6th December 2024

Mona Offshore Wind Ltd

Via email only: <u>monaoffshorewindproject@planninginspectorate.gov.uk</u>

Dear Sirs

MONA OFF SHORE WIND FARM G LLOYD EVANS & SONS, BRYN HEN, GROESFFORDD MARLI, LL22 9ED RESPONSES TO THE EXAMINING AUTHORITY'S WRITTEN QUESTIONS AND REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION (ExQ2 – Q2.6.17) REGISTRATION ID: 20048549

Para 1.0	"Can you provide an update on any negotiations with the Applicant since CAH1 (EV-008)" ?
Para 1.1	It is confirmed that there have been no subsequent meaningful negotiations since CAH1 (EV-008). Our Clients' and the Projects position remains as previously. We have recently requested a meeting with the Applicant, who confirmed that their position is 'non negotiable', which we find disappointing.
	It is accepted that the opportunity for negotiations has been limited by the absence of one of the Partners to the farming business being out of the country.
Para 2.0	"What agreement or assurances would the Applicant need to provide to your clients in order to enable them to withdraw their objection to the Proposed Development?"
Para 2.1	The project has committed to drill a minimum of 650m out of the 950m length in the location shown on the attached plan and marked "area of land subject to trenchless commitments". (Plan No. 22000496-PLN-HOT-4609.1.A.").
Para 2.2	Our clients' require, that of the 650m drill commitment, approximately 450m will be drilled in a single length from the eastern boundary in a north westerly direction throughout the "area of trenchless commitments (" Plan No. 22000496-PLN-HOT-4609.1.A"). For clarity, this has been marked on the plan between points A and B. These fields are critical to the successful operation and viability of the farm.
	The 'drilling option' would result in a reduction of the temporary loss of land available to my clients and, consequently, a reduction in the number of the cows they will be forced to sell. The result would be a fall in the predicted annual loss of Gross Margin and this would help to mitigate the overall impact on the farm business.

	Our clients are willing to maintain some flexibility over the remaining 200m length to be drilled and to work with the applicants, and we believe we could reach a voluntary agreement.
Para 2.3	A more detailed and focussed specification as to <u>all</u> accommodation works and other agreed mitigation works which will reduce land take and disruption to the farming business in order to mitigate the impact of the scheme upon the Farm Business.
Para 3	<i>"Is there anything that you want to add to your existing submissions in respect of the Applicants response to J. Bradburne Price & Co on behalf of G. Lloyd Evans & Sons ExQ1 responses (REP4-070)" ?</i>
Para 3.1	The clients' submissions remain and have not been satisfactorily answered by the applicants' response.
Para 3.1.1	The clients' assessment of the impact of the scheme does not concur with the Applicants that it is a "low" assessment. Our clients also do not agree with the Applicants conclusion that it does not compromise the overall viability of the holding. There is no evidence as to how this is determined other than reliance on the overriding vagueness of the criteria in Table 7.18 of the Environmental Statement Volume 3 – Chapter 7:- land use and recreation.
Para 3.1.2	The clients have reservations as to the Applicants' grasp and understanding of their business and the day-to-day farming operations undertaken. This is coupled with a lack of understanding of the clients' comments in Para 1.1.2 of J Bradburne Price's representations and that the individual undertakings provided in the Code of Construction Practice do not collectively alleviate the concerns.
Para 3.1.3	The clients do not accept that the "conversations" over attempts to mitigate the scheme are at an advanced stage. It is accepted that significant progress has been made, but agreement on the final details is still outstanding. And this is the crucial element of our clients' concern.
Para 3.1.4	It is unreasonable to expect the clients to withdraw their limited statutory rights to object to such a major medium term disruption to their Farming Business based only upon vague and unspecified assurances.

MONA OFF SHORE WIND FARM MR ROBERTS SARN RUG, ST GEORGE, ABERGELE, LL22 9RR RESPONSES TO THE EXAMINING AUTHORITY'S WRITTEN QUESTIONS AND REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION (ExQ2 – Q2.6.18) REGISTRATION ID: 20048550

Para 1.0	"Can you provide an update on any negotiations with the Applicant since the Accompanied Site Inspection on 15 October 2024 when clarification was provided on the access it is seeking over your client's land?" "What agreement or assurances would the Applicant need to provide to your client to enable him to withdraw his objection to the Proposed Development?"
Para 1.1	The proposed compound access was not meant to be an objection, rather a concern, and we are pleased that the proposed compound access will not be shared with the main farm access. Please consider the objection withdrawn.

Yours faithfully

Susie Griffiths MProf For and on behalf of J Bradburne Price & Co

