

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Hearing Summaries ISH2

Deadline: 1

Application Reference: EN010137

Document Reference: S_D1_3

Document Number: MOCNS-J3303-BSN-10248

August 2024

F01



Image of an offshore wind farm

Document status

Version	Purpose of document	Authored by	Reviewed by	Approved by	Review date
F01	Submission at Deadline 1	Burges Salmon	Mona Offshore Wind Ltd.	Mona Offshore Wind Ltd.	August 2024

Prepared by:

Burges Salmon LLP

Prepared for:

Mona Offshore Wind Ltd.

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Contents

HEARING SUMMARY ISH2 3
ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARING 2: WEDNESDAY 17 AND THURSDAY 18 JULY 3

Tables

Table 1.1: Written summary of the Applicant's oral submission at ISH2 4

HEARING SUMMARY ISH2

ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARING 2: WEDNESDAY 17 AND THURSDAY 18 JULY

This document presents a written summary of Mona Offshore Wind Limited's (the Applicant) oral case at Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH 2) on Onshore and Offshore Environmental Matters and draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) (Table 1.1). ISH 2 on the Mona Offshore Wind's Development Consent Order (DCO) application took place on 17 and 18 July 2024 starting at 09:30am on both days at Venue Cymru, Promenade, Llandudno, LL30 1BB.

Table 0.1: Written summary of the Applicant’s oral submission at ISH2

ID	Agenda Item	Notes
3. Construction Matters		
a)	Offshore construction matters including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-construction • Wind turbine layout 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) The Applicant confirmed that the definition of commencement in the draft development consent order (PDA-003) (Draft DCO) has two limbs: (a) offshore and (b) onshore. In respect of offshore commencement in so far as it is controlled through the deemed marine licence, the definition excludes certain pre-construction surveys, monitoring surveys, unexploded ordnance (UXO) surveys and UXO clearance. The Applicant confirmed that these surveys are not included in Table 3.37 of Environmental Statement - Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description (APP-050) (the Project Description Chapter) as the purpose of this table is to identify the construction programme from commencement itself rather than from the pre-commencement period. The Applicant agreed to include the pre-commencement activities in this table by Deadline 1 and indicate how pre-commencement surveys will influence detailed design. [Post hearing note: see S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points, Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_01.] (2) The Applicant confirmed that in accordance with Principle 1 of Table 3.7 in the Project Description Chapter the positioning of the wind turbine generators (WTGs) would be at least half a rotor diameter from the boundary of the Order Limits. (3) The Applicant confirmed that any requirement for micro-siting would not result in any WTGs being constructed within half a rotor diameter of the boundary of the Order Limits. The Applicant confirmed that it is a condition of the Applicant’s lease from The Crown Estate that WTG blades cannot oversail the boundary of the Order Limits. (4) The Applicant confirmed that vessels associated with the construction of Mona Offshore Wind Project (the Project) can be outside the Order Limits during construction. The transiting of vessels is not a licensable activity under the marine licences and does not require consent. (5) The Applicant confirmed that a 500 metre safety zone will be sought by the Applicant and will extend from any vessel actively constructing WTGs or offshore substation platforms. A 500 metre safety zone could extend to outside the Order Limits where construction is occurring at a WTG. [Post hearing note: see section 1.3 of the Safety Zone Statement (APP-192).] (6) The Applicant confirmed that two indicative design scenarios have formed the basis for the environmental impact assessment where information about indicative layout was required. These were based on the smallest number (68) of the largest WTGs and the largest number (96) of smallest WTGs. The Applicant explained that worst case indicative layouts have been used where required, for example in relation to aviation and radar the indicative layout assumed the largest WTG tip-height with WTGs spread across the array area. [Post hearing

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

ID	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>note: this is set out in section 1.7 of Environmental Statement - Volume 4, Chapter 1: Aviation and radar (APP-075).]</p>
b)	The offshore export cable and landfall	<p>(7) The Applicant confirmed that Energy Act 2004 which allows for safety zones does not provide for safety zones around cable installation. The Applicant confirmed that for cable installation there would be a rolling advisory exclusion zone that would move with the vessels. This could extend beyond the Order Limits depending on the final location of cables. The Applicant confirmed that temporary advisory exclusion zones could be required where, for example, target cable burial depth has not been achieved and that the length of time a temporary advisory exclusion zone is in place depends on the timing of the construction programme, but could be in place for months.</p> <p>(8) The Applicant highlighted that using these rolling advisory exclusion zones would avoid the need to create an exclusion zone within the cable corridor thereby allowing for maximum use by others during construction. The Applicant referenced the Safety Zone Statement (APP-192) which sets out further detail and confirmed that the safety zone will be applied for post-consent and is identified in the Outline Fisheries Liaison and Co-Existence Plan (APP-199).</p> <p>(9) The Applicant confirmed that the Outline Landfall Construction Method Statement (APP-226) sets out a maximum trenchless drilling depth of 30 metres, but does not set a minimum depth. The Applicant confirmed that there would be obstacles it would need to cross which would require a minimum depth for example, Network Rail requires a minimum 9 metre depth. [Post hearing note: by way of clarification the Outline Landfall Construction Method Statement does not currently include a maximum trenchless drilling depth of 30 metres. The Applicant will include this update in the Outline Landfall Construction Method Statement when it is next submitted to the Examination.]</p> <p>(10) The Applicant confirmed that further detail in relation to design of the landfall works will be informed by pre-construction surveys. The Applicant has reduced impacts on the beach by committing to trenchless cable installation techniques.</p> <p>(11) The Applicant confirmed its understanding that monitoring for exposure of cables has been included in other projects because trenchless exit pits are within the intertidal zone or because of coastal erosion being an issue at those locations. The Applicant clarified coastal erosion is not a specific concern at the landfall location.</p> <p>(12) The Applicant clarified that Conwy County Council's pre-application consultation response raised in relation to beach erosion was at the point where the Project still retained the optionality for a shorter drill exiting within the intertidal area and open-cut trenching between the exit pit and mean low water. The Applicant confirmed that this optionality has been</p>

ID	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>removed from the Application and this removal has changed the nature of impacts arising from the Project. The Applicant nonetheless agreed to consider this issue in further detail. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points, Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_04.]</p> <p>(13) The Applicant agreed to provide further information on the sequencing of the works taking place at landfall. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points, Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_05.] The Applicant further clarified that cofferdams are not required for this Project because the exit for the trenchless techniques at landfall is a 'wet exit' seaward of mean low water.</p> <p>(14) The Applicant confirmed that drilling will take place over an estimated 9-month period within a 24-month period. The Applicant confirmed that this approach is primarily driven by restrictions on the timing of works to avoid disturbance to over-wintering birds.</p>
c)	<p>Onshore construction matters including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-commencement activities • Cable laying & cable corridor, including crossings [APP-083] • Temporary construction compounds • Haul roads and laydowns • The onshore substation 	<p>(15) The Applicant clarified that demolition in relation to onshore site preparation works as defined in the draft development consent order (PDA-003) (Draft DCO) relates to boundary features, for example walls and fences, and it is not currently anticipated that any existing buildings will be demolished as part of the onshore site preparation works. [Post hearing note: See also S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points, Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_07.]</p> <p>(16) The Applicant provided an update on the trial trenching survey and confirmed that the June 2024 campaign was completed but 11 trenches were not completed due to difficulty gaining access. The Applicant confirmed it requires another phase of trial trenching and archaeological investigations to take place. Further investigations may be needed post-consent.</p> <p>(17) The Applicant agreed to review the Outline onshore written scheme of investigation (APP-209) to check whether temporary construction compounds for archaeological investigations would be needed and confirmed that the intention of the Outline onshore written scheme of investigation is that it contains sufficient controls which are adhered to when surveys are undertaken. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points, Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_06.]</p> <p>(18) The Applicant confirmed that hardstanding is needed for temporary construction compounds. The Applicant confirmed that the creation of site accesses is shown on the Outline highways access management plan (APP-228). The Applicant confirmed that access to the haul road is through temporary construction compounds.</p> <p>(19) In response to points raised by SP Manweb the Applicant confirmed that there are a number of options available to it in relation to existing statutory undertaker apparatus, including avoidance and diversion as a worst-case scenario. The Applicant confirmed that it would seek</p>

