility was forecast at the nearest Met Office weather stations. CD pointed out that Met Office forecasts are not always accurate and on some of the surveys, visibility was not as clear as the forecast predicted. In those cases, further surveys would be undertaken as required. The methodology would also use data from the Met Office setting out the number of days that good visibility would be expected at the local weather stations.</p> <p><u>Representative viewpoint locations</u></p> <p>CD explained that a ZTV was generated for the Mona Array Area based on the tallest wind turbine within the project envelope (324m above LAT) and candidate viewpoints were identified. Stakeholders were contacted in February 2022 and were asked to comment on the suggested viewpoints. Very few responses were received; one suggestion was to use the Awel y Mor viewpoints as a base case. Not all of Awel y Mor’s viewpoints were within the Mona study area or were not appropriate for the Mona Offshore Wind Project and so were discounted. However, the number of viewpoints were adjusted where they were considered appropriate,</p>		

	<p>e.g.four additional points were added on the Isle of Man. One set of photographs were taken from all the candidate viewpoints and are currently being reviewed to ensure that the weather conditions were suitable.</p> <p>CD explained that there are a number of other offshore wind farms located within the buffers of designated landscapes that are in operation or in planning. A figure shows the location of these wind farms in relation to the distance to the designated landscapes.</p>		
6.	<p>Design (Presented by CD)</p> <p>CD explained that there was no opportunity for changing the location of the Mona Offshore Wind Project as, subject to signing the AfL, bp/EnBW only have rights to develop the array area presented in the Scoping Report. As such, the location of the array is a hard constraint. The baseline character work has identified that the location of the array is within a lower sensitivity seascape with a greater capacity of accommodating development.</p> <p>CD presented a plan illustrating some of the constraints, such as commercial shipping and MoD training areas.</p> <p>CD explained that turbine layout patterns can be either edge-weighted or non-edge weighted. The edge-weighted option is typically the worst case in most scenarios and that this pattern has been applied as the base case. GV stated that this approach is becoming a standard industry practice.</p> <p>The height and number of turbines can also influence the worst case: the Mona Offshore Wind Project is considering several wind turbines options within the following range:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 107 wind turbines with a maximum tip height of 293m LAT (Layout 22 [L22]). • 68 turbines with a maximum tip of 324m LAT Layout 26 [L26]). <p>Additionally, the project envelope includes for up to four Offshore Substation Platforms (OSPs) with a maximum height (excluding cranes and antennae) of 70m above LAT.</p> <p>Wirelines were generated for these options from five viewpoints located on the Isle of Anglesey, Great Orme, Blackpool, Lake District National Park and the Isle of Main (VPs 3, 7, 15, 17 and 19). Turbines from existing offshore wind farms were also presented.</p>		

7.	<p>Questions/Points raised</p> <p><u>Field of View</u></p> <p>EH – asked if an appropriate field of view had been applied because Gwynt y Mor was not shown.</p> <p>CD - explained that the photos taken were 360 degrees views, but that 75 degrees is the accepted field of view for a human (more than that is out of focus). CD suggested that we could present a series of 75 degree wirelines to pan around from Mona to the North Welsh Coast.</p> <p>ACTION- present the series of 75 degree wirelines from VP3 and (additional) VP 28.</p> <p><u>Inclusion of turbines from proposed OWF</u></p> <p>EH – commented that the wirelines were not showing the proposed turbines for Awel y Mor.</p> <p>CD – explained that the wirelines presented the baseline and that Awel y Mor will be shown as a Tier 1 project in the cumulative effects assessment. NM - asked if there was an opportunity for the Project to install its cables at the same time as Awel y Mor to minimise disruption.</p> <p>EH – said that it was more difficult to provide a view on the worst case if Awel y Mor turbines were not presented. He also said that developers may change their mind on what they build compared to what has been assessed.</p> <p>GV and CD – explained that the purpose of the meeting was to agree what was the worst-case option for Mona Offshore Wind Project.</p> <p>ER – the cumulative impact of Morgan and Mona Offshore Wind Projects is a key issue for the Isle of Man because you will have to look through Morgan in order to see the Mona turbines. On that basis, it would be useful to know the potential location of the proposed turbines.</p> <p>CD- asked if we can assume that the largest turbines for both schemes presents the worst case.</p> <p>ACTION – wirelines for VP3 and VP 28 will include Awel y Mor. Wireline for VP19 will include Morgan.</p>	CD	Wirelines updated in the slide pack
8.	<p>Next steps</p> <p>CR thanked the attendees for their time. An updated slide pack would be circulated and the attendees would be asked to consider the options and confirm their views on which presented the worst case for the purpose of the assessment.</p>	CD	Wirelines updated in the slide pack

9.	Close of meeting		
----	-------------------------	--	--

MINUTES OF MEETING

Security Classification: Project Internal



AGREEMENT LOG

Meeting Date	Issue on which agreement is sought	Consultee	Progress of agreement	Agreement	Notes
28/09/2022	Which turbine layout option presents the worst case for the purpose of the SLVIA assessment.				