

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

S_PD_1 Errata F05

Deadline: 4

Application Reference: EN010137

Document Reference: S_PD_1 F05

Document Number: MOCNS-J3303-JVW-10216

04 November 2024

F05



Image of an offshore wind farm

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Document status

Version	Purpose of document	Authored by	Reviewed by	Approved by	Review date
F01	Procedural Deadline	Mona Offshore Wind Ltd	Mona Offshore Wind Ltd	Mona Offshore Wind Ltd	June 2024
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
F04	Submission at Deadline 3	Mona Offshore Wind Ltd	Mona Offshore Wind Ltd	Mona Offshore Wind Ltd	Sept 2024
F05	Submission at Deadline 4	Mona Offshore Wind Ltd	Mona Offshore Wind Ltd	Mona Offshore Wind Ltd	Nov 2024

Prepared by:

Mona Offshore Wind Ltd

Prepared for:

Mona Offshore Wind Ltd.

Contents

1	ERRATA SHEET	1
1.1	Overview	1
1.2	Application errata list	2
1.2.1	HRA Stage 2 Information to Support an Appropriate Assessment Part Two: Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) Assessments (APP-032)	2
1.2.2	HRA Stage 1 Screening Report (APP-034)	3
1.2.3	Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description (APP-050).....	4
1.2.4	Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic and subtidal ecology (APP-054)	5
1.2.5	Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology (APP-055)	6
1.2.6	Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals (APP-056).....	7
1.2.7	Volume 2, Chapter 7: Shipping and navigation (APP-059).....	8
1.2.8	Volume 2, Chapter 8: Seascape and visual resources (APP-060)	9
1.2.9	Volume 2, Chapter 9: Marine archaeology (APP-061).....	10
1.2.10	Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology (APP-066)	11
1.2.11	Volume 3, Chapter 6: Landscape and visual resources (APP-069)	12
1.2.12	Volume 3, Chapter 7: Land use and recreation (APP-070)	14
1.2.13	Volume 3, Chapter 8: Traffic and transport (APP-071)	15
1.2.14	Volume 3, Chapter 9: Noise and vibration (APP-072)	16
1.2.15	Volume 4, Chapter 1: Aviation and radar (APP-075)	17
1.2.16	Volume 5, Annex 5.1: Cumulative effects screening matrix (APP-084).....	18
1.2.17	Volume 6, Annex 2.2: Water Framework Directive Coastal Waters Assessment (APP-088)	19
1.2.18	Volume 6, Annex 7.1: Navigation Risk Assessment (APP-098)	20
1.2.19	Volume 6, Annex 8.4: Seascape, landscape and visual resources impact assessment methodology (APP-104)	21
1.2.20	Volume 7, Annex 2.1: Flood consequences assessment (APP-117)	22
1.2.21	Volume 7, Annex 2.4: Water Framework Directive surface and groundwater assessment (APP-120).....	23
1.2.22	Volume 7, Annex 5.1: Desk based assessment (APP-143).....	24
1.2.23	Volume 7, Annex 9.2: Construction noise and vibration technical report (APP-179)	25
1.2.24	Volume 8, Annex 1.1: Aviation and radar technical report (APP-181)	26
1.2.25	Mitigation and monitoring schedule (APP-196).....	27
1.2.26	Outline Offshore Written Scheme of Investigation and Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (APP-204)	28
1.2.27	HRA Stage 2 Information to Support an Appropriate Assessment Part Three: Special Protection Areas and Ramsar sites Assessments (REP2-010).....	29
1.2.28	HRA Stage 1 Screening Report (REP2-012)	30
1.2.29	Volume 6, Annex 5.5: Offshore Ornithology Apportioning Technical Report (REP2-022)31	
1.2.30	Volume 6, Annex 5.6: Offshore Ornithology Population Viability Analysis Technical Report (REP2-024)	32

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 Examining Authority's feedback at Issue Specific Hearing 3 on 16 October 2024, the following updates have been made to this Errata sheet:

- Errata have been grouped under specific documents or ES chapters, with each section representing a different document or ES chapter
- Errata in non-certified documents (e.g. the Planning Statement (APP-186)) have been removed
- Where errata have been corrected in documents re-submitted into the Mona Offshore Wind Project DCO Examination (for instance those corrected in the HRA Stage 2 Information to Support an Appropriate Assessment Part Three: Special Protection Areas and Ramsar sites Assessments F02 (REP2-010)), these have been removed from this Errata sheet
- Errata reference numbers have been removed
- The 'error' and 'correction' columns used in previous versions of the Errata sheet have been merged into a 'Description of errata' column.

