Partners in UK offshore wind

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Errata Sheet

Deadline: 1

Application Reference: EN010137

Document Reference: S_PD_1 F02

Document Number: MOCNS-J3303-RPS-10207

August 2024

F02

Image of an offshore wind farm

www.morganandmona.com/en

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
F02	Submission at Deadline 1	Mona Offshore Wind Ltd	Mona Offshore Wind Ltd	Mona Offshore Wind Ltd	August 2024

Prepared by:

Mona Offshore Wind Ltd.

Prepared for:

Mona Offshore Wind Ltd.

Contents

Appendices

1 Errata Sheet

1.1 Overview

1.1.1.1 On 21 March 2024, the application by Mona Offshore Wind Limited (the Applicant) 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, points highlighted in Relevant Representations, and questions raised during Issue specific hearings one and two held on 16, 17 and 18 July 2024, the Applicant has reviewed the application documentation for any errors or inconsistencies. The table below provides correction or clarification on matters identified.

1.1.1.3 As described in the errata sheet provided for the Procedural Deadline (PDA-006), this errata sheet has been updated to 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)).

1.1.1.4 The Applicant recognises that a small number of the discrepancies in relation to the offshore ornithology documents could be considered to affect the assessments within the Environmental Statement and Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA), although wishes to highlight that none are considered to alter the conclusions drawn. Nonetheless, it is appreciated that these discrepancies make it challenging for stakeholders to confirm agreement on the scale of predicted impacts and the Environmental Impact Assessment and HRA conclusions. The Applicant appreciates the need for clarity in the application material and has been engaging with NRW and JNCC to determine the best course of action. The Applicant will provide updated versions (tracked and clean) of the offshore ornithology application document that include errata listed in paragraph 1.1.1.3 at Deadline 2. This is considered appropriate for the offshore ornithology errata identified in relevant and written representations. For other documents and errata typing errors and minor corrections will be identified in the errata sheet only.

1.1.1.5 Whilst the Applicant is mindful that the Examining Authority is likely to want to see the submission of updated information into examination as early as possible, it is considered necessary to take sufficient time over this exercise to ensure that all discrepancies are fully and appropriately addressed where required. The Applicant also wishes to utilise the opportunity to provide further clarity for key stakeholders on aspects of the assessment where this is beneficial and where they may have been looking to raise points within their written representations. It is considered that this approach will save time for examination overall.

1.2 Errata sheet

Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
PD	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.
PD	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.
D1	APP-033	HRA Stage 2 ISAA for SPAs and Ramsar sites	Section 5	The lowest displacement and mortality rates have been taken forward in the HRA.	The Applicants considered most scientifically robust value should be used as presented with Volume 6, Annex 5.5: Offshore ornithology displacement technical report (APP-092).
PD	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.

Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
PD	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.
PD	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.
D1	APP-034	Stage 1 HRA Screening Report	Table 1.9	Atlantic puffin were incorrectly treated as part qualifying breeding bird assemblage	Atlantic puffin are an individual qualifying feature
D1	APP-034	Stage 1 HRA Screening Report	Table 1.10	Common guillemot and razorbill were treated as individual qualifying features. The inaccuracies are used in all tables relating to Skomer, Skomer, Skokholm, and Seas off Pembrokeshire SPA.	Common guillemot and razorbill are part of the 'seabird assemblage' feature.
D1	APP-034	Stage 1 HRA Screening Report	Table A 2 to A14	The lowest displacement and mortality rates have been taken forward in the HRA.	The Applicants considered most scientifically robust value should be used as presented with Volume 6, Annex 5.5: Offshore ornithology displacement technical report (APP-092).
PD	APP-043	Technical Engagement Plan Appendices - Part 2 (F to M)	L.4	The meeting minutes for a Morgan Offshore Wind Project consultation meeting where included.	The correct Mona Offshore Wind Project consultation meeting minutes are included in Appendix A.

Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
D1	APP-050	Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description	Glossary table Term: Micrositing	The final selection of the position of infrastructure which may move in the order of a few metres to avoid an obstruction.	The final selection of the position of infrastructure which may move up to one hundred metres to avoid an obstruction.
D1	APP-050	Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description	3.5.6.2	States 'However, the final layout of the wind turbines will be confirmed through the design plan submitted to NRW for approval in consultation with Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA) and Trinity House prior to commencement of construction offshore and secured within the deemed marine licence (dML) in the Draft DCO (Document Reference C1) submitted with the application for development consent and expected to be secured in the standalone NRW marine licence.'	Should state 'However, the final layout of the wind turbines and OSPs will be confirmed through the design plan submitted to NRW for approval in consultation with Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA) and Trinity House prior to commencement of construction offshore and secured within the deemed marine licence (dML) in the Draft DCO (Document Reference C1) submitted with the application for development consent and expected to be secured in the standalone NRW marine licence.'
D1	APP-050	Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description	Table 3.22	Maximum number of crossings listed as 24.	Maximum number of crossings should be listed as 14
D1	APP-050	Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description	Table 3.28	Maximum TJB construction compound (m): 200 x 100.	Maximum TJB construction compound (m): 150 x 100
D1	APP-050	Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description	3.7.3.22	Incorrect cross reference stating that a cut/fill exercise is shown Figure 3.22.	The indicative location of the attenuation pond is shown on Figure 3.22.
D1	APP-050	Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description	3.5.8.7	Up to two vessels may be piling and two other vessels drilling simultaneously, with concurrent piling being undertaken at a maximum distance of 15 km between locations.	Up to two vessels may be piling or drilling simultaneously, with concurrent piling being undertaken at a maximum distance of 15 km between locations

Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
D1	APP-056	Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals	4.9.5.22	Multiplying the area of ensonification by each species-specific density would lead to unrealistic estimates, as serious disturbance would not occur over ranges such as 23 km.	Multiplying the area of ensonification by each species-specific density would lead to unrealistic estimates, as serious disturbance would not occur over ranges such as 4.08 km.
D1	APP-056	Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals	A.3.8.1.4	The iPCoD models were set up as described in sections A.3.2 and A.3.3 for demographic parameters and reference populations, respectively, and with the same days of residual disturbance specified in section 0.	The iPCoD models were set up as described in sections A.3.2 and A.3.3 for demographic parameters and reference populations, respectively, and with the same days of residual disturbance specified in section A.3.4.
D1	APP-056	Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals	4.9.2.39	Modelling of concurrent piling assumes piling will occur at exactly the same time and strike piles simultaneously, whereas in reality this is highly unlikely and could lead to overestimates in the injury and/or disturbance ranges.	Modelling of concurrent piling assumes piling will occur at exactly the same time with each phase (soft start, ramp up, full power) coinciding, whereas in reality this is unlikely and could lead to overestimates in the injury and/or disturbance ranges.
D1	APP-056	Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals	4.9.3.38	The duration of piling is up to 113 days, within a two-year piling programme (as defined in Table 4.22).	The duration of piling is up to 113.5 days, within a two-year piling programme (as defined in Table 4.22)
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.27	Number of Black-legged kittiwake subject to mortality in the breeding season is 1 to 20.	Number of Black-legged kittiwake subject to mortality in the breeding season is 1 to 12.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.42	The northern Gannet total monthly collision estimates (indiv.) Natural England avoidance rates Annually is 5.64.	The northern Gannet total monthly collision estimates (indiv.) Natural England avoidance rates Annually is 5.65.

Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	5.9.2.70	During the autumn migration season (post-breeding), displacement from operation results in a loss of 20 (19 to 281) individuals from the migratory population.	During the autumn migration season (post-breeding), displacement from operation results in a loss of 20 (12 to 281) individuals from the migratory population
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	5.9.2.70	The addition of 20 (19 to 281) individual mortalities due to cumulative displacement from the presence of infrastructure….	The addition of 20 (12 to 281) individual mortalities due to cumulative displacement from the presence of infrastructure….
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	5.9.2.85	The addition of 10 26 (22 to 298) individual mortalities due to cumulative displacement from the presence of infrastructure…	The addition of 26 (22 to 298) individual mortalities due to cumulative displacement from the presence of infrastructure…
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	5.9.2.86	During the autumn migration season (post-breeding), displacement from operation results in a loss of 18 (18 to 204) individuals…	During the autumn migration season (post-breeding), displacement from operation results in a loss of 18 (15 to 204) individuals…
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	5.9.2.86	The addition of eight (18 to 204) individual mortalities due to cumulative displacement from the presence of infrastructure…	The addition of 18 (15 to 204) individual mortalities due to cumulative displacement from the presence of infrastructure…
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.112	Repeats Table 5.111.	The correct table 5.112 will be provided at Deadline 2
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	5.9.3.13	The estimated cumulative collision mortality during the nonbreeding/winter season for great black-backed gull for species-specific and group-specific avoidance rates is 11.67 and 66.00, respectively.	The estimated cumulative collision mortality during the nonbreeding/winter season for great black-backed gull for species-specific and group-specific avoidance rates is 11.61 and 66.00, respectively.

Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	5.9.3.14	As the predicted increase in baseline mortality of the population for great black-backed gull exceeds an increase of 1% when considering an avoidance rate of 99.28 in the non-breeding season and annually.	As the predicted increase in baseline mortality of the population for great black-backed gull exceeds an increase of 1% when considering an avoidance rate of 0.9939 in the non-breeding season and annually.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	5.9.3.15	The model predicts a positive rate of growth for the population based on growth rates of 1.122 to 1.127 per annum at the range of scenarios from unimpacted baseline to 0.9991 and 0.9939 avoidance rate.	The model predicts a positive rate of growth for the population based on growth rates of 1.125 to 1.122 per annum at the range of scenarios from unimpacted baseline to 0.9991 and 0.9939 avoidance rate.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.128	Expected annual collision mortality for northern gannet cumulative total (all projects) is 156.82.	Expected annual collision mortality for northern gannet cumulative total (all projects) is 160.09.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	5.9.3.30	The estimated cumulative collision mortality of northern gannet from the relevant projects with available data is 156.54 per year.	The estimated cumulative collision mortality of northern gannet from the relevant projects with available data is 160.09 per year.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	5.9.3.31	The addition of 156.54 mortalities would increase the baseline mortality rate by 0.123%.	The addition of 160.09 mortalities would increase the baseline mortality rate by 0.123%.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	5.9.3.33	A total of 15 migratory species are estimated to experience a cumulative collision mortality greater than one per year.	A total of 16 migratory species are estimated to experience a cumulative collision mortality greater than one per year.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	5.9.4.5	Using the largest UK Western Waters BDMPS population of 911,586 individuals, with an average baseline mortality rate of 0.157, the background predicted mortality would be 142,207.	Using the largest UK Western Waters BDMPS population of 911,586 individuals, with an average baseline mortality rate of 0.157, the background predicted mortality would be 143,119.

Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 1.13	The Atlantic Puffin non-breeding period used in the assessment is September to February.	The Atlantic Puffin non-breeding period used in the assessment is September to March.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 1.14	The Atlantic Puffin non-breeding period used in the assessment is mid-August to March.	The Atlantic Puffin non-breeding period used in the assessment is September to March.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.25	Atlantic puffin in the non-breeding season Mean Seasonal Peak abundance is 0 birds.	Atlantic puffin in the non-breeding season Mean Seasonal Peak abundance is 22 birds.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.61	Atlantic puffin cumulative abundances for Erebus Floating Wind Demo is 15 individuals during the breeding season.	Atlantic puffin cumulative abundances for Erebus Floating Wind Demo is 1,416 individuals during the breeding season.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.93	Atlantic puffin cumulative abundances for Erebus Floating Wind Demo is 15 individuals during the breeding season.	Atlantic puffin cumulative abundances for Erebus Floating Wind Demo is 1,416 individuals during the breeding season.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.61	Atlantic puffin cumulative abundances for Erebus Floating Wind Demo is 0 individuals during the non-breeding season.	Atlantic puffin cumulative abundances for Erebus Floating Wind Demo is 160 individuals during the non-breeding season.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.93	Atlantic puffin cumulative abundances for Erebus Floating Wind Demo is 0 individuals during the non-breeding season.	Atlantic puffin cumulative abundances for Erebus Floating Wind Demo is 160 individuals during the non-breeding season.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.65	Northern gannet cumulative abundances for Erebus Floating Wind Demo is 0 individuals during the non-breeding season.	Northern gannet cumulative abundances or Erebus Floating Wind Demo is 100 individuals during the non-breeding season.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.98	Northern gannet cumulative abundances for Erebus Floating Wind Demo is 0 individuals during the non-breeding season.	Northern gannet cumulative abundances or Erebus Floating Wind Demo is 100 individuals during the non-breeding season.

Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.75	Manx shearwater cumulative abundances for Awel y Môr is 177 during the post-breeding season.	Manx shearwater cumulative abundances for Awel y Môr is 214 during the post-breeding season.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.75	Manx shearwater cumulative abundances total for the post breeding season is 1,414.	Manx shearwater cumulative abundances total for the post breeding season is 1,451.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.78	Construction phase cumulative Manx shearwater mortality in the post-breeding season is 4 (range 3 to 57).	Construction phase cumulative Manx shearwater mortality in the post-breeding season is 7 (range 4 to 102).
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.81	Guillemot cumulative abundances for Twinhub is 238 for the breeding season.	Guillemot cumulative abundances for Twinhub is 183 for the breeding season.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.98	Northern gannet cumulative abundances total (all projects) for annual abundance is 6,690.	Northern gannet cumulative abundances total (all projects) for annual abundance is 7,119.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.102	Operations and maintenance phase cumulative northern gannet mortality is 47 (range 40 to 535).	Operations and maintenance phase cumulative northern gannet mortality is 50 (range 43 to 570).
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.104	Black-legged kittiwake cumulative abundances total (all projects) for annual abundance is 26,604.	Black-legged kittiwake cumulative abundances total (all projects) for annual abundance is 25,897.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.108	Operations and maintenance phase cumulative black-legged kittiwake mortality is 133 (range 80 to 1,862).	Operations and maintenance phase cumulative black-legged kittiwake mortality is 129 (range 78 to 1,813).
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.28	Manx shearwater bio-season and annual displacement estimates spring migration is 6 birds.	Manx shearwater bio-season and annual displacement estimates spring migration is 3 birds.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.35	Manx shearwater bio-seasons and annual displacement estimates spring migration is 6 birds.	Manx shearwater bio-season and annual displacement estimates spring migration is 3 birds.

Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.31	Razorbill bio-seasons and annual displacement estimates breeding migration abundance is 92.	Razorbill bio-seasons and annual displacement estimates breeding migration abundance is 83.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.31	Razorbill bio-seasons and annual displacement estimates Autumn migration abundance is 86.	Razorbill bio-seasons and annual displacement estimates Autumn migration abundance is 91.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.117	Collision impacts from Burbo Bank Extension where incorrectly assigned to Burbo Bank for black-legged kittiwake.	Collision impacts from Burbo Bank Extension where incorrectly assigned to Burbo Bank for black-legged kittiwake.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.128	Collision impacts from Burbo Bank Extension where incorrectly assigned to Burbo Bank for northern gannet.	Collision impacts from Burbo Bank Extension where incorrectly assigned to Burbo Bank for northern gannet.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.122	Expected annual collision mortality across relevant offshore wind farms for herring gull for Morecambe Offshore Windfarm Generation Assets annually is 0.45.	Expected annual collision mortality across relevant offshore wind farms for herring gull for Morecambe Offshore Windfarm Generation Assets annually is 3.42.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.122	Expected annual collision mortality across relevant offshore wind farms for herring gull for Morecambe Offshore Windfarm Generation Assets during the breeding season is 0.53.	Expected annual collision mortality across relevant offshore wind farms for herring gull for Morecambe Offshore Windfarm Generation Assets during the breeding season is 0.93.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.122	Expected annual collision mortality across relevant offshore wind farms for herring gull for Morecambe Offshore Windfarm Generation Assets during the non-breeding season is 0.98.	Expected annual collision mortality across relevant offshore wind farms for herring gull for Morecambe Offshore Windfarm Generation Assets during the non-breeding season is 2.49.

Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.122	Expected annual collision mortality across relevant offshore wind farms for herring gull for Morgan Offshore Windfarm Generation Assets annually is 0.71.	Expected annual collision mortality across relevant offshore wind farms for herring gull for Morgan Offshore Windfarm Generation Assets annually is 11.82.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.122	Expected annual collision mortality across relevant offshore wind farms for herring gull for Morgan Offshore Windfarm Generation Assets during the breeding season is 2.10.	Expected annual collision mortality across relevant offshore wind farms for herring gull for Morgan Offshore Windfarm Generation Assets during the breeding season is 2.57.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.122	Expected annual collision mortality across relevant offshore wind farms for herring gull for Morgan Offshore Windfarm Generation Assets during the non-breeding season is 2.81.	Expected annual collision mortality across relevant offshore wind farms for herring gull for Morgan Offshore Windfarm Generation Assets during the non-breeding season is 9.25.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.10	Atlantic puffin were incorrectly treated as part qualifying breeding bird assemblage.	Atlantic puffin are an individual qualifying feature.
D1	APP-057	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology	Table 5.38, Table 5.39, Table 5.40, Table 5.41, Table 5.42, Table 5.43, Table 5.44, Table 5.45, Table 5.48, Paragraph 5.7.6.4, paragraph 5.7.6.7.	Species group avoidance rates are 'JNCC avoidance rates'.	Species group avoidance rates are 'Ozsanlav-Harris *et al.* (2023)'.
D1	APP-059	Volume 2, Chapter 7: Shipping and navigation	Table 7.18	Example Vessels (2019-2022): Stena Edda/Stena Embla/Stena Mersey/Stena Horizon/Stena Lagan/Stena Forecaster/Stena Forerunner.	Example Vessels (2019-2022): Stena Edda/Stena Embla/Stena Estrid/Stena Foreteller.

Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
D1	APP-059	Volume 2, Chapter 7: Shipping and navigation	Table 7.18	Approximate Annual Crossings (2022): 1,442.	Approximate Annual Crossings (2022): 1,098.
D1	APP-059	Volume 2, Chapter 7: Shipping and navigation	Table 7.18	Baseline Distance: 142.3 nm.	Baseline Distance: 113.3 nm.
D1	APP-059	Volume 2, Chapter 7: Shipping and navigation	Table 7.18	Deviated Distance: 144.6.	Deviated Distance: 114.4 nm.
D1	APP-059	Volume 2, Chapter 7: Shipping and navigation	Table 7.18	Additional Mona Offshore Wind Farm Project Time (Minutes): +7.4.	Additional Mona Offshore Wind Project Time (Minutes): +3.4.

Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
PD	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 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	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)’.
D1	APP-060	Volume 2, Chapter 8: Seascape and visual resources	Figure A.4	ZTV is calculated using a blade tip height of 324 m.	ZTV is calculated using a blade tip height of 364 m.

Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
D1	APP-066	Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology	3.9.2.32	The requirement to remove approximately 600 m^2 of woodland through open-cut trenching, works would have a medium-term moderate adverse impact on the woodland block 11 to the north of the Onshore Substation.	The requirement to remove approximately 600 m^2 of woodland to facilitate the construction of the permanent access road to the Onshore Substation would have a medium-term moderate adverse impact on the woodland block 11 to the north of the Onshore Substation.
D1	APP-066	Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology	3.9.4.41	The requirement to remove approximately 600 m^2 of woodland through open-cut trenching, works would have a medium-term moderate adverse fragmentation impact on the woodland block 11 to the north of the Onshore Substation.	The requirement to remove approximately 600 m^2 of woodland to facilitate the construction of the permanent access road to the Onshore Substation would have a medium-term moderate adverse fragmentation impact on the woodland block 11 to the north of the Onshore Substation.
D1	APP-066	Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology	3.9.2.45	Approximately 550 m of hedgerow will be permanently lost as a result of the Onshore Substation and permanent access road. In addition to this, there will be a requirement to remove hedgerows at the identified construction access locations to ensure visibility requirements are met. The permanent loss of up to 500 m of hedgerow habitat will be mitigated for by the 2.5 km of proposed species-rich hedgerow creation and enhancement at the Onshore Substation that will restore former field boundaries and help to improve habitat connectivity, particularly to Ancient Woodland sites to the south, such as Bryn Cefn, north of the River Elwy.	Approximately 550 m of hedgerow will be permanently lost as a result of the Onshore Substation and permanent access road. In addition to this, there will be a requirement to remove hedgerows at the identified construction access locations to ensure visibility requirements are met. The permanent loss of up to 550 m of hedgerow habitat will be mitigated for by the 2.5 km of proposed species-rich hedgerow creation and enhancement at the Onshore Substation that will restore former field boundaries and help to improve habitat connectivity, particularly to Ancient Woodland sites to the south, such as Bryn Cefn, north of the River Elwy.

Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
D1	APP-066	Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology	3.9.2.105 bullet point 1	The enhancement of 11 strategic hedgerows within Mona Onshore Development Area, to improve connectivity to existing woodland blocks.	The enhancement of 10 strategic hedgerows within Mona Onshore Development Area, to improve connectivity to existing woodland blocks.
D1	APP-066	Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology	3.5.4.28	The number of ordinary watercourses within the Mona Onshore Development Area was incorrectly reported to be 14.	There are 10 ordinary watercourses within the Mona Onshore Development Area (see Volume 7, Annex 3.2: Phase 1 habitat survey technical report of the Environmental Statement). These are (from north to south): • In Section 2 at Nant Fawr west of the A548, a tributary of The River Dulas flowing west • In Section 2 at Pen-Y-Bryn west of the A548, two small unnamed streams/drainage channels • In Section 3 at Bryn-tywydd south of the B5381 and east of the A548, three four tributaries flowing north into the (off-site) Nant-y-Bryniau watercourse • In Section 9 two an unnamed watercourses alongside the north access to the Onshore Substation location, flowing north to join the Nanty-y- Faenol (which in turn flows into the River Clywd) some 950 m to the north of the Mona Onshore Development Area • In Section 9 an unnamed watercourse along the eastern edge of the Onshore Substation location, flowing north to join the River Elwy at St Asaph.
D1	APP-066	Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology	Paragraph 3.9.2.49 3.9.3.54	The number of ordinary watercourses within the Mona Onshore Development Area was incorrectly reported to be 14.	There are 10 ordinary watercourses within the Mona Onshore Development Area.

Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
D1	APP-066	Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology	Table 3.1	Climate adaptation is considered in section 3.7.1.1, Climate Change relating to onshore ecology is also considered in more detail in Volume 4 Chapter 2 Climate Change, and Volume 8, Annex 2.2 Climate change risk assessment of the Environmental Statement.	Climate adaptation is considered in section 3.8, Climate Change relating to onshore ecology is also considered in more detail in Volume 4, Chapter 2: Climate change, and Volume 8, Annex 2.2: Climate change risk assessment of the Environmental Statement.
D1	APP-066	Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology	Table 3.1	Climate change and its potential impact on the Mona Onshore Development Area baseline conditions is considered in section 3.9. The potential impacts of climate change on the proposed ecological mitigation are considered in section 3.8 of this chapter. Climate Change relating to onshore ecology is also considered in more detail in Volume 4 Chapter 2 Climate Change, and Volume 8, Annex 2.2 Climate change risk assessment of the Environmental Statement.	Climate change and its potential impact on the Mona Onshore Development Area baseline conditions is considered in section 3.5.7. The potential impacts of climate change on the proposed ecological mitigation are considered in section 3.8 of this chapter. Climate Change relating to onshore ecology is also considered in more detail in Volume 4, Chapter 2: Climate change, and Volume 8, Annex 2.2: Climate change risk assessment of the Environmental Statement.
D1	APP-066	Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology	Table 3.1	The potential impacts of climate change on the proposed ecological mitigation are considered in section 3.7.1.1 and section 3.9 of this chapter. Climate Change relating to onshore ecology is also considered in more detail in Volume 4, Chapter 2: Climate Change, and Volume 8, Annex 2.2: Climate change risk assessment of the Environmental Statement.	The potential impacts of climate change on the proposed ecological mitigation are considered in section 3.8 and section 3.9 of this chapter. Climate Change relating to onshore ecology is also considered in more detail in Volume 4, Chapter 2: Climate change, and Volume 8, Annex 2.2: Climate change risk assessment of the Environmental Statement.

Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
D1	APP-066	Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology	Table 3.34 and Table 3.35	Anomalies between the significance of effects and residual effects in Table 3.34 and Table 3.35.	Updated Table 3.34 and Table 3.35.
D1	APP-069	Volume 3, Chapter 6: Landscape and visual resources	Table 6.2	Incorrect text stating that 'during the construction phase no work will be undertaken during the hours of darkness'.	The text should be deleted as the potential impacts of working during hours of darkness has been included in the assessment.
D1	APP-070	Volume 3, Chapter 7: Land use and recreation	7.8.6.4	Based on a negligible magnitude of effect on the Wales Coast Path and NCR 5 that are of very high sensitivity, it is assessed that the temporary effect would be that there would be no change to NCR 5 and the Wales significance, which is not significant in EIA terms.	Based on a negligible magnitude of effect on the Wales Coast Path and NCR 5 that are of very high sensitivity, it is assessed that the temporary effect would be that there would be no change to NCR 5 and the Wales Coast Path, which is not significant in EIA terms.
D1	APP-075	Volume 4, Chapter 1: Aviation and radar	Tables 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4	Cross-referencing error in ‘How and where considered in the Environmental Statement’ columns of each table. The potential impacts of the Mona Offshore Wind Project during the construction, operations and maintenance, and decommissioning phases are considered in section 0 and assessed, where relevant, in section 1.9.	The potential impacts of the Mona Offshore Wind Project during the construction, operations and maintenance, and decommissioning phases are considered in section 1.4 and assessed, where relevant, in section 1.9.
D1	APP-084	Volume 5, Annex 5.1: Cumulative effects screening matrix	Section 1.9	The screening for Commercial Fisheries for the Dublin Array Offshore Wind Farm is 'a'.	The screening for Commercial Fisheries for the Dublin Array Offshore Wind Farm should be 'c'.

Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
PD	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.
PD	APP-092, APP-093	Volume 6 – Offshore ES Annexes	N/A	Environmental Statement (Doc F6) Referencing inconsistencies on page 1 of the following documents: F6.5.2, F6.5.3, F6.5.5, F6.5.6, F6.8.1. F6.5.2, for example, is referenced as 'F.6.5.2'. A full consistency check of document references is suggested.	The Applicant has undertaken a full consistency check of document references and identified the following minor inconsistencies below. • 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'.
D1	APP-093	Volume 6, Annex 5.3: Offshore ornithology collision risk modelling technical report	Table 1.10	The northern Gannet total monthly collision estimates (indiv.) Natural England avoidance rates Annually is 5.64.	The northern Gannet total monthly collision estimates (indiv.) Natural England avoidance rates Annually is 5.65.

Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
PD	APP-095, APP-096, APP-099	Volume 6 – Offshore ES Annexes	N/A	Environmental Statement (Doc F6) Referencing inconsistencies on page 1 of the following documents: F6.5.2, F6.5.3, F6.5.5, F6.5.6, F6.8.1. F6.5.2, for example, is referenced as 'F.6.5.2'. A full consistency check of document references is suggested.	• 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 apportioning technical report (Document Reference F6.5.5)'. • 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'.

Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
D1	APP-104	Volume 6, Annex 8.4: Seascape, landscape and visual resources impact assessment methodology	A.1.1.1.2	ZTVs are produced on the assumption that the Mona Offshore Wind Project wind turbines are modelled relative to Lowest Astronomical Tide (LAT) sea level at their maximum blade tip height (324 m). The closest tidal stations show LAT as between 4.9 m and 3.85 m Below Ordnance Datum (BOD). As per the MDS, the turbines were modelled at 324 m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD).	ZTVs are produced on the assumption that the Mona Offshore Wind Project wind turbines are modelled relative to Lowest Astronomical Tide (LAT) sea level at their maximum blade tip height (364 m). The closest tidal stations show LAT as between 4.9 m and 3.85 m Below Ordnance Datum (BOD). As per the MDS, the turbines were modelled at 364 m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD).
PD	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	Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description paragraph 3.13.3.3 (APP-050) states that the operational life of the onshore substation is expected to be 50 years, whereas Volume 7, Annex 2.1: Flood consequences assessment (APP-117) 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.
PD	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".
D1	APP-143	Volume 3, Chapter 5: Desk based assessment	Paragraph 1.4.3.26	Furthermore, a Tree and Hedgerow Retention Plan (Document Reference B13) has been developed, and will be submitted with the DCO, that shows important hedgerows.	This paragraph has been deleted.

Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
D1	APP-181	Volume 8, Annex 1.1: Aviation and radar technical report	A.3.3.1.1	The infrastructure assessed is shown in Error! Reference source not found..	The infrastructure assessed is shown in Table A. 1.
PD	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'.
D1	APP-189	Design Principles	Table 5.1	Highest part of any external electrical equipment, excluding lightning rods, above finished ground level (m) is 11.	Highest part of any external electrical equipment, excluding lightning rods, above finished ground level (m) is 12.5.
PD	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.
D1	APP-203	Measures to Minimise Disturbance to Marine Mammals and Rafting Birds from Transiting Vessels	1.1.3.3	Several measures will apply to both marine mammals and offshore ornithology receptors (plus other marine wildlife; see Section 0)…	Several measures will apply to both marine mammals and offshore ornithology receptors (plus other marine wildlife; see Section 1.2)…
D1	APP-203	Measures to Minimise Disturbance to Marine Mammals and Rafting Birds from Transiting Vessels	1.2.1.1	The measures described in Section 0 apply to all marine locations directly related to the construction and operations and maintenance activities, unless otherwise specified.	The measures described in Section 1.2 apply to all marine locations directly related to the construction and operations and maintenance activities, unless otherwise specified.

Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
D1	APP-203	Measures to Minimise Disturbance to Marine Mammals and Rafting Birds from Transiting Vessels	1.3.1.1	In addition to the measures outlined in Section 0, measures applicable to rafting birds (specifically common scoter and red-throated diver as features of the Liverpool Bay/Bae Lerpwl SPA) will be applied during transiting to and from port and works areas.	In addition to the measures outlined in Section 1.2, measures applicable to rafting birds (specifically common scoter and red-throated diver as features of the Liverpool Bay/Bae Lerpwl SPA) will be applied during transiting to and from port and works areas.
D1	APP-203	Measures to Minimise Disturbance to Marine Mammals and Rafting Birds from Transiting Vessels	1.3.1.2	Where it is necessary for cable laying vessels to go outside of established navigational routes during transit to/from port and working areas, routes will be pre-selected to avoid locations where birds are known to aggregate in accordance with the measures described in Section 0.	Where it is necessary for cable laying vessels to go outside of established navigational routes during transit to/from port and working areas, routes will be pre-selected to avoid locations where birds are known to aggregate in accordance with the measures described in Section 1.2.
D1	PDA-003	Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)	Schedule 14, Part 2, Paragraph 10.-(1), Table 4	Maximum volume of scour protection for offshore substation foundations and wind turbine generators (m3): 1,759,698.	Maximum volume of scour protection for offshore substation foundations and wind turbine generators (m^3): 1,760,359.

Appendix A: Seascape, landscape and visual resources meeting minutes

MINUTES OF MEETING

Security Classification: Project Internal

Partners in UK offshore wind

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	:	[redacted] (RPS)
ISSUED BY	:	[redacted] (RPS)

PERSONS PRESENT:

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

APOLOGIES:

- [redacted] (bp)
- [redacted] (CADW)

ITEM NO:	DISCUSSION ITEM:	Responsible party	HCDate
1.	**Introductions** (Presented by CR) Introductions were made for everyone on the call. 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. The purpose of the meeting is to present the wind turbine option layouts in the context of the baseline seascape character and ask		

	the stakeholders to confirm which option presented the worst case. The agreed worst case option would form the basis of the assessment. The agenda of the meeting is presented below. • Introductions • About the Project • Project timeline (indicative) • Bodelwyddan – scoping • Offshore cable corridor to landfall • Baseline character • Representative viewpoint locations • Design • Summary		
2.	**About the Project** (Presented by GV) GV presented a general introduction to the Mona and Morgan Offshore Wind Projects confirming that the meeting would focus on Mona. 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. GV explained the timeline for stakeholder engagement and flagged that engagement with the statutory consultees was key to ensuring a robust PEIR and Application.		
3.	**Offshore cable corridor to landfall** (Presented by GV) 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. 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. 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 be set out in the PEIR. 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		

	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 Rhyll: 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 Rhyll flats in shallow waters which was considered to be technically unfeasible. 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. The eastern part of the landfall at Llanndulas crosses the Traeth Pensarn SSSI. GV acknowldeged 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.		
4.	**Baseline character** (presented by CD) <u>Guidance documents</u> 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 *Guidance on the Assessment of the Impact of Offshore Wind Farms: Seascape and Visual Impact Report* (2005). <u>Study areas</u> The following study areas have been used to establish the baseline character: • 50km for the array • 10km for the onshore substation • 1km for the onshore cable corridor <u>Character areas</u> 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. <u>Sensitivity</u> Nationally Designated Landscapes i.e., National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, are landscapes of the highest		

	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. 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: '*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*.' Report no. 331 notes that for Zone 2 *"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) *...".* For Zone 5 *"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."*		
5.	**Visual baseline** (Presented by CD) <u>Visibility</u> The methodology used for the photography survey is in line with the Landscape Institute *Technical Guidance Note 06/19: Visual representation of development proposals*. 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. <u>Representative viewpoint locations</u> 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,		

	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. 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.		
6.	**Design** (Presented by CD) 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. CD presented a plan illustrating some of the constraints, such as commercial shipping and MoD training areas. 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. 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: • 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]). 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. 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.		

7.	**Questions/Points raised** <u>Field of View</u> EH – asked if an appropriate field of view had been applied because Gwynt y Mor was not shown. 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. ACTION- present the series of 75 degree wirelines from VP3 and (additional) VP 28. <u>Inclusion of turbines from proposed OWF</u> EH – commented that the wirelines were not showing the proposed turbines for Awel y Mor. 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. 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. GV and CD – explained that the purpose of the meeting was to agree what was the worst-case option for Mona Offshore Wind Project. 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. CD- asked if we can assume that the largest turbines for both schemes presents the worst case. ACTION – wirelines for VP3 and VP 28 will include Awel y Mor. Wireline for VP19 will include Morgan.	**CD** **CD**	**Wirelines updated in the slide pack** **Wirelines updated in the slide pack**
8.	**Next steps** 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.		

9.	**Close of meeting**		

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.				