ID	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>to avoid such apparatus where possible, but because it has not yet undertaken detailed design it cannot commit to this. The Applicant confirmed that any works undertaken in proximity to SP Manweb’s assets will need to be in accordance with the protective provisions as agreed with SP Manweb. The Applicant confirmed that Article 31(a) of the Draft DCO allows the Applicant to acquire compulsorily land belonging to statutory undertakers shown on the Land plan (onshore) (B5 F03) and Book of Reference (D4 F03) and Article 31(b) of the Draft DCO provides the Applicant with the right to relocate the apparatus belonging to statutory undertakers, subject to the terms of any protective provisions.</p> <p>(20) The Applicant agreed to update Figure 3.17 of the Environmental Statement - Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description (APP-050) (the Project Description Chapter) to include annotations and indicative dimensions particularly for the top and subsoil bund. [Post hearing note: The Applicant has reviewed the Outline Soil Management Plan (APP-220) and confirms that the maximum height of the topsoil and subsoil bunds are set out in paragraph 1.11.1.2 of the Outline Soil Management Plan (APP-220). Other updates are made to Figure 3.17 as per S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points, Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_08.]</p> <p>(21) The Applicant confirmed that the meaning of ‘prepare’ in paragraph 3.7.2.7 of the Project Description Chapter means to install.</p> <p>(22) In relation to cable installation, the Applicant confirmed it intends to dig a section of trench at a time once joint bays are established. The Applicant confirmed that it intends to excavate and backfill trenches the same day to avoid trenches being left open overnight. [Post hearing note: see S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points, Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_08.]</p> <p>(23) The Applicant confirmed that the length of the cable between joint bays will determine the size of the cable drums and that this will be done as part of detailed design. The Applicant confirmed that the cable drum would be transported by a cable drum trailer which will be parked on a stoned area off the haul road. The Applicant confirmed that once joint bays are constructed there will be hardstanding areas around joint bays for the cable drums. The Applicant confirmed that the base case separation distance for joint bays is 1,000 metres but may be less, or more, depending on detailed design and that there will be a maximum of 14 locations for joint bays but this could be reduced down during detailed design. [Post hearing note: By way of clarification, Environmental Statement - Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description (APP-050) sets out that the maximum number of joint bays is 80 which consists of one joint bay for each of the four circuits at 20 locations along the onshore cable corridor. See also S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points, Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_11 and Annex 4.]</p>

ID	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>(24) The Applicant confirmed that assessment of the impact of temporary laydown areas has followed the same principles for the assessment of the haul road. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points, Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_11 and Annex 4.]</p> <p>(25) The Applicant confirmed that the dots on Figure 1.5 of the Environmental Statement - Volume 5, Annex 5.3: Onshore Crossing Schedule (APP-083) show obstacles and do not reflect the type of trenching the project is using. The Applicant confirmed that the colour coding in this figure indicates how the relevant obstacle will be crossed. The Applicant confirmed that where dots are coloured green the crossings will be trenchless and orange dots indicate the crossing may either be trenchless or trenched. The Applicant confirmed that it can provide indicative detail on cross sections. [Post hearing note: S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points, Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_08.]</p> <p>(26) The Applicant confirmed that the dot outside the Order Limits in Figure 1.64 of the Environmental Statement - Volume 5, Annex 5.3: Onshore Crossing Schedule (APP-083) is a block of woodland and that it is not intending to do a trenched or trenchless crossing outside the Order Limits. The Applicant agreed to ensure this identifier is shown within the Order Limits on the plan and confirmed that if there are dots or obstacles shown on or outside the Order Limits, the Applicant is not intending to work in this area. [Post hearing note: an updated Onshore Crossing Schedule (APP-083) has been provided at Deadline 1, see F5_4.3 F02. See also S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points, Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_10.]</p> <p>(27) The Applicant confirmed that the updated plans submitted at the Procedural Deadline were to show the inclusion of the existing substation access and these changes did not affect the Environmental Statement – Volume 5, Annex 5.3: Onshore Crossing Schedule (APP-083) and remaining plans submitted therewith.</p> <p>(28) The scheduled works within the Draft DCO include temporary construction compounds. There is a temporary construction compound of up to 30,000 square metres at landfall within Work No. 10 which is made up of a temporary construction compound and drilling compound. Work No. 7 is not a temporary construction compound and is only proposed to be used for laydown and parking. The Applicant confirmed it would provide a definition of what a temporary construction compound is. Along the cable corridor there will be one primary temporary construction compound which will be up to 25,500 square metres and up to four temporary construction compounds each up to 15,000 square metres. There will also be temporary construction compounds at the onshore substation of up to 150,000 square metres and a further temporary construction compound at Work No. 28. The Applicant needs flexibility as to the location of the primary and secondary compounds as their location will be determined as</p>

ID	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>part of the construction contract. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points, Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_11 and Annex 4.]</p> <p>(29)The Applicant clarified that haul roads will not always be in middle of the cable corridors and flexibility is needed in the onshore cable corridor for ecological and other constraints. The Applicant confirmed it has not specified the haul road in the description of works in the draft development consent order (PDA-003) (Draft DCO) for each part of the cable corridor as it is included within the description of associated development. Further, the Applicant confirmed that haul roads are temporary for purposes of construction.</p> <p>(30)The Applicant clarified that gravel aggregate along with protective matting will be used to construct the haul road. These are identified in the Project Description Chapter. The Environmental Statement – Volume 3, Chapter 8: Traffic and Transport (APP-071) assessment is based on the number of movements for stone and other construction activities.</p> <p>(31)The Applicant confirmed that storage areas may be required in various locations within the onshore cable corridor for example cable pulling or cable drum locations. These have not been identified at this stage as their location will be determined by the detailed design. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points, Annex 4.]</p> <p>(32) The Applicant agreed to provide an indicative annotation of Figure 1.2 of Design Principles (APP-189). The Applicant confirmed that this figure is an indicative layout created primarily to inform the landscape and visual assessment. The Applicant clarified that this figure therefore focused on the height of equipment rather than the layout of any roads. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points, Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_12.]</p> <p>(33)The Applicant confirmed that reference to Figure 3.22 in paragraph 3.7.3.22 Project Description Chapter in relation to cut and fill is a typo. It should instead refer to the location of the attenuation pond. The Applicant agreed to review the Environmental Statement – Volume 3, Chapter 8: Traffic and Transport (APP-071) to provide details of how the volume of material from the cut and fill balance has been assessed. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points, Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_13.]</p> <p>(34)The Applicant agreed to review the Environmental Statement – Volume 3, Chapter 8: Traffic and Transport (APP-071) to provide the indicative peak period for the maximum number of construction workers for the onshore substation. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points, Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_14.]</p> <p>(35) In relation to the Awel y Môr Offshore Wind Farm, the Applicant confirmed that Environmental Statement – Volume 5, Annex 5.3: Onshore Crossing Schedule (APP-083) only shows existing</p>

ID	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>obstacles to be crossed and not Awel y Môr's cables as there is no fixed position yet for them. The Applicant agreed to share a first draft of the overlay plan as committed to in Issue Specific Hearing 1 with Awel y Môr and engage with them to create an indicative overlay plan showing both projects. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points, Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_15 and S_D1_5.7 Mona Offshore Wind Project and Awel y Môr Offshore Wind Farm Works Plans Overlays.]</p> <p>(36) In response to Cefn Mariaidog community council the Applicant confirmed that it has sought to minimise disruption to the Cefn Mariaidog community by adopting controls to ensure impacts are minimised as far as possible, whilst seeking to keep the construction period as short as possible.</p>
d)	Construction working hours	<p>(37) The Applicant confirmed that offshore working hours would be 24 hours. The Applicant agreed to review the application documentation to ensure this is included. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points, Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_16.]</p> <p>(38) The Applicant confirmed that its proposed onshore working hours are 7am to 7pm Monday to Saturday with no working on bank holidays. The Applicant confirmed that there are no specific caveats to this for the Christmas period but reiterated that there would be no working on bank holidays. The Applicant highlighted that the Awel y Mor Offshore Wind Farm Development Consent Order 2023 allows for working hours between 7am to 7pm.</p> <p>(39) The Applicant confirmed that time critical activities for extended working hours are activities that need to happen at a very specific period of time or where there is a requirement to finish something, for example a concrete pour which has to continue once it has begun, or for health and safety reasons. The Applicant confirmed that delayed activity because of for example weather would not, on its own, give rise to a time critical activity. The Applicant confirmed that continuous concrete pouring would occur for foundation works for the onshore substation platform.</p> <p>(40) The Applicant submitted that its proposed working hours are considered to be appropriate and are driven by the duration of works and minimising this duration as much as possible. The Applicant submitted that the proposed working hours have been considered as part of the environmental impact assessment and no significant effects have been identified from this assessment. The Applicant submitted that working hours involve a balance between longer days and shorter duration versus shorter days and longer duration and the Applicant has considered the proposed working hours on local residents and has not identified any significant effects.</p> <p>(41) The Applicant confirmed that onshore activities may require task led lighting for health and safety reasons. The Applicant confirmed it would clarify the reference to 'darkness' in Table</p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