1.2 Application errata list

1.2.1 HRA Stage 2 Information to Support an Appropriate Assessment Part Two: Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) Assessments (APP-032)

Table 1.1: HRA Stage 2 Information to Support an Appropriate Assessment Part Two: Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) Assessments (APP-032) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Table 1.5	It is mentioned that the Offshore CMS is expected to be secured within the deemed marine licence in Schedule 14 of the draft DCO and expected to be secured within the standalone NRW marine licence. The reference to the deemed marine licence in the DCO is incorrect, the offshore CMS is only expected to be secured within the standalone NRW marine licence
Table 1.78	The West Wales Marine SAC should have been included in Table 1.78 but was not – however, it was included in the assessment.
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.
Table 1.220	EMF is listed as an impact in Column 4, it should not be.

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

1.2.2 HRA Stage 1 Screening Report (APP-034)

Table 1.2: HRA Stage 1 Screening Report (APP-034) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Table 1.6	Table 1.6 presenting European sites designated for Annex II marine mammal species taken forward for determination of LSE, states that the distance to the North Anglesey Marine SAC from the Mona Array Area is 22.58 km. This is incorrect, it 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 are valid.
Table 1.40	The LSE matrix for Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC contains grey seal. However, 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.
Table 1.51	LSE matrix for the Chaussée de Sein SCI, for grey seal includes cells that have a conclusion of no LSE (Likely Significant Effect) but are highlighted in blue rather than green for the following impacts: 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. 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.

1.2.3 Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description (APP-050)

Table 1.3: Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description (APP-050) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Glossary table Term: Micrositing	The definition of micrositing was given as ‘The final selection of the position of infrastructure which may move in the order of a few metres to avoid an obstruction.’ It is possible that micrositing may involve moving the position of infrastructure up to 100 m. For clarity it is confirmed that micrositing will not involve moving the position of any infrastructure outwith the Mona Offshore Wind Project Offshore Order Limits.
Paragraph 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.’ The final layout will also include the location of the offshore substation platforms (OSPs) as well as the wind turbines.
Paragraph 3.5.8.7	States that ‘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’. This should state that ‘up to two vessels may be piling or drilling simultaneously, with concurrent piling being undertaken at a maximum distance of 15 km between locations’.
Table 3.22	The maximum number of crossings is listed as 24, it should be 14.
Table 3.28	The maximum TJB construction compound dimensions (in metres) are given as 200 x 100, they should be 150 x 100. 150 x 100 has been used in relevant Maximum Design Scenario tables within chapter assessments.
Paragraph 3.7.3.22	A cross-reference incorrectly states that a cut/fill exercise is shown on Figure 3.22. Figure 3.22 shows the indicative location of the attenuation pond.

1.2.4 Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic and subtidal ecology (APP-054)

Table 1.4: Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic and subtidal ecology (APP-054) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Table 2.19	Table 2.19 states that 'A 50 m exclusion buffer will be in place to avoid the <i>Sabellaria alveolata</i> reef and <i>Mytilus edulis</i> bed at the landfall is included in the Landfall construction method statement which is expected to be secured within the standalone NRW marine licence. It should state that the 50 m exclusion buffer will be secured within the offshore construction method statement expected to be secured as a condition of the standalone NRW marine licence.

1.2.5 Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology (APP-055)

Table 1.5: Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology (APP-055) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Table 3.18	The Maximum Design Scenario incorrectly states that clearance of up to 23 UXOs will be required. The correct number is 22 UXOs, which is what has been assessed, this error is purely typographical and in Table 3.18 only.

