Partners in UK offshore wind

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

S_PD_1_Mona_Errata F03

Deadline: 2

Application Reference: EN010137

Document Reference: S_PD_1

Document Number: MOCNS-J3303-JVW-10216

27 August 2024

F03

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
F03	Submission at Deadline 2	Mona Offshore Wind Ltd	Mona Offshore Wind Ltd	Mona Offshore Wind Ltd	27 Aug 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, Written 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. Table 1.1 below provides correction or clarification on matters identified which have not resulted in the need to fully update a document.

1.1.1.3 As per the errata sheet provided for Deadline 1 (REP1-044), the Applicant recognised that a small number of the discrepancies in relation to the offshore ornithology documents could have been considered to affect the assessments within the Environmental Statement and Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA), although wished to highlight that none were 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.

1.1.1.4 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 has therefore provided updated versions (tracked and clean) of the offshore ornithology application document that include errata at Deadline 2. This is considered appropriate for the offshore ornithology errata identified in relevant and written representations. Errata which have been corrected in updated versions of documents are presented in Table 1.2.

1.1.1.5 For other documents and errata typing errors and minor corrections will be identified in Table 1.1 only.

1.2 Errata

Table 1.1: Errata.

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
1	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.
2	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.
4	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.
5	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.

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
6	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.
10	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.
11	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.'
12	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
13	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
14	D1	APP-050	Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description	Paragraph 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.

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
15	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.
16	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
17	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.
18	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.
19	D1	APP-056	Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals	Paragraph 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).
20	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)
21	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.

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
23	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
24	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….
25	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…
26	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…
27	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…
29	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.
31	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.

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
32	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
33	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
34	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%.
36	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.
37	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
47	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
48	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).
49	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
50	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.

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
51	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).
52	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
53	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)
54	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	This was erroneously identified as an error in the Mona errata sheet at Deadline 1 (REP1-044). Upon further review at Deadline 2 the original number (6) is correct and therefore this does not require correction.
55	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	This was erroneously identified as an error in the Mona errata sheet at Deadline 1 (REP1-044). Upon further review at Deadline 2 the original number (6) is correct and therefore this does not require correction.
68	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
69	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
70	D1	APP-059	Volume 2, Chapter 7: Shipping and navigation	Table 7.18	Baseline Distance: 142.3nm	Baseline Distance: 113.3nm
71	D1	APP-059	Volume 2, Chapter 7: Shipping and navigation	Table 7.18	Deviated Distance: 144.6	Deviated Distance: 114.4nm

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
72	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
73	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)’
74	D1	APP-060	Volume 2, Chapter 8: Seascape and visual resources	Figure A.4	ZTV is calculated using a blade tip height of 324m	ZTV is calculated using a blade tip height of 364m

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
75	D1	APP-066	Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology	3.9.2.32	The requirement to remove approximately 600 m2 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 m2 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.
76	D1	APP-066	Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology	3.9.4.41	The requirement to remove approximately 600 m2 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 m2 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.
77	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.

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
78	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
79	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
80	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.

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
81	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.
82	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
83	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.

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
84	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.
85	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
86	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.
87	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.
88	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'.
89	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.

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
93	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).
94	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.
95	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"
96	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.

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
97	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.
98	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'.
99	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
100	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.
101	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)…
102	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.

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
103	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.
104	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.
105	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 (m3): 1,760,359
106	D2	APP- 032	HRA Stage 2 Information to Support an Appropriate Assessment Part Two: Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) Assessments	Table 1.220	Column 4 (impact), Menai Strait and Conwy Bay/Y Fenai a Bae Conwy SAC, Operations and maintenance phase • Increase in SSC and sediment deposition (Mona Offshore Cable Corridor and Access Areas only) • Increased risk of introduction and spread of invasive non-native species • Changes in physical processes • EMF • Accidental pollution • In-combination effects.	• Increase in SSC and sediment deposition (Mona Offshore Cable Corridor and Access Areas only) • Increased risk of introduction and spread of invasive non-native species • Changes in physical processes • Accidental pollution • In-combination effects.