ID	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>6.2 of the Environmental Statement - Volume 3, Chapter 6: Landscape and visual resources (APP-069). [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_37.]</p> <p>(42) The Applicant agreed to review the relationship between Requirement 14 of the draft development consent order (PDA-003) (Draft DCO) and the Outline Code of Construction Practice (APP-212). [Post hearing note: the Applicant intends to submit an updated Draft DCO at Deadline 2.]</p> <p>(43) The Applicant confirmed that the Outline Code of Construction Practice (APP-212) includes a mobilisation period before and after core working hours which would involve non-noisy working hours, for example workers arriving on site and cleaning up. The Applicant confirmed that 24-hour trenchless installation activities during this mobilisation period are not required and this period would only involve non-noisy activities. The Applicant confirmed that any heavy goods vehicle delivery, abnormal indivisible load deliveries or piling activity would only be undertaken during core working hours. [Post hearing note: There may be specific circumstances in which out of hours deliveries of abnormal indivisible loads are required. These will be agreed with the local planning authority through the process of discharging the Code of Construction Practice.]</p>
4. Shipping and Navigation		
a)-d)	<p>Effects on navigational safety</p> <p>Effects on adverse weather routeing</p> <p>Effects on commercial shipping operations including strategic passenger and freight routes and lifeline ferries</p> <p>Mitigation</p>	<p>(44)The Applicant provided an update on its engagement with shipping and navigation stakeholders. The Applicant confirmed that it set up the Marine Navigational Engagement Forum and has committed to continuing this forum into the construction and operation of the Project. The Applicant confirmed that since submission of its application it has not had another meeting with this forum, but has continued engagement with stakeholders on whom moderate significant effects were identified in its Environmental Statement - Volume 2, Chapter 7: Shipping and navigation (APP-059).</p> <p>(45)The Applicant confirmed it had a statement of common ground (SoCG) meeting on 12 July 2024 with the Maritime Coastguard Agency (MCA) and made good progress in this meeting. The Applicant confirmed it intends to submit an initial SoCG with the MCA at Deadline 1. The Applicant confirmed that it managed to close out nearly all of agreement statements within the SoCG and the key points the MCA took away relate to relevant requirements within the draft development consent order (PDA-003) (Draft DCO) which the MCA are still reviewing and for the MCA to review impacts on search and rescue with their specialists. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_16 Mona and Maritime and Coastguard Agency SoCG.]</p> <p>(46)The Applicant confirmed that in respect of the Draft DCO Requirements and deemed marine licence Conditions the Applicant has had regard to the MCA, Trinity House and Natural Resources Wales' (NRW) standard set of conditions in its drafting. The Applicant confirmed</p>

ID	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>that it has captured what the MCA is seeking to achieve through its deemed marine licence conditions, but that this is subject to confirmation from the MCA.</p> <p>(47)The Applicant confirmed that it had a SoCG meeting with Trinity House and agreed the majority of statements with the exception of mitigation measures described in Table 1.10 of the Navigation Risk Assessment [Post hearing note: see Environmental Statement - Volume 6, Annex 7.1: Navigational Risk Assessment (APP-098)] as Trinity House has not yet worked through all of the materials. The Applicant confirmed that it will look at the outstanding matters at the next meeting with Trinity House, including the Draft DCO.</p> <p>(48)The Applicant confirmed that it has been engaging with the Isle of Man Steam Packet Company (IOMSPC) directly on residual matters and has had several meetings with them following submission of the Application. The Applicant confirmed it is also engaging with the Territorial Seas Committee (TSC) within the Department of Infrastructure of the Isle of Man Government who represents Manx stakeholders including the IOMSPC. The Applicant confirmed that the TSC submitted a relevant representation and that it is preparing a SoCG with the TSC and aims to submit this at Deadline 1. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_11Mona and Isle of Man Government – Territorial Sea Committee SoCG.]</p> <p>(49)The Applicant confirmed that the residual effects identified on the IOMSPC relate to increased routing as a result of diversions that will be required to avoid the Project and that they are generally commercial in nature, and include increased fuelling requirements.</p> <p>(50)The Applicant confirmed that it has reached out on number of occasions to Seatruck Ferries (now CLdN RoRo Ltd as of February 2024) but it has not been successful in securing a meeting. The Applicant confirmed that it will continue trying. The Applicant confirmed that CLdN were part of the marine navigation engagement forum from its inception and attended bridge simulations and both hazard workshops. The Applicant confirmed that CLdN has engaged with the Applicant throughout the pre-application process up to December 2023.</p> <p>(51)The Applicant confirmed that where it is not receiving engagement with stakeholders and stakeholders do not submit relevant representations, the Applicant will continue trying to engage but highlighted that there is only so much the Applicant can do without detailed communication from parties.</p> <p>(52)The Applicant welcomed Stena Line’s confirmation that the impacts of the Mona array area had been reduced to ALARP and confirmed that it is engaging with Stena Line on residual matters and is engaging with the Chamber of Shipping on producing a SoCG which it intends to submit this at Deadline 1. [Post hearing note: see S_D1_18 Mona and UK Chamber of Shipping SoCG.]</p>

ID	Agenda Item	Notes
		(53)The Applicant confirmed that Peel Ports (the owner of Liverpool and Heysham Ports as well as some other Ports) and Ørsted are members of the Marine Navigation Engagement Forum.
5. Marine Mammals		
a)	Maximum Design Scenario	<p>(56)In relation to piling, the Applicant confirmed that there would not be two piling vessels on a single location on a single foundation. If there are two vessels piling concurrently, they will be at different wind turbine generator locations. Two separate piles would then be driven at the same time. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_18.]</p> <p>(57)The Applicant clarified in relation to paragraph 4.9.3.26 of Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description (APP-050) that the duration of piling will be up to 113.5 days, but that for the purpose of the population model this was rounded to 114 days because whole 24 hour periods were used for the model. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_19.]</p>
b)	Significance of Effects	<p>(58)The Applicant noted that its explanation of the assessment of injury from elevated underwater sound due to piling in response to Natural Resources Wales' (NRW) comments is in its response to relevant representation [Post hearing note: see the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (PBA-008), row RR-011.28.]. The Applicant submitted that these effects are captured within the Environmental Statement - Volume 5, Annex 3.1: Underwater Sound Technical Report (APP-079).</p> <p>(59) In relation to vessel movements, the Applicant confirmed that it does not assess precise vessel movements but rather looks at the location and how many vessels may be on site at one time. The Applicant confirmed that its assessment is: S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points precautionary and applies conservative thresholds to noise modelling. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_21.]</p>
c)	Mitigation Measures	(60)The Applicant confirmed that measures to minimise disturbance to marine mammals are secured by the offshore environmental management plan Condition of the deemed marine licence which describes a code of conduct for vessels. The Applicant confirmed that Table 4.17 in Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals (APP-056) makes reference to the Wildlife Safe (WiSe) Scheme, and measures are contained within this scheme to minimise risk of disturbance and collision with marine mammals including sudden changes in speed, for example. The Applicant agreed that it will review the relevant documentation to ensure the measures to minimise disturbance are sufficiently secured. That document describes the code of conduct for vessels that would minimise disturbance to marine mammals and to rafting birds as well. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points Table 2.1

ID	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>row HAP_ISH2_23.] The Applicant confirmed it would review the reference vessel speed in the Planning statement (APP-186). [Post hearing note: The Applicant will address this in the next iteration of the Planning statement.]</p> <p>(61)The Applicant confirmed that the offshore construction method statement and offshore environmental management plan were not intended to be provided in outline and confirmed that it will review and delete any references to such outline documents in the development consent order (PDA-003) (Draft DCO). [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_26.]</p> <p>(62)The Applicant clarified that the Marine Licence Principles Document (PDA-005) refers to an offshore environmental management plan as being secured in Condition 18(1)(e) of Schedule 14 of the Draft DCO because this plan is expected to form part of the standalone marine licence to be granted by NRW, and the deemed marine licence and those need to align. The Applicant confirmed that there may be different terminology used in the deemed marine licence and standalone marine licence but those are explained within the Marine Licence Principles Document. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_26.]</p> <p>(63)The Applicant confirmed that there are separate controls for pre-commencement activities involving unexploded ordnance clearance within Schedule 14 (the deemed marine licence) of the Draft DCO. The Applicant confirmed that Condition 21 controls pre-commencement unexploded ordnance surveys.</p> <p>(64) The Applicant confirmed that it does not intend to have an offshore environmental management plan in place for pre-commencement activities. [Post hearing note: Under Condition 18(1)(e) the offshore environmental management plan must be approved by Natural Resources Wales prior to commencement, but there is no obligation for that to be in place in advance of that point.]</p> <p>(65)The Applicant confirmed that there will be one offshore environmental management plan secured within the Draft DCO. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_26.]</p> <p>(66)The Applicant confirmed that it concluded in the environmental impact assessment that no significant Project alone effects were identified for piling and it has therefore not committed to post-construction monitoring for marine mammals.</p>