1.2.6 Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals (APP-056)

Table 1.6: Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals (APP-056) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Paragraph 4.9.3.38	The duration of piling is described as up to 113 days, within a two-year piling programme (as defined in Table 4.22). The correct duration of piling is actually up to 113.5 days.
Paragraph 4.9.5.22	It is stated that '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'. It should state that serious disturbance would not occur over ranges such as 4.08 km.
Paragraph A.3.8.1.4	A cross-reference incorrectly states that '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 same days of residual disturbance are specified in section A.3.4.

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

1.2.7 Volume 2, Chapter 7: Shipping and navigation (APP-059)

Table 1.7: Volume 2, Chapter 7: Shipping and navigation (APP-059) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Table 7.18	The list of Example Vessels (2019-2022) should not include Stena Mersey, Stena Horizon, Stena Lagan, Stena Forecaster or Stena Forerunner. However, it should include Stena Estrid and Stena Foreteller.
Table 7.18	The Approximate Annual Crossings (2022) is given as 1,442. It should instead be 1,098.
Table 7.18	The Baseline Distance is given as 142.3 nm. It should instead be 113.3 nm.
Table 7.18	The Deviated Distance is given as 144.6 nm. It should instead be 114.4 nm.
Table 7.18	The Additional Mona Offshore Wind Project Time is given as +7.4 minutes. It should instead be +3.4 minutes.

1.2.8 Volume 2, Chapter 8: Seascape and visual resources (APP-060)

Table 1.8: Volume 2, Chapter 8: Seascape and visual resources (APP-060) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Paragraphs 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)'.
Paragraphs 8.8.4.61, 8.8.4.512, 8.8.4.525	The sensitivity of views/visual amenity of people at this viewpoint was incorrectly stated to be very high. The sensitivity should instead be high.
Paragraphs 8.8.4.62, 8.8.4.513, 8.8.4.526	The sensitivity of views/visual amenity of people at this viewpoint was incorrectly stated to be very high. The sensitivity should instead be high.
Paragraphs 8.8.4.65, 8.8.4.516, 8.8.4.529	The sensitivity of views/visual amenity of people at this viewpoint was incorrectly stated to be very high. The sensitivity should instead be high.
Paragraphs 8.8.4.66, 8.8.4.517, 8.8.4.530	The sensitivity of views/visual amenity of people at this viewpoint was incorrectly stated to be very high. The sensitivity should instead be high.
Table 8.13	The definition for very high sensitivity should, in addition to internationally designated landscapes, also include important views from nationally designated landscapes. The definition for high sensitivity should, in addition to nationally designated landscape, also include important views from regionally designated landscapes.
Table 8.23 (Viewpoints 6, 52 and 53)	The sensitivities of these viewpoints were listed as very high for the Construction (C), Operations and maintenance (O) and Decommissioning (D) phases. For all phases, the sensitivity should instead be high.
Figure A.4	It is stated that ZTV is calculated using a blade tip height of 324 m. ZTV is calculated using a blade tip height of 364 m.

1.2.9 Volume 2, Chapter 9: Marine archaeology (APP-061)

Table 1.9: Volume 2, Chapter 9: Marine archaeology (APP-061) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Table 9.16	<p>The extents of the following AEZs were incorrectly given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ID: Mona_0009 AEZ(m) was stated to have 50 extents – it should have instead been 100 extents • ID: Mona_0040 AEZ(m): was stated to have 25 extents – it should have instead been 50 extents • ID: Mona_0067 AEZ(m): was stated to have 50 extents – it should have instead been 25 extents • ID: Mona_0014 AEZ(m): was stated to have 25 extents – it should have instead been 50 extents • ID: Mona_0025 AEZ(m): was stated to have 50 extents – it should have instead been 25 extents • ID: Mona_0033 AEZ(m): was stated to have 25 extents – it should have instead been 50 extents • ID: Mona_0038 AEZ(m): was stated to have 50 extents – it should have instead been 25 extents • ID: Mona_0044 AEZ(m): was stated to have 25 extents – it should have instead been 50 extents • ID: Mona_0065 AEZ(m): was stated to have 50 extents – it should have instead been 25 extents

