

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Mona Offshore Wind Project](#)
Subject: EN010137
Date: 30 September 2024 22:35:57

[REDACTED]

IP ref: 20048555

Re ExQ1 Q1.8.2

In answer to the exa's question regarding watercourses and flooding in the area of tcc2, has the applicant addressed my concerns? The answer is no.

The applicant's response has been to direct me back to their existing application documentation, which i have already made clear lacks any detail and has significant abnormalities, that makes looking at it again useless.

The document suggested makes no mention of the fact that if they are permitted to drill their cable where they sometimes say they want to (but at other points they indicate a different track) they will alter the location of the head of a river. It is impossible to predict the new location of a spring once its track has been disturbed at depth. The river issuing from the spring that i am talking about does not even feature on the applicants mapping. So their conclusion that damaging it will be negligible, when they don't even acknowledge its existence is baffling.

I do understand that the exa has confined it's question to me to watercourse and flooding, but with the exa's permission i will be writing a fuller version of my initial representation as the 500 word limit does not lead to a cohesive document that can be worked with. The site inspection, requested by stuart neil, of the area of tcc2 is vitally important, but i notice from the documents that despite the applicant indicating that they are in favour of the visit they have not included it in their itinerary for the scheduled visits.

Rebecca Face