6. Commercial Fisheries and Fish

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

ID	Agenda Item	Notes
a)	Baseline data	(67) The Applicant confirmed that it will respond to points raised by the Scottish Fish Producers Association's once they have been submitted in their written representation.
b) – c)	Significance of effects Mitigation measures	<p>(68) The Applicant agreed to provide details of the current size of the core scallop ground within Mona array area and size of the scallop mitigation zone by Deadline 1. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_30.]</p> <p>(69) The Applicant confirmed that the scallop mitigation zone is described in the Outline Fisheries Liaison and Co-Existence Plan (APP-199) and the final plan must accord with this outline document. The Applicant noted that the final location of the scallop mitigation zone may be subject to refinement as part of the finalisation of the array design post consent, and that cables and cable protection are not excluded from this area. The Applicant confirmed it would update the Outline Fisheries Liaison and Co-Existence Plan (APP-199) to align with the coordinates system used in the deemed marine licence. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_31.]</p> <p>(70) The Applicant confirmed that 14 days' notice is required to be given prior to commencement of licenced marine activities as set out in the deemed marine licence and Outline Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan (APP-199) refer to the initial notice. Following this initial notice, additional notices to mariners will then be issued periodically.</p> <p>(71) The Applicant confirmed that in relation to static fishing gear, if it gave notice and did not receive a response within the required timeframe it would remove static fishing gear.</p> <p>(72) The Applicant confirmed that Table 1.1 of the Outline Fisheries Liaison and Co-Existence Plan (APP-199) notes that 14 days' notification requirements should also apply to those pre-commencement site surveys and unexploded ordnance clearance activities. The Applicant confirmed that following the initial notice to mariners, notices would be issued at regular intervals. [Post hearing note: the Applicant proposes to update the drafting of Schedule 14 to align with this position. An updated draft development consent order will be provided at Deadline 2.]</p> <p>(73) The Applicant confirmed that the phrasing in paragraph 1.3.3.3 of the Outline Fisheries Liaison and Co-Existence Plan (APP-199) the Applicant's approach is "<i>anticipated to follow</i>" the Fishing Liaison with Offshore Wind and Wet Renewables Group "Best Practice Guidance for Offshore Renewables Developments" is because those are due to be updated.</p> <p>(74) The Applicant confirmed that the duration of implementation of safety zones at a specific location is generally short-term and that safety zones move with vessels. The Applicant confirmed that for this reason no significant effects on displacement of fishing activity have been identified despite the length of the offshore construction programme. The Applicant</p>

ID	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>confirmed that is has not proposed any disturbance payments during construction because no significant impacts have been identified.</p> <p>(75) The Applicant confirmed that, as no residual significant effects are predicted to fish and shellfish ecology receptors following the assessment and application of mitigation measures, no monitoring is considered required.</p>
<p>7. Civil Military Aviation and Defence Interests</p>		
<p>a)</p>	<p>Significance of effects on the Blackpool Airport Minimum Safe Altitude and security of mitigation</p>	<p>(76)The Applicant explained that the environmental impact assessment found that there is an impact on the Blackpool Airport 25 nautical mile Non-Directional Beacon (localiser) south-west Minimum Sector Altitude (MSA). The Applicant explained that Instrument Flight Procedures (IFP) are established for the safe and efficient flow of aircraft when aircraft are unable to operate in visual flight conditions. The Applicant explained that in Instrument Meteorological Conditions aircraft can't operate visually and operate, if they are able following IFP published by each airport. These IFP provide a safe minimum altitude of a minimum of 1000 feet from obstacles below the aircraft. The Applicant explained that the maximum tip height of wind turbine generators (WTGs) would breach the southwest sector of the MSA and requires mitigation.</p> <p>(72) The Applicant clarified that the effect on Blackpool Airport MSA would take place from the first erection of the WTGs and that it is the physical presence of the structure breaching the height of the MSA that triggers the need for mitigation.</p> <p>(73) The Applicant confirmed that the required mitigation is for Blackpool Airport to agree to change the height of the affected MSA from 2000 to 2200 feet. The Applicant confirmed that this process is defined and accepted by the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) and that the MSA is reviewed on a 5-year basis but can be reviewed before this if necessary. The Applicant explained that the Airport can present to the CAA for approval after they have completed their required safety management system process and the CAA can consider approval of the change to the MSA.</p> <p>(74) The Applicant confirmed that the mitigation has been identified based on construction of WTGs with a maximum tip height of 364 metre above LAT. The Applicant confirmed that if it builds out the Project under scenario 1, there may not be a requirement to change IFP. The Applicant confirmed it is pursuing the process based on worst case scenario and securing mitigation in case it is necessary.</p> <p>(75) The Applicant confirmed that it has been engaging with Blackpool Airport on the required change to IFP until December 2023, but that the airport then made the Applicant aware that the CAA had asked them to update their flight procedures for all of the offshore wind farm</p>

ID	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>projects proposed in the area. The Applicant confirmed that it has a further meeting with Blackpool Airport on Thursday 23 July 2024 which will hopefully provide clarity on the Airport's current positioning and next steps. The Applicant confirmed it is not aware of any impediments that would prevent the airport from raising its MSA. [Post Hearing Note: See S_D1_21 Mona and Blackpool Airport SoCG.]</p> <p>(77) The Applicant reiterated that the process of reviewing and amending MSA is standard and happens on a regular basis. The Applicant confirmed that this is something the airport will need to do in order to ensure safe operation in the event that this scheme and others in the Irish Sea proceed. The Applicant highlighted that this process is not within its control but is a regular technical process which the airport must undergo.</p> <p>(78) In relation to Table 1.19 of Environmental Statement - Volume 4, Chapter 1: Aviation and radar (APP-075) the Applicant clarified that where a minor adverse effect is identified, a residual effect is noted as N/A because there is no change to the residual effect where no further mitigation has been identified.</p>
b)	Significance of effects on civil and military radar systems and security of mitigation	<p>CIVIL RADAR</p> <p>1. NATS</p> <p>(79) The Applicant confirmed it has received a draft mitigation contract from NATS and is in the process of reviewing this and the statement of common ground (SoCG) with NATS. The Applicant confirmed it met with NATS on 11 July 2024 where it managed to close out in principle agreements with the exception of mitigation and the Applicant confirmed it will have another meeting with NATS prior to submission of SoCG at Deadline 1. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_19 Mona and NATS (En Route) plc SoCG.]</p> <p>(80) The Applicant confirmed that there is nothing currently in the draft development consent order (PDA-003) (Draft DCO) securing this mitigation but it is the Applicant's intention that this will be included in the next draft of the Draft DCO subject to the agreement of NATS. The Applicant confirmed that this was not in the Application version of the draft development consent order because the Applicant did not have sufficient information from NATS at that stage in relation to particular radars.</p> <p>(81) The Applicant confirmed that there are three sites where mitigation will be required for NATS (Lowther Hill, St Anne's and the Great Dun Fell PSRs).</p> <p>2. Ronaldsway Isle of Man Airport PSR</p>