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
107	D2	APP-054	Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology	Table 2.19	A 50 m exclusion buffer will be in place to avoid the Sabellaria alveolata reef and Mytilus edulis bed at the landfall is included in the Landfall construction method statement which is expected to be secured within the standalone NRW marine licence.	A 50 m exclusion buffer will be in place to avoid the Sabellaria alveolata reef and Mytilus edulis bed at the landfall is Included in the offshore construction method statement and must be agreed as part of the deemed standalone NRW marine licence.
108	D2	APP-069	Volume 3, Chapter 6: Landscape and visual resources	Paragraph 6.11.2.21	Equestrians, cyclists and walkers using the road network, have a medium susceptibility to the changes in medium value views. The value of the view is medium and the susceptibility of the viewer is high. The sensitivity of the visual receptors at this location varies between low and medium.	Equestrians, cyclists and walkers using the road network, have a medium to high susceptibility to the changes in medium value views. The sensitivity of the visual receptors at this location varies between medium and high.
109	D2	APP-069	Volume 3, Chapter 6: Landscape and visual resources	Paragraph 6.11.2.25	Equestrians, cyclists and walkers using the road network, have a medium susceptibility to the changes in medium value views. The value of the view is negligible and the susceptibility of the viewer is medium. The sensitivity of the visual receptors at this location varies between low and medium	Equestrians, cyclists and walkers using the road network, have a medium to high susceptibility to the changes in medium value views. The sensitivity of the visual receptors at this location varies between medium and high
110	D2	APP-069	Volume 3, Chapter 6: Landscape and visual resources	Paragraph 6.10.5.23	The magnitude of the impact on the landscape character of the Onshore Substation is high, the sensitivity of the agricultural landscape is also high. The significance of effect on the landscape character of the Onshore Substation is major adverse.	The magnitude of the impact on the landscape character of DNBGHVS033 Cefn Estate Mosaic Rolling Lowland (Visual and Sensory) due to the onshore substation is large. The sensitivity of this landscape is high. The significance of effect on the landscape character of the DNBGHVS033 Cefn Estate Mosaic Rolling Lowland (Visual and Sensory) is major adverse.

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
111	D2	APP-098	Volume 6, Annex 7.1 Navigation Risk Assessment	1.5.4.1	His Majesty's Coastguard (HMCG) is responsible for requesting and coordinating SAR activities within the UK's SAR region. The local coastguard base for the region is Holyhead Coastguard Operations Centre.	His Majesty's Coastguard (HMCG) is responsible for requesting and coordinating SAR activities within the UK's SAR region. The local coastguard base for the region is Holyhead Maritime Rescue Coordination Centre.
112	D2	APP-098	Volume 6, Annex 7.1 Navigation Risk Assessment	1.8.2.4	Given that this has not occurred, and no such routes are indicated on charts, Article 60 and NPS EN-3 2.6.161 would not apply.	Given that this has not occurred, and no such routes are indicated on charts, Article 60 and NPS EN-3 2.8.187 would not apply.
113	D2	APP-098	Volume 6, Annex 7.1 Navigation Risk Assessment	7.2.1.1.4 of Appendix E	Given that this has not occurred, and no such routes are indicated on charts, Article 60 and NPS EN-3 2.6.161 would not apply.	Given that this has not occurred, and no such routes are indicated on charts, Article 60 and NPS EN-3 2.8.187 would not apply.
114	D2	APP-098	Volume 6, Annex 7.1 Navigation Risk Assessment	1.9.3.6	Hazards are then defined as either Broadly Acceptable, with existing mitigation, or Unacceptable	Hazards are then defined as either Broadly Acceptable, Tolerable if ALARP, or Unacceptable
115	D2	APP-179	Volume 7, Annex 9.2: Construction noise and vibration technical report	1.5.1.7	The paragraph details the inclusion of a 2.4 m high barrier around the perimeter of the temporary construction compounds. The 3D acoustic model was updated to remove the barriers and the construction noise impacts presented reflect the construction noise levels in the absence of the barriers but include the mitigation measures set out in Table 1.13. The update had not been reflected in Volume 7, Annex 9.2: Construction noise and vibration technical report (APP-179),	Paragraph 1.5.1.7 should be deleted.

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
116	D2	APP-060	Volume 2, Chapter 8: Seascape and Visual Resources	8.8.4.61 8.8.4.512 8.8.4.525	The views/visual amenity of people at this viewpoint is deemed to be of very high value and very high susceptibility to the proposed development. The sensitivity of the receptor is therefore, considered to be **very high**.	The views/visual amenity of people at this viewpoint is deemed to be of high value and high susceptibility to the proposed development. The sensitivity of the receptor is therefore, considered to be **high**.
117	D2	APP-060	Volume 2, Chapter 8: Seascape and Visual Resources	8.8.4.62 8.8.4.513 8.8.4.526	…the sensitivity of the receptor is very high	and the sensitivity of the receptor is high
118	D2	APP-060	Volume 2, Chapter 8: Seascape and Visual Resources	8.8.4.65 8.8.4.516 8.8.4.529	The sensitivity of the view/visual amenity at this viewpoint is as set out above for the construction and decommissioning phases, namely **very high**.	The sensitivity of the view/visual amenity at this viewpoint is as set out above for the construction and decommissioning phases, namely **high**.
119	D2	APP-061	Volume 2, Chapter 8: Seascape and Visual Resources	8.8.4.66 8.8.4.517 8.8.4.530	The sensitivity of the receptor is very high.	The sensitivity of the receptor is high.
120	D2	APP-203	Measures to Minimise Disturbance to Marine Mammals and Rafting Birds from Transiting Vessels	Table 1.1	Agreement was received from NRW (JNCC deferred to NRW) that vessel movement at the landfall to install the export cable would not be subject to seasonal restrictions.	Agreement was received from NRW that vessel movement at the landfall to install the export cable would not be subject to seasonal restrictions.
121	D2	APP-060	Volume 2, Chapter 8: Seascape and Visual Resources	Table 8.23 viewpoints 6, 52 and 53	C: Very high O: Very high D: Very high	C: High O: High D: High