1.2.10 Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology (APP-066)

Table 1.10: Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology (APP-066) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Table 3.1	A cross-reference incorrectly states that climate adaptation is considered in section 3.7.1.1. Climate adaptation is considered in section 3.8.
Table 3.1	A cross-reference incorrectly states that climate change and its potential impact on the Mona Onshore Development Area baseline conditions are considered in section 3.7.1.1. Climate change and its potential impact on the Mona Onshore Development Area baseline conditions are considered in section 3.5.7.
Table 3.1	A cross-reference incorrectly states that the potential impacts of climate change on the proposed ecological mitigation are considered in section 3.7.1.1 and section 3.9. The potential impacts of climate change on the proposed ecological mitigation are considered in section 3.8 and section 3.9.
Paragraph 3.5.4.28, 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.
Table 3.17	Ancient woodland habitat has been incorrectly assigned a district value, it should instead have a national value.
Table 3.17	Hedgerow habitat has been incorrectly assigned a national value, it should instead have a county value.
Table 3.17	Terrestrial invertebrate has been incorrectly assigned a local value, it should instead have a county value.
Table 3.23	Terrestrial invertebrate has been incorrectly assigned a local value, it should instead have a county value.
Table 3.23	Great crested newt has been incorrectly assigned a national value, it should instead have a county value.
Paragraphs 3.9.2.30, 3.9.2.32, 3.9.4.38, 3.9.4.41	The land required to facilitate the construction of the permanent access road to the Onshore Substation was incorrectly stated to result in the permanent loss of approximately 600 m ² of woodland. It will instead result in the permanent loss of approximately 870 m ² of woodland.
Paragraph 3.9.2.45	The amount of hedgerow expected to be permanently lost as a result of the Mona Onshore Substation and permanent access road was stated to be both 550 m and 500 m at different points in this paragraph. The correct figure is 550 m.
Paragraph 3.9.2.105 bullet point 1	It is stated that 11 strategic hedgerows within the Mona Onshore Development Area will be enhanced, to improve connectivity to existing woodland blocks.

1.2.11 Volume 3, Chapter 6: Landscape and visual resources (APP-069)

Table 1.11: Volume 3, Chapter 6: Landscape and visual resources (APP-069) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Table 6.2	The text incorrectly states that 'during the construction phase no work will be undertaken during the hours of darkness'. This text should be deleted as the potential impacts of working during hours of darkness have been considered in the assessment.
Paragraph 6.10.5.23	This paragraph incorrectly reads '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.' It should instead state that '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 high. 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.'
Paragraph 6.11.2.8	The text incorrectly includes 'The value of the view is negligible and the susceptibility of the viewer is medium.' This text should be deleted.
Paragraph 6.11.2.9	The sensitivity of the receptor is incorrectly stated to be low to high. The sensitivity of the receptor is low to medium.
Paragraph 6.11.2.21	Equestrians, cyclists and walkers using the road network are incorrectly stated to have a medium susceptibility to the changes in medium value views. They have a medium to high susceptibility to the changes in medium value views. The text also incorrectly states that 'The value of the view is medium and the susceptibility of the viewer is high.' This text should be deleted.
Paragraph 6.11.2.22	The sensitivity of the receptor is incorrectly stated to be low to high. The sensitivity of the receptor is medium to high.
Paragraph 6.11.2.25	Equestrians, cyclists and walkers using the road network are incorrectly stated to have a medium susceptibility to the changes in medium value views. They have a medium to high susceptibility to the changes in medium value views. The text also incorrectly states that 'The value of the view is negligible and the susceptibility of the viewer is medium.' This text should be deleted.
Paragraph 6.11.2.26	The text incorrectly states that '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 magnitude during operations and maintenance is high in Year 1 winter reducing to medium at Year 15 summer. The sensitivity of the receptors is also stated to vary between low and medium, which is incorrect. The sensitivity of receptors varies between medium and high.
Paragraph 6.11.2.58	The sensitivities of equestrians, cyclists and walkers using the road network were incorrectly grouped and defined as medium. The sensitivity of equestrians and cyclists is medium, and the sensitivity of walkers is medium to high.