ID	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>(82) The Applicant confirmed that likely mitigation for Ronaldsway Airport relates to blanking of their radar and a Transponder Mandatory Zone covering the array area, which is the same mitigation preferred by NATS. The Applicant confirmed it was discussing the inclusion of additional Secondary Surveillance Radar within the area, but first needs to understand NATS' position. The Applicant confirmed that since these discussions Ronaldsway Airport informed the Applicant it is planning undertake a surveillance strategy for next 20 years for maintenance of safety in light of offshore wind proposals in the Irish sea. The Applicant confirmed its understanding is that the airport would undertake its strategy from February 2024. The Applicant is supportive of this initiative. The Applicant has since not had further engagement with the airport but has a SoCG meeting set up with IOM Territorial Seas Committee, which is one of the Isle of Man's government departments and is hoping to be able to provide Examining Authority with an update at Deadline 1. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_11 Mona and Isle of Man Government – Territorial Sea Committee SoCG.]</p> <p>(83) The Applicant confirmed it is aware it may need to update the Draft DCO depending on what mitigation is agreed with Ronaldsway Airport.</p> <p>3. Liverpool Airport PSR</p> <p>(84) The Applicant confirmed that Liverpool Airport has not submitted a relevant representation. The Applicant confirmed it has reached out to ask if this means the airport is not objecting to the application and is not taking part in the examination, but the Applicant has not received a response. The Applicant confirmed that its understanding is that Liverpool Airport will not be involved in the examination.</p> <p>(85) The Applicant confirmed that it completed an array area red line boundary site radar line of sight analysis between Liverpool Airport using the maximum blade tip height across the array area. The Applicant confirmed that this identified the potential for radar clutter from the operational wind turbine generators (WTGs). The Applicant confirmed that it approached Liverpool Airport about this result and the Airport indicated that it could manipulate its radar system to mitigate any effect and confirmed it would speak to their radar manufacturer to discuss. The Applicant has not heard anything further from Liverpool Airport. The Applicant confirmed that any mitigation put in place for NATS would potentially apply to Liverpool Airport as well.</p> <p>(86) Due to the general aviation operations conducted at minor aerodromes, most of which do not possess aviation radar systems, the Applicant confirmed that it has discounted these from assessment. The controlled airspace above the array area is controlled in the main by NATS, radar impact will fall within the impacts considered to NATS' systems.</p>

ID	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>DEFENCE RADAR</p> <p>(87) Through pre-application stakeholder engagement (including with the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO)), the Applicant confirmed that no effects were identified on military or defence radar systems. The Applicant confirmed it has received a relevant representation from the DIO raising concerns in relation to the impact of the development on British Aerospace (BAE) Warton and RAF Valley PSRs. The Applicant confirmed that this is a change of stance from the one the Ministry of Defence took at pre-application stage. The reason for this change in position has not been confirmed to the Applicant.</p> <p>(88) The Applicant confirmed that on 24 June DIO updated the Applicant to explain that it was raising an objection specifically in relation to BAE Warton and not RAF Valley. The Applicant confirmed that it has organised a meeting with BAE on Monday 22 July 2024 to discuss the impacts on radar and any mitigation that may be determined necessary. The Applicant confirmed it would feedback its discussions with the DIO to Examining Authority at Deadline 1. [Post Hearing Note: The meeting on 22 July with BAE regarding BAE Warton took place and relevant updates will be captured in the SoCG with the Infrastructure Organisation (Ministry of Defence) that is anticipated to be submitted at Deadline 2. Additionally, the Applicant understands that the Defence Infrastructure Organisation have submitted a written representation at Deadline 1 which sets out the objection.]</p> <p>(89) The Applicant confirmed that it has no knowledge or understanding of the mitigation in place for existing wind farms as this information is not in the public domain. The Applicant therefore confirmed that it can only work with BAE Warton and discuss matters through this channel.</p> <p>(90) The Applicant confirmed that it is aware of other projects in the area and that they may collaborate but that equally each project must also deliver its own mitigation.</p> <p>EMBEDDED MITIGATION</p> <p>(91) The Applicant confirmed that including two lines of orientation in the conditions of the deemed marine licence is in relation to search and rescue mitigation and is predominantly a shipping and navigation matter. This would not therefore be relevant for aviation matters and those consultees should not be named in the Draft DCO condition. [Post hearing note: the condition noted is condition 18(1)(a) of the draft development consent order (PDA-003).]</p> <p>(92) The Applicant confirmed that in relation to Requirement 3 (aviation safety) of the draft development consent order (PDA-003), the draft wording was agreed by the DIO during the pre-application consultation phase. The Applicant agreed to include this in its statement of common ground with the DIO. [Post hearing note: This position will be captured in the SoCG</p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

ID	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>with the Infrastructure Organisation (Ministry of Defence) that is anticipated to be submitted at Deadline 2.]</p> <p>(93) In relation to Requirement 3(1), the Applicant confirmed that its intention is that lighting will be in place for civil and military interests. The Applicant confirmed it would review the drafting and consider whether the CAA should also be a stakeholder in relation to Requirement 3. [Post hearing note: the Applicant intends to submit an updated Draft DCO at Deadline 2.]</p> <p>(94) The Applicant confirmed it would review Requirement 3(2)(b) and consider whether this should refer to commencement of WTG construction. [Post hearing note: the Applicant intends to submit an updated Draft DCO at Deadline 2.]</p> <p>(95)The Applicant confirmed Requirement 3(3) has been included to address seascape, landscape and visual impacts by reducing the level of light emitted in clear conditions. This was included in the recent Awel y Mor Offshore Wind Farm Development Consent Order 2023.</p> <p>(96) The Applicant confirmed that it would review Condition 15 of the deemed marine licence and whether sub-paragraph (5) should also apply in the event of damage to the authorised scheme more generally. [Post hearing note: the Applicant intends to submit an updated Draft DCO at Deadline 2.]</p>

8. Landscape, Seascape and Visual Effects

	<p>The approach to the assessment of the significance of impacts, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approach and methodology with particular regard to Natural Resources <p>Wales’s Relevant Representation [RR-011]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Maximum Design Scenario for the SLVIA • SLVIA Visualisations • The LVIA study area and the Zone of Theoretical Visibility • How representative viewpoints have been assessed 	<p>SEASCAPE</p> <p>(97)The Applicant confirmed that the maximum design scenario (MDS) is the 364 metre height of wind turbine generators (WTGs) (in other words fewer, taller WTGs) [Post hearing note: as set out in Table 8.17 of APP-060 and as stated in paragraph 8.8.1.4 of APP-060.]. The Applicant confirmed that this was chosen as the MDS because the zone of theoretical visibility (ZTV) using this MDS identified a more extensive area with potential visibility of the WTGs. The Applicant confirmed that the MDS layout was edge-weighted meaning more WTGs were set on the outer edges of the array area boundary. The Applicant confirmed that the boundary of the array area would not change with the different WTG sizes and is a set boundary.</p> <p>(98) The Applicant confirmed that its seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment demonstrates that due to the distance of the WTGs from the shore (approximately 29 km at the closest point) no significant effects were identified as a result of the presence of the WTGs. The Applicant confirmed that the layout of the WTGs in the array area would not change the assessment of significance of effects because of the distance of the array area from the shore. The Applicant compared the Project to other offshore wind farms which are located closer to shore where receptors may have a better sense of the scale of the WTGs, noting that in this</p>
--	---	--

ID	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>Project the distance of the WTGs from the shore is approximately 29 kilometres. [Post hearing note: see S_D1_ 31 Mona Distances to other offshore wind farms from Mona representative viewpoints. This is provided to assist the Examining Authority in determining the distances of other offshore wind farms considered in the cumulative effects assessment in respect of effects experienced by people at representative viewpoints contained within F2.8 Environmental Statement - Volume 2, Chapter 8: Seascape and visual resources (APP-060).]</p> <p>(99) In relation to determining the worst case scenario, the Applicant confirmed that the seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment (SLVIA) was undertaken the array area was edge-weighted so that the densest amount of WTGs were on the boundaries of the array area (towards land) so the assessment covered the greatest number of WTGs over the widest stretch of the array. The Applicant confirmed that the larger WTGs were chosen because these are the most visible. The Applicant confirmed that the ZTV for the SLVIA assessment, 364 metre tip WTGs were used as they have greater visibility and are therefore the worst-case scenario on which to base the assessment.</p> <p>(100) The Applicant confirmed that there could be minor visual differences using the two different MDS scenarios (in other words the smallest number (68) of the largest WTGs and the largest number (96) of smallest WTGs), but that is because of the distance of the WTGs from the shore, these differences would not be perceptible.</p> <p>(101) The Applicant confirmed that the SLVIA had been revised since the preliminary environmental information report (PEIR) stage and the new assessment was based on the increased WTG height. However, the Applicant confirmed that using the greater WTG height did not make a significant difference to the assessment due to the distance of the array from land.</p> <p>(102) The Applicant confirmed that some of the documents produced for application were updated from those used at the PEIR stage, and that some errors in drafting (not assessment) had been identified in the environmental statement as a result. The Applicant confirmed that the assessment submitted as part of the application was based on the higher 364m WTG height and agreed to review the SLVIA assessment to correct any errors. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_34.]</p> <p>(103) In relation to identifying the representative viewpoints (VPs) for the SLVIA assessment, the Applicant confirmed that it ran the ZTV at 364 metre WTG height and passed this ZTV in front of all statutory consultees. The Applicant confirmed that the statutory consultees requested that the Applicant look at the VPs used for Awel y Mor Offshore Wind Farm. The Applicant confirmed that some of these VPs were not relevant because of the difference in</p>