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
122	D2	APP-069	Volume 3, Chapter 6: Landscape and visual resources	6.11.2.8	Equestrians, cyclists and walkers using the road network, have a medium susceptibility to the changes in medium value views. The value of the view is negligible and the susceptibility of the viewer is medium. The sensitivity of the visual receptors at this location varies between low to medium.	Equestrians, cyclists and walkers using the road network, have a medium susceptibility to the changes in medium value views. The sensitivity of the visual receptors at this location varies between low to medium.
123	D2	APP-069	Volume 3, Chapter 6: Landscape and visual resources	6.11.2.9	…the sensitivity of the receptor is low to high	… the sensitivity of the receptor is low to medium.
124	D2	APP-069	Volume 3, Chapter 6: Landscape and visual resources	6.11.2.26	Overall, the magnitude of visual impact caused by the onshore elements within the Mona Onshore Development Area during operations and maintenance and experienced by people at this viewpoint is medium. The sensitivity of the receptors varies between low and medium. The effects will be major adverse at Year 1 winter reducing to moderate adverse at Year 15 summer as the landscape mitigation (shown on Figure 6.5) matures, which are significant to not significant effects.	Overall, the magnitude of visual impact caused by the onshore elements within the Mona Onshore Development Area during operations and maintenance and experienced by people at this viewpoint is large at year 1 reducing to medium at year 15 summer. The sensitivity of the receptors varies between medium and high. The effects will be major adverse at Year 1 winter reducing to moderate adverse at Year 15 summer as the landscape mitigation (shown on Figure 6.5) matures, which are significant to not significant effects.
125	D2	APP-069	Volume 3, Chapter 6: Landscape and visual resources	6.11.2.58	Equestrians, cyclists and walkers using the road network, have a medium to low susceptibility to the changes in low value views. The sensitivity of these receptors is medium.	Equestrians, cyclists and walkers using the road network, have a medium to low susceptibility to the changes in low value views. The sensitivity of equestrians and cyclists is **medium.** The sensitivity of walkers is **medium to high.**

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
126	D2	APP-069	Volume 3, Chapter 6: Landscape and visual resources	6.11.2.60	Overall, the magnitude of the visual impact experienced by people at this viewpoint during construction and decommissioning is low and the sensitivity of the receptor is low to medium. The temporary effects will be minor to moderate adverse, which are not significant	Overall, the magnitude of the visual impact experienced by people at this viewpoint during construction and decommissioning is ~~low~~ small and the sensitivity of the receptor varies from medium to high. The temporary effects will be **minor to moderate** adverse, which are not significant
127	D2	APP-069	Volume 3, Chapter 6: Landscape and visual resources	6.11.2.63	The sensitivity of the views/visual amenity at this viewpoint is as set out above for the construction and decommissioning phases, that is, low to medium.	The sensitivity of the views/visual amenity at this viewpoint is as set out above for the construction and decommissioning phases, that is, medium for equestrians and cyclists. The sensitivity of walkers is medium to high.
128	D2	APP-069	Volume 3, Chapter 6: Landscape and visual resources	6.11.2.64	Overall, the magnitude of visual impact caused by the onshore elements within the Mona Onshore Development Area during operations and maintenance, experienced by people at this viewpoint is low to medium. The sensitivity of the receptor is high. The effect will be minor to moderate adverse, which are not significant.	Overall, the magnitude of visual impact caused by the onshore elements within the Mona Onshore Development Area during operations and maintenance, experienced by people at this viewpoint is small. The sensitivity of the receptor varies from medium to high. The effect will be minor to moderate adverse, which are not significant.
129	D2	APP-069	Volume 3, Chapter 6: Landscape and visual resources	6.11.2.72	Equestrians, cyclists and walkers using the road network, have a medium susceptibility to the changes in medium value views. The sensitivity of these receptors is medium.	Equestrians, cyclists and walkers using the road network, have a medium susceptibility to the changes in medium value views. The sensitivity of equestrians and cyclists is medium. The sensitivity of walkers is high