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Document section	Description of errata
Paragraph 6.11.2.60	The sensitivity of the receptor was incorrectly stated to be low to medium. The sensitivity of the receptor varies from medium to high.
Paragraph 6.11.2.63	The sensitivities of equestrians, cyclists and walkers using the road network were incorrectly grouped and defined as medium. The sensitivity of equestrians and cyclists is medium, and the sensitivity of walkers is medium to high.
Paragraph 6.11.2.64	The magnitude is incorrectly stated to be low to medium. It should state that the magnitude is small. In addition, the sensitivity of the receptor was incorrectly stated to be high. The sensitivity of the receptor varies from medium to high.
Paragraph 6.11.2.72	The sensitivities of equestrians, cyclists and walkers using the road network were incorrectly grouped and defined as medium. The sensitivity of equestrians and cyclists is medium, and the sensitivity of walkers is high.
Paragraph 6.11.2.74	The magnitude is incorrectly stated to be low. It should state that the magnitude is small. In addition, the sensitivity of the receptor was incorrectly stated to be low to medium. The sensitivity of the receptor varies from medium to high.
Paragraph 6.11.2.77	The sensitivity of the receptor was incorrectly stated to be low to medium. The sensitivity of the receptor varies from medium to high.
Paragraph 6.11.2.78	The magnitude is incorrectly stated to be negligible. It should state that the magnitude is small.
Paragraph 6.11.2.292	The sensitivity of the receptor was incorrectly stated to be high. The sensitivity of the receptor varies from medium to high.

1.2.12 Volume 3, Chapter 7: Land use and recreation (APP-070)

Table 1.12: Volume 3, Chapter 7: Land use and recreation (APP-070) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Paragraph 7.8.6.4	There is an incorrect reference to the 'Wales significance'. This should instead read the 'Wales Coast Path significance'.

1.2.13 Volume 3, Chapter 8: Traffic and transport (APP-071)

Table 1.13: Volume 3, Chapter 8: Traffic and transport (APP-071) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Table 8.14	The table incorrectly includes 46/2019/0806 (Development of 0.75 ha of land for residential purposes). It should instead include 46/2021/0159 PF (Glascoed Road, St Asaph Business Park).

1.2.14 Volume 3, Chapter 9: Noise and vibration (APP-072)

Table 1.14: Volume 3, Chapter 9: Noise and vibration (APP-072) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Table 9.18	For Gwrych House, Sirior Bach and Dinorben Farm, the night SOAEL level is incorrectly stated as 45 dB The correct figure is 50 dB.

1.2.15 Volume 4, Chapter 1: Aviation and radar (APP-075)

Table 1.15: Volume 4, Chapter 1: Aviation and radar (APP-075) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Tables 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4	A cross-reference incorrectly states that the potential impacts of the Mona Offshore Wind Project during the construction, operations and maintenance, and decommissioning phases are considered in section 0. The potential impacts of the Mona Offshore Wind Project during the construction, operations and maintenance, and decommissioning phases are considered in section 1.4.

1.2.16 Volume 5, Annex 5.1: Cumulative effects screening matrix (APP-084)

Table 1.16: Volume 5, Annex 5.1: Cumulative effects screening matrix (APP-084) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Section 1.9	The screening for Commercial Fisheries for the Dublin Array Offshore Wind Farm is incorrectly listed as 'a' whereas it should be 'c'.

1.2.17 Volume 6, Annex 2.2: Water Framework Directive Coastal Waters Assessment (APP-088)

Table 1.17: Volume 6, Annex 2.2: Water Framework Directive Coastal Waters Assessment (APP-088) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Paragraph 1.4.1.1	The text incorrectly 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.