ID	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>location of the projects. The Applicant confirmed it reviewed the relevant VPs requested by statutory consultees as well as the VPs identified from the ZTV.</p> <p>(104) In relation to designated landscapes, the Applicant confirmed that it reviewed the special qualities of all three nationally designated landscapes: the Anglesey National Landscape; the Clwydian Range and Dee Valley National Landscape; and Eryri National Park [Post hearing note: see Environmental Statement - Volume 6, Annex 8.5: International and nationally designated landscape study (APP-105)]. The Applicant confirmed that these nationally designated landscapes were not solely relevant to choosing the VPs, as the Applicant chose VPs within the ZTV from which there was visibility of the WTGs. The Applicant confirmed that that both Natural Resources Wales and Eryri National Park Authority confirmed to it that it did not need to use Yr Wyddfa as a VP, as it lies beyond 60 km from the Mona array area. The Applicant confirmed that the summits of Carnedd Llewelyn and Carnedd Dafydd had been used as VPs, together with others within Eryri National Park due to their height, and proximity to the Mona array area compared with Yr Wyddfa.</p> <p>(105) In relation to Happy Valley Pleasure Gardens, Llandudno Pier and Gwyrch Castle, the Applicant confirmed that the impact of the onshore infrastructure on the setting of historic assets are assessed as part of the Environmental Statement - Volume 7, Annex 5.6: Settings assessment (onshore infrastructure) (APP-150). The Applicant in its seascape assessment only assesses the effects on visual receptors at publicly accessible locations. In relation to the relationship between heritage assets and how they are assessed in the SLVIA, the Applicant confirmed that the seascape assessment does not look at the settings of heritage assets. The Applicant confirmed that VPs are representative of visual impacts and not just what can be seen at that specific VP.</p> <p>(106) The Applicant confirmed that it undertook cumulative wirelines including the Awel y Mor Offshore Wind Project array as well as other Tier two arrays as set out in the Environmental Statement - Volume 6, Annex 8.6: Seascape visualisations Part 7 (Figures 47- 56) (APP-112). The Applicant agreed to review this assessment and confirm which developments were assessed cumulatively and where this assessment is set out. [Post hearing note: please see Appendix B of Environmental Statement - Volume 2, Chapter 8: Seascape and visual resources (APP-060) and Environmental Statement - Volume 6, Annex 8.6: Seascape visualisations Part 7 (Figures 47- 56) (APP-112). The offshore cumulative assessment assessed the effects of the Mona array on seascape and visual receptors as set out at section 8.11 of the Seascape and visual resources chapter (APP-060). Figure A.5 of that chapter illustrates the other offshore wind farm arrays that are considered within the cumulative assessment. The full list of cumulative assessment projects considered is at Appendix B of the chapter. The cumulative assessment of the Mona array area on the special qualities of the</p>

ID	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>nationally designated landscapes is detailed in the Environmental Statement - Volume 6, Annex 8.5: International and nationally designated landscape study (APP-105).]</p> <p>(107) The Applicant confirmed that the Mona SLVIA methodology is set out in the Environmental Statement [Post hearing note: see Volume 6, Annex 8.4: Seascape, landscape and Visual Resources Impact Assessment Methodology (APP-104) and Volume 7, Annex 6.4: Landscape, seascape and visual impact assessment methodology (APP_156)]. The Applicant confirmed that sensitivity is defined in these documents and the assessment of significance matrix refers to these definitions. The Applicant confirmed that its methodology is set out clearly and follows Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Third Edition and Guidance on the assessment of the impact of offshore wind farms: Seascape and visual impact report (DTI, 2005) (referred to as 'key guidance' in White 2020). In relation to this key guidance, the Applicant confirmed that when judging significance, up to and including minor to moderate effects are not significant and moderate to major effects are significant. The Applicant confirmed that it used professional judgment in deciding whether moderate effects are significant. The Applicant confirmed that the DTI 2005 Guidance states that effects of moderate could be judged as significant, but it is more than likely that they are not significant. The Applicant confirmed that professional judgment includes reviewing the actual sensitivity of the receptor, for example if the receptor is a nationally designated landscape.</p> <p>(108) In relation to the WTG colour, the Applicant confirmed that conditions 14(1) and 14(2) of the deemed marine licence within the draft development consent order (PDA-003) (Draft DCO) separates out the colour of the foundation, structures and transition piece structures. The Applicant confirmed that these structures are required by Trinity House guidance to be coloured yellow as a safety requirement. The Applicant confirmed that other colour is mentioned for the remainder of the structure (i.e. the tower and blades) and that these are listed in deemed marine licence condition 42 as grey. The Applicant confirmed that this is standard practice and this colour is precedented. The Applicant confirmed that these provisions do not relate to landscape mitigation and do not typically sit on the face of the Draft DCO as a requirement. The Applicant confirmed that landscape mitigation is secured through lighting requirements for the CAA and MOD, but agreed to review where these provisions are best placed. [Post hearing note: the Applicant intends to submit an updated Draft DCO at Deadline 2.]</p> <p>(109) The Applicant confirmed that the WTGs will be visible from shore in certain conditions but because of the distance there will be many days when they are not visible. The Applicant confirmed that wireframes show the WTGs with no atmospheric conditions as a worst-case. [Post hearing note: as set out in Table 8.2 of the Environmental Statement - Volume 2, Chapter 8: Seascape and visual resources (APP-060), National Policy Statement EN-3, paragraph 2.8.208 requires the SLVIA to use the latest Offshore Energy Strategic</p>

ID	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>Environmental Assessment 4 (OESEA4). Paragraphs 1.2.2.10 and 1.2.2.16 of Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations from Natural Resources Wales (NRW): RR-011.89 to RR-011-97 (PDA-011) refers to the influence of meteorological conditions and paragraph 1.2.3.9 refers to OESA4.]</p> <p>LANDSCAPE</p> <p>(110) The Applicant confirmed that the WTGs are significantly further from the coast than Gwynt y Mor Wind Farm, and can speak directly on the difference between the two SLVIA's to Martin Barlow at Cefyn Community Council. [Post hearing note: The Applicant provided Martin Barlow with further information regarding this point at the hearings.]</p> <p>(111) In relation to determination of the ZTV for the onshore substation site, the Applicant confirmed that this it considered the finished level of the platform on which the onshore substation will be built. The Applicant confirmed that this platform slopes from 61 metres to 57 metres above ordnance datum (AOD) and the height of the tallest building is 15 metres on top of this. The applicant confirmed that the ZTV was therefore run at 72 metres to 76 metres AOD.</p> <p>(112) The Applicant confirmed that the 30 metres high lightning protection equipment were not included in the visualisations due to uncertainty about where these will be located on the substation platform. The Applicant confirmed that it ran the ZTV a buffer of 10 kilometres from the outer edges of the substation platform. [Post hearing note: This buffer is sufficient for structures up to 30 metres high (Visual Representation of Wind Farms: Version 2.2, 2017, NatureScot).] The Applicant confirmed that the 400 kilovolt overhead lines and that the 30 metres high lightning masts would not break the skyline of the Clwydian Range in views from the west of the substation.</p> <p>(113) The Applicant confirmed it assessed the substation building located at the north of platform which is the most exposed area and the most visually prominent. The Applicant also confirmed that the assessment was undertaken without any façade optimisation from use of colour. In relation to any design changes at final design, the Applicant confirmed that because the assessment was done on this basis, any changes would not increase the significance of the effects.</p> <p>(114) The Applicant confirmed that the reason for the slope at the substation is to tie in with drainage requirements which will target the low point of the substation where the Applicant has identified the sustainable drainage system and the attenuation pond.</p> <p>(115) The Applicant explained that the choice of VPs was made prior to PEIR. The Applicant confirmed that it identified the most sensitive and closest VPs and that it was keen to assess VPs within Clwydian Range and Dee Valley National Landscape, and so had chosen a 10</p>