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
130	D2	APP-069	Volume 3, Chapter 6: Landscape and visual resources	6.11.2.74	Overall, the magnitude of the visual impact experienced by people at this viewpoint during construction and decommissioning is low and the sensitivity of the receptor is low to medium. The temporary effects will be minor to moderate adverse, which are not significant	Overall, the magnitude of the visual impact experienced by people at this viewpoint during construction and decommissioning is small and the sensitivity of the receptor varies from medium to high. The temporary effects will be minor to moderate adverse, which are not significant
131	D2	APP-069	Volume 3, Chapter 6: Landscape and visual resources	6.11.2.77	The sensitivity of the viewers at this viewpoint is, as set out above for the construction and decommissioning phases, low to medium.	The sensitivity of the viewers at this viewpoint is, as set out above for the construction and decommissioning phases, and varies from medium to high.
132	D2	APP-069	Volume 3, Chapter 6: Landscape and visual resources	6.11.2.292	Overall, the magnitude of visual impact of the transmission assets within the Mona Onshore Development Area during operations and maintenance and, experienced by people at this viewpoint is negligible. The sensitivity of the receptor is high. The effects will, be moderate adverse, which are not significant.	Overall, the magnitude of visual impact of the transmission assets within the Mona Onshore Development Area during operations and maintenance and, experienced by people at this viewpoint is small. The sensitivity of the receptor is high. The effects will, be moderate adverse, which are not significant.
133	D2	APP-069	Volume 3, Chapter 6: Landscape and visual resources	Tables 6.24 and 6.25	Anomalies between the significance of effects and residual effects in Table 6.24 and Table 6.25	Updated Table 6.24 and Table 6.25.
134	D2	APP-072	Volume 3, Chapter 9: Noise and Vibration	Table 9.18	For Gwrych House, Sirior Bach and Dinorben Farm, the night SOAEL level is stated as 45dB	For Gwrych House, Sirior Bach and Dinorben Farm, the night SOAEL level is 50dB
135	D2	APP-071	Volume 3, Chapter 8: Traffic and Transport	Table 8.14	46/2019/0806 (Development of 0.75 ha of land for residential purposes)	46/2021/0159 PF (Glascoed Road, St Asaph Business Park).

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction
136	D2	APP-186	Planning Statement	1.6.4.5	1.6.4.5 In relation to cumulative effects the only potentially significant adverse effects are in relation to: • Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology where potentially significant effects in the short to medium term relating to temporary habitat disturbance/loss are predicted to decrease to be non-significant in the long term • Fish and shellfish where the only effect is the potential for underwater sound effects in relation to herring and cod spawning. However, as above, the Project's commitment to a UWSMS (Document Reference J16) will reduce sound levels so as to effects to a non-significant level	The benthic bullet point should not be included.
137	D2	APP-069	Volume 3, Chapter 6, Landscape and Visual Resources	6.11.2.23	….the sensitivity of the receptor is low to medium.	….the sensitivity of the receptor is medium to high.
138	D2	APP-069	Volume 3, Chapter 6, Landscape and Visual Resources	6.11.2.78	…..the sensitivity of the receptor is high	…..the sensitivity of the receptor is medium to high

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

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction	Updated document reference
3	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).	E1.3 F02
7	D1	APP-034	HRA Stage 1 Screening Report	Table 1.9	Atlantic puffin were incorrectly treated as part qualifying breeding bird assemblage	Atlantic puffin are an individual qualifying feature	E1.4 F02
8	D1	APP-034	HRA Stage 1 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.	E1.4 F02
9	D1	APP-034	HRA Stage 1 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).	E1.4 F02
22	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.	F2.5 F02
28	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	F2.5 F02

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction	Updated document reference
30	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	F2.5 F02
35	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.	F2.5 F02
38	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	F2.5 F02
39	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	F2.5 F02
40	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	F2.5 F02
41	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	F2.5 F02
42	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	F2.5 F02

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction	Updated document reference
43	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	F2.5 F02
44	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	F2.5 F02
45	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	F2.5 F02
46	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	F2.5 F02
56	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	F2.5 F02
57	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	F2.5 F02
58	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	F2.5 F02
59	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	F2.5 F02

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction	Updated document reference
60	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	F2.5 F02
61	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	F2.5 F02
62	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	F2.5 F02
63	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	F2.5 F02
64	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	F2.5 F02
65	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	F2.5 F02

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction	Updated document reference
66	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	F2.5 F02
67	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)'	F2.5 F02

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction	Updated document reference
90	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'.	F6.5.2 F02 F6.5.3 F02

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction	Updated document reference
91	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	F6.5.5 F02 F6.5.6 F02

Errata reference number	Deadline included	Document number	Volume and chapter	Paragraph	Error	Correction	Updated document reference
						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'.	
92	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.	F6.5.3 F02

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.				