1.2.18 Volume 6, Annex 7.1: Navigation Risk Assessment (APP-098)

Table 1.18: Volume 6, Annex 7.1: Navigation Risk Assessment (APP-098) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Paragraph 1.5.4.1	The local coastguard base for the region was incorrectly named as Holyhead Coastguard Operations Centre. The correct name is Holyhead Maritime Rescue Coordination Centre.
Paragraph 1.8.2.4	The relevant paragraph reference of NPS EN-3 is incorrectly given as 2.6.161. The correct paragraph reference is 2.8.187.
Paragraph 1.9.3.6	The text incorrectly states that 'Hazards are then defined as either Broadly Acceptable, with existing mitigation, or Unacceptable'. It should state that Hazards are then defined as either Broadly Acceptable, Tolerable if ALARP, or Unacceptable.
Paragraph 7.2.1.1.4 of Appendix E	The relevant paragraph reference of NPS EN-3 is incorrectly given as 2.6.161. The correct paragraph reference is 2.8.187.

1.2.19 Volume 6, Annex 8.4: Seascape, landscape and visual resources impact assessment methodology (APP-104)

Table 1.19: Volume 6, Annex 8.4: Seascape, landscape and visual resources impact assessment methodology (APP-104) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Table 1.2	The definition for very high sensitivity should, in addition to internationally designated landscapes, also include important views from nationally designated landscapes. The definition for high sensitivity should, in addition to nationally designated landscape, also include important views from regionally designated landscapes.
Table 1.3	The text reads 'Sensitivity of receptor (value)'. It should simply read 'value'.
Table 1.3	The text reads 'Sensitivity of receptor (value): community, regional, national, international'. It should read 'Value: negligible, low, medium, high and very high'.
Table 1.3	The text reads 'Value: Negligible'. It should read 'Value: Negligible – Negligible, Negligible, Negligible, Low, Low'.
Paragraph A.1.1.1.2	The maximum blade tip height of the Mona Offshore Wind Project above LAT is incorrectly stated to be 324 m. The correct figure is 364 m.

1.2.20 Volume 7, Annex 2.1: Flood consequences assessment (APP-117)

Table 1.20: Volume 7, Annex 2.1: Flood consequences assessment (APP-117) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Paragraph 3.1.4.1	The expected operational life of the Mona Onshore Substation is incorrectly stated to be 35 years. The correct figure is 50 years.

1.2.21 Volume 7, Annex 2.4: Water Framework Directive surface and groundwater assessment (APP-120)

Table 1.21: Volume 7, Annex 2.4: Water Framework Directive surface and groundwater assessment (APP-120) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Table 1.15	An incorrect category was used to describe the status of the North Wales coastal body. The measures adopted as part of the Mona Offshore Wind Project assessment element for North Wales coastal water body should be moderate status, rather than the good status reported in 2021 classification. This is because the measures adopted as part of the Mona Offshore Wind Project should be 'not in place - not yet identified' instead of 'Not applicable - not required in this water body'.

1.2.22 Volume 7, Annex 5.1: Desk based assessment (APP-143)

Table 1.22: Volume 7, Annex 5.1: Desk based assessment (APP-143) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Paragraph 1.4.3.26	The following text is incorrectly included and should be deleted: 'Furthermore, a Tree and Hedgerow Retention Plan (Document Reference B13) has been developed, and will be submitted with the DCO, that shows important hedgerows.' The preceding paragraph refers to historically important hedgerows and implies that their location is shown on the Tree and Hedgerow Plan. Only ecologically important hedgerows are shown on the Tree and Hedgerow Plan and therefore, paragraph 1.4.3.26 has been deleted to avoid confusion.

1.2.23 Volume 7, Annex 9.2: Construction noise and vibration technical report (APP-179)

Table 1.23: Volume 7, Annex 9.2: Construction noise and vibration technical report (APP-179) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Paragraph 1.5.1.7	<p>The following text should be deleted: ‘An acoustic barrier of height 2.4 m high barrier has been included in the model around the perimeter of the construction compounds. This barrier is likely to take the form of a spoil bund constructed of the material removed during construction.’</p> <p>The text should be removed to be consistent with the 3D acoustic model and the construction noise impacts .</p>

1.2.24 Volume 8, Annex 1.1: Aviation and radar technical report (APP-181)

Table 1.24: Volume 8, Annex 1.1: Aviation and radar technical report (APP-181) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
A.3.3.1.1	A cross-reference incorrectly states that the infrastructure assessed is shown in 'Error! Reference source not found.' The infrastructure assessed is shown in Table A. 1.