ID	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>kilometre buffer. Users of Offa’s Dyke National Trail have the highest sensitivity. [Post hearing note: All VPs suggested by NRW within the National Landscape were taken and used in the assessment.] The Applicant confirmed that it extended the study area to 10 kilometre to also capture the effects on the special qualities of the National Landscape. The Applicant confirmed that it looked at other sensitive VPs, including public rights of way and views of the onshore substation at the most open points within the National Landscape. The Applicant confirmed it took into account distance and orientation, as well as intervening vegetation when determining the locations of VPs.</p> <p>(116) In relation to the southeast section of the ZTV at Figure 6.4 of the Environmental Statement - Volume 3, Chapter 6: Landscape and visual resources (APP-069), the Applicant confirmed that it went to this area and noted that due to distance, angle of view and intervening vegetation the views of the substation from this area were not as open as other views and the effects on views did not have the potential to be significant. The Applicant confirmed that it was not asked to do an assessment of this location by statutory consultees. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points, Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_38.]</p> <p>(117) The Applicant confirmed that the landscape assessment was done on a worst-case layout and if this changed at detailed design, this would result in a lessened effect. The Applicant confirmed that the layout of the substation on the visualisations is indicative and representative of a functional electrical onshore substation with the tallest buildings in the northernmost corner, representing a worst-case. The Applicant confirmed that the colour difference of the rendering of the substation buildings between the close and more distantly located VPs/visualisations is simply to aid the viewer to identify the onshore substation in distant views. The Applicant confirmed that the colours used are not representative of the colours that may be used for the onshore substation buildings and confirmed that a brown colour was used instead of grey for the onshore substation buildings in the more distant visualisations, as the grey colour, used for the onshore substation in the closer VPs/visualisations was not visible.</p> <p>(118) The Applicant confirmed that page 8 of the Environmental Statement - Volume 3, Chapter 6: Landscape and visual resources (APP-069) refers to lighting in respect of the National Policy Statement wording and that task lighting within construction compounds is proposed. The Applicant confirmed that the substation will not be flood lit but if activities are undertaken in the hours of darkness (within construction working hours) task lighting will be required. The Applicant confirmed that task lighting has been assessed in the MDS. The Applicant agreed to clarify what is meant by working in ‘darkness’ and confirm whether there will be seasonal variation to working hours. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points, Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_37.]</p>

ID	Agenda Item	Notes
----	-------------	-------

9. Good Design

The overall approach to good design, including:

- Analysis, approach and vision
- The Design Principles Document and related requirements in the Draft DCO (Requirement 5, 6 and 7)
- Onshore Substation site selection, substation design principles, layout, and mitigations
- The Design Champion and Design Guide

- (119) The Applicant confirmed that the identification of the onshore substation site started with identifying the National Grid Connection at Bodelwyddan as the Project’s point of connection as part of the holistic network design process. The Applicant confirmed that it then identified an initial 5 kilometre radius in which it would look to site the onshore substation. The Applicant confirmed that it identified guiding principles for the substation site selection as set out in Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (APP-016), which include siting the substation as close as possible to the National Grid connection point. The Applicant added that it followed the Horlock rules adopted by National Grid Electricity Transmission in 2003 and avoided key sensitive features where possible. The Applicant continued that where avoidance was not possible, it ensured that impacts are mitigated to minimise the disruption to populated areas. The Applicant confirmed that within the 5 kilometre search area it identified 17 options which it assessed through a feasibility assessment, 10 of which were presented to statutory consultees and seven of which were then taken forward to form the basis of the Project’s targeted consultation. The Applicant then confirmed that it identified two options for the project environmental information report (PEIR) and consulted on both as part of its statutory consultation. The Applicant confirmed that following this statutory consultation and further technical work, the current onshore substation site was selected.
- (120) The Applicant confirmed that it applied the siting principle to avoid key sensitive features in its black, red, amber, green (BRAG) assessment (Environmental Statement - Volume 5, Annex 4.2: Site Selection BRAG Report (APP-082)) alongside which it applied buffers to existing urban development to conflate noise and visual impacts.
- (121) The Applicant confirmed that the onshore substation site was refined at PEIR and then further refined prior to submission of the Applicant’s application. The Applicant confirmed that this refinement included a reduction in the footprint of the onshore substation from the choice of gas insulated switch gear (GIS) and an adjustment to its orientation. The Applicant added that part of the reason for the adjustment to orientation is so that it aligns with National Grid 400 kilovolt overhead powerlines. It is as close as possible to the National Grid Network. The onshore substation is also in alignment with the existing topography.
- (122) The Applicant confirmed that the surface area identified for the onshore substation site is required to offer maximum flexibility because detailed design has not yet been undertaken and flexibility is required in relation to the electrical and engineering components of the substation. The Applicant confirmed that the assessment undertaken is based on the realistic worst-case scenario and any flexibility would involve the internal layout of the substation rather than where the boundary or fencing lines would be placed.
- (123) The Applicant confirmed that it has committed to using GIS rather than air insulated switch gear to reduce impacts as this means that more of the infrastructure or equipment is inside the onshore substation building rather than outside and the overall footprint of the substation is smaller for GIS. The Applicant has confirmed that this commitment has reduced

ID	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>the footprint of the onshore substation. The Applicant confirmed that this commitment was made in response to pre-application statutory consultation responses, following the PEIR.</p> <p>(124) The Applicant agreed to provide an indicative layout in the Design Principles document (APP-189) with annotations including the length and width of the footprint (65,000 square metres) of the substation.</p> <p>(125) The Applicant confirmed that incorporating good design in the onshore substation process is the next stage of the process and is the basis for the Design Principles document (APP-189). The Applicant confirmed that good design is linked to Requirement 5 of the draft development consent order (PDA-003) (Draft DCO) which requires details of the substation itself to be approved by relevant planning authority and will determine layout, scale, finishing, dimensions etc. of the substation. The Applicant added that the design must be substantially in accordance with the Design Principles document (APP-189).</p> <p>(126) The Applicant confirmed that a level of design has gone into determining the layout of the onshore substation and that the design is based on technical requirements required to deliver the Project (e.g. the number of circuits, required electrical equipment, the supply chain etc.).</p> <p>(127) The Applicant submitted that is has engaged with the local planning authority (LPA) at all opportunities and has been present at working groups as part of the pre-application process and the LPA provided good technical feedback on various areas including ecology. The Applicant confirmed that the LPA does not currently have a landscape officer and has not been able to provide feedback in relation to design and landscaping. The Applicant confirmed that it is in communication with the LPA in relation to provide it with support and is moving forward with a short term and longer-term solution so that the LPA has the required resources to competently discharge requirements relating to design.</p> <p>(128) The Applicant confirmed that it has included the Environmental Statement - Volume 5, Annex 3.2: Sulphur Hexafluoride Report (APP-080) within its application that talks about the optionality for technology to deliver the gas insulated design. The Applicant confirmed that it has not decided on the precise technology that will be used yet as this will be part of the detailed design to allow the Applicant to understand the supply chain at the time.</p> <p>(129) The Applicant confirmed that one of principles in the Design Principles document (APP-189) is that that setting will be considered to minimised impacts such as landscape. The Applicant confirmed that the assessment is done on a worst-case but there is flexibility to move components to a more screened location with fewer impacts, if possible. The Applicant confirmed that flexibility is required for detailed design so that the Applicant can review different options in the market which would ultimately determine final design and layout.</p> <p>(130) The Applicant confirmed that the 4 buildings presented in the indicative layout in the Design Principles (APP-189) is a worst case scenario in terms of the number of buildings to be built at the substation. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points, Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_12.]</p>

ID	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>(131) In relation to the potential design scenarios, the Applicant agreed to include an illustrative indication of where any containerised structures will be in the indicative layout to be provided. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points, Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_12.]</p> <p>(132) The Applicant confirmed that it can use colour in a number of ways and proposes to do a façade treatment to mitigate visual impacts. The Applicant confirmed that it can use colour to mute or camouflage or integrate the substation into the colours and materials of the surrounding area. The Applicant also submitted that it can use colour as a distraction or creative colours as a design elements. The Applicant also confirmed that colour can be used to break up the bulk of the substation, as has been undertaken at Wylfa power station. The Applicant confirmed that it is too early in the process to undertake a colour assessment because it does not yet know its supplier and it requires flexibility in relation to its final layout and design but this is something it can commit to undertaking. The Applicant agreed to submit colour palettes on an indicative basis. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points, Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_41.]</p> <p>(133) The Applicant confirmed that the Design Champion is the Project Director for the Project and has been working on the Project number of years as the Technical Lead prior that role. The Applicant confirmed that design is central to development of the Project and the project Design Champion will have an overview of the technical team and consents team and can bring forward meetings and discussions so that the interface between evolving design and mitigation and technical design is cohesive. The Applicant confirmed that as its outline plans develop these will reflect the technical design process so that mitigations are appropriately secured when the Project comes to discharging conditions or requirements</p> <p>(134) The Applicant confirmed that it would not have a formal design panel as a lot of design work has happened pre-application and the Project has engaged with the Design Commission for Wales and intends to engage with them again. The Applicant confirmed that it will also be engaging with Denbighshire County Council and has the design champion as integral to the Project.</p> <p>(135) In relation to National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1, the Applicant submitted that the Design Champion is embedded in the design process throughout and that design is also considered by various stakeholders and the LPA. The Applicant submitted that the NPS notes that in respect of electricity infrastructure such as substations there is limited design that can be done in terms of functionality and that safety and operation is of primary importance. The Applicant confirmed that it is committed to gas insulated switch gear, but that layout and design will be primarily driven by technical requirements for substation functionality. The Applicant confirmed that the main consideration for good design will be the finish of the buildings and potentially something around the arrangement of the buildings but with functionality and operation being the driving issue. The Applicant confirmed that it appreciates the wording in the NPS, confirmed it is aware of these policies, and confirmed that it is necessary to manage expectations around what can actually be done around good design. The Applicant submitted</p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