1.2.25 Mitigation and monitoring schedule (APP-196)

Table 1.25: Mitigation and monitoring schedule (APP-196) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Reference number	The Underwater Sound Management Strategy (UWSMS) is incorrectly referenced as J19. The UWSMS is J16 of the Mona application documents.

1.2.26 Outline Offshore Written Scheme of Investigation and Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (APP-204)

Table 1.26: Outline Offshore Written Scheme of Investigation and Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (APP-204) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Table 1.7	<p>The extents of the following AEZs were incorrectly given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ID: Mona_0009 AEZ(m) was stated to have 50 extents – it should have instead been 100 extents • ID: Mona_0040 AEZ(m): was stated to have 25 extents – it should have instead been 50 extents • ID: Mona_0067 AEZ(m): was stated to have 50 extents – it should have instead been 25 extents • ID: Mona_0014 AEZ(m): was stated to have 25 extents – it should have instead been 50 extents • ID: Mona_0025 AEZ(m): was stated to have 50 extents – it should have instead been 25 extents • ID: Mona_0033 AEZ(m): was stated to have 25 extents – it should have instead been 50 extents • ID: Mona_0038 AEZ(m): was stated to have 50 extents – it should have instead been 25 extents • ID: Mona_0044 AEZ(m): was stated to have 25 extents – it should have instead been 50 extents • ID: Mona_0065 AEZ(m): was stated to have 50 extents – it should have instead been 25 extents

1.2.27 HRA Stage 2 Information to Support an Appropriate Assessment Part Three: Special Protection Areas and Ramsar sites Assessments (REP2-010)

Table 1.27: HRA Stage 2 Information to Support an Appropriate Assessment Part Three: Special Protection Areas and Ramsar sites Assessments (REP2-010) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Table 1.19	The annual impact on razorbill from Skomer, Skokholm and the Seas off Pembrokeshire/ Sgomer, Sgogwm a Moroedd Penfro SPA is incorrectly stated to be 2.91. The correct figure is 0.4.

1.2.28 HRA Stage 1 Screening Report (REP2-012)

Table 1.28: HRA Stage 1 Screening Report (REP2-012) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Part C of paragraph 1.4.6.49	It is stated that the estimated mortality of lesser black-backed gull of 0.1 to 0.2 birds is for the combined impact of collision plus displacement. The estimated mortality of lesser black-backed gull of 0.1 to 0.2 birds is for collision impacts only.
Part C of paragraph 1.4.6.49	It is incorrectly stated that the estimated mortality of black-legged kittiwake is 0 birds for the combined impact of collisions plus displacement. The correct figure is 0.1.

1.2.29 Volume 6, Annex 5.5: Offshore Ornithology Apportioning Technical Report (REP2-022)

Table 1.29: Volume 6, Annex 5.5: Offshore Ornithology Apportioning Technical Report (REP2-022) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Table 1.3	An incorrect mortality rate was applied to calculation of adult baseline mortality. The baseline mortality should be 218.25 birds for Pen-y-Gogarth/Great Orme SSSI, and the baseline mortality should be 79.17 birds for Creigiau Rhiwledyn/Little Ormes Head SSSI.

1.2.30 Volume 6, Annex 5.6: Offshore Ornithology Population Viability Analysis Technical Report (REP2-024)

Table 1.30: Volume 6, Annex 5.6: Offshore Ornithology Population Viability Analysis Technical Report (REP2-024) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Appendix A A.1.1 Great Ormes Head Model A.1.2 Little Ormes Head Model	An incorrect productivity rate of 0.532 was used for the Great Ormes Head PVA and the Little Ormes Head PVA. The correct productivity rate has been used in the Offshore Ornithology Assessment of Pen y Gogarth / Great Orme's Head SSSI (S_D1_25 F02).