ID	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>that the policy in good design, particularly in NPS EN-1, is around all infrastructure and onshore substations are only a part of this. The Applicant reiterated that functionality and operational need to be the principal driving factor in substation design and that the Applicant is looking at finishes and elements around finishes to be embedded in Design Principles document (APP-189).</p> <p>(136) The Applicant confirmed it's understanding that the design panel for Awel y Mor Offshore Wind Project is that it is internal. The Applicant confirmed that it will have an internal design panel and can look at incorporating this into the application documents. The Applicant confirmed that it will make every effort to engage with the Design Commission for Wales, but recognised that any engagement would also require their involvement. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points, Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_42.]</p> <p>(137) The Applicant confirmed that the design guide would be produced post consent to take an approach in accordance with the Design Principles document (APP-189). The Applicant confirmed that paragraph 4.1.1.2 of the Design Principles document (APP-189) sets out engagement with the LPA and the Design Commission for Wales.</p> <p>(138) The Applicant confirmed that it would review Requirement 5 of the Draft DCO and check that the reference to the design principles document is correct and should not be a reference to a design guide. [Post hearing note: the Applicant intends to submit an updated Draft DCO at Deadline 2.]</p> <p>(139) The Applicant confirmed the site for the onshore substation was chosen because it is close to the existing National Grid stations, reflecting requirements in relation to the transmission system and Ofgem for an economic and efficient system design and the Horlock Rules. [Post hearing note: see the Environmental Statement - Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (AS-016).]</p> <p>(140) The Applicant reiterated that it has been approaching the LPA to get planning performance agreement in place but that it has not had engagement from the LPA recently partly because of lack of resource. In the short term the Applicant confirmed that it has agreed to provide support to the LPA for its Local Impact Report. The Applicant confirmed that it has agreed to provide support from Arup to both Denbighshire and Conwy Councils.</p>
10. Onshore Ecology		
a)	Baseline data	<p>(141) The Applicant confirmed that it would review whether and how it has assessed the impact to Clawdd dry stone walls in relation to ecology. The Applicant confirmed that as a geological feature it has been assessed in section 15.2 of Environmental Statement - Volume 7, Annex 5.3: Onshore geophysical survey report - Part 1 (APP-145). The Applicant confirmed it would review this point and revert to the Examining Authority by Deadline 1. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points, Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_43.]</p>

ID	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>(142) The Applicant confirmed that in relation to the parts of the onshore cable route as set out in the Environmental Statement - Volume 7, Annex 6.6: Tree survey and arboricultural impact assessment Part 4 - Appendix B (APP-163) which were not surveyed it is not uncommon to have restrictions on access for surveys, particularly for large schemes and the Applicant confirmed that the assessment considered the worst case. The Applicant confirmed that where it has not had access to trees in its survey, it has assumed based on other data present or protected species present and therefore mitigation has been proposed on an assumption of presence rather than absence. The Applicant added that prior to commencement it will need to do pre-construction surveys, and the draft development consent order (PDA00-3) contains rights of across the cable corridor allowing the Applicant to undertake pre-commencement surveys.</p> <p>(143) The Applicant confirmed that whilst it did not carry out a specific survey for barn owls, it has had access to the northeastern side of the substation for other purposes to undertake environmental surveys. The Applicant confirmed that whilst undertaking these surveys there has been no indication of any suitable barn owl habitat within that area and this is why no barn owl assessment was undertaken. The Applicant confirmed that ecologists undertaking these surveys were present during the evenings when barn owls would likely be spotted and no records of barn owls were reported. The Applicant confirmed that within the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, Appendix E (APP-208) it will undertake ongoing surveys in respect of relevant bird species. [Post Hearing note: The Applicant has submitted a further clarification note on its approach to assessing barn owls. See S_D1_26 Mona Barn Owl Clarification Note.]</p>
b)	Clarifications	<p>(144) Statement - Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore Ecology (APP-066) and the main onshore ecology assessment. [Post Hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points, Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_47].</p> <p>(145) The Applicant confirmed that in relation to hedgerows there are different ways of assessing hedgerows from an ecological and heritage perspective. The Applicant confirmed it would produce a note clarifying the difference between ecological and historically important hedgerows and clarify where any important hedgerows may be included in Schedule 11 of the draft development consent order (PDA-003) (Draft DCO). [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points, Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_48 and HAP_ISH2_49.]</p>
c)	EIA methodology including its application	<p>(146) The Applicant confirmed that the Project has employed the mitigation hierarchy and avoidance as a first approach was one of the principles during site selection. The Applicant clarified that the reason the including an area of ancient woodland at Figure 1.37, Sheet 35 Environmental Statement - Volume 7, Annex 3.2: Extended Phase 1 habitat survey technical report (APP-122) is because a wider area is needed to ensure an area of historic mineworks can be avoided. The Applicant confirmed that it has committed to doing a trenchless</p>

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

ID	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>crossing underneath this ancient woodland and that the haul road will maintain a 15 metre buffer from the ancient woodland to ensure any impacts are avoided.</p> <p>(147) The Applicant confirmed that it is necessary to look at the design of the Project holistically. The Applicant confirmed that it has had to take into account a number of factors to create a viable project, including siting of the onshore substation, appropriate landfall and cable corridor. The Applicant confirmed that the mitigation hierarchy has been employed but that there inevitably will be sections where the Project cannot avoid and needs to put in place mitigation for example committing to trenchless crossings so impacts are avoided.</p>
d)	Green corridors	<p>(148) The Applicant confirmed it has avoided impacts on woodland, with the exception of an area of Ash dieback near the onshore substation, which will be removed and allowed to naturally regenerate. Impacts to hedgerows have been minimised where possible, for example through the use of trenchless crossing techniques to cross important hedgerows. The Applicant confirmed it has sought to minimise impact and replant where impact cannot be avoided. The Applicant confirmed it has committed to improving 10, currently poor quality, hedgerows to improve connectivity and help species as part of its biodiversity commitments [Post hearing note: see Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (APP-208)].</p> <p>(149) In relation to Figure 1.14, Sheet 12, of Environmental Statement - Volume 7, Annex 3.2: Extended Phase 1 habitat survey technical report (APP-122), the Applicant confirmed that it has committed to trenchless techniques through the onshore cable corridor. The Applicant confirmed that the loop to the west of the main corridor figure targets an existing gap in the hedgerow for the haul road. The Applicant confirmed that this watercourse crossing is currently used by the landowner and the Applicant intends to use that access to go around and not install an additional crossing over this watercourse. The Applicant agreed to confirm whether it would be necessary to set up an appropriate crossing for the haul road in this area. [Post hearing note: See S_D1_5 Mona Response to Hearing Action Points, Table 2.1 row HAP_ISH2_50.]</p> <p>(150) The Applicant confirmed that it has sought to try and simplify drafting of Requirement 9 and reflect that documents will all be embedded within the Code of Construction Practice. The definition of the Outline code of construction practice in the draft development consent order (PDA-003) (Draft DCO) refers to Schedule 15 where the full list of outline documents forming part of that code of construction practice are set out. The Applicant confirmed that it would review the drafting of this Requirement to ensure that it applies to onsite preparation works. [Post hearing note: the Applicant intends to submit an updated Draft DCO at Deadline 2.]</p>
11. Land use and Recreation		
a)-b)	The approach to the assessment of the significance of effects, including the following:	The Applicant noted it would respond in writing to the National Farmers' Union's written submission (PDA-048). [Post hearing note: see S_D1_4 Mona Response to Written Submissions made at Procedural Deadline.]

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

ID	Agenda Item	Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effects on soils and agricultural land quality • Effects on farming operations • Effects on recreational resources and Public Rights of Way (PRoW) <p>The mitigation adopted to reduce the potential for impacts on land use and recreation.</p>	
13. Any other business		
		<p>The Applicant agreed to include chapter-based errata sheet by the end of the examination period. [Post hearing note: See S_PD_1 Mona Errata document.]</p>